A meeting of the University Court was held on 3 September 2012.

(Note: this business meeting formed part of the annual Court Retreat.)

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (in the Chair)(Minutes 90 – 94 & 98), Principal Professor CP Downes (Minutes 90 – 94 & 98), Professor RJ Abboud, Mr R Burns (Minutes 90-96), Mr M Arnott, Professor Sue Black, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Ms SC Campbell, Mr J Elliot, Mr IA Kennedy (Minutes 90 – 94 & 98-99), Ms S Krawczyk, Dr J Lowe, Dr H Marriage, Ms J McGovern (Minutes 98), Professor GJ Mires, Ms CA Potter, Dr AD Reeves, Mr KA Richmond, Dr AM Roger, Mr KAC Swinley, Professor J Taylor, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Vice-Principals Professor DA Cantrell (Minutes 98) and Professor S Decent, University Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources, Director of Strategic Planning, Director of External Relations, Director of and Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Mr I Stewart, Mr J Barnett, and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Lord Provost

The Chairman welcomed Professor Decent to the Court Retreat on his first day as Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Art, Science & Engineering. He also welcomed Mr Ian Stewart and Mr John Barnett who had been invited to attend the Court Retreat as lay members of the Audit Committee.

90. SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL OUTCOME AGREEMENT

[As a member of the Scottish Funding Council, Dr Janet Lowe declared a potential conflict of interest in this item]

The Principal presented to Court the draft Outcome Agreement between the University and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) for 2012/13. The agreement had been developed over the course of the summer, and University senior management had met with SFC staff on four occasions during the process. The agreement covered six areas (improve university/industry collaboration and the exploitation of research; enhance the international competitiveness of research at the University; access for people from the widest possible range of backgrounds; efficiency of the learner journey and improved retention; equality and diversity; and a more coherent pattern of provision in the higher education sector) but only three of the areas concerned had required to be addressed in detail in the current year. A timetable for future agreements was expected to be made available to Court by the end of the calendar year. It was noted that the University of Dundee Outcome Agreement was not dissimilar in nature to those of other research intensive Universities, but that the length of the agreements varied greatly between institutions.
The Principal told Court that the purpose of the agreement was to help SFC demonstrate the achievements of the sector in respect of key policy expectations of the Scottish Government. Engagement with the process was also noted to be of likely importance in securing funding in future spending reviews. In response to questions, the Principal confirmed that the content was based upon plans inherent within the University Strategy to 2017, the Performance Management Framework, and the University Vision, and as such the aims had not been externally imposed upon the University.

Court members discussed the purpose of the Outcome Agreement, and the Principal confirmed that, while the SFC had indicated that core funding would continue to be determined on the current formula-driven basis, there was potential for some aspects of SFC funding to be linked to the fulfilment of the agreement.

The Principal informed Court that once the University strategic plan and Performance Management Framework (including Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)) were agreed, these would be incorporated into the Outcome agreement.

Court also discussed the role of the University in supporting the learner journey and developing systems to ensure articulation between schools, FE institutions and the HE sector. The Principal reiterated the University’s commitment to working with partners to ensure transitions between the sectors were managed in a holistic fashion.

The Court decided: to approve the Outcome Agreement

91. **VICE-PRINCIPAL LEARNING & TEACHING**

The Principal presented a paper which outlined the rationale for seeking to appoint a Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching. Following the appointment of a Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Art, Science & Engineering, the Principal had given consideration to the allocation of senior management roles within the University and in particular, to the future leadership of the Learning & Teaching Strategy of the University. It was the opinion of the Principal that the agenda in this area was such that it could not be undertaken sustainably in combination with a School or College management role, as had been the case with the research portfolio, and under article 6.2 of the Royal Charter, approval was sought to appoint a Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching).

In response to questions, the Principal confirmed that the previous Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching), Professor James Calderhead, had simply retired on 31 August 2011 rather than taken voluntary severance. The Principal envisaged that the new role would be considerably different from that of the previous incumbent.

Members of Court requested that the Principal circulate information to clarify the roles performed by the existing Vice-Principals.

It was confirmed that the position would be advertised externally, and that a recruitment agency would be engaged in the process. Members of Court were
invited to indicate their interest to the Director of Human Resources with regard to serving on the appointment panel.

**The Court decided:** to approve the appointment of a Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching

### UPDATE ON THE APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY PRINCIPALS

The Principal highlighted to Court the appointment of three Deputy Principals, made in accordance with the processes agreed by Court on 12 December 2011 (Minute 21 (e)). The appointments were as follows: Professor Margaret Smith, Deputy Principal for Internationalisation; Professor Alan Page, Deputy Principal for Research Governance; Professor Georgina Follett, Deputy Principal for Knowledge Exchange in the Creative Arts. The appointments were made with effect from 1 August 2012, and were for a period of three years in the first instance.

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

### UPDATE ON STUDENT RECRUITMENT

The Court received a paper from the Director of Student Operations regarding the current position with respect to undergraduate recruitment for 2012/13. The University Secretary confirmed that although it was still early in the process, targets for Scottish/EU student recruitment appeared to have been reached. Court noted that the Rest of UK (RUK) student recruitment figures had, as expected, decreased in comparison to figures for 2011/12, but that it seemed likely they would exceed the modelled financial targets. Information relating to overseas recruitment figures and bursary and scholarship awards was not available at the time of the meeting.

The University Secretary highlighted to Court the University’s approach to clearing, confirming that the same requirements were applied to RUK student applications as to Scottish/EU student applications. Court members noted that the recruitment figures for Scottish/EU students were subject to Government limits, and asked officers to circulate, when available, information outlining the relative number of Scottish and EU student applications and admissions.

Court discussed the higher than normal conversion rate of offers for Medicine, and noted that steps were being taken to address the issue in future cycles. Court also noted that the School nevertheless expected to stay within the global tolerance limit for undergraduate medical students.

**The Court decided:** to note the report and await further updates at future meetings

### GOVERNOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Court members were encouraged to review the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE) Governor Development Programme (GDP) 2012-13 brochure. Members attending elements of the programme in the past had found the sessions to be highly beneficial opportunities for professional development.
The Court decided: to note the brochure and to convey their interest in attending sessions to the Clerk to Court

ANNUAL REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS: CHAIRPERSON AND COURT

[Officers (except for the Secretary and the Clerk to Court) withdrew from the meeting for this item. In line with discussions of the Governance & Nominations Committee (Minute 63) refers) and following discussion among its members, the Chairman was not present for this section of the meeting. The Principal and President of the Students’ Association were also absent for this item attending the student welcome event. The session was chaired by the Chancellor’s Assessor, Dr Lowe]

The Court considered the performance of the Chairman of Court under the following four sub-headings: Stewardship, Communication, Challenge and Sectoral Awareness. Useful feedback was collated and provided to the Chairman by the Chancellor’s Assessor and University Secretary at a meeting following the Court Retreat. A report of the outcomes of the discussions was also prepared for the Chairman to consider.

During discussions Court members also raised issues relating to the effectiveness of Court. Owing to time constraints, Court decided to defer a full debate on its own performance and effectiveness until its next meeting. In addition, the University Secretary reminded members that he would be submitting a paper to the next meeting of the Governance & Nominations Committee regarding the role and attendance of officers at meetings of Court.

The University Secretary also noted recommendations emerging from discussions regarding the format of future Court Retreat meetings.

The Court decided: (i) to await a response from the Chair in relation to the feedback provided by members on his own performance, which would be considered in the first instance by the Governance & Nominations Committee prior to submission to the Court.

(ii) to defer consideration of its own performance and effectiveness until its next meeting

STATUTE 16 – GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

The University Secretary provided an update to Court on Statute 16 Grievance procedures.

The Court decided: (i) to note that the Committee established at the meeting of Court on 23 April 2012 to hear a grievance from an unnamed staff member had now met and rejected the grievance;
(ii) to approve the change to the composition of the panel established at the meeting of Court on 11 June 2012 to hear a grievance from an unnamed staff member as set out below, noting that no member of the Committee was a member of staff from the same College as the member of staff bringing the grievance.
Professor John Connell (Convener)
Professor Ann Burchell (Lay Court Member)
Professor Carol MacKintosh (Senate Nominee); and

(iii) to approve the composition of a Committee, as set out below, to hear a grievance from an unnamed member of staff, noting that no member of the Committee was a member of staff from the same College as the member of staff bringing the grievance.
Professor David Coates (Convener)
Ms Christina Potter (Lay Court Member)
Professor Rod Jones (Senate Nominee)

EMPLOYMENT LAW ESSENTIALS

Mr Finlay MacKay, Senior Associate at Dundas & Wilson delivered a training and development session to members of Court focussing on: employment law and whistle blowing. Court thanked Mr MacKay for the presentation, and invited him to provide a further session focussed on appeal hearings at a future meeting of Court.

The Court decided: to thank Mr MacKay for the presentation, and invite him to provide a further session focussed on appeal hearings at a future meeting of Court.

COURT RETREAT PRESENTATIONS

Following the Court Retreat business meeting, Court members were invited to discuss a series of presentations related to the University Vision, University Strategy to 2017 and the Performance Management Framework.

The Court decided: to approve the University Strategy to 2017, and await further information regarding the roll-out of the University Vision and updates to the Performance Management Framework.