A meeting of the Court was held on Monday 12 December 2011.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Mr M Arnott, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr R Burns, Mr D Cathcart, Mr J Elliot, Mr IA Kennedy (President, Students’ Association), Dr J Lowe, Dr LI McLellan, Dr H Marriage, Ms CA Potter, Dr AD Reeves, Mr KA Richmond, Dr AM Roger, Mr K Swinley, Professor J Taylor, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Information Services, Director of Human Resources, Director of Strategic Planning, Director of External Relations, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Mr R Isles and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Professor RJ Abboud, Mr M Kendrick, Lord Provost Dr J Letford, Professor GJ Mires.

20. **MINUTES**

The Court decided: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 24 October 2011.

21. **MATTERS ARISING**

(1) **Senior Appointments (Minute 3(1))**

(a) **Director of Finance**

The Court welcomed Mr Andrew Hewett to his first meeting as Director of Finance. The Court also extended its thanks to Ms Catriona Blake for her hard work over recent months in her role as Acting Director Finance.

(b) **Dean of Humanities**

The Principal informed the Court of the appointment of Professor David Finkelstein as Dean of Humanities.

(c) **Vice-Principal & Head of College of Art, Science & Engineering**

The Principal reported that the interview process for the Vice-Principal & Head of College of Art, Science & Engineering had concluded unsuccessfully, with no appointment being made. The Principal confirmed that a selection process would begin again in the New Year; and the Chairman confirmed that consideration was being given to how best to ensure a successful outcome. The Principal set out proposals for interim arrangements, which would see Professor Malcolm Horner (Civil Engineering) taking on the role of interim Vice-
Principal & Head of College of Art, Science & Engineering for a fixed term of 6 months commencing on 1 January 2012.

The Court decided: to approve the interim appointment of Professor Horner.

(d) Vice-Principal & Head of College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing

The Principal reported that the sole-candidate interview for the post of Vice-Principal & Head of the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing, as approved by Court at its meeting on 24 October 2011, would be held on 14 December 2011.

(e) Appointments to the role of Deputy Principal

The Court received a paper from the Director of Human Resources which reviewed the history and current use of Deputy Principal appointments within the University and across the Scottish higher education sector. It was proposed that the appointment of Deputy Principals remain formally delegated to the Principal, and that such appointments would be made, as required, to provide leadership to key pan-University projects or portfolios. The appointment would be for a flexible fixed period of time according to the portfolio or project concerned, up to a maximum of 4 years (with the possibility of renewal for a further period), with clear lines of reporting and accountability. Appointments would normally be made from among the Deans of Schools, which would present a useful development opportunity. It was proposed that there should normally be no more than 4 individuals appointed as Deputy Principal at any one time.

The Principal confirmed his intention to identify a Vice-Principal to act as his deputy, once all appointments had been made at this level.

The Court decided: to approve the proposals.

(2) Discussions with the Scottish Funding Council (Minute 6)

The Principal reported on discussions with the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and confirmed that the proposed merger with the University of Abertay Dundee was no longer being pursued by the SFC. The Principal outlined that ongoing media interest in this subject was likely, particularly in light of a recent freedom of information request to the SFC. The Principal gave an outline of further discussions with the SFC in which both Universities had been encouraged to consider opportunities for enhanced collaboration with each other and with other potential partners in the Tayside region. The Principal detailed the potential advantages of further widening the scope of collaboration to include other institutions such as the University of Aberdeen, which were more similar in nature and reputation to Dundee University. Discussions with colleagues at Aberdeen had been held, and a range of areas for further exploration were agreed. There was also scope for enhanced collaboration with, for example, the James Hutton Institute.
(3) Statute 16 – Grievance Procedures (Minute 16(2))

The Court decided: to note that the Committee established to hear a grievance from an unnamed staff member had now met and rejected the grievance.

(4) Court Retreat 2012 (Minute 17)

The Court decided: to note that the rescheduled date of the 2012 Court Retreat would be Monday 3 September 2012.

22. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

The Chairman reported that he and the University Secretary had attended a Universities Scotland meeting looking at the nature and impact of the ongoing Review of HE Governance. The Chairman detailed that concerns regarding the potential for a prescriptive outcome to the review had been raised, but that he had been encouraged by the open discussions and it seemed likely that the current governance policies and practices at the University would be seen positively by the review. The Chairman confirmed that the review’s report was expected to be published before the end of the year, and that Scottish University Chairs would be collaborating on a sector response to that paper.

The Chairman had also attended a Holyrood Conference event on Higher Education in Scotland. Amongst other things, delegates raised potential changes to research funding models as a cause for concern for the future.

The Chairman had continued visits to academic Schools, including to the Schools of Psychology and Computing. During the visit to the latter he listened to concerns regarding the proposed merger with the School of Engineering, Physics and Mathematics. The chair noted that an improved understanding of both the direct and indirect operating costs of Schools would aid future discussions.

The Chairman had also represented the University at a Times Higher Education Awards (THE) dinner where the University had been one of 6 Universities shortlisted in the category of ‘University of the Year’. The award was in fact won by the University of Sheffield, but the Chairman noted that the University of Dundee might benefit from submitting in a number of other categories in future.

23. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Court received a report from the Principal (Appendix 1). Since the financial statements would be covered in more detail elsewhere on the agenda, he focussed on the other elements of his report. A better than expected settlement from the Scottish Government for the sector had reduced financial concerns to an extent, he said, but the impact of the introduction of fees in Scotland for rest of UK students remained difficult to assess. The Principal confirmed that an indicative SFC grant letter for 2012/13 was expected to be published on 21 December 2011 and noted that Universities Scotland had made a request to the SFC for funding plans to be made on a 3-year cycle – this would enhance planning capability and introduce stability to the
Scottish HE sector. A response was expected by March 2012, but the request had been positively received.

The Principal highlighted progress with regards to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) preparations, reporting that the mid-term review was nearing completion. This would enable a provisional assessment by Schools of the likelihood of inclusion of individual academics. This early indication of submission would be used to focus staff time to support the best possible outcomes. The Principal reported that Senate was in the process of resolving the selection process and agreeing a suitable grade point average for research outputs (likely to be in the range 2.7-2.8, based on the scale 1*-4*). He informed Court that research activity rated below 3* would be unlikely to be funded, making preparations to maximise grade averages crucial to achieving a good outcome. He also confirmed that a REF Code of Practice for the selection of staff was being developed by the Director of Human Resources and her team to support the final selection process.

The Principal summarised his visit to India as being a positive experience which had given an opportunity to showcase the University of Dundee and enhance existing relationships.

The Principal highlighted the similarities between the focus on collaboration in the Scottish Government’s consultation on post-16 education ‘Putting Learners at the Centre’ and the existing University strategy in this area. However he expressed strong concerns over plans for the SFC to legislate for a single central knowledge exchange office, noting that devolved interactions were preferable and generally more successful. A more detailed response to this proposal was being developed by the Universities Scotland Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee, of which the Principal was Chair.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to note the Chairman’s request for discussion on the University’s Internationalisation Strategy, with a paper to come forward to a future meeting of Court;

(ii) to note concerns regarding the potential for legislation leading to a centralised knowledge exchange office; and

(iii) to note the importance of securing appropriate recognition for excellence in learning and teaching, and in particular to encourage the development of criteria for promotion for staff engaged primarily in teaching and learning.

24. **FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 21 November 2011 (Appendix 2). The Chairman drew the Court’s attention to two items: the solid performance of Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA); and the decision to provide an additional loan of £100,000 to Dundee University Press Ltd.

**The Court decided:** to approve the report.
25. AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 28 November 2011 (Appendix 3). The Committee had considered the financial statements for 2010/11 as well as those for the University’s subsidiary companies. The Committee had also compiled its annual report for 2010/11. The Convener was pleased to report that in a private meeting with the internal and external auditors, confidence had been expressed in both the finance team and the University management.

The Court decided:  
(i) to approve the Committee’s annual report for onward submission to the Scottish Funding Council; and  
(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.

26. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31 JULY 2011

(1) Financial Statements

The Court received the reports and financial statements for 2010/11 http://www.dundee.ac.uk/finance/doc/financial_statements.htm.

An improving operating result and strong cash position was noted, putting the University in a solid position as it entered a difficult year with significant funding uncertainties.

The operating surplus for 2010/11 was £1m, but adding back voluntary severance costs and endowment adjustments, the underlying operating result was around £5.6m, representing 2.4% of income and an increase on the result for 2009/10 of £1.5m. Income for the year had increased by 5%, with tuition fees rising more slowly, but with research income outperforming targets with a rise of 13% mainly from research council awards. Expenditure rose by 4%, with staff costs broadly flat while other operating costs rose by 7%. The overall surplus for the year was £2.5m.

The University’s cash position was described as healthy, chiefly as a result of a positive net working capital movement of £7.4m. The net cash position was £29m, up from £16.6m at the previous year end. Future commitments represented by net liabilities had increased to £46m, thus requiring efficient cash management going forward.

The Court decided: as recommended by the Finance & Policy and Audit Committees, to approve the Reports & Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2011.

(2) Letter of Representation

The Court decided: to approve the letter of representation for signature by the Chairman and Principal.
27. REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 22 November 2011 (Appendix 4). The Convener brought to the Court’s attention a proposed review for the remit and operation of the Remuneration Committee, and in discussion it was acknowledged that the review should lead to further transparency and the enhanced communication of the criteria for pay awards for senior staff. It was also noted that a second meeting would occur in spring 2012 to hear proposals from the College of Life Sciences. The potential for the REF to have an impact on future remuneration was raised by the Convener.

[The Principal and senior officers (except the University Secretary and the Clerk to Court) left the meeting at this point.]

The Court discussed the issue of the Principal’s remuneration. Court members acknowledged that, in coming to a decision about the appropriate level of remuneration for the Principal, the Committee had fully and thoroughly considered a range of relevant information relating to performance and sector-wide comparative data and had done so in the context of the pay environment in the public sector and how any enhancement might be perceived internally and externally. Nevertheless, serious concern was raised by some members that the Committee had decided to enhance the Principal’s remuneration at a time of austerity.

The Court decided: (i) to note the report and the decisions contained within it; and

(ii) to approve the planned review of the Remuneration Committee’s remit.

28. BURSARIES & SCHOLARSHIPS

The Court received a paper setting out the proposed strategy for awarding bursaries to students from the rest of the UK (RUK) and academic scholarships to students from Scotland as well as the rest of the UK. A rationale for the adoption of the proposed strategy as well as financial modelling projecting the impact of RUK fees and the bursaries and scholarships programme was presented, along with an appendix showing details of comparative schemes at other Scottish institutions.

Regarding bursaries, a two-level approach was proposed, with a bursary of £3,000 available to students with a family income of less than £20,000 and a £1,000 bursary available to students with a family income of less that £42,600. The two band approach was seen to be simple, mirroring thresholds for other types of support and offering a meaningful level of support to a significant number of students.

The proposed scholarship programme would see academic schools offering a flexible range of scholarships of between £1,000 and £3,000 designed to attract high-achieving applicants and to improve conversion of applications to enrolments.

The Court decided: (i) to approve the proposals, subject to the review of criteria relating to eligibility for applicants through clearing and adult returners;
(ii) to request a report at a future meeting setting out the number of applications to each academic school; and

(iii) to ask officers to confirm the legal position on limiting access to the scheme to Scottish and RUK students to the exclusion of other EU students.

29. **LEAGUE TABLE PERFORMANCE**

The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs presented a paper which provided analysis of the University’s performance in a range of world and UK rankings. The variation of ranking in these different league tables was reviewed by the Director. It was highlighted that methodological changes to the THE rankings had affected the University’s position in that league table; further analysis of the underlying data suggested that the University’s own performance was relatively unchanged, but that other universities were improving faster. An examination of individual subject rankings highlighted the range in quality across the disciplines in the University – reinforcing the importance of the strategic review approach towards excellence, focus and impact. Information on individual component ranks revealed specific areas which adversely affected the overall ranking, for instance facilities spend and completion rates.

The Court decided: (i) to note that the excellence, focus, impact agenda and the ongoing work to address teaching and learning excellence should in itself increase the University’s standing in league tables;

(ii) to note the impact of employability on rankings and request that Professor Christopher Whatley and/or Mr Graham Nicholson update the Committee on the activities of the Employability Committee at a future Court meeting; and

(iii) otherwise, to note the paper.

30. **STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK – TIME SERIES REPORT**

The Director of Strategic Planning presented a report focusing on the performance over time of the University in meeting allocated quantitative targets specified in the Strategic Framework. The report used a traffic light system to highlight areas where progress was on or ahead of target and those areas where remedial action was required. Improvements could be seen in the level of entry qualifications, whereas action was still necessary to improve progression rates. Unregulated income from taught postgraduate and research activity continued to be strong, matching the increased mid-term targets. For a third year in a row the efficient consumption of energy remained an area for further attention. In contrast to previous reports, progress on embedding staff performance management was disappointing, although this was partly due to the roll-out of Objective-Setting & Review (OSAR) to all staff groups rather than just the professoriate and senior officers.
In discussion, Court members noted that the planned reduction in estate size would improve energy efficiency, but that potential investment in energy saving initiatives might be required before efficiency targets could be met. The Court encouraged the appropriate embedding of responsibility for achieving Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) within the system of OSAR – this would help to promote ownership of KPIs by Schools, Colleges, Directorates and individuals. The Director of Human Resources reported that this had also been highlighted by the internal auditors. It was suggested that future reports of this nature could be accompanied by action plans to improve those areas where progress was slow and that consideration be given to the frequency of these reports.

Court decided: to note the report

31. **ELECTION TO COURT FROM ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

The Court decided: (i) to congratulate Dr McLellan on her appointment as Director of Quality Assurance with effect from 1 January 2012, and, noting that she had thereby decided to resign from the Court, to extend its thanks to Dr McLellan for her hard work and dedication to the Court and the Finance & Policy Committee; and

(ii) to note the election of Professor Sue Black (College of Life Sciences) to serve on Court for the remainder of Dr McLellan’s period of office to 31 July 2013, in accordance with the provisions of Ordinance 18.

32. **UNIVERSITY STRATEGY TO 2018**

The Court received a report detailing progress on the development of the University Strategy to 2018. Discussion focused on linking the development of strategy to the improvement of performance against Key Performance Indicators. Members suggested that the strategy needed to be clear about those areas which would no longer be priorities.

Court decided: to note the report.

33. **RESEARCH GOVERNANCE & POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Court decided: to note the report, and await further reports on an annual basis.

34. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS**

The Court received a report from the meeting of Senate on 30 November 2011 (Appendix 5).

The Court decided: to note the report
35. **HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Human Resources Committee on 22 November 2011 (Appendix 6).

**The Court decided:**

(i) as noted above at Minute 23, to note the importance of developing promotion criteria based on teaching and learning, and request that the Human Resources Committee continue to report on this aspect;

(ii) to ask that the Convener of Learning & Teaching Committee be invited to Court to give a presentation on these criteria once developed; and

(iii) to otherwise approve the report.

36. **ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Academic Council on 14 November 2011.

**The Court decided:** for its part, to note the report.

37. **STAFF**

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

- **Mark Whitehorn** Chair of Analytics 5 August 2011
- **Divya Jindal-Snape** Personal Chair of Education, Inclusion and Life Transitions 26 September 2011
- **Andrew Hewett** Director of Finance 5 December 2011
- **David Finkelstein** Dean of Humanities 1 February 2012

38. **DR NEALE LAKER**

The Chair noted that Dr Neale Laker had been appointed as Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs and would be stepping down from the role of Clerk to Court, although he would continue to attend Court meetings. The Chair recorded the Court’s thanks to Dr Laker for his work and support as Clerk to Court.
APPENDIX 1

PRINCIPAL’S REPORT
(Minute 23)

Finance

Later in the meeting we will consider the financial statements, which have already been discussed at the Finance & Policy and Audit Committee meetings earlier in November. At the Audit Committee, members received a positive report from the external auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers, on the quality of our internal controls as well as of the records provided to the auditors.

The bottom-line position for the year ended 31 July 2011 is a surplus of £2.5m, £0.8m lower than in 2009/10, but this year’s accounts show £3.8m of costs under the voluntary severance scheme. Leaving these out of the equation, along with endowment adjustments, gives us an underlying surplus for the year of £5.6m, representing 2.4% of turnover and £1.5m better than 2009/10.

This is a good result for the University. It puts us in a strong position to deal with the funding uncertainties that are inevitably coming our way. The better than expected settlement from the Scottish Government for the sector will reduce these difficulties to a certain extent, but the impact, for instance, of increased fees in England and of the introduction of fees in Scotland for students from the rest of the UK (RUK) remains difficult to assess fully and with any accuracy. Later on the agenda, we will consider draft proposals for a bursaries and scholarships programme, which it is hoped will mitigate some of the effects of the introduction of fees on RUK student recruitment, but of course the programme comes with its own cost, too.

As last year, we expect to receive an indicative grant letter from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) before we break for Christmas and the New Year. Of course, this will itself be a ‘best guess’ on the part of the SFC (albeit very well informed!), but it seems pretty much certain that research activity rated below 3* will be unfunded in the future, and that for teaching funding the units of resource will be returned to the higher 2010-11 levels.

I will of course let Court members know the broad details once we receive word from the SFC.

Research Excellence Framework

The census date for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) assessment exercise may still be two years away, but preparations within the University are in full swing. The remaining two years will see submissions developed and finalised and staff formally selected for inclusion on the basis of their proven research performance. Given that, as stated above, funding councils will no longer be funding 1* and 2* research, we need to ensure that we submit only the highest quality research, or research from early career academics who are proving their potential to produce work of the highest quality.

At the moment, a mid-term review is nearing completion, led by the co-ordinators of individual units of assessment (ie the disciplines/subjects being submitted in the REF). This work, amongst other things, will make provisional assessments of the likelihood of inclusion in the REF of individual academics. Some staff already have the requisite publications at the right level, others may still be able to do so before the census date, but there will be some who will be unlikely to achieve the quality threshold required for submission. It is important to have an early indication now of the likely size of submissions in each of the units of assessment. This will help some areas to plan the use of staff time to support the best possible outcome for their discipline; it will also give Heads of College and the Senior Management Team an idea of any areas where further investment at this stage could make a difference to our submission. Of course, final decisions on staff selection will not be made for some time yet, and indeed before we are in a position to do so, the University must develop and agree a Code of Practice for the selection of staff. This is now fully underway and being led by the Director of Human Resources, and it is hoped that we will be able to submit our Code to the national REF team in April 2012.

Prior to the mid-term review, most disciplines took part in external research reviews, which included input from academics from other HEIs and from external stakeholder groups where appropriate, and which assessed the quality, breadth and range of research activity in individual disciplines. All of this information, from the mid-term reviews, the external research reviews and also from draft impact statements that are being developed, will help us to make the strongest submission that we possibly can.
India

Earlier in November I made a useful trip to India, visiting Bangalore and New Delhi. In Bangalore I signed Memoranda of Understanding with the RV College of Engineering and the Alliance University. In New Delhi the trip centred around the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) Higher Education Summit. Under the auspices of Scottish Development International, I was part of a delegation including a number of other Scottish Principals along with the Cabinet Secretary for Education & Lifelong Learning, Mike Russell, to show Scotland’s commitment to building and maintaining closer links with the Indian University Sector. This is particularly important because of the Indian Government’s stated aim of increasing higher education participation rates to 30% by 2020. If this is to be realised it will require the establishment of around 1000 universities and colleges to accommodate the 40 million students attending at any one time. These are staggering statistics. Dundee already has a series of high quality collaborations with institutions across India, and the delegation’s presence at the summit will hopefully lead to yet more.

While in India, I also managed to speak to an alumni event as well as presenting my thoughts on growing a research culture, and attached as annex a is a transcript of the latter, which members might find interesting.

Putting Learners at the Centre

At the last meeting, members received a paper introducing the Scottish Government’s consultation exercise on post-16 education, entitled ‘Putting Learners at the Centre’. Work is ongoing to draw together the University’s response (and the draft will be made available to Court members once complete), but since Universities Scotland is developing a sectoral response, of which we are broadly supportive, it seems appropriate to focus on those areas of the consultation that are most apposite to the University of Dundee and our mission. These include: government thinking on merger and collaboration; closer articulation with further education to enable greater flexibility of the individual learner journey; thoughts on the regionalisation of provision; concentration on research excellence and improving knowledge exchange; and university governance.

One area that I am currently particularly exercised with, through my chairmanship of the Universities Scotland Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee, is the proposal to establish a single knowledge exchange office for Scotland. Knowledge exchange is a central part of any institution’s innovation strategy, and relies heavily on the wide-ranging relationships that build up between academics and the users of research, driving innovation in business as well as social and cultural development. To be effective, business development activity of this kind has to have a clear understanding of the institution’s research capability and capacity, and it must be able to assess the value and potential of the knowledge creation process. Potential partners in innovation must have close links to the researchers to enable institutions to act on opportunities as they present themselves. There is a synergy here in the relationship which feeds the innovative flow of creative ideas, and which risks being lost if these relationships are ‘managed’ by a separate and independent centre, at one remove from the universities. There is an even greater ‘cultural’ risk that universities cease to regard knowledge exchange as being part of their business at all. Finally, there are also concerns for the treatment of intellectual property. This includes an institution’s ability to profit from the discoveries and innovations of their own research but more importantly the role of IP in driving productive partnerships with users of research.

And finally ...

can I just wish all members of Court a very merry Christmas and all the very best for 2012!

Professor Pete Downes
Principal & Vice Chancellor
Before commencing my talk I would first like to respond to the chairman’s suggestion that the most significant research breakthroughs are often brought about by individuals unsupported by grand strategy or by eye-wateringly expensive infrastructure. At the University of Dundee, which I am fortunate to lead as its Vice Chancellor, we have developed one of the world’s leading centres for biomedical research. In terms of citations and other markers of excellence our scientists and clinicians have enviable reputations, but more significantly, our work has impact on society in terms of clinical outcomes and the development of a biotechnology cluster in Dundee that now accounts for 16% of the area’s economy. I am therefore asked frequently, by politicians, journalists and fellow academics, ‘what is Dundee’s secret; what was the strategy for success?’ Well I can reveal now that our secret strategy was that we had no strategy! Developing research excellence was the result of grasping opportunities and selectively supporting emerging strengths. Retrospectively, it has the appearance of a strategy that worked, but don’t be fooled. What I believe does matter, however, is culture. The culture in Dundee that nurtured its success and continues to do so has the following elements:

1. Only recruit faculty whom we believe are better than we are.
2. Collaborate to compete.
3. Respect and value the contributions of all staff including support staff.
4. Celebrate one another’s success stories.

I now want to contribute to the topic of ‘developing a research culture’ under four headings. Why we do research; the role of universities in innovation; capturing the impact of investment in research; implications for research-led teaching.

Why we do research

By this I mean of course why should universities do research? The first reason is that we have a responsibility to create a legacy of new knowledge for future generations. The technological, social and cultural developments from which we benefit today are the result of advances in knowledge made by previous generations. We stand on the shoulders of giants. Abdicating this responsibility would be the academic equivalent of failing to provide for our children! The second reason is that humankind is curious by nature. Creating new knowledge and understanding is one of our greatest cultural achievements and is intrinsically rewarding, motivating and inspiring. The third reason, to quote Einstein, is that we are curious for a reason. We know, both instinctively and from experience, that knowledge and understanding of the most fundamental and esoteric kinds, can eventually be put to good use. That universities should bear the major responsibility for driving curiosity-led research relates, in my view to the fundamental concepts of independence and academic freedom as well as to its role in inspiring students.

The role of universities in innovation

Innovation concerns the harnessing of new knowledge and understanding to the needs of society and it includes not just economic, but also social and cultural needs.

Traditionally the role of universities has been to expand knowledge, to publish the findings of research and to allow others to exploit it as they will. Such a passive approach has been justified by the unpredictable nature of when and how knowledge can best be exploited. I do not accept this justification not least because it is tolerant of an approach that is demonstrably inefficient. Universities should play active roles in ensuring the efficient exchange of knowledge with the many users of the outputs of research. They should do this not by shifting from curiosity-driven research to applied research, but by developing partnerships with industry and those who will drive cultural and social developments.

There are two key lessons that emerge from the above two headings. Firstly, universities must not be persuaded to stop doing curiosity-driven research. Secondly, they must shift from a traditionally passive mode of knowledge dissemination to one that is more actively engaged with the users of research.

Capturing the impact of innovation locally

Governments which invest heavily in the research capacity of universities nowadays increasingly expect a return on their investment not least because the people who elect them want that too. This is why the traditional, passive approach to knowledge dissemination on its own is inadequate. Publications in high quality journals and the resulting citations for that work enhance the reputations of individuals and the institutions which employ them,
but the information is more or less instantly available throughout the world. Any applications that arise are therefore not, in any obvious way, linked to the city or nation which made the initial investment. The partnership approach introduced earlier tends to create clusters of intensive activity where new knowledge is much more likely to be exploited by users of research within the cluster than elsewhere in the world. As a bonus, the users of research, in partnership with universities, will begin to frame research questions designed to address problems they face in their businesses driving a self-supporting, mutually beneficial virtuous circle.

This brings me back to the concepts of knowledge exchange and intellectual property (IP) which are central to my University’s engagement with innovation. IP can be broadly divided into two types. Tangible IP takes the form of patents, copyright and direct university-owned spin-outs. Intangible IP is best represented by the distinctive, high quality expertise and reputations of the faculty and the research units in which they work. The latter is frequently underestimated in terms of its significance and power to drive the key partnerships that I have referred to frequently in this presentation. An example of the latter in Dundee would be the Division of Signal Transduction Therapy, based around world class expertise in cell signalling research, which has brought inward investment in excess of £50 million from several of the world’s leading pharmaceutical companies and spawned two new companies in the city.

**Implications for research-led teaching**

As research, especially in technology-driven disciplines, becomes more and more intensively competitive, we will need new models to deliver research-led teaching. The old model of individual faculty doing research, teaching and shouldering their share of administration is out of date and can often lead to a culture of mediocrity in both teaching and research. Workload allocation will in the future increasingly recognise the distinctive contributions individual faculty can make and research-led teaching will be delivered by teams, not individuals. In turn academic leaders will need proactively to manage workload allocation, and differentiation of faculty roles.

But there is something else more profound than more efficient ways of working. There is a tendency for universities to be cloistered environments where academic achievement is held above all other forms of distinction. Yet we want our students to be highly employable and key participants in economic growth. Ensuring universities are highly networked organisations fully engaged with multiple partners is the best way I know to maintain the links not just between teaching and research, but between teaching, research and innovation. The type of engaged university that I have described therefore will not only produce research that has impact, but, even more importantly, employable, innovative graduates.
Senior Management Team Meetings (SMT)

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

The Senior Management Team has met every Wednesday (with the exception of Graduation Day on 16 November 2011). Since the last report to the Court, the Senior Management Team considered a number of issues, including the following:

- University Strategy to 2018;
- Strategic Framework to 2012 (Time Series Report)
- Possible School mergers;
- Preparations for the Research Excellence Framework (REF);
- RUK Bursaries and University Scholarships;
- Feedback from the Rector’s Q&A session;
- Senior Appointments;
- Updates from Distance Learning working groups;
- Discussions with the University of Abertay and the Scottish Funding Council;
- An Organisational Change Proposal relating to the Medical School Resource Unit;
- Reductions to medical student numbers;
- Consideration of a paper from Campus Services on Internal Recycling;
- Initial thoughts on Establishing a Review of the Academic Year;
- Finance Matters:
  - Management Accounts;
  - Implications of the Scottish Government Spending Review;
  - Consideration of a draft Financial Strategy;
- Human Resources Matters:
  - Membership of Athena Swan;
  - Remuneration Committee;
  - Arrangements for the 2012 leave year;
  - Industrial Action: 30 November 2011;
- Routine Matters:
  - Approval of Honorary Professorships;
  - Voluntary Severance Cases.
Major Grants and Awards

- **£1.9m from NHS National Institute for Health Research to Professor Nigel Pitts** for INTERVAL Dental Recalls Trial (Investigation of NICE Technologies for Enabling Risk-Variable-Adjusted-Length Dental Recalls Trial)
- **£1.8m from the Arts & Humanities Research Council to Professor Georgina Follett** for Design in Action (joint with Abertay, RGU, St Andrews, Glasgow School of Art, and Edinburgh)
- **£0.8m from the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council to Dr Gordon Simpson** for The Non-Coding Arabidopsis Genome
- **£0.4m from the Science and Technology Facilities Council to Professor Allan Gillespie** for Joint UK/CERN R&D Programme on CLIC (CERN Linear Collider) – Dundee package is ‘Instrumentation Electro-Optic’
- **£0.4m from the Economic and Social Research Council to Dr Fabio Sani** for Group Identification and Health: A Longitudinal and Cross-National Investigation
- **£0.3m from European Union Framework 7 Programme to Professor Steve Parkes** for CHiSSI: Very High Speed Serial Interfaces (joint with six industrial partners across Europe)

People and Prizes

- Emeritus Professor John Cummings has been named winner of the 2012 Rank Prize for his research into the role of the colon in human health and nutrition;
- Pawel Grzyb, a third-year Time Based Art & Digital Film student at Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design, has won the top prize at the Filmteractive Festival in Łódź for his exploration of life for the few remaining residents in Bucklemaker Court, a 23-storey tower block in Dundee’s Hilltown area;
- Dublin-born author Simon Ashe-Browne has been announced as the winner of the 2011 Dundee International Book Prize for his novel debut *Nothing Human Left*;
- Professor Mike Ferguson, Dean of Research for the College of Life Sciences at the University of Dundee has been appointed to the Board of Governors of the Wellcome Trust;
- Dr David Pontin, Lecturer in Mathematics, and Dr Maria Ana Cataluna, Royal Academy of Engineering/EPSRC Research Fellow & Lecturer have been named among the winners of this year’s Philip Leverhulme Prizes, awarded by the Leverhulme Trust;
- Professor Stephen Greene has been elected President of the International Society of Paediatric and Adolescent Diabetes (ISPAD);
- Dr Gemma Webster, recent PhD graduate, has been named as one of three winners of the Research Councils UK ‘Telling Tales of Engagement’ Competition, receiving a prize of £10,000 to promote software to help improve the care of people with dementia.
APPENDIX 2

FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE
(Minute 24)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 21 November 2011.

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

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage, University Secretary, Acting Director of Finance, Director of Strategic Planning, Director of Campus Services, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs and Financial Controller (Items 1-4).

1. **MINUTES**
   Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 3 October 2011.

2. **MATTERS ARISING**

   **Financial Strategy (Minute 8)**

   The Acting Director of Finance reported that, following the comments from the Committee at its last meeting, a revised version of the strategy had been considered by the Senior Management Team and was now being considered by the Deans and Directors. She proposed that a revised version of the strategy would be circulated to the Committee for approval by correspondence.

   Resolved: to await receipt of the revised version of the strategy in due course.

3. **ACCOUNTING POLICIES**

   The Committee received a paper setting out a series of enhanced wordings for the accounting policies for inclusion in the relevant section of the financial statements. The recommendation for these changes had arisen from the work of the external auditors.

   Resolved: to approve the changes to the accounting policies as presented.

4. **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 JULY 2011**

   The Acting Director of Finance presented the draft accounts for 2010/11. The Audit was now more or less complete, and the management letter from the external auditors, which would be seen by the Audit Committee at its meeting on 28 November 2011, reported no significant issues requiring to be addressed.

   The operating surplus for 2010/11, as shown in the Consolidated Income & Expenditure Account, was £1m, but adding back voluntary severance costs and endowment adjustments, the underlying operating result was around £5.6m, representing 2.4% of income and an increase on the result for 2009/10 of £1.5m. Income for the year had increased by 5%, with tuition fees rising more slowly than in previous years, but with research income outperforming targets with a rise of 13%, mainly from research council awards. Expenditure rose by 4%, with staff costs broadly flat while other operating costs rose by 7%. The overall surplus for the year was £2.5m.

   The University’s cash position was healthy, buoyed by an increased operating cash inflow chiefly as a result of a positive net working capital movement of £7.4m. The net cash position was £29m, up from £16.6m at the previous year end. Nevertheless, the future commitments represented by the net current liabilities, which had increased to £46m, would require that efficient cash management remain a focus for the University going forward.

   Turning to the balance sheet, the Committee noted the fall in tangible fixed assets reflecting the fact that depreciation for the year exceeded new additions to the estate, which in turn reflected the slowdown in capital spend at the University. Total net assets, including a reduced pensions liability, had increased by £34m.
Summarising, the Acting Director pointed to an improving operating result and the strong cash position. The Committee then provided a series of comments on the accounts. In relation to the University’s capital expenditure commitments over the short to medium term, members requested that officers prepare a review for the Committee of the goals and progress of the various fundraising campaigns supporting the capital projects at Ninewells and in the College of Life Sciences.

Resolved: (i) for its part, to recommend that the Court approve the accounts for the year ended 31 July 2011;

(ii) to ask officers to prepare a report setting out progress against the targets of each of the fundraising campaigns currently underway.

5. SUBSIDIARIES’ AND ASSOCIATE COMPANIES’ ACCOUNTS 2010/11

The Committee received a report summarising the financial results of the University’s subsidiary companies for the year 2010/11. It also provided members with an update on the status of the current spin-out companies with which the University was associated.

Resolved: to note the report.

6. DUNDEE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION (DUSA) – ACCOUNTS 2010/11

The President of the Students’ Association presented a summary report of DUSA’s accounts. He remarked that 2010/11 had been a good trading year, although turnover had seen an overall decrease. A revised business plan for DUSA had begun to show benefits and, whilst the market in which DUSA operated was still uncertain, DUSA had achieved a bigger underlying surplus than previously, and there was increased focus on diversification. It was noted that DUSA had received a positive report from the internal auditors during the year. In response to questions, the President explained that DUSA was building up cash reserves in preparation for a major round of refurbishment in the near future, although he noted suggestions that it might be financially more prudent to use the reserves to reduce DUSA’s debt burden.

Resolved: to congratulate DUSA on a solid year, and to note that the internal auditors would be carrying out a commercially focused review of DUSA as part of their audit plan for 2011/12.

7. DUNDEE UNIVERSITY PRESS LTD (DUP)

The Acting Director of Finance provided an update on the current position of DUP. The Committee learnt that a significant contract to produce a new title had now been signed, which it was anticipated would provide considerable income to secure DUP in the short term. Until income through the contract was received, however, it would be necessary for additional working capital to be provided for the press to meet its liabilities, and the Committee was invited to consider agreeing further investment to support it. In discussion, the Committee noted that steps were now being taken to reduce stock levels; it also acknowledged that a key purpose of DUP was to enhance the reputation of the University, and that this therefore needed to be considered alongside its financial performance, when considering the future of DUP.

Resolved: to approve the loan of an additional £100k to DUP, specifying that this take the form of debt rather than equity.

8. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 3

The Committee received the accounts for the period to 31 October 2011. These showed a similar picture to the accounts seen by the Committee for the period to 31 August 2011 in relation to the shortfall in tuition fees. However, expenditure projections had improved the operating forecast by £0.9m. The year-end forecast was an operating deficit of £0.8m against a small budgeted surplus of £0.1m. The bottom-line forecast was for break even.

The Committee noted that additional work had been carried out on budget phasing, and some adjustments had been included in the accounts as presented. Officers were questioned on the likelihood of achieving the level of disposals forecast for the year. The property market continued to be difficult, but officers in Estates & Buildings were paying careful attention to disposals and would report progress to the next meeting of the Committee.
Resolved: to note the accounts.

9. **ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORT**

The Director of Campus Services introduced his routine report to the Committee. He highlighted: the draft business plan for the botanic garden to be considered by its advisory committee in early December; ongoing work in relation to the energy management and carbon reduction strategies of the University; changes to the provision of cleaning services; and the purchase of two electric vans. He provided the Committee also with a progress report on capital works currently ongoing, notably at Ninewells, Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design and in the Centre for Anatomy & Human Identification.

Resolved: to note the report.

10. **BURSARIES & SCHOLARSHIPS**

The Secretary introduced a paper which set out the University’s draft proposals for the introduction of a bursaries programme in response to the introduction of fees for students from the rest of the UK (RUK). Under the proposals, RUK students would be eligible for bursaries of £3000 where combined family income was below £20k, or £1000 where combined family income was below £40k. This would be supported by a series of scholarships at School level which would be targeted at all students and for which the main criterion would be academic excellence.

The Committee raised some important issues. In particular, members wanted to know the likely impact of the proposals on the income generated by the introduction of RUK fees. Members would also welcome further context in relation to the underlying rationale behind the proposals.

Resolved: to broadly recommend the proposals to Court, but to ask officers to provide more detailed information for presentation to Court at its meeting on 12 December 2011.
APPENDIX 3

AUDIT COMMITTEE

(Minute 25)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 28 November 2011.

Present: Dr H Marriage (Convener), Mr JE Barnett, Mr J Elliot, Mr I Stewart, Mr KAC Swinley.

In Attendance: Mr R Burns, Principal Professor CP Downes, University Secretary, Acting Director of Finance, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Ms A Taylor (KPMG), Mr M Timar and Ms L Paterson (PricewaterhouseCoopers).

Apologies: Emeritus Professor A Burchell.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 4 October 2011.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Follow-up Reporting (Minute 3(4))

Officers set out for the Committee how it was intended that implementation of recommendations from previous internal audit reports would be monitored in the future. It was envisaged that a recently-appointed member of staff in the Directorate of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs would take on this work and that routine reports would be provided to each meeting of the Committee.

Resolved: to note the new process and await reports with interest.

3. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 JULY 2011

(1) Proposed Amendments to Accounting Policies

The Committee received a paper setting out a series of enhanced wordings for the accounting policies for inclusion in the relevant section of the financial statements. The recommendation for these changes had arisen from the work of the external auditors.

Resolved: to approve the new wordings for inclusion in the annual accounts.

(2) External Auditors’ Report – Management Letter

The external auditors presented their report to the Committee, noting that the Committee had received an interim report at its last meeting and that no further significant issues had arisen in the intervening period.

In introducing the report, Mr Timar praised the quality of the internal controls in place as well as that of the records made available to the auditing team during the process. In addressing the audit focus areas as identified in the audit plan from May 2011, he made the following observations: that the testing carried out as part of the audit had not found any indication of fraud; that there were no significant issues in relation to income recognition, although the team had made recommendations in relation to University of Dundee Nursery Ltd; and that there were no matters for concern in relation to the University’s investments.

A series of issues for consideration were raised by the auditors. Firstly, it was pointed out that the inflation assumption underlying the University’s net pension liability was outside the auditors’ expected acceptable range. Whilst the auditors were satisfied with the net effect of the assumption when taken together with the discount rate, it was suggested that this might be an area for further investigation.

Secondly, the auditors highlighted the performance of Dundee University Press Ltd (DUP) as an area for concern, and in particular the high levels of stock maintained by DUP. Officers confirmed that the Finance & Policy Committee at its most recent meeting had reviewed the
progress of DUP, its new book deal and management approach and had approved a further loan of £100k to support DUP in the short to medium term.

Thirdly, the auditors brought to the Committee’s attention the difficulties experienced in auditing the accounts of the Nursery, where it had been necessary to reconstruct transactions because a number of income records had not been available for inspection. It was recommended that a review of processes within the Nursery be undertaken, and officers confirmed that this was now in hand following the appointment of a new nursery manager.

The auditors stated that there were no uncorrected misstatements and were able to confirm that the accounts complied with the relevant statement of recommended accounting practices, with the Scottish Funding Council’s Accounts Direction and Financial Memorandum. One overstatement in relation to a voluntary severance payment had been uncovered, which had now been adjusted.

The auditors brought to the Committee’s attention a number of recent developments which would have an impact on the audit of future accounts. Chief amongst these was the indication of a likely timeframe for the introduction of International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), and clarification of the position with regard to VAT on shared services and on zero-rated buildings.

Resolved:
(i) to thank the auditors for their report; and
(ii) to thank in particular the Financial Controller for her industry in preparing the accounts for the audit.

(3) Financial Statements 2010/11

The Committee received draft statements for the period to 31 July 2011.

Resolved: having received the report of the external auditors and considered the points made therein, to recommend to Court that it approve the statements at its meeting on 12 December 2011

(4) Letter of Representation

The Committee receive a draft of the proposed letter.

Resolved: to approve the letter, subject to minor rewording.

4. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF SUBSIDIARY AND ASSOCIATED COMPANIES

The Committee considered the accounts for the year ended 31 July 2011 for:

(a) AMCET Ltd
(b) Dundee University Press Ltd (DUP)
(c) Dundee University Project Management Ltd
(d) Dundee University Utility Supply Company Ltd
(e) University of Dundee Nursery Ltd
(f) Dundee University Incubator Ltd
(g) Dundee Student Villages (DSV)
(h) West Park Conference Centre (WPCC)

Resolved: to note the subsidiary and associate companies’ accounts.

5. INTERNAL AUDITORS

(1) Treasury Management

The Committee received a report assessing the control environment of the processes of treasury management. The audit had uncovered no significant areas for concern, and the nine recommendations contained in the report were essentially areas for enhancement that the University should consider. All of the recommendations had been accepted by officers and the timeframes for implementation were reasonable. The Committee noted that the cash flow
forecasting for research income was to be the focus of an internal audit report within the plan for 2011/12.

6. **PRIVATE MEETING WITH THE AUDITORS**

The officers withdrew from the meeting at this point so that the Committee could speak in private with the external and internal auditors. At the conclusion of the discussion, officers were re-admitted, and the Convener was pleased to report that both external and internal auditors had expressed complete confidence in the finance team and the University management.

7. **ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered a draft of its annual report to Court. This document would also be submitted to the Scottish Funding Council.

Resolved: to approve the report for submission to the Court and the Scottish Funding Council (annex refers).

8. **LEGAL MATTERS**

The Secretary brought to the attention of the Committee two serious matters. The first involved a member of the University staff, who was currently subject to legal proceedings. The member of staff had been suspended by the Principal pending the outcome of the criminal proceedings.

The second related to a recent incident at Knockhill racing circuit. A student member of the University’s DRIVE team, which aims to design and build a prototype racing car as part of a nation-wide student programme, was seriously injured when the car he was driving collided with a crash barrier. The student remains in hospital but is now in a stable condition. An investigation into the incident is ongoing and the University’s Safety Manager is co-operating fully with that investigation as well as reviewing the incident from the University’s perspective.
AUDIT COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2010/11

1. MEMBERSHIP AND MEETINGS

The Committee meets four times per annum, and the meetings for the year 2010/11 took place as follows: 5 October 2010, 2 December 2010, 8 March 2011 and 25 May 2011.

Attendance by members was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Marriage (Convener)</td>
<td>Court member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Burchell</td>
<td>Court member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Elliot</td>
<td>Court member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Swinley</td>
<td>Court member</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barnett</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Thomson</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee, Richard Burns, was in regular attendance at meetings of the Audit Committee in 2010/11. Miss Thomson demitted office on the Committee with effect from 1 August 2011 and her place was taken by the appointment of Mr Ian Stewart.

2. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Year ended 31 July 2011

The Committee received draft financial statements for the University for the year ended 31 July 2011 at its meeting on 28 November 2011, following their consideration by the Finance & Policy Committee at its meeting on 21 November 2011. The Committee also received a report from the external auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC). PwC were formally appointed for the provision of external audit services for the financial years 2010-11 to 2012-13 (with the possibility of an extension of up to two additional years) at the meeting of the Court on 26 April 2011.

In terms of audit and financial reporting the report indicated that:

- The auditors expected to give an unqualified opinion on the statements and that they had been prepared in accordance with the Accounts Direction of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and the appropriate Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP);
- The auditors expected to conclude that income from the SFC, as well as from other sources, had been appropriately applied;
- The statements had been produced on a timely basis in accordance with the agreed timetable, but that areas for highlight included the following:
  - University of Dundee Nursery Ltd’s accounting records required improvement;
  - The financial performance of Dundee University Press continued to be cause for concern; and
  - Pension liability assumptions in relation to the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme should in future be adjusted to be more in line with sector norms.

During the course of the audit, the auditors were pleased to report that they had not identified any significant internal control deficiencies or regulatory matters requiring to be reported to the Committee.

Having carefully considered the report of the external auditors, the Audit Committee resolved to recommend to Court that the financial statements should be approved. The Committee noted the recommendations contained in the report from the external auditors and were satisfied by the associated management responses.

3. INTERNAL AUDIT

Internal audit work for the year was provided by KPMG LLP. During 2010/11 the Committee received reports on the following internal audit assignments with recommendations graded as shown. Each report was considered in detail, with the auditors and officers addressing comments and questions from Committee members. The Committee was generally satisfied with the management responses to the issues raised and
with the timescales for addressing them, where appropriate. Progress on the implementation of recommendations will be monitored through follow-up reports from the auditors, as well as through active monitoring by the University officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Development and Cost of Course Delivery</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Governance and Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Approval and Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Income Generation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Management and Retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud, Impropriety and Misconduct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised Timetable System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Controls Risk Self-assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Specific Review</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUSA**

The auditors carried out the annual routine review of finance arrangements in place at DUSA. The focus of the report was on financial controls and in particular financial forecasting. A range of minor recommendations were suggested, but on the whole it recognised that DUSA was a well-managed organisation. The Committee suggested that the next review of DUSA should take a more commercial focus.

*Assessment of the Effectiveness of the System of Internal Control*

The internal auditors provided the Committee with their overall assessment of the University’s internal control systems. Based on their work in 2010-11, the auditors were of the opinion that these systems provided a ‘reasonable basis for maintaining control’ and that the control framework provided ‘reasonable assurance regarding the effective and efficient achievement of strategic objectives’. In their annual report, the auditors highlighted the following significant recommendations emanating from their audit work during the year:

- Active monitoring of engagement with the objective-setting and review process for academic staff;
- In light of the review of the central timetabling system, introducing a clear assessment of project objectives at an early stage of the project planning cycle;
- Enhancing the status, usefulness and organisation of the risk register as a risk management tool; and
- Improving oversight and review of supplier master data to ensure they are properly authorised; and
- Developing a formal tracking system for reviewing the implementation of prior year audit recommendations.

4. **RISK MANAGEMENT**

The Committee received regular reports from the Risk Management Monitoring Group. As noted above (Section 3), the internal auditors carried out a comprehensive review of the University’s high level risk management processes and made a series of recommendations. The Audit Committee oversaw the root and branch review of the institutional risk register, incorporating an assessment of gross and residual risk, the adoption wherever appropriate of SMART mitigating actions, and the focus on key strategic risks. Court adopted a revised format for the risk register at its meeting on 24 October 2011.

*Bribery Act 2010*

The Committee oversaw the development of an institutional policy statement on bribery and corruption in response to the Act, which came into force on 1 July 2011. Additionally, Court approved a revised Gift & Hospitality Policy to accompany the policy statement. The implementation of the new policies and their compliance will be reviewed as part of the internal audit plan for 2011-12.

*Protection of Vulnerable Groups (PVG) Scheme*

The Committee noted changes to the system for carrying out criminal records checks for staff and students whose work would bring them into contact with vulnerable groups. The new legislation placed emphasis on
regulated types of work and excluded activity which only incidentally brought people into contact with vulnerable groups.

5. **OPINION**

*Auditors*

The Committee has been satisfied with the performance and diligence of the internal and external auditors.

*Effectiveness of Internal Controls*

The Committee can assure the Court that the University has effective financial management and financial controls in place. The Committee will continue to monitor the progress of the University on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the external auditors’ report and the various reports from the internal auditors.
APPENDIX 4

REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

(Minute 27)

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

Present:  Mr Richard Burns (Convener), Mr Jo Elliott, Dr Janet Lowe, Mr Eric Sanderson

In Attendance:  The Principal (for part of the meeting).
Other Officers also attended parts of the meeting to advise on specific items.

1.  The Committee met to conduct a review of non-clinical Professorial and equivalently graded staff salaries.

2.  The Committee discussed a paper prepared by the HR Director on the Remit and Policy of the Remuneration Committee, which considered matters such as scope of the Committee, grading for Professors, linkages between performance and pay for senior staff, bonus payments, timing of the Committee and the formulation of a more detailed remit for the Committee.

Resolved to recommend:

(i)  that the HR Director should draft a revised remit and policy for the Remuneration Committee to consider at their next meeting in Spring 2012.  This should then be considered by the HR Committee, Governance and Nominations Committee and subsequently be approved by Court;

(ii)  that the Remuneration Committee should continue to meet in November of each year to conduct the review of salaries for Professorial and equivalently graded staff.

(iii)  that exceptionally there would be a meeting arranged for Spring 2012 which would review submissions from the College of Life Sciences and the draft Remit and Policy to be formulated by the HR Director.

(iv)  that the College of Life Sciences should be informed that the Remuneration Committee meeting will remain scheduled for November each year.

3.  Salary increases in addition to the nationally agreed settlement were agreed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art, Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>£13,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>£-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, Dentistry &amp; Nursing (non-clinical)</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student &amp; Academic Support Services</td>
<td>£11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Vice-Chancellor’s Office</td>
<td>£9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>£8,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.  A total of £54,668, (cf £42,000 in 2010) was distributed selectively to 15 individuals from the eligible group of 160 members of staff.  In reaching decisions on this matter, the Remuneration Committee took note of the current economic climate and the restraint demonstrated by the Principal, Secretary and Heads of College in being very selective with the nominations coming forward to the Committee.  In addition, relevant college and support services salaries over the last five years, issues of gender equity and University sector comparators were also taken into account.  The Committee adopted a highly selective approach, also taking account of the level of pay increases resulting from national negotiations over recent years.

5.  The Committee discussed specifically issues in relation to gender balance and equal pay for non-clinical professorial staff.  It was acknowledged that over the last seven years the percentage of women in the
professoriat had plateaued at around 20%. It was also acknowledged that in the lower academic grades there were in fact more women than men but that this pattern changed dramatically at the senior lecturer level. It was agreed that the University’s recent commitment to the ‘Athena Swan’ initiative would allow such matters to be looked at in more depth and put in place mechanisms which would help to re-dress the balance in the senior academic grades. In relation to pay and gender for the professoriat, the Committee considered information from the HESA staff return for 2009/10 (the most recent available) and that revealed that in general, average professorial pay at Dundee was not out of line with other comparator institutions such at Aberdeen and St Andrews but unlike most other Universities, on average, female professors at Dundee were paid more than their male counterparts. However, it was also acknowledged that when small numbers are being used to calculate averages (i.e. small numbers of female salaries) figures can swing very easily should certain individuals leave.

6. Approval was given for a number of ‘in-year’ decisions which had been taken with the authority of the Principal which in fact were, all bar one case, related to staff taking on additional roles/remits:

(a) the appointment of a Deputy Head of College for the College of Arts & Social Sciences for which a £5,000 honorarium is being paid.

(b) the appointment of an Associate Dean in the School of the Environment for which a £2,000 honorarium is being paid.

(c) the appointment of an Associate Director in the School of Medicine for which a £2,500 honorarium is being paid.

(d) an enhanced salary level of £7,000 per annum was agreed for a member of staff in the College of Arts and Social Sciences in order to retain that member of staff in Dundee. Actual increase is less as member of staff is part time.

7. The Committee was reminded that under the ‘Schedule of Delegation’ as approved by the University Court, the Committee had the responsibility for reviewing honoraria payments made to Deans and other members of staff. Having considered this, the Committee agreed that it would review these payments at its next meeting in Spring 2012.
APPENDIX 5

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

(Minute 34)

1. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

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

On the ‘merger’ with Abertay, the Principal indicated that the current position was an agreement for the two universities, along with Dundee College, to explore the opportunities for enhanced collaboration in the context of the Scottish Government’s White Paper on post-16 education.

On School mergers, the Principal intimated his view that a merger of the present Schools of Law, Business and the Graduate School of Natural Resources Law, Policy & Management would be of significant advantage enabling a sustainable focus to support excellence in teaching and research, with an emphasis on postgraduate taught provision. It would also provide enhanced opportunity to grow unregulated fee income especially since currently the three Schools encompassed approximately ninety percent of the University’s taught postgraduate activity. However, he acknowledged that this proposal would only be fruitful with the positive endorsement of both the staff involved and the Senatus.

In relation to the proposal to join Computing with Engineering, Physics and Mathematics, he noted that the basis for this suggestion arose from the need to provide enhanced stability and financial sustainability for the disciplines involved and his belief that the best way of supporting Computing in particular was to place it within a larger School. He noted that the decisive factor here was strengthening all disciplines in the potential new School without damaging any.

The Principal also reported on his recent trip to India and his view that there was great potential for engagement in a variety of collaborative areas. Currently many of our international links were at the level of individual research collaboration or via undergraduate and taught postgraduate recruitment. India was one area where cross-institutional initiatives at the corporate level might well be of significant benefit to the University. In addition, there might be scope for specialist areas of the University to consider DASMAN-type initiatives. Student exchanges were another area of potential growth.

More generally in the area of mergers, and in answer to a question, the Principal expressed the view that while it was unlikely for there to be University mergers there was certainly heavy fiscal pressure upon the FE sector which might well face mergers in the next two or three years. In terms of reducing subject duplication across universities in the Scottish regions, he reported that the SFC was working on defining those regions and that proposals for rationalisation might attract funding support from the Council. However in many regions apparent duplication in subject provision masked the fact that the provision concerned appealed to very different student markets and entry standards.

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

2. RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK (REF)

The Senatus received a paper from the Vice-Principal (Research), Professor Irene Leigh and the clarification in the agenda.

Professor Leigh’s paper was subsequent to the previous discussion at Senate and centred upon clarification of the processes for the mid-term review and initial triage of staff and preparation of a modified code of practice. On the matter of funding it was noted that the SFC was expected to withdraw research funding from areas below 3/4* next year well in advance of the next assessment exercise.

The Principal stressed the urgency required in applying strategic investment in those research areas which had been consistently strong, noting however that the indicative SFC Grant letter (expected before Christmas) along with an estimate of RUK fee income was necessary in order to determine the money available.

The Senatus decided: to approve the report and the statement in the agenda of the University’s strategy for selection.
3. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received a communication from the special meeting of 3 October and the meeting of 24 October 2011.

On paragraph 3, the Principal indicated that subject to the outcome of the forthcoming interview process, he was minded that the Vice-Principal for Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing would take on the University-wide leadership role in research assisted by Professor Page, the Dean of Law.

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

4. RUK BURSARY PROPOSALS

The Senatus received a paper from SMT.

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

5. PUTTING LEARNERS AT THE CENTRE – DELIVERING OUR AMBITIONS FOR POST 16 EDUCATION

The Senatus received a paper from the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Dr Neale Laker.

The Senatus decided: to note the paper.

6. GRADUATION IN ERITREA

The Senatus decided: to approve the proposal that the Dean of Nursing and Midwifery be empowered to grant degrees at a ceremony for Distance Learning students in Eritrea in January 2012.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Retiral

The Senatus was informed that the Academic Secretary, Dr Ian Francis, was retiring at the end of 2011 after 32 years of outstanding service in the University including 22 years as Clerk to the Senatus.

The Senatus joined the Principal in wishing him well for the future and thanking him for his significant contribution to the University and its students in particular.
APPENDIX 6

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

(Minute 35)

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

Present: Dr J Lowe (Convenor), Mr I Leith, Dr H Marriage, Professor G Mires, Ms C Potter, Dr A Rogers, Professor C Whatley.

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Human Resources, Acting Director of Finance, Deputy Director of Human Resources, Dr Lesley McLellan (for Item 5).

Apologies: Professor R Abboud, Mr D Cathcart.

1. MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

   (1) Minutes of the meeting of 13 September 2011 were approved subject to:

       (a) a suggested amendment to wording in Item 9 to read that ‘Following discussion, members agreed that the data presented (on professorial salary levels) gave the Committee no cause for concern’;

       (b) noting that the Acting Director of Finance had been present at the meeting.

   (2) Statute 16

       The Director of HR reported that, now an agreed position had been reached with the unions on ‘Time Off for Union Duties’, she was hopeful that discussions with DUCU on the policies relating to Statute 16 would commence.

2. UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC REVIEW

   The University Secretary reported that the Senior Management Team was currently reviewing the position in relation to Strategic Review and considering options with regard to taking this forward in the future. This would include consideration of strategic priorities while budgetary planning was on-going for 2012-2013 and in the context of the funding settlement from SFC, which was likely to be trailed in a letter prior to the end of the year.

3. HUMAN RESOURCES

   (1) National Pay Negotiations

       The Director of HR advised that the current pay proposal under consideration was an additional £150 to each spinal point and that it was unlikely that there would be an agreed position on this before Christmas. It was noted that Unison was currently taking part in dispute resolution discussions, UNITE had formally rejected the proposal and UCU had not rejected the proposal but neither had it accepted it formally. The University would continue to be advised by UCEA on implementation of the pay award and was hopeful that agreement would be reached early in the New Year.

       Resolved: to note the position

   (2) Industrial Action

       The Director of HR updated the Committee on current and pending industrial action. UCU on a national level was continuing to take action short of a strike in response to recent changes to the Pension Scheme; it was reported that this had not appeared to have had any impact at a local level. Unite had recently balloted its members and had not received a mandate for strike action, but instead would also be taking action short of strike over the proposed pay settlement. There was some discussion about the strike action being taken on 30 November in response to proposed changes to local government and other public sector pension schemes. It was highlighted that the University did not have many staff in the local government schemes and
consequently had not received formal notification that any of the University Unions would be taking part in this action. It was noted however that UCU had indicated that it may participate.

Resolved: to note that it was unlikely that the University would be directly affected by Strike Action on 30 November. However, it may be the case that due to the closure of schools staff may require annual leave in order to look after their children.

(3) UoD Pension Scheme

The Director of HR reported on UNISON’s recent letter to Court, which had highlighted certain concerns on its part over the lack of comparability between the University of Dundee’s Pension Scheme and USS and the inequity with regard to the outcomes following the recent reforms of the two schemes. The Committee understood the importance of comparability. However with two independent pension schemes, one national and one local, it was agreed that this was outwith the University’s control. It was noted that a response was currently being prepared for UNISON by the Chairman of Court.

Resolved: to note the concern raised by UNISON through Court.

(4) HR Strategy

The Director of HR advised that comments on the first draft of the HR Strategy document had been received and a revised version had now been circulated. It was confirmed that the first section outlined nine key strategic themes; section 4.9 provided the context and would form part of University’s overarching document and a SWOT analysis had also been included for the Committee to consider. The Action Plan previously submitted to the Committee was being re-formatted in accordance with the University Strategy document.

Feedback on the document was very positive and a number of suggestions were made by the Committee to provide greater clarity in certain areas specifically around section 4.2 relating to staff numbers and turnover rates. It was also highlighted that in some areas there was reference to continuous activities and key drivers as opposed to other areas that highlighted specific action points. There was also discussion about career progression and the fact that section 6 appeared to focus solely on academic staff; and it was therefore recommended that this was expanded to include career progression relating to support staff. It was recognised that the summary in section 4.9 had been formatted to a pre-determined template that was consistent with the overarching strategy document, but it was felt that this should be more representative of the whole document and focus on the nine themes highlighted.

Resolved: (i) to invite Mr Leith to provide input into Section 6 specifically in relation into career development for support staff.

(ii) to request that Section 4.9 is re-drafted to reflect the key themes highlighted in the HR Strategy document.

(5) MRC Protein Phosphorylation Unit (PPU) TUPE Transfer

The Director of HR reported that currently the University had approximately 40 staff employed by the Medical Research Council (MRC) based in Dundee. MRC was engaged in a national wide programme to transfer staff out of MRC Units into the various organisations they were currently based in. It was confirmed that meetings had just commenced in Dundee with regard to this and TUPE arrangements.

Resolved: to note the position.

(6) Queen’s Jubilee

It was confirmed that the University would not close on 5 June 2012 for the Queen’s Jubilee but instead would add an extra day to all holiday entitlements for 2012, pro-rata for part-time staff.

Resolved: to note the position.
The minutes from the Concordat Steering Group were received. The Committee was pleased to note the ongoing programme of activities and the action points identified and being progressed. The Director of HR advised that SMT had agreed that the University would be signing up to Athena Swan, a body that encourages the career development of women in Science and Technology, and it was noted that Professor Cantrell would be leading this work. There was some discussion about the proportion of women being promoted from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer at the University and the barriers that can be faced by women progressing to this level.

Resolved: (i) to invite a member of the Concordat Group to present their recommendations on actions from the CROS survey to the Committee.

(ii) to request further information on Athena Swan at a future meeting.

4. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

A report from the Equality and Diversity Officer was received. The report summarised key work on-going in relation to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and the development of a Code of Practice. It was highlighted that every institution needed to produce a Code of Practice to allow entry into the REF. The Director of HR confirmed that the Code of Practice is concerned about the process, how selection takes place for inclusion in the REF and consistency across the University. The matter of selection process was subject to discussion at the forthcoming meeting of Senate. The Code of Practice had been consulted on widely and various groups across the University were considering a number of issues relating to REF and the Code of Practice. There was some discussion about staff who have a teaching and scholarship contract who would not expect to be returned in the REF and it was agreed that it was important to stress the work they do and the alternative strands of achievement recognised at the University.

Resolved: (i) to commend Mr Trivedi for the development of the draft Code of Practice and to recognise the benefit this would provide in influencing and enhancing the REF process.

(ii) to support the work that Professor Coates would be undertaking in relation to the development of Teaching and Scholarship criteria for progression and to recognise teaching and scholarship as another strand of achievement.

(iii) to note that the Committee was pleased to learn that the REF process has renewed an interest in completing the Equality and Diversity Training modules.

5. ORGANISATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(1) A report from the Head of OPD was received, which outlined the key activities relating to the launch of OPD and highlighted work in progress. The Committee was very impressed with the breadth and focus of courses being offered on the OPD programme, and the fact that significant opportunities were being offered to all staff including research staff.

Resolved: to congratulate Dr Milburn and her team for a successful launch and to look forward to feedback on take-up of courses.

(2) Structured Mandatory Training Programme for Research Supervisors

Dr Lesley McLellan, co-convenor of the Research Supervision Working Group introduced this item. It was confirmed that both the QAA Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Programme and the University’s own Code of Practice for supervised Postgraduate Research recommend that new supervisors should undertake relevant training to assure their competence in the role. Dr McLellan highlighted that what had emerged through discussions of the Postgraduate Affairs Sub-Committee was that there was not a uniform approach to supervisory training across the University. The proposal being put forward by the Working Group was that training should be mandatory for all supervisors. Training would be provided through workshops run throughout the year, coordinated by the Library and Learning Centre Education development, delivered in collaboration with Colleges, OPD, Registry and the Directorate of Policy, Governance and Legal Affairs, and tailored to meet the needs of Colleges or Schools. Dr McLellan outlined the proposed content of the
workshops and confirmed that an on-line resource and training programme would also be developed as ‘refresher’ training for existing supervisors or as an alternative to the workshop model.

There was some discussion regarding the opportunities to develop the on-line facility into an accredited training programme and the benefits of this for supervisors who wish to pursue this option as part of their on-going CPD.

It was recognised that introducing a mandatory element to training did then require further action in terms of monitoring and follow up if the required training did not take place.

The Committee was fully supportive of the proposal and while did not underestimate the challenge of introducing training as a mandatory requirement did believe that for new staff there would be the required engagement. For more established supervisors the importance of Deans and Heads of Colleges/VP’s reinforcing the mandatory aspects of the training was emphasised.

Resolved: (i) to support the proposal to introduce mandatory training for research supervisors.

(ii) to recommend that this is implemented for new supervisors in the first instance and that for existing supervisors voluntary involvement would be encouraged in the first instance but completion expected within a three year period.

(iii) to request that a report be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee following implementation.

6. HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICES

A report from the Head of Safety Services and minutes from the Health & Safety Committee were received.

The report highlighted a recent accident which is currently being investigated; it was noted that the matter would be considered in detail by the Health and Safety Sub-Committee and then reported to Court. It was also recommended that this should be considered by the appropriate School Board.

Resolved: to note the position and to wish the individual involved a good recovery.

7. LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES

Minutes from the meetings of the three Local Joint Committees were received.

8. ANNUAL REVIEW AND CRPs

Minutes from the College Annual Review and CRP meetings were received (annex).

Points made by the CASS Annual Review Group were noted. It was agreed that work being undertaken by the group led by Professor David Coates should address some of the issues relating to promotion on the basis of teaching and scholarship and that it would be helpful if CASS were able to contribute to this work.

The Committee agreed that it would be useful if information from the Annual Review Committees were presented in an alternative format so that it could establish how many teaching and scholarship cases went forward and how many were subsequently approved. Information on the reasons why promotion was declined should also be stated. The Committee discussed the importance of ensuring fairness and consistency across the institution and the benefit of having some pooling of results from each of the Committees.

Resolved: to recommend that the data from Annual Review is presented in an alternative format to allow some assessment of the basis of promotions in each College.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 21 September 2011.

Present: Professor C Whatley, Vice-Principal and Head of College  
Professor Y Muschamp, Dean, School of Education, Social Work and Community Education  
Professor A Page, Dean, School of Law  
Professor N Davey, Dean, School of Humanities  
Professor T Harley, School of Psychology  
Professor R Duck, Dean, School of the Environment  
Professor C Helliar, Dean, School of Business  
Mr I Ball, Dean, Graduate School of Natural Resources Law, Policy & Management  
Professor P Davies, External Representative, College of Science & Engineering

In Attendance: Ms L Poor, College HR Officer (Minute Secretary)  
Mrs K Gray, College HR Officer

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

1. PROGRESS REPORTS

Resolved: (i) to note progress reports for 2 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)  
(ii) to note progress reports for 2 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)  
(iii) to note progress reports for 1 permanent Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research)

2. PROBATIONARY ANNUAL REPORTS (not in penultimate or final year)

Resolved: (i) to note annual reports for 8 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)  
(ii) to note annual reports for 2 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)  
(iii) to note annual report for 1 fixed-term Lecturer (Teaching & Research)  
(iv) to note annual reports for 3 fixed-term Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)

3. PENULTIMATE YEAR ANNUAL REPORTS

Resolved: (i) to note annual reports for 4 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)  
(ii) to note annual report for 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) and to consider his progress again once internal research review ratings received.  
(iii) to note annual reports for 3 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)  
(iv) to issue a warning letter to 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship)  
(v) to note annual reports for 3 fixed-term Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)

4. EARLY CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT

Resolved: to approve early confirmation for 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research)

5. CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT

Resolved: (i) to approve the confirmation of appointment for 4 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)  
(ii) to approve the confirmation of appointment for 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) subject to completion of the LTA  
(iii) to extend the probationary period for one year for 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research)  
(iv) To approve the confirmation of appointment for 8 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)  
(v) To approve the confirmation of appointment for 3 fixed-term Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)
6. **PROMOTION TO GRADE 8**

The criteria under the Framework Agreement for transition from Grade 7 to Grade 8 is that progression will occur providing that the role has developed to meet the generic profile/role size for Grade 8 and assuming satisfactory performance in the role.

Resolved: (i) to approve promotion to Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 8 to 3 existing permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research) Grade 7
(ii) to decline promotion to Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 8 to 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 7
(iii) to decline promotion to Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 8 to 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 7 who submitted a self-nomination.

7. **PROMOTION TO GRADE 9, SENIOR LECTURER**

In determining whether promotion to senior lecturer level is appropriate, factors to be taken into consideration will include: matching of the role against the nationally agreed role profiles for academic staff and assessing whether the qualitative aspects of the role profile have been met.

Resolved: (i) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 9 to 2 existing permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research) Grade 8
(ii) to decline promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 9 to 3 existing permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research) Grade 8
(iii) to decline promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 9 to 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 7
(iv) to note no decision made pending further information regarding 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 8
(v) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship) Grade 9 to 2 existing permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship) Grade 8
(vi) to note no decision made pending further information regarding 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship) Grade 8
(vii) to decline promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship) Grade 9 to 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 8
(viii) to decline promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 9 to 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 7 who submitted a self-nomination

**Other Points**

1. As raised at the last two years’ meeting, it was agreed that there needed to be clear criteria for scholarship at the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer levels in Teaching & Scholarship. The Committee was disappointed that this had not yet been achieved. The Vice Principal and Head of College confirmed that work had been done and it was hoped this would be finalised and in use very soon.

2. The Committee wished to bring to the attention of HR and the University that it would like to see more referees required for promotion to Senior Lecturer Grade 9 and in particular more external referees than were currently called for in the Annual Review procedure and asked that this be raised at the appropriate committees.

3. The Committee agreed that it could not consider the promotion of a Lecturer where this would mean a move from one profile to another. The Lecturer would have to request a move within the grade either at interview of by formal request prior to being put forward to be considered for promotion.
ACADEMIC STAFF ANNUAL REVIEW
COLLEGE OF LIFE SCIENCES

A meeting of the Committee was held on 21 September 2011.

Present: Professor D Cantrell, VP & Head of College of Life Sciences (CHAIR),
         Professor D Coates, Dean of School of Life Sciences Learning & Teaching
         Professor M Ferguson, Dean of School of Life Sciences Research
         Professor T Palmer, Head of Division of Molecular Microbiology
         Professor M Chaplain, Division of Mathematics, College of Art, Science and Engineering
         Professor T Tanaka, Division of Gene Regulation and Expression
         Professor R Soames, Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification
         Mrs G Jones, College HR Officer

1. ANNUAL REPORTS FOR STAFF ON PROBATION/TENURE TRACK

(1) Tenure Track PIs

Resolved: to note the undertaking of probationary annual reports for 12 Principal Investigators. To note Tenure denied to 2 Independent Investigators, 1 in October 2010, 1 in November 2010.

(2) Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship)

Resolved: to note the undertaking of probationary annual report for 1 Lecturer (T&S).

(3) Fixed-term Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship)

Resolved: to note the undertaking of probationary annual report for 2 Lecturers (T&S) and the fact of probation having been met by 1 Lecturer (T&S) at another HE institution.

2. NOMINATION FOR PROMOTION TO GRADE 7

Resolved: to approve the request for promotion to Grade 7 Researcher.

3. NOMINATION FOR PROMOTION TO GRADE 9

Resolved: to decline the request for promotion to Grade 9 Teaching and Research Lecturer.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 4 October 2011.

Present:  
Professor C Whatley, vice Principal & Head of College of CASS (Chair)  
Professor T Inns, Dean, Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design  
Professor M R Jones, Dean, School of Engineering, Physics and Mathematics  
Dr J Hughes, Dean, School of Computing  
Professor S Black, Centre of Anatomy and Human Identification, External College  
Representative  
Mrs I Mair, College Secretary, College of Art, Science and Engineering  
Ms K Brackenbury, College Human Resources Officer

1. PROBATIONARY ANNUAL REPORTS

Resolved:  
(i) to note annual reports for 2 Lecturers (Teaching & Research).  
(ii) to note annual reports for 6 Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship).

2. ELIGIBLE FOR CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT AT 1 OCTOBER 2012

Resolved:  
(i) to note the annual report for 4 Lecturers (Teaching & Research)  
(ii) to note the annual report for 1 Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship)  
(iii) to defer annual report for 1 Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship)  
(iv) to accelerate confirmation for 2 Lecturers (Teaching & Research)

3. CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENTS 2011

Resolved:  
(i) to approve confirmation of appointment for 1 Lecturer (Teaching & Research)  
subject to submission and approval of additional information as requested  
(ii) to extend probation for 1 Lecturer (Teaching & Research) for one year

4. PROMOTION FROM GRADE 7 TO GRADE 8

Resolved:  
(i) to approve promotion to Lecturer Grade 8 for 1 Lecturer (Teaching & Research)  
(ii) to approve promotion to Lecturer Grade 8 for 1 Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship)

5. PROMOTION FROM GRADE 8 TO GRADE 9

Resolved:  
(i) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer for 4 Lecturers (Teaching & research)  
(ii) to decline to promote 5 Lecturers (Teaching and Research)  
(iii) to decline to promote 1 Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship)
ACADEMIC STAFF ANNUAL REVIEW
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, DENTISTRY & NURSING

A meeting of the Committee was held on 11 October 2011.

Present: Professor IM Leigh, Vice Principal and Head of College (Chair)
Professor JM Connell, Dean, School of Medicine
Professor M Hector, Dean, School of Dentistry
Professor MC Smith, Dean, School of Nursing & Midwifery
Mr I Ball, External College Representative
Mrs G Boyd, College Human Resources Officer
Miss S Hunter, College Human Resources Officer

1. ANNUAL REPORTS

Resolved: (i) to note annual reports for 9 fixed-term Lecturers.
(ii) to note annual reports for 10 SCREDS Clinical Lecturers

2. ELIGIBLE FOR CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT AT 1 OCTOBER 2012

Resolved: (i) to note the penultimate annual reports for 6 permanent Lecturers.
(ii) to note the penultimate annual report for one Clinical Senior Lecturer.
(iii) to raise concern regarding one permanent Lecturer.
(iv) to raise concern regarding one permanent Senior Lecturer.

3. CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENTS 2011

Resolved: (i) to approve confirmation of appointment for 9 permanent Lecturers.
(ii) to extend the probationary period for 2 permanent Lecturers.
(iii) to extend the probationary period for one Senior Lecturer.

4. PROMOTION FROM GRADE 7 TO GRADE 8

Resolved: to promote 1 permanent Research Assistant to Academic Related, Grade 8.

5. PROMOTION FROM GRADE 8 TO GRADE 9

Resolved: (i) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer for 2 permanent Lecturers.
(ii) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer for one permanent Senior Research Fellow.
(iii) to decline to promote one permanent Lecturer.

6. PROMOTION FROM CLINICAL LECTURER TO CLINICAL SENIOR LECTURER

Resolved: to approve promotion for one existing Clinical Lecturer

7. PROMOTION FROM SENIOR LECTURER TO READER

Resolved: to approve promotion for one existing Senior Lecturer

8. PROMOTION FROM CLINICAL SENIOR LECTURER TO CLINICAL READER

Resolved: to approve promotion for one existing Clinical Senior Lecturer