UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE

UNIVERSITY COURT

A meeting of the University Court was held on 22 October 2012.

Present: Dr J Lowe (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Mr R Burns, Mr M Arnott, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Ms SC Campbell, Mr J Elliot, Mr IA Kennedy, Ms S Krawczyk, Dr H Marriage, Ms J McGovern, Professor GJ Mires, Ms CA Potter, Dr AD Reeves, Mr KA Richmond, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: University Secretary; Vice-Principal & Head of the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing (item 10); Director of Finance; Director of Human Resources; Director of Strategic Planning; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr EF Sanderson, Professor Sue Black, Dr AM Roger, Mr KAC Swinley, Professor J Taylor, Lord Provost Mr R Duncan.

In the absence of the Chairperson of Court, the Court agreed that the Chancellor’s Assessor, Dr J Lowe, should chair the meeting.

1. MINUTES

The Court decided: (i) to approve the minutes of the meeting on 11 June 2012; and

(ii) to approve the minutes of the business meeting held as part of the Court Retreat on 3 September 2012.

2. VISION – DUNDEE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION

The President of the Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA) presented to Court the vision for DUSA for the next five years. In doing so, he highlighted the successes of DUSA in recent league tables (best union in Scotland for last three years (Times Higher Education Student Experience Surveys), third best Union in the UK (Times Higher Education Student Experience Survey 2011) and best Union for nightlife in UK (Which? 2011)) and outlined the DUSA strategic plan. The strategic plan focussed on the areas of: representation, advice & guidance, employability & opportunity, activity & community, communications & media, and commercial opportunities. Court members commended the President on the ambitious, yet achievable goals set and noted that the strategy aimed to create long-term continuity for the work of the DUSA executive and ensure a continued strong partnership with the University and clarity over issues such as the process for establishing the annual level of subvention.
The President went on to draw the attention of the Court to the complementarity of the University Vision core values with the DUSA charitable objectives, and outline the role of DUSA in both the creation and roll-out of the University Vision.

The Court decided: to thank the President for the presentation and to wish DUSA every success for the academic year 2012/13.

3. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

As the Chair of Court had been unable to attend the meeting, he provided a written report outlining his activities since the Court Retreat. The report detailed the Chair’s attendance at meetings of the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) and also its governance working group. The CSC meeting had focussed on the experiences of English universities that had set their student fees below the £9,000pa maximum level; the number of Key Performance Indicators being used by universities; and sustainability.

Court was advised that Professor Julie Taylor (Senate elected member of Court) had tendered her resignation with immediate effect following her acceptance of a position at the University of Edinburgh. The Court asked that their congratulations be passed to Professor Taylor, along with their thanks for her service while a member.

The Court decided: (i) to thank the Chair of Court for the report; and

(ii) to note that an election would be held by Senate to replace Professor Taylor as an elected member of Senate to Court.

4. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Court received a report from the Principal (Appendix 1). In presenting the report, he advised that the roll-out of the Vision (as discussed at the meeting of Court in June 2012) had now commenced. Feedback from the Roadshows had so far been very positive, as had feedback from a meeting with the Student Representative Council (SRC). Staff members appeared to be engaged with the Vision, and questions had focussed on how staff could contribute to the process. The SRC had also commented that the long-term goals would benefit current students in years to come as alumni.

The Principal drew members’ attention to the recent publication of university league tables. The drop in ranking within the Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) and Times Higher Education (THE) rankings (199 to 204 and 201 to 255 respectively) despite improvement in the scores within both tables was, he said, a stark reminder that making progress toward institutional goals must be achieved against the background of rapid development of the Higher Education Sector elsewhere in the world. Court members noted that English universities could be in a strong position to advance their positions owing to the new fee regime south of the border. Court asked that the paper produced
last year outlining the University’s performance in league tables be updated for its December meeting and that such a report be considered on an annual basis henceforward.

The Principal updated the Court on recruitment figures for entry in 2012/13. The figures were positive, with Scottish/EU entrants on target and RUK numbers above the threshold set within the budget. Overseas numbers were provisional and remained subject to the January intake, but suggested an improved position on 2011/12, although the budget for 2012/13 had been based on growth.

Court members discussed the planned initiative from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) to fund additional places for wider access in 2013/14 and looked forward to an update on this matter at their next meeting - noting that both the University of Dundee Learning & Teaching strategy and the Scottish Government agenda placed an importance on this element.

Turning to research matters, the Principal highlighted the record-breaking performance in securing external research income during 2011/12. In addition, he highlighted the recent award of £12m from the HEFCE/BIS initiative for major capital projects (Research Partnerships Investment Fund (RPIF)) which would allow the full completion of the £38m Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR).

**The Court decided:**

(i) to suggest that the issue of wider access be discussed at the next meeting of Court once further information was available from the SFC on its plans;

(ii) to ask that officers prepare a paper for the next meeting of Court on the University’s performance in league tables, and that this become an annual report;

(iii) to congratulate Professor Ferguson and his team on their success in raising funds for the CTIR; and

(iv) otherwise, to thank the Principal for his report.

5. **REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COURT**

*At the start of the item, Members agreed that it would be beneficial for officers to remain during the discussions.*

Discussion on the performance and effectiveness of Court had been previously postponed owing to time constraints at the Court Retreat. As with previous reviews, the discussions focussed on the areas of: effective governance, strategic role, conduct and spread of business, quality of communication and information, opportunities for participation and support for members. The Acting Chair highlighted actions being implemented as a
result of the review of the effectiveness of the Chair at the Court Retreat, and
drew member’s attention to the discussions and recommendations from the
Governance & Nominations Committee relating to this issue (Minute 12).

In discussing communication and information issues, Members requested an
annual report from those areas responsible for student welfare and support.
Members also asked if officers could endeavour to look to reduce the volume
of papers for meetings of Court, while at the same time ensuring that they
were sufficiently analytical and critical and that both data and contextual
information were comprehensive and balanced.

Court members considered the strategic role of the Court. Members were in
agreement that in this respect the role of Court was to ensure that the strategy
was developed in an appropriate manner and to comment upon the strategy
rather than itself to develop it. Members commented that the involvement of
Court at the early stages of development of the Strategy to 2017 had been a
welcome and productive approach and suggested that the practice of early
engagement of Court on key issues be continued.

Members noted the discussions and actions resulting from the review of the
effectiveness of the Chair with regard to the structuring of the agenda and
asked that time on agendas also be allocated to the discussion of external
issues and strategic matters.

In reviewing the Court Retreat, Members expressed a desire for the format to
be more interactive, with break-out opportunities to allow Members to
contribute in an informal manner. The benefits of holding a residential retreat
were suggested but the cost of such events was also noted.

The Court decided: (i) to request an annual report from areas of
Student Services with pastoral and welfare responsibilities;

(ii) to ask officers to further consider agenda
structuring to accommodate strategic debates;

(iii) to request that Court continue to be involved in
the early stage development of strategic
matters; and

(iv) otherwise, to note that the process of review
had been thorough and had already resulted in
beneficial changes to practices.

6. FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE

The Court received a report of the meetings of the Committee on 20 August
2012 (Appendix 2) and 1 October 2012 (Appendix 3). In presenting the
report, the Convener highlighted discussions relating to the proposed
transfer of the MRC Protein Phosphorylation Unit (MRC PPU) to the
University of Dundee, the proposed extension of the £100k loan to Dundee
University Press (DUP) to July 2013, a planned review of DUP by the Senior Management Team and the recommendation that the notional budget for the Remuneration Committee for 2012/13 be approved.

The Court decided: (i) to approve the transfer of the MRC PPU to the University of Dundee in principle, subject to an acceptable agreement being reached in relation to any outstanding issues and in particular written confirmation that the MRC would buy out the section 75 additional pension liability;

(ii) to approve the extension of the DUP loan and await the outcome of the review of DUP;

(iii) to approve the notional budget for the Remuneration Committee, noting that it was likely that successful cases would be concentrated on the professoriate and agreeing that the Committee should be able to bring forward proposals to exceed this budget in the event it was thought it necessary to protect the University’s REF position; and

(iv) otherwise, to approve the report.

7. UNIVERSITY STRATEGY TO 2017

At the Court Retreat on 3 September 2012 Court approved the University Strategy to 2017 subject to further review of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Performance Indicators (PIs) within the Performance Management Framework. The Director of Strategic Planning presented the revised Performance Management Framework, including 15 KPIs and their associated targets along with all PIs. Members were pleased to see that the issues raised previously had been addressed.

In response to questions, the Director of Human Resources provided further information on the process and targets relating to Athena Swann awards. She also discussed the Objective Setting and Review (OSaR) engagement figures and Court noted that the engagement figures for the last OSaR year would be provided to the Human Resources Committee in November. It was expected that engagement figures would rise following a concerted effort led by the Senior Management Team. With regard to equality and diversity training, the Director confirmed that the Human Resources Committee was monitoring engagement levels and that the Research Excellence Framework activities had led to improved engagement.

The Court decided: (i) to approve Performance Management Framework and associated PIs, KPIs and targets;
(ii) to ask that management continue to drive engagement with OSaR processes and equality & diversity training; and

(iii) otherwise, to note the report.

8. STRATEGIC GUIDANCE FROM THE CABINET SECRETARY TO THE SFC

The University Secretary introduced the Cabinet Secretary’s letter of guidance to the SFC on its approach to funding the sector in 2013/14.

The Court expressed some concern with regard to the proposed 2% per annum efficiency gains proposed within the letter, which appeared to run counter to the Scottish Government’s previous agreement that university funding would keep pace with that south of the border. Members also discussed the proposed introduction of incentives for increasing the number of wider access places and improved articulation between Further and Higher Education, but noted that any approach by the University to this issue could only be speculative until the SFC confirmed the process and criteria.

The Court decided: to note the letter and the concerns of members of Court, and to schedule discussion at a future meeting of Court once the SFC funding intentions were known.

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

The Vice-Principal with responsibility for research presented a report which provided an update on progress toward meeting the requirements of the Strategic Framework in the areas of research, collaboration and knowledge transfer. Set against a difficult economic background, the Court heard that the University had performed well, securing around £133m of external research funding in 2011/12. The Vice-Principal also highlighted the collaboration with Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) to establish an ‘easy access’ IP scheme.

Court commended the reported increase in research income per academic FTE, and noted arrangements for the Research Excellence Framework - including the launch of the University-wide Research Information Management System (PURE) in August 2012.

The Vice-Principal confirmed that he intended to review potential efficiency savings and indexation of grants. He also noted that the overhead as a percentage of income, and postgraduate student numbers, were areas for future review.

The Court decided: to note the paper.
10. **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Court considered a report of the meeting of the Committee on 18 September 2012 (Appendix 4). The Convener introduced the annual report by the internal auditors. Noting that the Court delegates responsibility to the Audit Committee, the Convener invited Court to comment on any areas of concern. Court members were satisfied that the Audit Plan for 2012/13 balanced governance and operational aspects, and focussed not only on avoidance of problems, but also potential gains and improvements.

In discussing the Donations Policy, Court members recommended the inclusion of a recommendation that where contention was noted or possible the donation should be brought to Court for consideration.

**The Court decided:**  (i) to approve the Donations Policy subject to minor amendment; and

(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.

11. **GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE**

The University Secretary introduced the report of the meeting of the Committee on 1 October 2012 (Appendix 5). The Committee had discussed the outcomes of the Review of Effectiveness of the Chair of Court that had taken place at the Court Retreat and the Chair had made a number of suggestions following discussion with the Committee.

The University Secretary also highlighted discussions regarding the process for the election of the Chair of Court. The process for the upcoming election would be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee, including the potential introduction of numbering of ballot papers and the possible engagement of an external person to oversee and scrutinise the election process.

**The Court decided:**  (i) to approve the advertisement for lay members of Court as presented;

(ii) to approve the changes to the Terms of Reference for the Governance & Nominations Committee; and

(iii) otherwise, to approve the report.

12. **CODE OF PRACTICE FOR SCOTTISH HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE**

The Court noted that the group established by the Scottish Chair of Courts to develop a Code of Practice for Scottish Higher Education Governance had circulated its terms of reference along with arrangements for institutional
consultations. The consultation was to include meetings with four groups: (a) Governing Body members (including the Chair and the Secretary), (b) the Senior Executive, (c) staff and (d) students. The Court agreed that Mr Eric Sanderson (Chair of Court), Dr Janet Lowe (Chancellor’s Assessor), Mr Richard Burns (Lay Court Member), Dr Howard Marriage (Lay Court Member) and Mr Iain Wright (Graduates Council Assessor) be asked to represent the Governing Body in the consultation along with Dr Neale Laker (Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs). The Principal, University Secretary, Director of Human Resources, and Director of Finance would form group (b). Elected staff members of Court would form group (c), which would be linked to meetings with Trade Union Representatives. The President of DUSA would lead on the development of the group representing the students, with the DUSA President and Vice-President, Rector and independent student member of Court ideally being involved in the group.

The Court decided: to approve the proposed composition of the consultation groups.

13. NINEWELLS CANCER CAMPAIGN

Court received the annual report from the Chair of the Ninewells Cancer Campaign, Lady Fiona Fraser. The Court was pleased to note the success of the campaign, with around £1m raised to date for the Jacqui Wood Centre.

The Court decided: to note the report.

14. ETHICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

[Emeritus Professor Ann Burchell declared an interest in this item and withdrew for the duration of the discussion].

The Court heard that the current Convener of the Ethical Review Committee (ERC) had indicated his intention to step down at the end of December 2012. In addition, a number of recent legislative changes meant that the name of the Committee, composition, remits and procedures for which it was responsible would need to be reviewed. Emeritus Professor Ann Burchell had been approached with regard to the Convenership of the Committee and had indicated a willingness to take over as Convener for an interim period of 2 years, with the possibility of extending the appointment thereafter.

The Court noted that it may be appropriate, given the nature of the role, for Emeritus Professor Burchell to become a member of University staff. Given that Emeritus Professor Burchell had chosen not to stand for re-election as Graduates’ Council Assessor on Court and as such had nine months remaining on her term on Court, the Court was asked to consider waiving the stipulation in Statute 9(l) that no member of staff of the University may be a member of the Court save as a Senate or Academic Council Assessor or as an elected member of the non-academic staff.
The Court decided:  

(i) to approve the appointment of Emeritus Professor Burchell as Convener of the ERC;  

(ii) to ask Emeritus Professor Burchell to carry out a review of the operation and effectiveness of the ERC; and  

(iii) to waive the stipulation in Statute 9(l) that no member of staff of the University may be a member of the Court save as a Senate or Academic Council Assessor or as an elected member of the non-academic staff for the remaining period of office of Professor Burchell on the Court.

15. OUTCOME AGREEMENT

Court received the finalised Outcome Agreement with the Scottish Funding Council. Court had previously approved the Agreement at the Court Retreat on 3 September 2012 subject to the inclusion of Key Performance Indicators and targets which were being refined at that time.

The Court decided: to approve the finalised Agreement.

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

The Court received the University’s annual statement to the SFC detailing the subject reviews that had been carried out over the past year. The report had been submitted to the SFC by its deadline of 30 September 2012 following circulation by email to members of Court.

The Court decided: to approve the report.

17. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

The Court received a report of a meeting of the Senate on 10 October 2012 (Appendix 6). The Court noted the discussions on the University Vision, arrangements for the QAA Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) and ongoing preparations for the Research Excellence Framework.

The Court decided: to approve the report.

18. HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Court received a report of a meeting of the Committee on 17 September 2012 (Appendix 7).
The Court decided: to approve the report.

19. CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

The Court received a revised Code of Practice on Conflict of Interest and draft US Public Health Service (PHS) policy, these changes were necessary as a direct result of changes to the regulations governing research funded through US Public Health Service (PHS) in order to apply for funding (or be a sub-recipient).

The Court decided: (i) to approve the changes to the existing Code of Practice on Conflict of Interest; and

(ii) to approve in principle the draft PHS policy subject both to further comment and refinement internally with colleagues within Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs and Research & Innovation Services and to formal approval via the Audit Committee in November 2012.

20. STAFF

(1) Professorial and Other Grade 10 Appointments

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunnar Horning</td>
<td>Personal Chair of Magneto-hydrodynamics</td>
<td>1 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalu Waller</td>
<td>Personal Chair of Human Communication</td>
<td>1 June 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Statute 16

The Court decided: to approve the composition of two Committees, as set out below, in the event that they were required to: (a) hear disciplinary charges against a member of staff in the College of Art, Science & Engineering that might arise from an ongoing grievance investigation (Committee 1); and (b) hear disciplinary charges against a member of staff in the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing (Committee 2):
Committee 1:
Professor CA Whatley (Convener)
Dr H Marriage (Lay Court)
Professor T Palmer (Senate Nominee)

Committee 2:
Professor SP Decent (Convener)
Ms S Campbell (Lay Court)
Professor GJ Mires (Senate Nominee)

21. ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETINGS OF COURT

The Court noted arrangements for the remaining meetings of Court during the academic year 2012/13, which included a training presentation by Dundas & Wilson prior to the December meeting, and a tour of Ninewells prior to the February meeting of Court.

The Court decided: to note the arrangements.
Vision

Work steams ahead on the implementation of the new University Vision. You will remember I gave a presentation to Court at the meeting in June in which I set out the core purpose, goal, values and themes of the new Vision. Over the next few weeks, I am hosting a series of roadshow events to which staff have been invited and at which I will set out the details of the Vision to the staff of the University. Up until now Deans, Directors and Senate members have been involved, but it is time to take the Vision out to the wider University community, and get their views on what it will mean for the way we do our business. The Director of External Relations is discussing with the Students’ Association the best way of engaging the student community, too. I am excited by the vision, and it was good to be able to use the recent meeting of the Senate to consider what we might mean by the term ‘leading University’ from our goal to be ‘Scotland’s leading University’. Certainly some interesting ideas emerged from the Senate debate, but I think the conversation needs to be widened and deepened as we make our journey towards our ambitious goal.

We have also been forging ahead with the underlying enabling strategies that underpin the overall strategy through which this goal will be achieved. Part of this work has been about identifying coherent and meaningful performance and key performance indicators; the comments from the Court Retreat and the recent meeting of the Finance & Policy Committee have been helpful in focusing on what is absolutely necessary here.

Ministerial Letter of Direction

I have included in the papers the recent ministerial letter of direction to the Funding Council from the Cabinet Secretary for Education & Lifelong Learning, Mike Russell. I think it is important that Court see the text of this letter for two reasons: firstly it sets the tone and timetable for the next round of discussions on the Outcome Agreement for 2013/14, and secondly it sets out with deafening clarity the current policy of the Scottish Government in relation to Widening Access and Participation in particular. Additional resources for increased numbers of places for students from deprived backgrounds are to be made available via the Funding Council, as are further places in support of articulation with Colleges. There is an interesting debate underlying this, in that the widening access funds are to be made available to the ‘most selective’ institutions, of which Dundee is one. The danger here is the increased competition that this will cause in attracting students from deprived backgrounds, since it is unclear at the moment how big that market really is, and it is possible that the new policy may pit institutions against one another.

The sting in the tail of the ministerial letter is the expectation that institutions will help to create the means to provide these funds by achieving year on year efficiency gains of 2% (in our case between £800k and £1.4m depending on if the efficiency gain is applied to the total SFC grant or to the teaching grant only), which appears to cut straight across the deal struck with the sector out of the last Comprehensive Spending Review. This is a very challenging target, and it will be interesting to hear Court members’ views on this.

League Tables

Since the last meeting, two world rankings have been released: Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) and Times Higher Education (THE). Until 2010, these two organisations produced a single joint ranking, but each has published separately since then. In the QS world rankings, the University’s ranking has fallen from 199 to 204. In the THE rankings, the University’s ranking has fallen from 176 to the banding of 201-225.

The University’s overall score in both the QS and THE rankings improved slightly, but it would seem that other institutions have improved more in their own scores and/or there are institutions included this time that were not previously included and which have entered the rankings above the University. Universities in the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China) are seeing relatively large levels of investment compared to Scottish institutions, for instance, and are making inroads in the rankings. At subject level the University was not included in the top 50 subject rankings of the Times Higher, but was ranked 76 (up from 85) for Life Sciences and Medicine.
These are the vagaries of league tables. It’s never good news to hear that the University has dropped from its previous position in the tables, whatever we might personally think about their validity and usefulness. For me these tables suggest that our excellence agenda has to be much more deeply embedded if we are to make headway on achieving our goal. It is also a stark reminder that making progress toward our institutional goals will have to be achieved against a background of rapid development of higher education system elsewhere in the world.

Recruitment Update

In overall terms the student entrant population has dropped from 2011/12 to 2012/13, but this masks a number of issues. The University had to take a conscious decision to control Home/EU recruitment to ensure that we did not breach consolidation targets for its overall SFC funded places; and this the University has managed, after a series of years of high home intakes. Because of the introduction of fees for students from the Rest of the UK (RUK), this has meant management of EU applications in particular has been difficult. But Scottish/EU entrants are just about on target. In RUK terms, comparing 2011/12 with 2012/13 shows a reduction in overall numbers, but this has been the case across the Scottish sector, (and indeed in England itself). The University had anticipated reduced numbers in setting a prudent budget, and of course since RUK students no longer form part of our funded numbers, every student represents additional income. So whilst there is a reduction in UK student numbers from outside Scotland year on year, this year’s intake is nevertheless above the targets we had set ourselves. We must, of course, learn lessons from this year’s approach to RUK recruitment so as to inform our strategy for the coming year and maximise our ability to capitalise on this additional source of unregulated income.

UG Intake figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of postgraduate students, the picture is still changing, and of course we will have the January intake, but currently the entrant population has increased over last year’s figures, with overseas postgraduate numbers increasing by 10.5% and home/EU increasing by 15.5%. Nonetheless, these numbers are still below the targets we had set ourselves, requiring us to focus on our January intake; and it serves to show the general difficulties in the PG market both home and abroad, not least those associated with the UKBA.

Research update

It is self evident that this is a time of great uncertainty, which brings with it both opportunities and a heightened sense of risk. Hence we should take confidence from the past year’s record-breaking performance in securing external research income. This has been topped off with the recently-announced award of £12m from the HEFCE/BIS initiative for major capital projects (Research Partnerships Investment Fund (RPIF)) which will allow the completion of the £38m CTIR project. Court will remember the difficult decision which had to be taken to support the initiation of this project with £5m of our own capital to support a bid to the Wellcome Trust/Wolfson Scheme. RPIF funding provides the ultimate justification for the Court’s decision to build the CTIR, with exceptional leverage having been generated as a result of the University’s investment. I hope the Court will join me in congratulating Professor Mike Ferguson and his team, who together have raised £33m of the total funding for this project.

Professor Pete Downes
Principal & Vice Chancellor
Senior Management Team Meetings (SMT)
http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/court/com/smt/

Since the last report to the Senate, the Senior Management Team has met as follows: 28 May, 13 June, 4 and 18 July, 18 and 29 August, and 19 September 2012; it considered a number of issues, including the following:

- University’s Vision and the Strategy to 2017
- Outcome Agreement with the Scottish Funding Council
- Research Grants and Contracts Performance
- UK Research Partnership Investment Fund
- Innovation Centres
- Health & Safety Leadership
- REF Code of Practice
- UK Borders Agency
- Management Accounts
- Capital Expenditure Plans
- Athena Swan
- Contingency Planning for Turmoil in the Eurozone
- Decanal Appointments
- Human Resources Issues:
  - National Pay Negotiations
  - Review Procedure for Probationary Lecturers
  - Academic Staff Annual Review and CRP Round
  - Objective-setting and Review
  - Voluntary Severance cases
  - Honorary Professorships
Major Grants and Awards

- **£5.9m from the Wellcome Trust to Professor Irwin McLean** for Dermatology and Genetic Medicine (Strategic Grant) (Joint with Kings College)
- **£5.4m from the Wellcome Trust to Professor Angus Lamond** for Centre Status Grant – Gene Regulation and Expression
- **£4.3m from Medical Research Council to Professor Dario Alessi** for Protein Phosphorylation Unit
- **£1.9m from the Wellcome Trust to Professor Ron Hay** for Determining the Role and Mechanism of Action of SUMO Targeted Ubiquitin Ligase RNF4 in Maintaining Genome Integrity (Senior Investigator Award)
- **£1.4m from Medical Research Council to Professor Sir Philip Cohen** for Characterisation of Signal Transduction Pathways that Restrict Activation of the Innate Immune System to Prevent Inflammatory and Autoimmune Diseases (Programme Grant)
- **£1.4m from Cancer Research UK to Professor Roland Wolf** for Molecular and Pharmacological Characterisation of Pathways Which Determine the Sensitivity of Cells to Anti-Cancer Drugs and Chemopreventive Agents
- **£0.9m from Cancer Research UK to Professor Julian Blow** for Preparing the Genome for Replication: Exploring the Consequences of Origin Licensing and Exploiting its Inhibition (Programme Grant)

People and Prizes

- Professor Terry Dawson, SAGES Chair in Global Environmental Change at the University of Dundee, has been appointed to the UK National Committee for Biodiversity
- Professor Vicki Hanson, of the University of Dundee, has been elected Secretary/Treasurer of the ACM (Association for Computing Machinery), which represents more than 100,000 members worldwide.
- Scott Brady, a successful businessman who has built up and sold three companies across different sectors, has been appointed as the University’s first entrepreneur in residence.
- The Sir James Black Awards for 2012 were presented to Rachelle Binny, College of Art, Science and Engineering; Duncan Blues, College of Arts and Social Sciences; Magdalena Grzeszczuk, College of Life Sciences; and Mary Duffy, College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing during graduation.
- Dr Mhairi Towler has been named as the first winner of the University of Dundee’s Principal’s Prize for Enterprise and Entrepreneurship
- Conor Kerr, who graduated in Law from the University of Dundee in June, was named the winner of this year’s Colin Donald Environmental Law Prize, sponsored by the National Trust for Scotland and Pinsent Masons.
- Product Design graduates Nikki Ferguson and Andrew Knott both picked up prizes at this year’s New Designers event in London, which is among the main showcases for graduates and young designers
- Two scientists from the College of Life Sciences were among the winners of the Royal Society of Edinburgh's inaugural prizes. Professor Geoffrey Gadd, a world pioneer in the growing field of geomicrobiology, received the RSE/Sir James Black Prize, and Dr Nicola Stanley-Wall, lecturer in the Division of Molecular Microbiology, received the RSE/Patrick Neil Medal.
- Sarah Stewart, a textile design graduate from Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design (DJCAD) has won the Graduate Showcase prize at The Festival of Quilts.
- Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design’s innovative approach to marketing saw it win a prestigious prize at this year’s Scottish Event Awards, taking the 'Best Marketing Strategy' title.
- Professor Ron Hay, of the College of Life Sciences, has been presented with the 2012 Novartis Medal and Prize.
APPENDIX 2

FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE

(Minute 6)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 20 August 2012.

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

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage; University Secretary; Director of Finance; Director of Strategic Planning; Director of Campus Services; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Professor RJ Abboud.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 14 May 2012.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Three-Year Forecast for the Scottish Funding Council (Minute 6)

The Committee noted that the forecasts had been revised as suggested prior to their submission to Court on 11 June 2012.

3. ESTATES & BUILDINGS

The Director of Campus Services introduced his routine report to the Committee by highlighting that ~60% of the energy meters had now been installed which would enable a building-by-building breakdown of energy usage to be produced. This information would be used to develop a targeted approach to the reduction of energy usage. The Committee acknowledged the difficulties in changing attitudes to energy consumption and the need to create a sense of ownership on the issue.

An update on the progress of current capital works projects was also provided. With regard to the Ninewells library & teaching accommodation project, the Director confirmed that discussions were ongoing between the NHS and University of Dundee in relation to options for the funding of sections 3 & 4 of Phase 2, but that other Phase 2 works were progressing well.

Turning to the DJCAD project, the Director informed the Committee that work to create a new entrance to the Matthew Building was behind schedule due to the poor performance of the contractor and the relocation of utilities. It was hoped that these works would be concluded before the start of the new academic year, and a meeting to discuss the phasing and prioritisation of other works within the overall DJCAD capital plan was to be held later in the week.

The Committee were pleased to hear that the majority of works at the Centre for Anatomy & Human Identification had been completed, but expressed concern at the news that the contractor working on the project had that day entered receivership. The Director confirmed that he would endeavour to engage the sub-contractors directly to complete the work and to obtain the outstanding health and safety certification, while also engaging with the receivers.

Since the last meeting of the Committee, contractors for the Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) building works had been appointed, and a start was made on site on 9 July 2012. Good progress had been made, with an expected completion date of November 2013.

Resolved: to thank the Director for his report and await further updates
4. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 12 (INTERIM) AND YEAR END TIMETABLE

The Director of Finance presented the management accounts for the period to the end of July 2012. The Committee noted that the figures were still subject to final review and external audit. At the time of the meeting, the accounts indicated an operating surplus of £5.4m, representing a favourable variance of £5.2m compared with the budget, and an improvement of £3.2m from the Period 8 predictions. This increase had largely been due to one-off gains made in areas such as exchange rate hedging and unfunded pension provisions. After provisions for voluntary severance and gains from disposals the bottom-line figure showed a surplus of £5.6m. Capital expenditure of £9.3m had been incurred, part-funded by external funding of £3.0m. Net funds had increased by £0.3m over the year. The Director of Finance proposed further discussions on the results and on the issue of financial sustainability at the next meeting of the Committee once the accounts had been analysed further.

The Committee requested an update on student recruitment figures for the 2012/13 intake, and asked how the emerging patterns compared to the scenarios presented to Court in December 2011. The University Secretary confirmed that recruitment figures for Scottish and European Union (EU) student places were expected to reach the targets set, and that it was likely that there had been an increase in the proportion of those entrants who were from the EU. The Rest of UK (RUK) recruitment levels had decreased from that of the 2011/12 intake, but appeared to be within the modelled ranges and above the figure budgeted for. International recruitment was at an early stage with places still subject to the award of visas; as such these numbers would be reported later in the process.

The Director of Finance provided a brief summary of the year-end timetable, informing the Committee that the external auditors had now completed the interim audit and were expected to review the accounts at the end of the month.

Resolved: (i) to note the current position and await the audited accounts in due course; and

(ii) to request a further update on student recruitment figures and the resulting financial impact at the Court Retreat on 3 September 2012.

5. REPORT OF THE TRIENNIAL REVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE SUPERANNUATION SCHEME

The Committee received a report on the actuarial valuation of the University of Dundee Superannuation and Life Assurance Scheme as at 31 July 2011, carried out by the scheme’s actuary Xafinity. A number of assumptions had been made in producing the valuation, and changes to two of these (longevity of scheme members, and investment yields) had combined to significantly increase the value of the scheme liabilities. The impact of these changes more than offset the additional payments made by the University to reduce the deficit, investment returns and the effect of lower salary increases. The Director of Finance confirmed that maintaining employer’s contributions at the current rate of 22.1% was predicted to be sufficient to remove the deficit within eight years – which was within the normal requirement of ten years set by the Pensions Regulator.

The Committee asked if comparable information regarding the USS Pension Scheme Liabilities was available. The Director of Finance confirmed that the University would be responsible for a share of the net assets/liabilities from the USS scheme, but that it was not possible to quantify these for individual institutions, given the number of institutions who were part of the scheme as well as the range of members.

Resolved: to note the position with regard to the pension schemes and in particular to accept the timescales associated with deficit reduction.

6. ENDOWMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report from the meeting of the Sub-Committee on 14 May 2012. A verbal report of the meeting had been provided at the last meeting of the Finance & Policy Committee. The Convener reported that the performance of the investment funds had improved in the three months from 30 April to 31 July, but that over the 12 months to the end of July 2012 performance had been underperformed in its benchmark. However over the three
year period to July 2012 performance was ahead of benchmark. The Convener informed the Committee that in the interim period the performance of the investment funds had improved, but that over the year there remained a decrease when compared to the benchmarked index.

The Committee enquired as to the status of the Bruce Johnston legacy, and the University Secretary confirmed that the bequest was not yet part of the endowments portfolio as the solicitors were still in the process of winding up the estate.

Resolved: to note the report.
APPENDIX 3
FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE
(Minute 6)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 1 October 2012.

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

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage; University Secretary; Director of Finance; Director of Campus Services; and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Director of Strategic Planning; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 20 August 2012 subject to minor amendment.

2. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

3. ESTATES & BUILDINGS

The Director of Campus Services introduced his routine report to the Committee by highlighting that the installation of energy meters was 75% complete, and that they would shortly be commissioned in full.

In turning to the capital plan, the Director confirmed that work on the Ninewells Library & Teaching Accommodation (Phase 2) was progressing well, with the new-build sections expected to be competed in January 2013, and the refurbished sections scheduled for completion in September 2013. He highlighted that, with the agreement of the NHS Endowment, £1m had been transferred from the Lecture Theatre 1 Refurbishment project to allow all sections of Phase 2 to be completed. Design, specifications and tenders documents for Phase 3 (Lecture Theatre Refurbishment) were due for completion in December 2012, and works would commence in summer 2013 subject to further fundraising.

An update on the DJCAD project was also provided. The Director reported that the formation of a new entrance at the Matthew Building had been subject to further delay due to the contractors, but that works to water services and fire alarms in the Crawford building had been completed on schedule. Discussions were taking place within DJCAD and Estates & Buildings to identify a programme of major works for summer 2013, likely to focus on level 5 of the Matthew Building.

The Director had reported at the last meeting that the company holding the main construction contract for works on the Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification (CAHID) had entered into receivership on 20 August 2012. At the time of that meeting there remained outstanding snagging issues with the project and the overall financial position had not been calculated. The Director updated the Committee, highlighting that Brown Construction had been due to pay the University a VAT refund of ~£70k, whilst the University was due to pay a final valuation to Brown Construction of ~£50k. He confirmed that an agent representing the receivers had been in contact with the University and negotiations were now underway.

In response to enquiries from the Committee, the Director outlined the nature of the various contracts used by the University in engaging contractors.

The Committee was pleased to hear that work on the Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) had commenced on 9 July 2012. Good progress had been made and the building was scheduled for completion in November 2013. The Principal
confirmed that a major application for £12.5m had been submitted to BIS, which if successful, would enable the shell floors of the building to be fully fitted out.

**Resolved:** to thank the Director for his report and await further updates

4. **MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 1**

The Director of Finance presented the management accounts for the period to the end of August 2012. These showed an operating surplus of £2.1m to the end of period 1 - a favourable variance of £1.3m compared with the phased budget. The year-end forecast was for an operating surplus of £0.4m. After gain on disposals of £1.9m, a bottom line surplus of £2.3m was forecast. At the time of the meeting, student numbers were subject to confirmation, and as such the effects of recruitment on the forecasts were yet to be finalised.

The Director outlined to the Committee a pilot that was being carried out in the College of Life Sciences relating to Research Finance Forecasting. The accuracy of the forecasts generated in the pilot would be compared over the course of the academic year to those of the existing system which continued to be used in the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing.

The Director also provided a report on the progress made in recruiting staff through the strategic investments approved in the 2012/13 budget. The Principal confirmed that the Senior Management Team would review the progress being made with these investments on a regular basis, paying particular attention to the quality of appointments, eligibility for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and future return on investment.

In response to questions, the Director informed the Committee that he would present an item to the next meeting on Financial Sustainability, which would address issues such as for how long strategic investments were offset against the University’s 6% surplus target.

**Resolved:**

(i) to await a report on Financial Sustainability; and

(ii) otherwise to note the accounts.

5. **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

The Director of Finance updated the Committee on progress with regard to the completion of the Financial Statements for 2011/12. Work was proceeding to schedule and the Statements would be submitted to the Finance & Policy Committee at its meeting on 19 November 2012. The Director informed the Committee that he had identified a number of areas which could be completed more quickly in future years that might enable the Statements to be considered at the October meeting of the Committee.

**Resolved:** to note the position.

6. **TREASURY ANNUAL REPORT**

The Director of Finance presented the annual Treasury Report which reviewed treasury activity over the last 12 months. The report covered the areas of: counterparty risk, liquidity risk, exchange rate exposure, foreign currency balances, the performance of banks and external service providers, investment returns, credit facilities, inflation risk, and loan covenants.

The Committee noted that the priorities for 2012/13 were: to develop longer term (3 year) forecasts to allow a view to be taken on the need to retain the undrawn facility with Barclays, the continued monitoring of shorter term cash flow forecasts to allow a larger proportion of total funds to be deposited for longer, and to look for alternatives for the Euro deposit in order to maximise the return on this cash.

With regard to counterparty risk, the Committee noted that a new facility had been opened with Lloyds (Bank of Scotland) which had reduced the gross exposure to RBS, but that further work was needed to ensure that the balances with RBS were maintained below the agreed 50% limit.

**Resolved:** to note the report.
7. PROPOSAL TO TRANSFER THE MRC PROTEIN PHOSPHORYLATION UNIT TO THE COLLEGE OF LIFE SCIENCES

The Committee received a paper which outlined the proposal to transfer the MRC Protein Phosphorylation Unit (MRC PPU) to the University. The MRC PPU had operated as an independent entity using facilities provided by the College of Life Sciences for a number of years. The MRC had similar arrangements with other Universities across the UK, but was now looking to transfer these Units into Universities together with the associated funding.

The Committee noted that there was no significant financial impact to the University from the transfer of the Unit, although there was some transfer of risk in relation to staff employment and pension issues. The Director of Finance confirmed that during negotiations the MRC had proposed to buy-out the section 75 additional pension liability (estimated at £1.3m), thus removing this element of risk.

Members agreed that the University would benefit from the arrangement in both financial and reputational terms, not least because the staff working in the Unit would become eligible for inclusion in the University’s REF return.

Resolved: to endorse the proposal to Court, noting that the merger would enhance the reputation of the University.

8. DUNDEE STUDENT VILLAGES

The Director of Finance presented a report routine report which outlined the performance of Dundee Student Villages (DSV) along with its subsidiary, West Park Conference Centre (WPCC) during 2011/12, and set out the future expectations for both. Draft accounts for DSV and WPCC were provided.

The Committee learnt that DSV had continued to perform above expectations and ahead of the business model despite a difficult economic period. The Committee noted that a number of assumptions made within the financial model were capable of materially affecting the financial success of the structure - the main risk being the ability for rents to continue to be increased at 1.5% above RPI for 35 years without becoming uncompetitive. The Director of Finance proposed that the model be stress-tested for its sensitivity to lower rent increases and reduced surpluses in WPCC.

Members of the Committee highlighted that Belmont Halls would only remain within the model for a few years, which could potentially bring greater flexibility to the model.

Resolved: to note the report.

9. DUNDEE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Director of Finance provided an update on the position of Dundee University Press (DUP). The University had loaned DUP £100,000 in February 2009, with the loan due to be repaid in July 2012. He informed the Committee that a book deal discussed last year was now expected to generate significantly less income than had been predicted at that time. Given the significant change in outlook for 2012/13, the Director highlighted the need to review the strategy for the future of DUP and proposed that a paper be prepared for the next meeting of the Committee which outlined options, including a comparison of the value of DUP to the University in reputational terms against its financial performance in the context of the University’s Vision and Strategy to 2017.

Resolved: (i) to endorse the roll forward of the existing loan for a further year (to 31 July 2013);

(ii) to await the outcome of the proposed review; and

(iii) to otherwise note the report.
10. **UPDATE ON STUDENT RECRUITMENT**

The University Secretary introduced a summary update on student recruitment numbers for entry in 2012/13. With a closing date for September matriculation of 5 October 2012, final student numbers (including international postgraduate numbers) were still subject to confirmation at the time of the meeting. The Student Loan Company was expected to provide information on student eligibility for the means-tested bursary scheme on 30 October 2012, subsequent to which information regarding bursary and scholarship awards would be provided to the Committee.

It was noted that Scottish/EU recruitment figures had reached their targets and were within tolerance limits of the capped figures. The Rest of UK (RUK) recruitment targets had been exceeded by 22%, although in the context of prudent budget targets. Overseas undergraduate figures were expected to be close to targets set, but the position with regard to postgraduates remained uncertain. He advised that visa appointment delays in all markets except China may yet adversely affect these figures.

The Committee noted that it was likely that RUK recruitment for 2013/14 would become more competitive, not least as a result of the apparent failure of the ‘AAB policy’ in England. The University Secretary informed the Committee that a full review of the marketing strategy and recruitment patterns for 2012/13 would be carried out as soon as confirmed recruitment figures were known in order to inform the approach for 2013/14.

In the course of discussion, members requested that information be provided to a future meeting on progression rates for overseas undergraduate students in comparison to Home, EU, and RUK students.

The Committee noted that the Scottish Funding Council had recently confirmed that to qualify for home fees in 2013/14, students must possess a (non-UK) EU passport and be able to demonstrate residency within an EU nation for 6 months. This clarification was welcomed.

Resolved: (i) to ask that officers provide a report on progression rates for overseas undergraduate students; and

(ii) to otherwise note the report and await an update at the meeting in November.

11. **REMUNERATION COMMITTEE**

In line with the recommendation from last year’s review of the remit, make-up and role of the Remuneration Committee, the Finance & Policy Committee received a paper from the Director of HR outlining aspects that needed to be taken into account when considering the University’s position with regard to remuneration of senior staff in this year’s round.

Following consideration of all of these factors, and especially in light of the forthcoming REF exercise, the Committee agreed with the recommendation that there was a need to retain the ability to reward key senior staff demonstrating the highest levels of performance. In taking forward such an approach, the Committee considered that priority should be given to the Professoriate rather than senior management.

The Committee approved the notional remuneration budget of £75k, noting that awards had very rarely reached this level in the recent past. In that context, while members felt it was important that the Committee kept awards within the budget, they also acknowledged the need for the University to be able to protect its position in respect of the REF and that the Remuneration Committee should be afforded some flexibility in that regard if necessary.

Resolved: (i) to recommend to Court that the notional budget for Remuneration Committee be approved

(ii) to ask that the Remuneration Committee provide a summary update to the next meeting of the Finance & Policy Committee, in particular identifying any additional financial requirements.
12. **PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK**

The Committee received a paper which provided a response to Court’s request of 3 September 2012 for further work to be done on the selection of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to support the University Strategy to 2017. The paper highlighted the complete suite of Performance Indicators (PIs), and the University Secretary confirmed that work on underlying benchmarking data and targets was underway, and was expected to be presented to Court on 22 October 2012.

Members were pleased to see that the issues raised when the framework had been discussed at the Court had been addressed, and that the responses had been provided to the questions asked by members. However, the Committee remained of the view that from a Court perspective information on progression rates, especially from year 1 to 2, should be a KPI rather than a PI.

**Resolved:** to thank the Director of Strategic Planning for the report, and to recommend the paper to Court for formal approval subject to the introduction of a KPI relating to progression.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 18 September 2012.

**Present:** Dr H Marriage (Convener), Mr JE Barnett (Item 3 onward), Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr KA Richmond, Mr I Stewart, Mr KAC Swinley.

**In Attendance:** University Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Director of Campus Services (item 6), Director of Student Operations (item 3(1) and 4(5)), Ms L Patterson (PricewaterhouseCoopers) Mr M Reid (PricewaterhouseCoopers), Mr A Shaw (KPMG), and Clerk to Court.

**Apologies:** Mr R Burns, Mr S Reid.

1. **MINUTES**
   
   Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 23 May.

2. **MATTERS ARISING**

   (1) **Update Report on Incidents of Potential Fraud (Minute 3)**

   The Director of Finance gave a presentation to the Committee outlining the three main areas for potential fraud: Financial Fraud, Employment Fraud, and Academic Fraud. He asked the Committee for its opinion on the level of detail it required within an annual report. The Committee commented that an annual update of the overview presented, along with a list of incidents of fraud during that 12 month period would provide reassurance that the issue was being appropriately managed.

   Resolved: to request the production of an annual report into incidents of fraud.

   (2) **Draft Information Security Policy (Minute 4(2))**

   The University Secretary informed the Committee that completion of the draft Information Security Policy had been delayed due to the retirement of Mr David George (Chief Information Officer). The Senior Management Team was currently reviewing the structure of Information Services, with the aim of recruiting a new Director by the end of the year. In the mean-time, Mr Tom Mortimer (Director of Information & Communication Services (ICS)) had been asked to lead the development of an interim report, and it was expected that this report would be provided to the next meeting of the Audit Committee. The University Secretary also confirmed that work on areas of risk as identified by the Information Security report from the internal auditors would be a priority, and that the 2012/13 internal audit plan had been designed to include an allocation of time to be used at the discretion of the new Director.

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

3. **INTERNAL AUDIT**

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

   (1) **UK Border Agency**

   The auditors presented a report on the control environment around compliance with UK Border Agency (UKBA) regulations. The initial scope of the audit had been expanded at the request of University management to include compliance with regulations concerning the employment of international staff, and to enable the
sampling of changes being implemented to enhance monitoring processes. Two high and 5 moderate risk recommendations were made, with the high graded recommendations reflecting opportunities to improve procedures in respect of international staff absence reporting; and the inherent risk of any potential non-compliance in School monitoring of international students.

In response to questions, the Director of Student Operations described how the reporting of aspects linked to compliance had been automated over the last few months through the ‘hard-coding’ of reports to remove the reliance on individual staff members. She also informed the Committee of plans to recruit a Compliance Officer in the near future, and provided an outline of the role of the University’s UKBA Compliance Group in responding promptly to the detection of potential issues. In discussing preparations for the upcoming UKBA inspection, the Director highlighted plans to utilise the North East of Scotland Alliance on UKBA to carry out spot-checks.

Resolved:

(i) to ask that an annual report on UKBA compliance be provided to the Audit Committee; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

(2) Research Cash Flow Forecasting

The auditors provided an overview of their report into Research Cash Flow Forecasting. There were three moderate risk recommendations relating to: research income and expenditure budgeting, cash flow monitoring, and research creditors. Members of the Committee commented that the inability to accurately predict a surplus may lead to a risk-averse mentality, however it was noted that a recent report to the Finance & Policy Committee had highlighted improvements made in forecasting over the last 6 months.

The Director of Finance informed the Committee that a new system for research cash flow forecasting would be piloted in 2012-13 within the College of Life Sciences. Results would be assessed over the course of the financial year and the system would be rolled-out to other Colleges in 2013-14 if it proved successful.

Resolved:

(i) to look forward to the 12 month follow-up report on this Item; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

(3) Long Term Strategic Planning

The Auditors presented a review of long term strategic planning. Six moderate and one low risk recommendation were made within the report, with the moderate risk recommendations relating to: the timeline to implementation, enabling strategy aims, KPIs, Performance appraisals link to University Strategy, School Operating Plans, and School Engagement. It was noted that management had accepted the recommendations, and that the embedding of the new planning processes would address a number of the recommendations.

Resolved: to note the report.

(4) Follow-up Report

The auditors presented a report which set out the University’s progress in implementing internal audit recommendations from previous years. Of the 137 recommendations open at the start of the follow-up audit, 77 had been completed, 43 were in progress, and only 6 were outstanding. A further 11 recommendations had been closed following discussion between management and the auditors. The Committee noted that a number of the recommendations that were outstanding or in progress related to PECOS, in relation to which the Director of Finance confirmed that the delays had largely resulted from resourcing issues and that the new target dates were realistic.
Turning to the six-month follow-up requested for the Health & Safety report viewed by the Committee on 6 March 2012, the Committee noted that work to address the critical risk recommendation on training was in-progress. The Committee asked that the officer responsible for implementation of the recommendation be invited to provide an update on progress at the next meeting of the Audit Committee. The Committee also commented on the need to ensure buy-in to Health and Safety issue, and suggested that a more corporate, less devolved approach was required. Members asked management to consider if aspects relating to Health & Safety could be included in the existing OSaR processes.

Resolved:  
(i) to ask management to prepare a mid-year report into the progress of recommendations;

(ii) to request the Deputy Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development be invited to the next meeting of the Audit Committee;

(iii) to ask management to consider ways in which buy-in to Health & Safety could be improved; and

(iv) otherwise to note the report.

(5) Status Update

The auditors presented their final status report on the audit plan for 2011-12. All work had been completed, and the Committee noted that one review had, on the advice of officers, been deferred to allow additional time to be used within the UKBA audit.

Resolved: to note the report.

(6) 2011-12 Annual Audit Report

The Committee received the auditors’ annual report on the effectiveness of internal controls. The auditors’ assessment was that the ‘University’s systems provide a reasonable basis for maintaining control’ and ‘the control framework provides reasonable assurance regarding the effective and efficient achievement of strategic objectives’. The report drew the Committee’s attention to the major recommendations from the year’s audit work, and the Committee commented that the report provided a useful summary for communication to Court.

Resolved:  
(i) to ask the annual report be included as an appendix of the minutes for transmission to Court; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

(7) 2012-2013 Internal Audit Plan

The auditors set out the proposed plan of work for the 2012-13 session. The plan had been developed in consultation with officers, and the Committee noted that the deferred audit on bribery and corruption had been scheduled for October 2012. The Committee welcomed the inclusion of references to the risk register within the plan, and in response to questions the University Secretary outlined the process by which the Schools to be subject to internal audit each year were selected.

Resolved: to approve the plan

4. EXTERNAL AUDIT

In presenting the ‘Interim Management Letter’, Ms Paterson highlighted the status of the audit, the review of financial governance arrangements, and the follow-up to recommendations from the previous year. The Committee heard that 8 of the 11 recommendations made last year that were outstanding related to IT (paragraph 2(2) above refers).
Ms Paterson confirmed that the final management letter would be presented to the Committee on 26 November 2012 along with the University’s Financial Statements.

Resolved: to await the presentation of the final external audit report and Financial Statements on 26 November 2012.

5. **HEALTH AND SAFETY SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report of the meeting of the Sub-Committee on 4 September 2012.

Resolved: for its part, to note the report.

6. **HEALTH AND SAFETY INCIDENT AT THE SIR JAMES BLACK CENTRE**

The University Secretary invited the Director of Campus Services to present management responses to the recommendations made by the investigating panel into the incident that occurred in the Sir James Black Centre in February 2012. The Director highlighted new guidelines for crisis management, a review of procedures in relation to statutory guidelines, centralised record keeping, and enhancements to training requirements for staff as some of the resulting measures implemented since the incident. The Committee commended the management response, noting that a draft policy on ‘alterations to the fabric, systems or fittings University buildings’ would be submitted to the Finance & Policy Committee by December 2012. The Committee also noted that a draft Business Continuity Plan for the University would be presented to the Risk Management Monitoring Group on 31 October.

Resolved: for its part, to note the report.

7. **LEGAL MATTERS**

The Committee received a routine update on legal matters and noted the decision of a recent employment tribunal to uphold two of the nine grounds stated for the claim. The University Secretary told the Committee that the formal judgement setting out the legal reasoning for the decision had not yet been received, and that the level of compensation was still to be determined. The University would await the judgement before considering whether or not to appeal.

In considering the format of the current report, the Committee asked that an estimate of the risk be calculated for all legal matters within the report (including employment tribunals), but was otherwise satisfied with the level of reporting.

Resolved: to note the report.

8. **WHISTLEBLOWING**

The University Secretary presented a paper summarising the outcomes of a recent investigation into a Public Interest Disclosure made by a member of staff. After careful consideration, the claims made within the disclosure had been rejected, however the panel had made a number of useful recommendations as a result of their investigation. The whistleblower had been advised of their right to remake their disclosure to the Chair of the Audit Committee or the Chair of Court, but to date had not done so.

Resolved: to note the report.

9. **DONATIONS POLICY**

The Committee reviewed a draft donations policy which had been prepared in response to the Woolf report (annex).

Resolved: to endorse the policy for the approval of Court subject to minor amendment.

10. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY**

The Committee noted that the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs was reviewing the existing Conflict of Interest Policy in response to revised National Institutes of Health
(NIH) guidelines. Given a short time-frame for making the required revisions to the policy, it was proposed that the draft be reviewed by the Committee by correspondence.

Resolved: to await the draft policy.

11. PRIVATE MEETINGS

(1) Private Meeting with the External Auditors

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

(2) Private Meeting with Management

Members of the Audit Committee then met with officers in the absence of the external auditors, the Convener noted that there was a good working relationship with the auditors, and that the audit process was progressing well.
Executive Summary

This Policy is intended to provide guidance to staff in relation to the acceptance of donations on behalf of the University. It defines circumstances in which a donation cannot be accepted and defines roles and responsibilities to protect the interests of the University. It also defines the University’s commitment to best practice in donor relations.

This Policy sits within the University’s wider ethics framework and should be read in conjunction with the University’s Policy on:

- Anti-bribery
- Acceptance of External Research Funding
- Gifts & Hospitality Policy
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1. Introduction

The University of Dundee actively seeks and encourages gift income from UK and internationally-based donors as a legitimate, sustained and vital component of its funding. This policy covers the solicitation and acceptance of donations and bequests by or in the name of the University. It sets out the University’s arrangements which are designed to ensure that such philanthropic support is aligned with its mission, values and financial needs.

The Institute of Fundraising Code of Practice on ‘The Acceptance and Refusal of Donations’ was used as a framework in defining this policy.

The University also has a separate Gifts & Hospitality Policy which covers the receipt and provision of non-monetary gifts by members of staff and members of Court. This can be found online at: http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/court/policy/Gifts.htm.

Both policies should, however, be read in conjunction with the University’s Anti-Bribery Policy Statement: http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/court/policy/bribery.htm.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all staff.

3. Purpose & Rationale

- To wholly protect the reputations of both the donor and the University from any real or perceived impropriety in the relationship that is established through the offer and receipt of a donation
- Ensure compliance with legal regulations
- Clarify the University’s and the University Court’s legal obligations with regard to the acceptance/refusal of donations
- Avoid confusion between Court members, senior officers, fundraisers, volunteers and staff as to who has the authority to take decisions in differing circumstances
- Help to ensure that decisions are not taken on an ad hoc basis, but are grounded in the University’s mission, values and agreed strategic objectives
- Provide a clear objective standard against which external bodies can judge the University’s actions in cases of potential or actual dispute
- Protect the University’s reputation against adverse public reaction from existing or potential supporters

4. Context

The University is a charity registered in Scotland SCO015096. It is subject to charity law in Scotland and to regulation by the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR). The members of the University Court, the governing body of the University, are the charity trustees and thus are ultimately responsible for operations of the charity. The University will at all times observe the requirements of charity law and other relevant legislation in relation to the receipt and expenditure of funds.

Responsibility for the acceptance and refusal of gifts rests ultimately with the Court of the University even where decision making has been delegated. Court must be able to demonstrate that it has acted in the best interests of the University in each case. It is clear from the guidance available that there is a presumption that in the generality of cases the interests of a charity will be furthered by increasing the resources at its disposal. There is a strong emphasis on great care being taken over any decision to refuse a donation. This may be done legitimately in certain circumstances, but judgments must not be influenced by the personal ethical viewpoints of trustees or those to whom they have delegated their decision making.

Court is responsible for approving this policy which sets out the framework within which gifts and bequests to the University may be accepted.
5. Policy Principals

5.1 Court Oversight

The Director of External Relations will be responsible for providing such information to the Court at its meetings about the solicitation and acceptance of gifts as the Court shall determine. As a minimum, the Director of External Relations will provide to the Court a report of all new gift agreements entered into by the University. (A gift agreement is required for all gifts of a cumulative value totalling £10,000 and above.) The report will indicate all ‘referral gifts’, i.e., those for which a formal test of compliance with this policy has been undertaken, together with the process by which each such gift came to be accepted.

The operation of the policy will be reviewed formally by Court on the advice of the Audit Committee in September 2013 and at least every third year thereafter.

5.2 Fundraising Operations

The University wants to develop a culture of philanthropic giving where responsibilities for fundraising are shared among Alumni Relations & Development (A&D) staff, the Principal, Vice-Principals, Deans and senior officers. Colleges, schools and individuals are encouraged to identify and assist in soliciting prospective donors. The A&D staff have a wealth of professional fundraising experience, early consultation with them will ensure appropriate guidance and support to help maximize the University’s philanthropic income. Efforts to secure gifts from private sources must in all cases be brought to the attention of the A&D Office in advance. Everyone seeking to raise funds in the University’s name must work in partnership with the A&D Office to ensure compliance with this policy.

The University recognizes the Dundee University Students’ Association which is a separate legal entity with its own trustee body. The University is committed to working in co-operation with DUSA to ensure that maximum benefit is derived from fundraising by and on behalf of Dundee students.

During University Campaigns, all development efforts will be in support of the defined goals of the campaigns and will be directed and coordinated through the A&D Office.

All gift solicitations should be made in support of university priorities as determined by the Principal, Vice-Principals and Directors. Written approval from the Principal must be obtained before any solicitations outside of campaign priorities can be made.

5.3 Gift Acceptance

Only authorised A&D Office staff members or their designees can accept new pledges on behalf of the university. Before soliciting or accepting any gift that requires a present or future financial commitment from the university over and above the amount pledged, written approval must be obtained from an appropriate officer in accordance with the delegation levels set out in the Schedule of Delegation and Decision-making.

5.4 Gift Refusal

The University will refuse a donation where there is reason to believe the money results from illegal activities or where the activities of the donor are inimical to the objectives of the University.

The University will not accept gifts where to do so would, in its considered opinion:

- Compromise its status as an independent institution
- Suppress or falsify academic research
- Limit freedom of enquiry
- Create unacceptable conflicts of interest
- Cause adverse damage to the University’s reputation (including deterring significant numbers of beneficiaries or other donors)
- Cause financial loss or any other damage to the University
- Be directly inimical to the University’s mission, objectives and values as approved by the Court of the University from time to time.

Great care will be taken by the University in deciding whether to accept or refuse a donation where:

- an offer of support is itself dependent upon the University first spending its own money or resources in order to facilitate the execution of the original offer of support, as this might be
placing the University’s assets under undue and inappropriate risk and/or unduly strain the University’s working capital.

- the support, whilst reflecting the University’s objectives, is impractical for instance because the University does not have the resources with which to maintain the running costs associated with it.
- the support consists of goods, services or property which the University cannot lawfully use, convert, exchange or sell in direct support of its charitable objectives.
- the offer is dependent upon the satisfaction of conditions by the University which are contrary to the University’s values and objectives, or unreasonable in relation to the nature of the donation
- conditions tie the donation to a specific activity and the activity itself is not within the objectives or strategy of the University

5.5 Due Diligence

The University will undertake all reasonable research on donation pledges to ensure that it is aware of the ultimate source of funding for each gift and to satisfy itself that the funds do not derive, directly or indirectly, from activity that was or is illegal or which runs counter to the provisions of this policy. This research will also include checks to determine whether the individual offering the donation in fact has the funds to do so. This research will involve appropriate searches of web and other resources and databases, and the results will be recorded on the University’s own information systems.

The test of compliance with this policy must be undertaken prior to solicitation wherever possible rather than at the point of acceptance. An unsolicited bequest would be an example of an exception to this general approach.

Potential gifts which may raise issues in terms of their acceptability under this policy or which may give rise to significant public interest or attract adverse comment will be drawn to the attention of the Director of External Relations at the earliest possible stage. The Director of External Relations will be provided with full information of the purpose and background to the potential donation and shall determine how to proceed in consultation with the University Secretary. This may involve referral of the matter to Court, and particularly so where there is any doubt or room for contention. In a case where the Director of External Relations is unable to act the University Secretary will nominate an appropriate senior member of staff to act in her stead.

In undertaking due diligence to assess the acceptability of a potential gift the University will have regard to the rights of prospective donors and will seek to distinguish between rumour or speculation and matters of confirmed fact or legal finding.

The Alumni Relations & Development Manager (the Manager) will be responsible to the Director of External Relations for the day-to-day operation of this policy. Responsibility for undertaking due diligence in line with the policy falls to the Manager and his or her staff, who will obtain and bring forward all relevant evidence and will present both sides of the argument fairly, ie for and against acceptance, before making a recommendation about a particular gift.

The University will be transparent about gifts accepted in terms of their sources and purposes. In cases where a donor wishes to remain anonymous, such anonymity will be respected so far as is legally and practically possible. Gifts will not be accepted where the source of the funds in question is unknown.

5.6 Gift Agreements and Use of Gifts

The University will enter into appropriate gift agreements with donors for all significant gifts, defined as those of a cumulative value totalling £10,000 and above. While donors will be offered opportunities for continuing engagement with the activities that they have funded, the management and governance of those activities will rest solely with the University.

The University will operate its standard policies and procedures including but not limited to recruitment, admissions, hiring, promotion, procurement, management and governance for all research, teaching and other activities funded by gifts. All funds raised in the name of the University or one of its constituent parts shall be administered by the University or in accordance with arrangements approved by the University Secretary acting on behalf of University Court.
The University welcomes gifts from both academic and non-academic staff members. It also recognizes the donor's right to designate a preferred, restricted purpose for his or her gift. All gifts from staff members must be credited to either school or college accounts that are controlled by an individual other than the donor. (If members of the immediate family also work at the university, this prohibition also extends to any accounts that such immediate family member may control.) Staff members can designate their gifts to a college, school or departmental discretionary fund that is fully controlled by the College Vice-Principal, Dean of School or Head of Department and can be used to support the research or teaching of any academic staff member, including the donor.

University staff members cannot designate their gift to funds that:
- support his or her salary
- pay for consumer goods to be used by him or her
- to pay for travel by him or her

5.7 Gift Recording and Reporting

The Alumni Relations & Development Office is responsible for issuing the official gift receipt and donor acknowledgement, and for the proper deposit of gift funds. Adequate records of all gifts shall be maintained by the Alumni Relations & Development Office in accordance with accepted accounting procedures to allow a proper audit trail. (See Donations Policy – Recording & Accounting for full details).

5.8 Returning a Gift

The University will not normally return a gift which has been accepted in good faith in compliance with this policy; indeed the circumstances in which it may do so are extremely limited by law. Exceptionally, subsequent events or the subsequent availability of additional information may give rise to the need to review a previous decision to accept a gift. A decision to return a gift shall always be a matter for the Court on the recommendation of the Principal, having taken appropriate legal advice.

5.9 Donor Relations

5.9.1 Privacy

The University respects the privacy of the generous donors who financially support its objectives and mission. The University will make every effort to ascertain a donor's wishes in this regard and to abide by them when practicable.

It is the policy of the University to hold the names of our donors in confidence unless one or more of the following conditions apply:
- it is common and established practice to list such gifts in a newsletter, annual report, etc.;
- the gift qualifies for a naming opportunity elected by the donor;
- the donor gives express permission to the University to make his/her gift public as part of a written document (such as a gift agreement) or other direct communication;
- the University is obliged by legal requirements, including the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002, to provide information regarding the gift.

5.9.2 Anonymity

When a donor asks that he or she remain anonymous in relation to a gift, the fundraiser must determine the appropriate level of anonymity.

For some donors, it is acceptable for University officials and internal entities to know about a gift. Their primary request is that their names and their gift not be discussed in any public setting or included in any published honour roll of donors. In this case, the gift will be recorded to the donor's individual entity record but will not be published in any University materials, nor recognised in any public fashion.

Other donors want complete anonymity, meaning that only the fundraiser(s) involved and a select number of University officers may know the source of this gift. The University Secretary must approve all such gifts and requests for complete anonymity.
5.9.3 Complaint

The University will respond to any complaints resulting from any matter addressed by this policy within the framework of the University’s Complaints Policy.

6. Policy Availability

This policy is available on the web at http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/senate_policies.htm and will be provided in hard copy to donors and prospective donors on request.
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Schedule 1: Scheme of delegation

The Alumni Relations & Development Manager is responsible to the Director of External Relations for ensuring the effective operation of this scheme of delegation. Responsibility for undertaking due diligence in line with this policy for all gifts falls to the Alumni Relations & Development Manager and his or her staff, who will obtain and bring forward all relevant evidence and will present both sides of the argument fairly, i.e. for and against acceptance, before making a recommendation about a particular gift.

Staff are not expected routinely to screen individual gifts below £10,000 for compliance with this policy, but will nevertheless bring such gifts to the attention of the Director of External Relations if they become aware of potential compliance issues.

A number of ‘caution topics’ have been identified to inform staff when they should refer the decision to solicit or accept a particular gift to the Director of External Relations. The list is not exhaustive and staff are expected to adopt a prudent approach, referring any gift or prospective gift to the Director of External Relations which might be expected to attract special interest, attention or adverse comment.

The ‘caution topics’ are:

- Areas of business of corporations and individuals who are their principal (>10%) owners or former owners: arms manufacture, tobacco, alcohol, gambling, pornography.
- Companies or states which have attracted widespread public criticism of their conduct in specific areas and individuals who have held high office (main board or cabinet level) in such organisations: human rights, child labour, anti-competitive practices, environmental responsibility.
- Significant (greater than £1,000) gifts from current or prospective students and/or persons known to be in a close familial or personal relationship with a current or prospective student.

In the case of gifts which raise no issues in relation to this policy and always provided that no relevant interest has been declared by the member of staff concerned, the delegated limits for acceptance are as follows:

a) £1,000,000+: University Court
b) £500,000 - £1,000,000: Principal in consultation with the Chair of Court
c) £250,000 - £500,000: Senior Management Team
d) £10,000 - £250,000: Director of External Relations
e) less than £10,000: Alumni & Development Manager

The financial limits set out in this policy shall apply to the total value of each gift or to the total value of gifts from a single donor in each calendar year, whichever is the greater. Wherever there is doubt or room for contention, cases should be brought to the attention of the Court.

Schedule 2: Types of Gifts

The following gifts are or may be acceptable (depending on restrictions):

- Cash or equivalent
- Tangible personal property
- Shares
- Real estate (property and land)
- Bequests
- Other gifts

Such gifts and donations may or may not attract Gift Aid and tax deductions, depending on the tax status of the donor. These benefits will not influence the University’s decision to accept or decline a gift.

The following criteria govern the acceptance of each type of gift:

Cash or equivalent

Cash donations of over £100 will not be accepted. Cheques are accepted and should be made payable to ‘University of Dundee’. The University accepts payment by Credit Card and Direct Debit which can be made online or via a donation form which can be downloaded at www.dundee.ac.uk/ad/donate.
Shares

The University can accept both publicly traded stocks & shares and private stocks & shares. As a general rule, all shares will be sold upon receipt unless otherwise directed by the University Finance Director acting on the advice of appointed investment advisers.

- Publicly traded stocks & shares: may be accepted subject to completion of the necessary transfer formalities and the payment of any Stamp Duty. In some cases stocks & shares may be restricted by applicable laws: in such instances the final determination on the acceptance of the restricted stocks & shares will be made by the University Finance Director, acting on such advice as he or she deems necessary.

- Private stocks & shares: which include not only debt and equity positions in non-publicly traded companies but also interests in limited partnerships and limited liability companies, or other ownership forms, can be accepted subject to the approval of the University Finance Director. However, such gifts must be reviewed prior to acceptance to determine that:
  - There are no restrictions on the stocks & shares that would prevent the University from ultimately converting those assets to cash.
  - The stocks & shares are marketable or likely to become marketable in due course (without imposing any undue costs, administrative or other burdens in the interim).
  - The stocks & shares will not generate any undesirable tax consequences for the University.

If potential problems are identified on an initial review of the stocks & shares, further review and advice from suitably qualified professionals may be sought before making a final decision on acceptance of the gift.

Tangible Personal Property

Tangible personal property includes art, furniture, books, memorabilia, coin and stamp collections, jewellery, vehicles and any other personal property item owned by a donor. It excludes property and land. The University will examine a potential gift of tangible personal property for the item’s financial value, its potential use by the University, any associated ongoing risks or costs to the University and, if the item will not be used or kept, whether the item could be sold quickly and converted into cash.

Property or Land

Gifts of real estate may include gifts of developed property or undeveloped land. Prior to acceptance of gifts of property or land the University shall require a structural survey or other similar review of the property to ensure that it offers no significant ongoing financial or environmental risks or costs to the University. The cost of such survey or review will generally be an expense of the donor. Prior to acceptance of the property or land, the gift will have to be approved by the University Secretary acting on such professional advice as he or she deems necessary. Some criteria for acceptance of property or land (but not an exhaustive list) are as follows:

- Is the property or land useful for the purposes of the University?
- Is the property or land saleable?
- Are there any restrictions, reservations, easements or other limitations associated with the property or land?
- Are there ongoing costs, which may include insurance, taxes and mortgages associated with the property or land?
- Does the structural survey show that the property is in a reasonable state of repair and likely to remain so prior to disposal?

The University may accept a remainder interest in a personal residence, farm, or vacation property subject to the provisions above. The donor or other occupants may continue to occupy the property for the duration of the stated life. On the death of the donor, the University may use the property or convert it to cash at its absolute discretion.

Bequests

The University will accept bequests. The University asks donors wishing to leave a bequest to execute an appropriate Codicil or include in their Will the suggested wording available online in the Development section of www.dundee.ac.uk. The University is also keen that such donors complete and
return a pledge form so that it can keep accurate records of those who have made a provision in their Will or Codicil and such pledge form should be kept updated from time to time (e.g. if the size and/or conditions attaching to the bequest change).

**Other Gifts**

The acceptance of any other gifts not listed above will be considered on a case by case basis.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 01 October 2012.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr R Burns, Dr J Lowe, Ms J McGovern, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: University Secretary; Policy Officer (Corporate Governance).

Apologies: Professor J Taylor, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 14 May 2012 subject to minor amendment.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Corporate Governance:

(a) Chairman of Court (Minute 2(1))

The University Secretary introduced a paper which summarised discussions held at the Court Retreat session on the effectiveness of the Chair of Court on 3 September 2012. The session had been held in the absence of the Chair and officers (other than the University Secretary and the Clerk to Court) and feedback from members on the Chair’s performance had been very positive.

Following the discussion of a number of areas identified for possible enhancement, the Chair of Court proposed a number of initiatives for implementation during the 2012/13 academic year. These included highlighting items at the start of meeting of Court where more detailed discussion was expected (or where members of Court had indicated a desire for discussion), and the inclusion of a summary of the Chair’s discussions with University senior management within the Chairman’s regular report which would help demonstrate to members his engagement with, and questioning of, the senior team.

The Committee also discussed the format of Court meetings and the Court Retreat. In doing so, members indicated a preference for regular meetings of Court to continue to be conducted in a round-table format, but requested that future Court Retreat meetings be focused around informal break-out sessions rather than presentations. The Committee also expressed an interest in the Retreat being held as a residential event.

The Committee noted that a paper later in the agenda (Minute 2(liii) regarding the attendance at Court by University officers made a number of suggestions which addressed members questions as to how priority could be given to members of Court in debates while still ensuring that officers had the opportunity to provide input relevant to their areas of expertise.

Resolved: (i) to endorse the proposals made by the Chair of Court in response to the summary paper;

(ii) to ask officers to investigate options for the 2013 Court Retreat to be organised as a residential event, and to request that future Court Retreat meetings be focused around informal break-out sessions;
(iii) to recommend that in addition to an annual meeting of Court in the absence of officers, members of Court be reminded that they may make a request to the Chair at any meeting for officers to withdraw; and

(iv) otherwise to note the summary report.

(b) Review of Effectiveness of Court (Minute 2 (1))

The Committee noted that due to time constraints, the review of the performance and effectiveness of Court had been deferred until the meeting of Court on 22 October 2012. The Committee considered the format and criteria for the review in light of discussions at the Retreat.

Resolved: (i) to recommend to Court that the review is carried out using a round-table format;

(ii) to recommend to Court that the discussion be included early on the agenda for the meeting of 22 October 2012, with time ring-fenced for discussion; and

(iii) to recommend to Court that the criteria used on previous occasions be used.

(c) Attendance at Court by University Officers (Minute 7)

The University Secretary presented a paper which reviewed the attendance of officers at meetings of Court. The Committee discussed the proposal that the number of officers routinely in attendance in addition to the University Secretary and the Policy Officer (Corporate Governance) (as Clerk to Court) be reduced to: Director of External Relations, Director of Finance; Director of Human Resources; and Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs. Other officers could, as presently, be invited to attend for particular agenda items as and when appropriate.

The Committee also considered the purpose of the attendance of officers at meetings of Court, and ways in which the difference between officers and members of Court could be made more explicit. The Committee highlighted the value of the contributions made by officers to debates, and indicated a preference for officers to remain at the main table as opposed to being located on a table at the side of the room. Members suggested that locating officers together at one section of the table (perhaps opposite the Chair) would facilitate this. The Committee was supportive of the proposal that officers restrict their direct contribution to: discussions where the Chairman or members have requested input, clarification of points of fact, or the introduction of papers for which they have authorship.

Resolved: (i) to endorse to Court the recommendations made within the paper; and

(ii) to suggest that these arrangements are reviewed on an annual basis.

(2) Succession Planning (Minute 4(2))

The Committee considered a paper which outlined lay vacancies arising on Court in 2013 and 2014 (Dr Janet Lowe - 31/07/2013, Dr Howard Marriage - 31/07/2013, Mr Richard Burns - 31/07/2014). In doing so, the Committee also reviewed a draft advertisement for the positions, and a document outlining the further particulars of the role. The Committee suggested that the advertisement be placed in the Courier, Scotsman, Herald, and on jobs.ac.uk in the first instance.
In discussing the role of Chancellor’s Assessor, members of the Committee commented that the role had evolved to become similar to that of a senior independent director, and asked that this aspect be formalised as a responsibility of the role. Members also highlighted the need to address the forthcoming vacancy as early as possible in consultation with the Chancellor.

The Committee also noted that Mr Mike Arnott was not eligible for re-nomination as Rector’s Assessor, but that he would continue on Court until such time as the forthcoming Rectoral election had been held and the successful candidate had identified an Assessor.

With regard to the position of Graduates’ Council Assessor on Court arising in 2013, the Committee noted that the incumbent Assessor had chosen not to stand for re-election. The Policy Officer (Corporate Governance) informed the Committee that 13 complete applications had been received by the closing deadline of 30 September 2012, with a further 4 incomplete applications and 20 notes of interest being recorded during the application process. The Committee was pleased to note the improved engagement with the election process, although concern was expressed at the potential for UKBA/Visa issues to arise in relation to certain overseas applications received. Following discussion, members were in agreement that the use of teleconference facilities to join Court meetings would introduce potential confidentiality, issues, and as such should not be considered other than in exceptional circumstances. The University Secretary and the Graduates’ Council Assessors on Court confirmed that the criteria for membership of Court would be provided to the Graduates’ Council electorate, and that all applicants had now been encouraged to speak with the current Graduates’ Council Assessors on Court to ensure they had a good understanding of the role.

Given the increased number of candidates standing in the election on this occasion, the Committee asked officers to review the appropriateness of the use of the ‘first past the post’ voting system for future elections, but indicated that it would not be appropriate to make any changes in relation to the current process.

It was recognised that the existing process for the election of Graduates’ Council Assessors on Court had the potential to result in the election of a lay member of Court who did not meet Court’s criteria for lay membership. In this respect, members asked officers to investigate the possible introduction of an agreement that all members would be asked to sign indicating their awareness of the principles of good governance and agreement to abide by them.

During discussions of the forthcoming election of the Chair of Court, a member of the Committee proposed an alternative methodology for voting based on queries that member had with regard to the election process in 2010. The University Secretary highlighted the fact that an external solicitor, and a lay member who was not a candidate, had been present to verify and scrutinise the counting of sealed ballot papers in 2010 and that no issues had been reported at the time or raised in the period since. Nevertheless, the Secretary undertook to commission a full investigation of the matter if any concerns underlying these queries were brought forward, and to identify any opportunities to improve the methodology used this time around.

Resolved: (i) to recommend to Court that, subject to minor amendment, the draft advert be placed in the Courier, Herald, Scotsman, and on jobs.ac.uk, with a closing date for applications of 30 November 2012 and shortlisting taking place in December 2012;

(ii) to ask officers in due course to prepare a paper outlining possible alternative voting systems for future elections of Graduates’ Council Assessors on Court; and

(iii) to commission a full investigation of the 2010 election process for Chair of Court if concerns underlying the member’s queries about the voting process were brought
forward, and to report to Court in December any proposed changes to the election methodology.

(3) Lord Provost (Minute 6)

The Principal informed the Committee that he had spoken with the newly elected Lord Provost of Dundee (Lord Provost Bob Duncan), and had asked him to consider if he planned to attend Court in person, or would look to appoint an Assessor to attend on his behalf. At that time, the Lord Provost had expressed an interest in attending Court, and the Principal confirmed that he would contact The Lord Provost to confirm his decision shortly.

[Secretary’s note: subsequent to the meeting, the Lord Provost confirmed his intention to attend Court in person]

3. SFC CIRCULAR ON CODE OF PRACTICE FOR UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

The Chair of Court introduced a circular from Universities Scotland which confirmed the terms of reference and composition for the steering group assembled by the Committee of Scottish University Chairs of Courts (CSC) to develop a Scottish Code of University Governance in response to the report of Ferdinand von Prondzynski’s review of Scottish Higher Education Governance. He informed the Committee that the first meeting of the steering group would take place on 2 October and that the inclusion of an additional student member was presently being considered. He also confirmed that the deadline for completion of the draft Code had been brought forward to May 2013.

Resolved: to note the Circular.

4. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: CORPORATE GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

The Committee reviewed the draft Corporate Governance Statement as provided to the external auditors for inclusion within the Financial Statements.

Resolved: to approve the draft Corporate Governance Statement subject to minor amendment.

5. SCHEDULE OF DELEGATION

The University Secretary informed the Committee that in line with good governance practice, the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs had proposed to review the Schedule of Delegation and had requested input from members of the Governance & Nominations Committee. Mr Iain Wright and Emeritus Professor Ann Burchell agreed to assist in the review on behalf of the Committee.

Resolved: to endorse the review of the Schedule of Delegation, and to await a report at the meeting of the Governance & Nominations Committee in May 2013.

6. REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

The Secretary reminded the Committee of arrangements for the production of an annual report on senior officers’ remuneration to Court as one of the innovations agreed as part of the review of the role and remit of the Remuneration Committee last session. He proposed that the report be circulated to members of the Governance & Nominations Committee and the Finance & Policy Committee on a confidential basis prior to submission to Court in December.

Resolved: to await the report

7. REGISTER OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

The Committee received a paper containing a summary of the most recent disclosures by members of Court.

Resolved: to note the content and endorse its publication on the University’s webpages.
8. **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2012/13**

The Committee received a paper which summarised the final membership of Court Committees for 2012/13 and included full membership of the Ethical Review Committee. Members noted that the Convener of the Ethical Review Committee had indicated his intention to step down at the end of the calendar year and the University Secretary confirmed that discussions were underway to identify a successor. He also highlighted that the structure and remit of the Ethical Review Committee would be reviewed at the same time in light of changes to legislation.

Members asked that consideration be given to the on-going role of the University Secretary as a Trustee of the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UODSS) given the potential for conflicts of interest to arise with his role as a senior manager in the institution. It was agreed that an alternative Trustee should be sought, but with attention being paid to ensuring that fellow Trustees did not see the change as reflecting any change on the University’s part in its full commitment to the Scheme.

Resolved: (i) to note the Committee memberships and await a proposal in relation to the Convenership of the Ethical Review Committee; and

(ii) to suggest that the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs be approached with regard to replacing the University Secretary as a Trustee of the UODSS.

9. **GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Revised Terms of Reference for the Governance & Nominations Committee were presented which incorporated the responsibility for recommendation to Court of employer-nominated trustees for the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (annex).

Resolved: (i) to endorse to Court the revised Terms of Reference for the Governance & Nominations Committee; and

(ii) to request that the revised Terms of Reference for the Remuneration Committee be brought to the next meeting of the Governance & Nominations Committee.

10. **ADDITIONAL MEETING OF THE GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE**

The Committee requested that an additional meeting of the Governance & Nominations Committee be scheduled for December 2012 to focus on the shortlisting of candidates for lay membership of Court arising from the advertising process and discussion of the selection process for the position of Chancellor’s Assessor.
Governance & Nominations Committee

Terms of Reference

- To advise Court on any matter pertaining to the University’s framework for corporate governance and its operation, including, but not limited to:
  - The role and manner of election of the Chairperson of Court;
  - Compliance with external governance requirements and consideration of matters of best practice;
  - Oversight of the University’s Charter, Statutes and Ordinances (in consultation with the Senate);
  - Oversight of the Court’s standing orders and any other documents relating to the role and conduct of Court members and to the mechanisms for the smooth operation of Court and its Committees;
  - Oversight of the election procedures for elected members of Court (where appropriate, in discussion with the relevant electing body);
- To make recommendations to Court on the appointment of Court members who are not elected, nor ex officio in terms of the Statutes;
- To recommend to Court the membership of Court committees; and
- To make recommendations to Court on the appointment of employer-nominated trustees to the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme.
APPENDIX 6

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS
(Minute 17)

1. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

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

The Principal drew attention to the Outcome Agreement recently negotiated with the Scottish Funding Council. The Funding Council would, as a condition of the main grant allocation, expect the University to measure success against six key outcomes - informed by the policy priorities of the Scottish Government directed through the Council.

The Principal noted that the outcomes required were challenging and activity to help meet them would need to continue through the year and indeed work was about to get underway on negotiating the agreement for 2013/14. In response to a question, the Principal clarified that a new agreement would be signed off each year but that the process was intended to be rolling and targets might well evolve over time. As yet, the longer term implications were unclear, but the Principal was certain that the SFC would expect the University to show ambition and to demonstrate real progress.

The Principal gave an indication that while accountability was important, especially in the context of relatively favourable financial settlements for the sector, the need for institutional autonomy would continue to be defended robustly.

The Principal asked Senate to note the many staff and student successes in his report and, in addition, to join him in offering congratulations to Professor Ferguson and his team for their success in the bid to the UK Research Partnership Investment Fund. This would see an investment of an additional £12 million in the Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research.

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

2. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received communications from the meeting of 11 June 2012 and the Court Retreat on 3 September 2012.

The Principal asked Senate to note that the Court had agreed to appoint a Vice-Principal for Learning and Teaching and the post would be advertised externally with interviews hopefully taking place by December 2012.

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

3. UNIVERSITY VISION – SENATE DEBATE

Professor Duck led the Senatus in an open debate on the University Vision and the central organising goal of becoming Scotland’s leading university. The discussions enabled members of the Senate to articulate the following positions in response to the question of what it would mean to be the leading university in Scotland.

- ‘Leading’ could mean both ‘coming in advance of others; first’ and ‘guiding, directing, or influencing’.
- Being top of league tables was not necessarily the best way to measure success. However, any measures used must be as clear and tangible as the league tables and league tables were nevertheless and important factor influencing perceptions of the University’s reputation and standing.
- Both quantitative and qualitative measures were needed to help focus on areas where the University needed to improve.
Leading as pioneers can be risky - as learning from the mistakes of others is not then possible.

There are already many parts of the University that can be described as leading in the way outlined in the Vision.

The Vision involves a longer timescale than many are used to working with but it is important to recognise that ‘ideas...take time to grow’ (Patrick Geddes).

Goals should be clear, achievable and help staff begin to reconcile often conflicting sets of priorities and pressures.

The transformational aspects of the Vision - making a positive impact on people’s lives – would prove to be its greatest strength.

It was noted that the Vision involved a long term goal and would need to be constantly refined and re-interpreted and that the Senate would wish to revisit many of the issues in due course.

The Principal thanked members for their contributions and welcomed the debates to come.

4. **LEARNING & TEACHING COMMITTEE**

The Senatus received a report from the Learning and Teaching Committee meeting of 27 September 2012. The report included the proposed visit dates for the QAA Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR): 15-17 October and during the week of 18 November 2013.

The Deputy Principal (Learning and Teaching) asked the Senate to note that (i) the main business of the Committee was to confirm and then to operationalise the Learning and Teaching Strategy and (ii) work was progressing on the development of a performance indicator that would range over the whole of a student’s learning context rather than the standard, more narrow and arguably less useful indicator that measured progression from Year 1 to Year 2.

*The Senatus decided:* to approve the report.

5. **RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

The Senatus received a report from the Research Committee meeting of 20 September 2012. The Vice-Principal (Research) asked the Senate to note progress on (i) Postgraduate Research Student matters, with Professor Page leading as the convener of the new sub-committee (ii) preparations for REF, with the Code of Practice now submitted and work on equality, diversity and complex circumstances review an ongoing activity.

The Vice-Principal asked Senate to note that all staff involved with REF must carry out the mandatory equality and diversity training as soon as possible.

Senate were also asked to note the very encouraging levels of external research funding announced in 2012/13. This stood at a record level (£113 million) and represented an outstanding achievement in difficult economic circumstances.

The Vice-Principal also reported progress on issues surrounding open access publishing within the institution and invited Senate to consider the topic as a future item for debate.

*The Senatus decided:* (i) to invite the Librarian to lead a debate on open access publishing at a future meeting;

(ii) to approve the report.

6. **STATUTE 16 - GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE**

The Senatus noted that Professor Carol MacKintosh will serve as the Senate representative on the above Committee.

7. **SFC OUTCOME AGREEMENT**

The Senatus noted the 2012/13 Outcome Agreement between the University and the Scottish Funding Council.
8. **ANNUAL QUALITY REPORT TO SFC in AY2011/12**

The Senatus received the Annual Quality Report to SFC in Ay 2011/12.

**The Senatus decided:** to endorse to Court the 2011/12 Annual Quality Report to the Scottish Funding Council.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 17 September 2012.

Present: Ms C Potter (Acting Convener), Professor S Black, Ms S Campbell, Mrs S Krawczyk, Dr H Marriage, Professor G Mires, Dr A Roger, Professor C Whatley

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development, Director of Finance, Deputy Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development, Mrs G Jones

Apologies: Dr J Lowe (Convener)

The Acting Convener welcomed Professor Sue Black, Ms Shirley Campbell and Mrs Sheila Krawczyk to their first Human Resources Committee meeting.

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 21 May 2012 were approved.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Statute 16 (Minute 2(1))

The Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development (HR&OD) reported that there was one outstanding policy associated with Statute 16 still to be reviewed with DUCU and that negotiations over this had commenced. It was confirmed that once this work had been completed, the University would request dissolution of the Statute by the Privy Council. The University Secretary highlighted that despite the Governance Review it was hoped that the Privy Council would consider this matter by the end of the academic year.

Resolved: to note the current position and to commend those responsible for progressing work on the review of the Statute to such an advanced stage.

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

The Director of HR&OD reported that following a final pay offer of 1%, UCEA had received formal notices of intention to ballot for strike action and action short of strike from UCU and for strike action only from UNISON. There were indications that UNITE also intended to ballot for strike action although no formal notification had been received. It was noted that the earliest possible date for any action would be 9 November.

Contingency planning in the event of strike action was being made by the Director of Estates and Buildings in key support areas such as the Library and Learning Centre, security and cleaning services. The Director of HR&OD advised that the University was aware from previous strike action where the likeliest areas of disruption may occur in the University and that once confirmation had been received on type of action and timescales, more specific planning would take place.

Resolved: to note that more specific contingency planning would take place once results of the ballots have been received and notification of action provided.

3. UNIVERSITY VISION AND STRATEGY

The University Secretary confirmed that the University Strategy was discussed at the recent Court retreat; in relation to the Human Resources Strategy, there had been two key
developments whereby ‘Human Resources’ had been changed to ‘People’ and one of the key performance indicators had been changed from ‘Staff Satisfaction Survey’ to ‘Staff Engagement Survey.’ It was noted that these points would be considered more fully under Item 5.

4. FINANCIAL UPDATE AND STRATEGIC REVIEW

The Director of Finance confirmed that the University would report good financial results for the year. The Period 12 management accounts showed a surplus before voluntary severance and property disposals of £5.2m compared to a budget of just £161,000. However, within the year’s result were a number of one-off items such as the crystallisation of exchange gains of £1.6m and provision movements of £0.4m.

The sustainable surplus was therefore about £3.2m. It was noted that these figures were stated prior to pension adjustments being applied which are awaited from the pension schemes actuary.

The Committee was reminded that the budget of 2012/13 made provisions for a surplus of £0.5m after investment in new posts of around £2.0m.

Various issues were discussed relating to the investment and recruitment to strategic posts and the REF exercise. The Committee recognised that in some cases, despite positive responses to offers and successful negotiations over salary packages, individuals could be reticent to move in the current economic climate. It was recognised, however, that some individuals were using the leverage of an offer to command a greater salary in their own institution.

The importance of retaining key staff through demonstrating recognition of their value was also discussed. One member felt that the mechanism for internal promotion was not agile enough, although considered the development of promotion criteria for teaching and scholarship to be a positive step for the future. The Director of HR&OD highlighted that staff could now be put forward for Personal Chair promotion at three points in the year and it was felt that this enabled the retention of key individuals to be managed in a proactive rather than reactive way. It was noted that in exceptional cases, the Principal could liaise with the Vice-Principal and Head of College if it became necessary to consider cases out with the scheduled meetings. However the Director of HR&OD was not aware of any cases where a lack of agility relating to promotion mechanisms resulted in the direct loss of staff.

The importance of clear career progression plans for professorial staff was discussed and that fact that OSaR discussions should play an important part in this process. The Committee considered whether the introduction of a professorial pay scale would provide a clearer career structure for academics and it was noted that the issue of a professorial salary scale was discussed at the University’s Remuneration Committee. UCEA were producing a report on this in the near future which the Remuneration Committee would consider.

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

(ii) to request that the report from UCEA on Professorial pay and grading structures is circulated to the HR Committee, when it becomes available.

5. HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(1) HR Strategy

The Director of HR&OD introduced the paper on the University Strategy and in relation to the HR strategy highlighted the change in title to ‘People’ to underpin the ownership of the strategy by the staff of the University rather than just HR. In relation to the KPI on staff engagement, it was reported that there had been some discussion at SMT as to whether the results of a staff survey would in fact be a KPI. It was however recognised that an outcome of a staff survey would be a measure of staff engagement, in part, and that the actions identified from the results of the staff survey could be a KPI in the future. Other methods of measuring engagement were considered including reports on absence levels and turnover.
Members of the Committee were in full agreement that the University should implement a staff survey before the Vision work was embedded. The Director of HR&OD confirmed to the Committee that the KPI is the measure reported to Court whereas there would be a number PIs reported to the HR Committee in addition to the KPI.

Benefits of using an external supplier for the staff survey were highlighted, including staff confidence in the confidentiality of the process in addition to robust analysis, reporting and feedback mechanisms and the opportunity to benchmark against other institutions. The importance of how the University communicates to encourage participation was also discussed and considered critical. The Director of HR&OD welcomed the proposal to arrange a presentation by survey providers to members of the HR Committee who wished to attend.

The Director of HR&OD highlighted the PIs for the HR Strategy and confirmed that it was disappointing to have a need for PIs relating to OSaR and the Equality & Diversity on-line modules completion rates, however it was deemed necessary until good participation rates were achieved.

Reasons for poor participation rates for OSaR were discussed. It was agreed that there was probably no single reason for lack of engagement in this process but it was agreed that if completion rates were poor for this year it would have to be considered further. It was recognised that once the University strategy was finalised, OSaR would play an important part in ensuring University, College, School and Directorate objectives were cascaded to staff and would provide an opportunity to discuss individual contributions to these objectives.

Resolved:  
(i) to note that the Committee supported the term ‘staff engagement’ as a KPI rather than ‘staff satisfaction’ which was considered too limiting.

(ii) to arrange a presentation from Staff Survey providers to which members of the Committee would be invited.

(iii) to agree that the Committee would continue to monitor completion rates for OSaR.

(2) Guidance: Chairing a Hearing

New guidance on chairing an internal employment hearing was considered. It was noted that a final version of the document would be incorporated into Dundas and Wilson’s follow up legal presentation to Court.

Resolved: to request feedback or comments to be provided to the Director of HR&OD on the guidelines.

(3) Programme for Organisational and Professional Development 2012/13

The Deputy Director of HR&OD advised the Committee that the OPD Programme 2012/13 was to be launched shortly. The Programme for staff and postgraduate research students, had been developed based on feedback from the previous year’s programme in addition to information received from individuals and Schools/Directorates on training needs as a result of OSaR discussions. It was noted that the majority of the courses were bookable directly by staff however certain courses required nominations by Deans and Directors.

Resolved: to commend OPD on the programme for 2012/13 and to note the number and range of new courses on offer.

(4) Library and Learning Centre Educational Development Update

The Deputy Director of HR&OD introduced the paper provided by the Assistant Director of Educational Development. Key activities were highlighted and included a progress report on mandatory training for postgraduate supervisors, proposals
regarding the 'Teach at Dundee' academic induction programme and information regarding the cross institutional mentoring scheme. It was noted that members of the HR Committee had been invited to the event to be held on 12 October to discuss and begin to identify promotion criteria for teaching and scholarship.

The Chair welcomed the student-led teaching award and its link with Senate.

Resolved: to note the report from LLC Educational Development.

6. ATHENA SWAN

The Director of HR&OD reported that the Athena SWAN Steering Group had met regularly over the summer and that a significant amount of work had taken place to produce the relevant statistics for these meetings. The importance of engagement at College level was recognised and it was noted that a lack of evidence of academic engagement has been cited as a reason for unsuccessful applications for the Bronze award by fellow Scottish institutions. The Committee noted the potential need for resourcing the management of the project at College level in light of the funding risks associated with not gaining the Award.

Resolved: to note the progress towards the submission of the application for the institution-wide Bronze award in November.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

The Director of HR&OD reported that matters relating to the REF remained the main work priority for Equality and Diversity. It was noted that the Code of Practice had now been submitted; the on-line modules on Equality and Diversity issues relating to the REF had been introduced and good feedback received; that the Group convened to consider individual circumstances had conducted its first meeting and it was noted that a procedure on the management of contractual changes for the REF had been developed. The Committee was also advised that a small working group had been convened to begin work on the revision of the Equality and Diversity policy and that once drafted would be shared with the unions.

Resolved: to note that a significant amount of work was on-going to progress the Equality and Diversity agenda particularly in relation to the REF.

8. HEALTH & SAFETY

(1) Report from the Head of Safety Services

(2) Minutes from the Health and Safety Sub-Committee held on 4 September 2012.

The Head of Safety Services' report highlighted that the three tier approach of the Health and Safety audit programme would be a high level audit by internal auditors; a review by a Health and Safety consultant on a three yearly cycle; and an annual review by Health and Safety staff from local education providers on a reciprocal basis. The inclusion of Health and Safety management training in this year's OPD programme was noted. The findings of the compliance audit on overseas travel were discussed in some detail and the proposed role of the Insurance Manager as gatekeeper for all aspects of compliance in relation to this, welcomed. It was noted that Head of Safety Services would carry out a similar audit next year on targeted areas. The Director of HR&OD stressed that the audit related to visits to destinations defined as high risk only.

The planned changes to HSE reporting requirements, including the proposal that students no longer would fall under the reporting requirements was discussed. The University Secretary advised that the HSE is redefining the kind of statistics that need to be reported and noted that clarity on this matter will be conveyed to the Committee.

Resolved: to note the position