UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE

UNIVERSITY COURT

A meeting of the University Court was held on 28 October 2013.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Professor SM Black, Dr WGC Boyd, Mr R Burns, Ms SC Campbell, Dr DH Crouch, Lord Provost Mr R Duncan, Mr J Elliot, Professor TA Harley, Ms S Krawczyk, Mr I MacKinnon, Ms B Malone, Dr AD Reeves, Mr KA Richmond, Ms M Tasevska, Mr D Taylor, and Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: University Secretary; Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Art, Science & Engineering (Minute 1(1)); Director of Finance; Director of Human Resources; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; Director of Strategic Planning (Minutes 1(2) and 10) and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr RS Bowie, Ms CA Potter, Professor GJ Mires, and Mr KAC Swinley.

1. **WIDER IMPACT**

   (1) **Wider Impact Strategy**

   The Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Art, Science and Engineering, Professor Stephen Decent, attended Court in his capacity as Vice-Principal with responsibility for Wider Impact. In presenting his vision for wider impact at the University he outlined examples of excellence, future projects and the development of an academic strategy to underpin the notion of wider impact.

   The Vice-Principal highlighted the key role of the wider impact agenda in achieving the University Vision, and in particular the need to focus efforts around the three central key challenges: improving social, cultural and physical wellbeing; shaping the future through innovative design; and promoting the sustainable use of global resources. He also highlighted the importance of considering wider impact activities such as knowledge exchange, commercialisation and public engagement as key academic priorities alongside research and teaching. In this way it was important, he said, that wider impact was not merely seen as a facet of research and teaching activity, but was a core goal in itself.

   The Vice-Principal used income from industry and other sources calculated per teaching and research academic staff FTE to illustrate the University’s performance against a broad range of Universities from the Russell and 1994 University Mission Groups. He also highlighted income sources from industry and a number of significant collaborative developments linked to the agenda including: the Division of Signal Transduction Therapy; the £4 million AHRC funded Knowledge Exchange Hub for the Creative Industries ‘Design in Action’, the importance of the concept of curation within DJCAD, and the Offshore Renewables Institute.

   Turning to the public engagement element of the wider impact agenda, the Vice-Principal highlighted the wealth of current activity including the Saturday Evening Lecture Series, the Five Million Questions series and examples from impact case
studies for the Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF 2014) including: the work of the Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification (CAHId); 3d-visualisation of the Costa Concordia salvage operation and Deepwater Horizon oil spill; concrete designed for weapons decommissioning; and satellite technology. The Court noted that impact currently contributed 20% to the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF), and that a recent review had proposed that this figure might rise to 25% for future REF exercises.

The Vice-Principal also highlighted the role of the wider impact agenda within education, in particular the need to: join knowledge exchange partnerships with careers and employability partnerships to enrich student enterprise and to provide networks that enhance graduate employment; ensure alumni are engaged with current students; and to use public engagement and media profiles, and international alumni relations to strengthen unregulated student recruitment.

Looking to the future, the Vice-Principal told the Court that the University’s wider impact activities must be of a standard considered excellent, should be rewarded appropriately, and must be supported by excellent and well-resourced professional services. Members discussed the resourcing and potential role of marketing and communications (both internally and externally) within the University to plan, coordinate and resource wider impact projects. Members noted that while some of the required support could be achieved through reprioritisation of existing resources, there was a need to invest in media relations and marketing to capitalise fully on wider impact activities.

The Vice-Principal went on to outline a number of suggestions for future projects and activities and an action plan for the coming academic year. Noting the examples provided, members discussed with the Vice-Principal his approach to the prioritisation of potential projects. Members also noted governance arrangements for the agenda, in particular the work of the Wider Impact Committee, and the three advisory groups (KE and Commercialisation; Public Engagement and Media Relations; and External Relations, Alumni and Fundraising) that were now being set up to serve the Committee.

The Court decided: to note the ongoing work in this area and thank the Vice-Principal for his presentation.

(2) Wider Impact Performance Indicators

The Court received a paper from the Director of Strategic Planning outlining early data on the performance indicators contained within the Wider Impact Enabling Strategy. The report highlighted performance over time, performance against target and performance compared with benchmarking institutions and considered: income from industry and other sources; licensing income and number of active licenses; number of spin-off/start-up companies created; consultancy income and number of consultancy transactions; public attendance at social, educational and cultural events; and the number of actively engaged alumni. Members made a number of suggestions for future presentation of the data and reviewed the targets for alumni contact.

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

The Court decided:  
(i) to approve the minutes of the meeting on 10 June 2013; and  
(ii) to approve the minutes of the business meeting held as part of the Court Retreat on 5 and 6 September 2013.

3. **CHAIRMAN’S REPORT**

The Chairman presented his regular report to the Court, outlining his activities since the last meeting. In doing so, he highlighted his recent meeting with the Rector and his attendance at meetings of the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) and the Committee of University Chairs (CUC). Discussions at the CSC and CUC meetings had focused on the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and the proposed new CUC Code. At the time of the meeting, the application of the new CUC Code to Scottish Institutions was still an issue subject to further debate.

The Chairman also reminded members of Court of the dates for the winter graduation ceremonies (21 and 22 November 2013) and the Christmas Service (8th of December 2013) and invited them to attend if able.

The Court decided: to note the report.

4. **PRINCIPAL’S REPORT**

The Court received a report from the Principal (Appendix 1). In his report the Principal reviewed his activities over the past year as the Convener of Universities Scotland and set out his plans for his remaining year in this role.

The Principal went on to highlight arrangements for the November 2013 winter graduation, the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) that was taking place in October and November, and the success of a team of students from the University who had been crowned European champions within the International Genetically Engineered Machine competition and would now compete in the world finals.

The Principal also provided an overview of recent league table performance. Members were pleased to note that the University had re-entered the top 200 within the Times Higher Education World Rankings, but noted that it had slipped in domestic rankings and suggested that the annual report on league table performance include an analysis of performance relative to other Scottish Institutions.

Turning to the student recruitment figures for entry in 2013/14 the Principal told the Court that the Rest of UK (RUK) recruitment figures had been disappointing and he assured members that officers were actively and urgently looking to address the issue with a range of immediate and longer-term measures. Members asked that a substantive paper be brought to the next meeting of Court analysing the recruitment figures, their financial impact, and the recruitment strategy in relation to other institutions where RUK recruitment had been more successful.
In his regular section on ‘Leading in Scotland’ the Principal chose to highlight the 11 subjects within the National Student Survey 2014 where the University could claim to be number 1 in Scotland. He also highlighted another record-breaking year for research grant capture, with the total for 2013/14 expected to be around £140m. He told the Court that increases had been made across all colleges within the University, both in areas with an existing strong record and areas which had previously not featured in this regard.

The Court decided:

(i) to request that the annual paper on league table performance indicate the relative performance of all Scottish Institutions in international tables; and

(ii) to request that officers prepare a paper on Rest of UK student recruitment patterns for consideration at the next meeting of Court.

5. STRATEGIC GUIDANCE FROM THE CABINET SECRETARY TO THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL (SFC)

The Principal introduced the Cabinet Secretary’s letter of guidance to the SFC on its approach to funding the sector in 2014/15. In doing so, he highlighted the proposed efficiency gain of 1% per year over the next two years and further development of the outcome agreement process. Court members noted that the 1% efficiency gain could effectively be seen to have been addressed within the funding envelope from the SFC.

Members discussed the letter’s reference to expectations for the development of governance in the sector in light of the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013 and publication of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. The Principal told the Court that further legislation was not expected at this time, although it was noted that clarification and interpretation of some aspects of the Code may be required.

In response to questions the Principal outlined developments relating to the single knowledge exchange office (Innovation Scotland) and the role of Interface in building partnerships with industry. The Court was pleased to note that the single knowledge exchange office had been developed in a manner compatible with the preservation of local Knowledge Exchange activities.

The Court also discussed the proposed short-term project to develop and enhance the sector’s capacity in online pedagogy and learning technology. Members heard that while the University had not yet pursued the drive for Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), the use of e-learning at the University was well developed, with around 25% of undergraduate students based overseas and taught via distance learning or e-learning programmes. In this respect the University was already a leading institution, although more could be done to capitalise on existing expertise. Members suggested that a summary report on students following e-learning programmes would be useful and asked that e-learning be considered as a topic for presentation and discussion at a future meeting of the Court.

The Court decided:

(i) to note the suggestion that e-learning be considered as a topic for future presentation and discussion; and

(ii) otherwise to note the letter.
6. FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE

The Court received a report of the meetings of the Committee on 19 August 2013 (Appendix 2) and 30 September 2013 (Appendix 3). The Convener of the Committee drew member’s attention to discussions relating to the Remuneration Committee approach and budget for 2013/14 and the proposed sale of the majority of assets of Dundee University Press (DUP) to Edinburgh University Press (EUP). Members noted that the sale of DUP assets was expected to be concluded on 1 November 2013.

The Court decided:
(i) to approve the approach and budget for the Remuneration Committee for 2013/14 as proposed;
(ii) to note the update on the sale of Dundee University Press; and
(iii) otherwise, to approve the report.

7. AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Court received a report of the meeting of the Committee on 17 September 2013 (Appendix 4). The Convener of the Committee highlighted the annual audit report from the internal auditors, recent internal audits on Payroll, PURE and IT, and the annual review of the remit and terms of reference for the Committee. Members noted that amendments to the review had focussed on good practice to ensure oversight of legal issues, and issues relating to public interest disclosures (PID), bribery and corruption, or fraud.

Members asked officers to reflect on what could be done to further support staff making a PID and also staff who were themselves the subject of a PID during any ensuing investigation.

The Court decided:
(i) to approve the changes to the terms of reference and remit of the Audit Committee; and
(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.

8. HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Director of Human Resources introduced a report of the meeting of the Committee on 24 September 2013 (Appendix 5). In doing so, she highlighted the revised Equality & Diversity policy, updated Objective Setting and Review (OSaR) paperwork, and the progress being made with the University’s application for the Athena Swan bronze award. Members noted that the OSaR completion rate for 2012/13 was expected to be around 80%.

The Director also confirmed that the University’s approach to the Living Wage had been agreed with all three campus unions and that the University would pay the current Living Wage to relevant staff in Grades 1 and 2 through the implementation of a locally agreed salary point equivalent to the current Living Wage rate.
The Court noted the current position of national pay award negotiations, in particular the intention of all three campus unions to strike on Thursday 31 October 2013. Members noted that contingency and communication plans were in place to seek to minimise any resulting disruption.

The Director also informed the Court of the publication of the University Staff Survey 2013 results. Plans were in place for communication of survey results across the University, and action plans were being developed at the University and College/Directorate levels based upon emerging themes within the response data. It was intended that these would be published within the University before Christmas.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to approve the revised Equality and Diversity policy; and

(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.

9. **COURT RETREAT**

Members received a paper which summarised feedback from members in relation to the Court Retreat on 5 and 6 September 2013. Members had been invited to comment on all aspects of the Retreat including: the benefits (or otherwise) of the Retreat being held as a residential event, the venue, and the programme and session arrangements.

Members had indicated that the event had been a valuable undertaking, but that there were some areas which could be further improved. The majority of members had indicated that the dedicated time in an off-site location had, along with the residential element, created an environment conducive to engaged debate with a clear distinction between the business of regular Court meetings and the more strategic and exploratory sessions of the Retreat where issues and initiatives could be discussed at a very early stage in their development.

A number of suggestions were made to improve the programme and individual sessions for future Retreat meetings. Members also discussed the role and presence of officers, both those normally in attendance at meetings of Court and also the Senior Management Team (SMT), at the Retreat. The opinion of the Court was divided on the presence of SMT at the Retreat, with some members finding their input valuable and others expressing a preference that the Retreat be attended by Court members only. Following discussion on this matter, members suggested that the Retreat include some sessions restricted to Court members only and that consideration be given to SMT being present for presentations and questions but not within break-out group discussions.

With regard to future Retreat events, members also asked that further consideration be given to the provision of advanced paperwork for substantial items, the selection of members to facilitate and report back on breakout group activities, and the introduction of sessions to summarise key actions.

**The Court decided:** to note the report.
10. **UNIVERSITY STRATEGY TO 2017: KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

The Court received a report from the Director of Strategic Planning, which set out the University’s performance across Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) within the first year of the planning period covered by the University Strategy to 2017 in comparison with a number of other universities. Analysis was also provided for two Performance Indicators (PIs) on which the Court had asked to be kept informed. The report highlighted performance over time, performance against target and performance compared with benchmarking institutions and used a traffic light system to highlight those areas where progress was on target and those areas where remedial action was necessary. Members noted that performance in terms of overall income per academic staff FTE (KPI 15) remained a cause for concern.

Members suggested a number of changes to improve the clarity of the report for future submissions, and in particular requested that the most important KPIs be highlighted within the report. Members also suggested that consideration should be given to whether it would be best to report against benchmarks in terms of averages or the rate of change; and highlighted the difficulties in benchmarking terms of using absolute values given the different size of individual institutions.

The Court decided: to note the report.

11. **NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS**

The Court received a report from the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) summarising the results from the National Student Survey (NSS) 2013. The paper highlighted the 2% drop in student satisfaction which had led to the University falling from 11th to 33rd within NSS rankings. In his paper, the Vice-Principal outlined his plans for the communication of the results within the University and also efforts to improve the University’s response rate and NSS scores.

The paper went on to highlight the role of NSS results within league table rankings and Key Performance Indicator targets to 2015. Members noted that the Vice-Principal would attend the next meeting of Court to outline his plans for the area of Learning & Teaching and would further outline his approach to NSS 2014 at that time.

The Court decided: to note the report.

12. **FARR INSTITUTE**

The University Secretary introduced a paper that highlighted governance and operations matters relating to the Farr Institute - a network of e-Health Informatics Research Centres established to improve patient care and public health, in which the University was the lead for the Scottish Centre.

Members noted arrangements for the administration of funds, data provisioning arrangements, benefits to the University’s reputation, and the contribution of these activities to the University’s performance in the Research Excellence Framework 2014.
The Court decided: to ask that a further paper detailing expected defined outputs be presented to the Court next year once the initial set up phase was complete.

13. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

The Court received reports from meetings of the Senate on 25 September 2013 (Appendix 6) and 9 October 2013 (Appendix 7). Members noted that the Senate had endorsed to Court the Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Quality.

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

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

14. WELFARE AND ETHICAL USE OF ANIMALS COMMITTEE

The Court received the reports from meetings of the Welfare and Ethical Use of Animals Committee (formerly the Ethical Review Committee) on 17 April 2013 (Appendix 8) and 24 July 2013 (Appendix 9).

The Court decided: to approve the reports.

15. ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL STATEMENT TO THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL (SFC) ON QUALITY

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 2013 following circulation by email to members of Court. In approving the report the Court was asked to: confirm that it had considered the institution’s arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2012-13, including the scope and impact of these; confirm that the institution had effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision; and therefore to provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at the University of Dundee continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

The Court decided: to approve the report.

16. STAFF

(1) Professorial and Other Grade 10 Appointments

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

Graeme Hutton Personal Chair of Architecture 1 June 2013

Bruce Burton Personal Chair of Finance 1 August 2013
(2) Statute 16 – Grievance Procedures

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

The Court decided: to delegate authority to the Chair of Court and University Secretary to set up two panels in the event that they were required.

17. ACCESS TO PAPERS

In response to questions, the University Secretary confirmed that Court members could access any papers for any committee of Court should they so wish, and that requests should be directed to the Clerk to Court.

The Court decided: to note the response.

RESERVED BUSINESS

[Secretary’s note: The Chairman asked those in attendance to leave the meeting while the reserved business items were taken - with the exception of those officers required to facilitate discussions as follows: the University Secretary, the Director of Finance, and the Clerk to Court.

Members noted the potential conflict of interest for the Principal, as a member of the Dundee Design Limited (DDL) board and the Lord Provost Bob Duncan, as Dundee City Council was a partner in the project. The Lord Provost did not attend for this item of business. The attendance of the Principal was accepted on the basis of his role and responsibilities within the University].

18. MINUTE OF THE COURT MEETING, 10 JUNE 2013 – MINUTE 107

The Court decided: to approve minute 107 of the meeting on 10 June 2013.


The Court decided: to approve minute 109 of the meeting on 6 September 2013.

20. RESERVED MATTERS ARISING

(1) V&A at Dundee

The Principal provided the Court with an update on negotiations with partners relating to the establishment of a Memorandum of Understanding with V&A at
Dundee. Members noted that the negotiation process had been slower than first expected, but that progress was being made.

**The Court decided:** to note the update.
Members will be aware that last year I was elected as Convener of Universities Scotland for a period of two years. As I reach the mid-point of my term of office I thought it would be appropriate for me to share with the Court my reflections on the past year and to outline what I see as my focus for the coming year. The past year has been a turbulent one for Scottish Higher Education with the passage of the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill, the Review of Higher Education Governance and our work to secure the best possible outcome for universities from the Scottish Government’s spending review. With regard to the bill this has now passed through Parliament, and I am pleased to report that the key amendments sought by this Court and Universities Scotland alike in order to preserve University autonomy were accepted and integrated into the Bill.

The Review of Higher Education Governance commissioned by the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning led to the development of a Scottish Code of Good HE Governance by a working group led from the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC). The CSC and Universities Scotland recognised the benefits of developing a Code which would highlight and embed existing best practice across the sector, and while we await the final position of the Scottish Government on the Code and the potential for further legislation, it is pleasing to note that the University of Dundee model was highly regarded by the working group. Compliance with the Code will be one aspect of the upcoming quinquennial review of Court effectiveness and I am sure that members will share my goal for the University to be seen as a model for progressive adoption of the Code’s key recommendations.

Lastly, the Universities Scotland report ‘Delivering for Scotland 2013/14’ has been praised by academic, government and industry leaders. I believe it has been instrumental in achieving a relatively positive settlement for the Higher Education sector within the Scottish Government’s spending review to which I will refer later.

With regard to the coming year, it is my plan to continue to champion university autonomy and to further promote the diversity of the sector which underpins the future of Scottish Universities, along with the other qualities which see the Scottish Higher Education sector so highly regarded across the world. In the run up to the referendum on independence for Scotland I will also be engaging politicians north and south of the border in recognising the merits of Scotland’s membership within a UK ecosystem of research funding regardless of the result on 18 September 2014.

Financial Position

As noted above the Scottish Government has recently announced the outcome of the Spending Review, which includes plans for the future funding of Scotland’s universities. The financial settlement for the sector represents continuing strong support for higher education when compared with other areas. Nevertheless it is a flat cash settlement in real terms and thus will cause an erosion of our current position relative to inflation. In this context, and in light of the projected break-even budget for 2013/14, it is even more important that the University plans carefully and makes the most of opportunities for the growth of unregulated income streams and strategic investments if it is to secure its future. In this respect I would like to thank members for their constructive and productive discussions at the Court Retreat. I expect to present a paper to the Court shortly outlining options for strengthening our financial position to enable investment in future excellence and growth.

Court Retreat

A review of the 2013 Court Retreat and options for the September 2014 event will feature on the agenda for the meeting of the Court on 28 October 2013, however I would like to take this opportunity to thank members for their participation this year. My personal reflection is that the Retreat held at Dunkeld was particularly notable for the degree of engagement and the commitment of members to discussions on the future of the University. I very much look forward to another year of productive debate at Court.

League Tables

It has been a varied year for the University with regard to performance within League Tables which can broadly be interpreted as the University marking time. However I am pleased to report our re-entry into the Times Higher World University Rankings top 200 for 2013/14 (positioned 196). Whilst the decisions and actions of the University should not be driven primarily by league table concerns, it is inevitable that progress towards our vision will be accompanied by improvements in the various league tables and moreover that this will be noticed by our competitors and prospective partners. Our international standing will also have a major influence on the
partnerships we can forge around the world and hence on the delivery of our internationalisation strategy. One thing in common across all institutions faring well within these tables is that they perform well across a broad range of areas and not just within a narrow field. We must therefore continue to strive for excellence across all of our disciplines and directorates if we are to continue to make progress toward our vision and drive up league table performance.

Mission Group Alignment

At the Court Retreat members expressed their support for the University joining the teaching focussed, research intensive, 1994 Mission Group of universities. I can now report that following a lively and stimulating debate at a special meeting of the Senate, members also gave their strong support for this alignment. I have conveyed our decision to the current convener of the Group who has welcomed us as new members. At the time of writing this decision remains embargoed as negotiations continue over the re-launch of the Group. I expect to be in a position to update the Court further on these discussions by the time of the meeting on 28 October 2013.

Recruitment Update

Analysis of recruitment figures for entry in 2013/14 gives a somewhat mixed story. On one hand we have been pleased to note that matriculations for undergraduate students from the 40% most deprived postcode areas (so-called MD40 students) came close to reaching the ambitious target of 150 additional widening access places awarded by the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) during the 2012/13 recruitment cycle. Recruitment to 50 additional articulation places was close to target. However, there were disappointing recruitment figures for Rest of UK (RUK) undergraduate student numbers, with figures well below target and showing a decrease against the 2012/13 figures. While increases to grade tariffs at the University of Dundee and changes in the recruitment behaviour of English institutions might have impacted on our recruitment of RUK students, we are making an immediate and developing response to target RUK undergraduate student recruitment within the 2013/14 cycle.

UG intake figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Scot/EU Fee</th>
<th>RUK Fee</th>
<th>Full Fee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Scot/EU Fee</th>
<th>RUK Fee</th>
<th>Full Fee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of postgraduate students, the picture is still changing, and we will of course have the January intake, but currently the entrant population is expected to increase marginally relative to last year’s intake. This however does include an expected 13% decrease to overseas postgraduate numbers (55 students) and home/EU increasing by 15% (78 students) suggesting the need to invest significantly in overseas TPG recruitment if we are to continue to grow this unregulated income source.

Leading in Scotland

In light of the long term goal of our vision and strategy I would like to use my regular report to highlight to members areas where the University can already claim to be Scotland’s leading university. The 2013 National Student Survey which features later on the Court agenda is one way in which we can identify areas where we are leading in learning and teaching activities. While we have slipped from 2nd in Scotland in 2012 (our best ever position), to 4th in 2013 behind St Andrews, Heriot-Watt and Glasgow, we can celebrate being number 1 in Scotland in 11 out of 30 subjects (Dentistry, Biology, Forensic and Archaeological Sciences, Physical Geography and Environmental Science, Mechanical Production and Manufacturing Engineering, Architecture, Media Studies (within English), American and Australasian Studies, Creative Arts and Design, Academic Studies in Education and Initial Teacher Training). If we as a University are able to share the good practice that undoubtedly exists in many parts of the University and recognise and commit to improving our weaknesses we can move towards the goal of leading in Scotland for higher education learning and teaching which would be a big step to achieving the University’s Vision.
Turning to our research performance, I am pleased to be in a position to highlight another record year for research grant capture at the University of Dundee, with grant awards for 2012/13 expected to total around £140m. It is particularly pleasing to see that this year increases in awards have been achieved across all four colleges within the University, including both areas with an existing strong record of grant awards as well as areas which had barely featured in this regard in previous years. This is a remarkable success story in a difficult economic and funding environment, and one which illustrates how our focus on excellence is putting the University in a leading position.

Winter Graduation

I would like to remind members that our winter graduation ceremonies will take place from 21 -22 November 2013. The participation of members of Court in the ceremonies is always greatly appreciated, and serves as an important reminder of our role and obligations as we honour our graduands. A summary of the ceremonies is provided below for members’ information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00am Thursday</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm Thursday</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>ESWCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2013</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>EPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DJCAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am Friday</td>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Since the last report to the Court, the Senior Management Team has met as follows: 12 June, 3 July, 31 July, 14 August, 28 August, 4 September, 25 September and 9 October 2013; it considered a number of issues, including the following:

- Future Strategy and Sustainability
- Performance Management
- Mission Group Alignment
- Winter Graduation
- Information Communication Services – UoD IT
- 2013 NSS Results
- Admissions & Student Recruitment
  - Student Admission figures
  - Student Recruitment Committee
- League Table Performance
- Finance
  - Management Accounts
  - Three Year Plan - Timetable
- Internal Audit Plan
- Human Resources Issues
  - Athena Swan
  - OSAR - Statistics and Review of Forms
  - Procedure for Managing Organisational Change
  - Health & Safety Review feedback
  - Living Wage
  - Academic Probation Procedures
  - Academic Promotions
  - Staff Survey
- ELIR Review
- Research & Innovation Services
  - Draft Consultancy & Service Policy
  - Research Grants: Award information & Trends
- External Relations – Communications and Marketing
- Honorary Fellows: Renewals
- Estates
  - Operational Review
  - Personal Safety/Out of Hours Working
Major Grants and Awards

- £23.9m Core Funding from Medical Research Council to Professor D R Alessi (MRC Protein Phosphorylation & Ubiquitylation Unit) for the University Unit Strategic Partnership Funding: MRC Protein Phosphorylation and Ubiquitylation Unit.

- £11.9m infrastructure grant from Scottish Funding Council to Professor MAJ Ferguson (Biological Chemistry and Drug Discovery) for the Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research.

- £5m infrastructure funding from Medical Research Council to Professor AD Morris (Medicine) for the Farr Health Informatics Research Institute (capital award).

- £3.3m from EC FP7 People/Marie Curie to Professor CJ Weijer (Cell and Developmental Biology) for Photonic Tools for Quantitative Imaging in Cells and Tissues (PHOQUUS).

- £3.1m from Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council to Professor S Cochran (Division of Imaging & Technology) for Sonopill: Minimally Invasive Gastrointestinal Diagnosis and Therapy (Joint with University of Glasgow & Heriot Watt University).

- £2.3m from Wellcome Trust to Professor MAJ Ferguson (Biological Chemistry and Drug Discovery) for Protein Glycosylation in Trypanosomes: Defining and Exploiting a Biological System (Senior Investigator Award)

- £1.9m from Wellcome Trust to Dr MMK Muqit (MRC Protein Phosphorylation Unit) for Biochemical Analysis of the PINK-1 Parkin Signalling Pathway in Parkinson’s Disease (Senior Clinical Fellowship)

- £1.4m from NHS National Institute for Health Research to Dr IS Mackenzie (Division of Cardiovascular & Diabetes Medicine) for Allopurinol and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients with Ischaemic Heart Disease (Joint with Robertson Centre for Biostatistics, University of Nottingham and University College London)

- £1.2m from Tayside Health Board to Professor Frank Sullivan (Division of Population Health Sciences) for Protein Glycosylation in Trypanosomes: Defining and Exploiting a Biological System (Senior Investigator Award)

- £1m from the Medical Research Council to Professor Andrew Morris (Medicine) for The Scottish eHealth Informatics Research Centre (E-HIRCs) (Joint with Universities of Aberdeen, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Strathclyde, St Andrews & Leicester and ISD).

- £1m from EC FP7 Ideas/European Research Council to Dr Paul Prentice (Division of Imaging & Technology) for TheraCav: Harnessing Cavitation for Therapy.

- £280k from EPSRC to Dr Ekaterina Komendantskaya (Computing) for Coalgebraic Logic Programming for Type Inference: Parallelism and Corecursion for New Generation of Programming Languages (Joint with the University of Bath).

- £280k from Royal Society of Edinburgh to Dr Yong Sung Park (Civil Engineering) for A New Framework for Experimental Study of Tsunamis (RSE/Scottish Government Personal Research Fellowship co-funded by Marie Curie Actions 2013).

- £180k from the Scottish Government to Dr Ian Barron (Education) for RCT: Trauma Recovery across Scotland’s Secure Estate.
People and Prizes

- The Sir James Black Awards for 2013 were presented to Pawel Grzyb, Barry Sullivan, Emma Bissett and Katie Linden in recognition of their outstanding contribution to research and scholarship in their respective disciplines.
- Professor Margaret Smith, Deputy Principal and Dean of the School of Nursing & Midwifery, received an OBE in the Queen’s Birthday Honours.
- PhD student Martin Muir was awarded the Area Prize from the Royal Geographical Society in recognition of his research into climate change adaptation.
- Emeritus Professor Alan Newell was presented with a Lifetime Achievement Award from the Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB) for his services to older, blind, and partially sighted people.
- Professor Robert Steele and Professor Annie Anderson who combined different areas of expertise to establish a nation-wide cancer prevention network, have been elected as Fellows of The Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh (RCPE).
- Dr Victoria Cowling was awarded a prestigious Medical Research Council Senior Non-Clinical Fellowship to continue her ground breaking research on how mutations in cancer genes can result in tumours forming.
- Final Year medical student Catriona Rother received a Young Scientist Award for her work on the impact of antibiotic resistance worldwide and its implications for pneumonia patients. The award was made by the European Respiratory Society at their annual congress in Barcelona.
- A team of students from the University of Dundee have been crowned European champions in a prestigious international competition designed to advance science and education (iGEM (International Genetically Engineered Machine) European Jamboree) and will now go forward to the World Final in Boston on 1st November.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 19 August 2013.

Present: Mr R Burns (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Mr I MacKinnon (President, Students’ Association), Mr KA Richmond, Mr EF Sanderson, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Mr J Elliot; University Secretary; Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching; Director of Finance; Director Campus Services; Director of External Relations (Minutes 1, 2 & 3); Head of Alumni Relations & Development Services (Minutes 1, 2 & 3); Director of Strategic Planning; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Professor SM Black, Mr R Bowie.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 13 May 2013.

2. DUNDEE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Director of Finance provided an update on discussions relating to the proposed sale of Dundee University Press (DUP) assets to Edinburgh University Press (EUP). The Committee noted that there were still some aspects of the sale which were subject to further negotiation, but that the Director expected that the matter would be concluded by the end of September 2013.

In response to questions regarding the annual financial statements, the Director confirmed that the financial position relating to DUP had already been recognised in the accounts, and so there would be little residual effect on the consolidated accounts.

Resolved: to note the update.

3. ANNUAL REPORT ON FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGNS

The Director of External Relations provided a report on the progress of the three current fundraising priorities: the Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR); the refurbishment of the Medical School at Ninewells; and the new mortuary facilities for the Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification (CAHId). In doing so the Director also highlighted the approach of the Alumni & Development team to fundraising from philanthropic sources.

The Committee noted that the CTIR project had almost reached its fundraising target, with a remaining funding gap of £183k and further applications totaling £50k submitted to trusts and foundations. The Ninewells refurbishment campaign had a remaining funding gap of £1m, with significant applications totaling £482k currently under consideration. Members noted that the CAHId campaign had been an excellent campaign in terms of profile and the awareness levels achieved for the University, but that despite best efforts the campaign had not been as financially successful as had been hoped. This campaign would close at the end of 2013, and there would be a further push to close the remaining funding gap of £362k.

The Director went on to outline the University’s fundraising strategy, highlighting recent restructuring and recruitment within the Alumni & Development team aimed at increasing the capacity to cultivate significant relationships with trusts and foundations and improving expertise in major giving. She also highlighted alumni fundraising activities and the development of the 2017 Anniversary Fundraising Campaign.

Noting that philanthropic giving was expected to become a significant potential revenue source for the Higher Education Sector in future years, Members highlighted that fundraising was an area which had historically under-performed due to a lack of investment on the part of the University. Members acknowledged that following the restructuring and recruitment within Alumni & Development, time would be required to build relationships, increase understanding of the donor pool, and set up the major gift programme, however they suggested the Director develop a business plan outlining proposed methods for the further engagement of alumni and what, if any, additional resources would be required to improve the success of the University’s fundraising activities.
In response to questions, the Director of Campus Services confirmed that the Ninewells refurbishment plans had been phased such that if the funding target were not achieved, then the final phases could be postponed. The Director of External Relations also outlined the conditions of existing pledges within this campaign.

Resolved: to note the report.

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 2013. The Committee noted that the figures were still subject to final review and external audit. The Period 11 accounts had indicated an operating surplus of approximately £2.775m, representing a favourable variance of £2.175m when compared with the budget, and an improvement of £575k from the Period 8 forecast. An additional unfunded pension liability of £500k had subsequently been received from the actuary and figures were subject to FRS17 and other year-end adjustments, however the Director expected the operating surplus for the year to rise to £3m when the Period 12 accounts were finalised.

The Director told the Committee that he planned to review the forecasting process once the Period 12 accounts were finalised and was of the opinion that the process, in particular in relation to cash predictions, could be further improved.

In response to questions relating to future financial sustainability in light of a break-even budget for 2013/14, the Director confirmed that a paper would be prepared for Court in due course focusing on plans for achieving the 6% return on investment/surplus identified by Court as that required for long term institutional sustainability.

The Committee requested an update on student recruitment figures for the 2013/14 intake, and asked how the emerging patterns compared to the recruitment figures for 2012/13. The University Secretary confirmed that recruitment figures for Rest of UK (RUK) student places had been disappointing and were currently below the targets set, but there had been significant progress made in achieving targets for recruitment from MD20/40 postcode areas, that standard Scottish/EU recruitment was satisfactory and there were indications that undergraduate overseas student numbers would be higher than last year. Members noted the need to release resource to invest in increased marketing and branding activities for the University, and the Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching updated the Committee on plans to establish a University-wide Recruitment Committee to oversee this area of activity.

Resolved: to note the accounts.

5. ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORT

The Director of Campus Services introduced his regular report to the Committee. In doing so he informed the Committee that the preliminary Operational Review report had now been received from Larch Consultants, and that issues for improvement had emerged in the following areas: working practices, relationships and management structure, compliance and audit, and single point of contact for Colleges and Directorates. Once the report was finalised a paper outlining changes to be implemented in response to the report would be presented to the Senior Management Team and the Audit Committee for consideration.

The University Secretary confirmed that there would be time in the internal audit plan for estates matters to be reviewed, and that this may be used to consider the changes implemented as a result of the Operational Review.

The Director also presented a capital plan update which highlighted progress with: Ninewells Library & Teaching Accommodation Project, phase 2 of which would be completed by the end of August; the commencement of work to the Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design (DjCAD) buildings; discussions to identify requirements for work to 1-3 Perth Road; the continuation of negotiations with the receivers for Brown Construction with regard to work carried out within the Centre for Human Anatomy and Identification (CAHId); and the progress of the Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) building project, which was expected to be fully completed by January 2014. The Director also invited members to attend a tour of the CTIR facility following the meeting. Members suggested that it would be useful for future reports to include an indication of any predicted cost-overruns.
Noting recent improvements to the property market, members asked that the Director prepare a report summarising the University’s physical footprint, recent University property sales, and further opportunities for divestment.

Resolved: (i) to request a report into the University’s physical footprint and divestment opportunities; and

(ii) otherwise, to note the report.

6. ENDOWMENTS COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report from the meeting of the Endowments Sub-Committee on 10 June 2013. In presenting the report the Convener told the Committee that investment performance continued to be satisfactory, and that membership of the Sub-Committee would be considered in light of his own impending retirement from the Court in July 2014.

In response to questions the Convener confirmed that the University regularly considered the selected investment manager through a full tender process.

Resolved: to note the report

7. REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

In line with the recommendation from the review of the remit, make-up and role of the Remuneration Committee, the Finance & Policy Committee received a paper from the Director of Human Resources 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.

Members approved the notional remuneration budget for 2013/14 of £85k, noting that last year’s budget of £131.5k had been exceptional due to the REF 2014, and that as a result it was not expected that the Remuneration Committee would exceed the budget set. Noting that last year priority had been given to the remuneration of the Professoriate, members agreed that all senior staff, including the Professoriate, grade 10 support staff and Senior Management, should be eligible for consideration in 2013/14. Members highlighted the need for awards to be based on exceptional performance, and to be subject to completion of Objective Setting and Review (OSeR) processes and the mandatory Equality& Diversity training.

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

8. CAR PARKING CHARGES

The Committee received for information notice of revisions to car parking charges for 2013/14 approved by the University Secretary under delegated authority.

Resolved: to note the revised charges.

9. V&A AT DUNDEE

The Principal provided the Committee with a verbal update on negotiations relating to revenue funding arrangements with the V&A at Dundee. The Principal told members that a memorandum of understanding was being drawn up via Dundee Design Limited (DDL) which would reflect the requirements of the Court, but that negotiations with partners were still on-going at the time of the meeting.

Resolved: to note the update.

10. MISSION GROUP – in Confidence

The Principal informed the Committee that the University had received an invitation to join a mission group of Universities. He told the Committee that the Senior Management Team had considered the initial invitation, and that he had established a working group to identify key questions and issues in relation to the invitation. Noting that the group planned to re-launch with revised membership and branding, the Principal went on to outline some of the benefits and disadvantages already identified and proposed that a paper be presented to the business meeting of the Court Retreat for full discussion. Members were broadly very supportive of the idea of joining the group concerned and looked forward to debating the issue at the Retreat.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 30 September 2013.

Present: Mr R Burns (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Professor SM Black, Mr R Bowie, Mr I MacKinnon (President, Students’ Association), Mr KA Richmond, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Mr J Elliot; University Secretary; Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching; Director of Finance; Director Campus Services; Director of Strategic Planning; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr EF Sanderson.

1. **MINUTES**

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 19 August 2013.

2. **MATTERS ARISING**

V&A at Dundee (Minute 9)

The Committee noted that negotiations with partners were ongoing at the time of the meeting.

3. **UPDATE ON STUDENT RECRUITMENT**

The Committee received a paper outlining the current position with respect to undergraduate and taught postgraduate student matriculations for 2013/14 entry. The Committee noted that the figures were subject to further change as the matriculation process was still on-going, particularly in respect of international students.

In terms of Rest of UK undergraduate recruitment, the figures were disappointing at 17.5% below target. They had also seen a decrease against the 2012/13 figures. Members were however pleased to hear that matriculations for undergraduate students from the 40% most deprived postcode areas (so-called MD40 students) had reached 96% of the ambitious targets set following the award of an additional 150 widening access places by the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) during the 2012/13 admissions cycle.

Overall recruitment of Scottish/European undergraduate students had increased by 8.6%, although this figure included the previously mentioned increase in MD40 student recruitment and a decrease in EU undergraduate matriculations. The Committee noted that increases to grade tariffs at the University of Dundee and changes in the recruitment behaviour of English institutions in respect of high-achieving applicants might have impacted on recruitment figures. In analysing the figures presented, members also noted that the conversion of offers to matriculations was one area where there was room for improvement.

In terms of taught postgraduate students, the University Secretary told the Committee that the final position would not be known until the completion of the January 2014 intake. When compared to data from an equivalent point in the 2012/13 entry cycle, Home/EU taught postgraduate recruitment had increased by 15% and overseas recruitment had fallen by 7%. Noting that international recruitment had increased steadily over the last few years, members highlighted the importance of maintaining progress in this area.

Members noted that the number of RUK students recruited across all Scottish institutions had increased by around 6%, whereas the University’s share had almost halved. Members suggested that further analysis of competitor’s recruitment strategies might be helpful.

In response to questions the University Secretary told the Committee that the University was making a series of senior appointments to provide leadership in recruitment and marketing activities. Furthermore, a new Student Recruitment Committee had been established, chaired by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) which would take forward the development of activities and actions to address the weaknesses exposed by this year’s recruitment cycle.
The Director of Finance told the Committee that based on the recruitment figures presented the financial projection was for a £1.2m decrease in income relative to the budget. This would however be offset in part by a £1m provision in the budget which had been made in case of underachievement against recruitment targets.

The University Secretary explained the University’s policy on the differentiation of offers for students from different backgrounds and in doing so he highlighted the difficulties created as a result, particularly in the context of fair admissions.

The Vice-Principal for Learning and Teaching outlined a number of initiatives that he expected to be implemented for the 2013/14 application cycle including: the possible introduction of unconditional offers within one College, academic excellence scholarships for RUK students achieving high A level results, and changes to the presentation of the University’s RUK fees externally to more accurately reflect the University’s RUK fee structure.

Members were keen to see targets for future recruitment from unregulated markets, along with an analysis of the role that this projected income would have within the University’s financial strategy.

Resolved: to note the report.

4. UNIVERSITY STRATEGY TO 2017: BENCHMARKING

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced a paper which proposed a group of comparator universities for use in presenting performance benchmarking reports associated with the University Strategy to 2017. Members noted that the purpose of benchmarking was to gauge progress in improving the University’s relative position on a number of key indicators.

The Director highlighted the benefits of selecting the comparator group based on institutional similarity and aspiration rather than selecting current peers. The comparator group proposed included ‘Scottish HEI average’ and ‘1994 Group average’ along with the following individual HEIs: Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, St Andrews, Strathclyde, Heriot Watt, Lancaster, York, Leicester, Reading, Brunel, and Queen’s Belfast.

Members were supportive of the proposed comparator group, but asked that an additional institution be included which was currently below the University of Dundee in league tables, but which was noted to be improving its position. Members suggested that it would be desirable if this was a Scottish HEI and asked the Director to consider appropriate options.

Through discussion, members noted that while the decisions and actions should not be driven solely by league table concerns, it was clear that so long as progress was being made towards the achievement of the University Vision then this should in turn improve the University’s position within league tables. The Principal told the Committee that institutions who performed well across a broad range of areas were particularly successful within league tables, and that the University must aim for excellence across all of its disciplines and directorates if it were to improve its position. The Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching went on to highlight the opportunity for improved coordination of certain data returns to HESA to improve the University’s league table positioning.

Resolved: (i) to recommend to the Court the approval of the comparator set presented subject to the inclusion of an additional Scottish HEI currently below the University of Dundee in league tables; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

5. ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORTS

(1) Estates Strategy: Space Reductions

The Director of Campus Services presented a paper outlining recent property disposals and acquisitions. Members noted that recent reductions had focused on University buildings on the periphery of the City Campus along with those on the City Campus which were deemed not to be fit for purpose. The reduction had not only realised capital, but had reduced maintenance, facilities costs and utility charges across the University. Campus Services were working with each of the Colleges and Directorates to develop plans to further reduce the overall footprint, and the paper indicated space reductions for each College, and properties for future review.
Members noted that the next space utilisation report was due for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting on 11 November.

Resolved: to note the report.

(2) Estates & Buildings Report

The Director of Campus Services introduced his regular report to the Committee. In doing so he advised that following the recent Estates Operational Review, organisational change proposals were to be presented to the Senior Management Team. These had been developed with the aim of delivering services consistent with, and in support of, the University’s vision and strategic plan in a manner representing value for money.

The Director also presented a summary of progress against the capital programme. In updating the Committee on the Ninewells Library and Teaching Accommodation Project the Director confirmed that outstanding Phase 2 work was due for completion in December 2013. Works on Lecture Theatre (LT) 1 within Phase 3 of the project was approximately 6 weeks behind programme, with completion expected by the end of November. Members noted that the delay had largely resulted from asbestos removal and issues with demolition contractors. A design team had been appointed to prepare plans for the redevelopment of LT2/3 and works were expected to start in summer 2014 subject to funding.

Turning to works within the Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design (DJCAD), the Director told the Committee that remedial works to the Matthew Building entrance were almost complete, but that additional legal fees had been incurred as a result of the main contractor going into liquidation. Members noted that Phase 3 works to the Crawford Building were almost complete and had been delivered within budget, and that Phase 4 works were currently within budget and on schedule.

The Committee heard that negotiations were still ongoing regarding outstanding mechanical work and the provision of operation and maintenance manuals for the Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification (CAHId), and that it would not be possible to confirm the overall financial position with the project until these matters had been resolved.

The Director told the Committee that works on the Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) were currently three weeks behind schedule, but that the contractor was confident that the project would be completed to time.

The Director also reported on the procurement of a 4th Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit. Tenders were currently being assessed, but it was expected that the projected cost would rise by approximately £40k as a result of increased market demand for this kind of plant. In response to questions, the Director told the Committee that the additional cost increase would add 1 month to the projected payback period of 2.7 years. Members asked if there was a business case for energy export from the University to the national grid, but it was noted that the engine would meet an energy deficit on campus rather than providing an export opportunity.

Members recommended that post-completion reviews of significant capital projects be brought to the attention of the Committee, and should include lessons learned, risk level information, a review of the quality of advice received, and user feedback on the delivered project.

Resolved: to note the report.

6. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 1

The Director of Finance presented the management accounts for the period to the end of August 2013. The operating surplus showed a favorable variance of £704k compared with the budget, but the Director informed the Committee that this was largely due to the timing on the expenditure of certain estates projects.

The year-end forecast remained the same as the budget, with an operating surplus of £88k predicted. 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. Members noted that a £1m provision within the budget in case of under recruitment of MD40 students was unlikely to be required given the recruitment figures presented
earlier in the meeting. This provision would however be required to cover the shortfall in other student recruitment areas, particularly RUK.

Members also noted that around 46% of employees automatically enrolled into the University pension scheme had chosen to opt out of the scheme. An initial analysis of those remaining within the scheme suggested that the provision within the budget of £1.0m for auto enrollment costs had been underestimated by approximately £0.1m.

Resolved: to note the accounts

7. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The Director of Finance updated the Committee on progress with regard to the completion of the Financial Statements for 2012/13. Work was proceeding to schedule and the Statements would be submitted to the meeting on 11 November 2013.

Members noted that the audit of subsidiary companies had been completed, and that the external auditors were now focusing on the University’s accounts. The period 12 accounts had shown an operating surplus of £2.6m which was further improved following actuarial adjustment, however offsetting actuarial losses within the pension scheme meant that overall little would be added to the University reserves.

Resolved: to note the position

8. 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 2013/14 were: to develop longer term cash forecasts based on three year plans and to adjust banking facilities as necessary; to consider the possibility of refinancing Dundee Student Villages (DSV) Ltd recognising that new accounting rules would potentially bring the associated debt onto the balance sheet; and to continue to improve the accuracy of short term cash forecasts.

The Committee discussed options for improving returns on cash, and noted that during 2012/13 investment periods had been increased to 30 days, but that there was flexibility to extend this period if it proved financially beneficial. Members also noted that Quayle Munro Project Finance LLP had been asked to undertake a sensitivity analysis around the DSV model. In response to questions the Director of Finance confirmed that occupancy for DSV was around 97.5% (above the level required by the current model), but that rents had been frozen for 2013/14.

Resolved: to note the report

9. DUNDEE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Director of Finance provided an update on discussions relating to the proposed sale of Dundee University Press (DUP) assets to Edinburgh University Press (EUP). At the time of the meeting a contract to sell DUP had been signed, but was subject to certain conditions which the University was working to satisfy. Members also noted that the process of communicating with authors had started.

Resolved: to note the update.

10. FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY GROUP ANNUAL SUSTAINABILITY ASSURANCE REPORT

The Committee noted the introduction in 2013/14 of a requirement to submit a formal financial sustainability report to the Scottish Funding Council once audited accounts were complete. The Financial Sustainability Strategy Group (FSSG) had recently announced their intention to change the content required within the report and as such members noted that the report had been delayed and would be presented to their meeting on 11 November 2013.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 17 September 2013.

Present: Mr Jo Elliot (Convener), Ms B Malone, Ms SS Morrison-Low.

In Attendance: University Secretary; Director of Finance; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; Chief Technology Officer (Minutes 1,2,3,4(1) & 4(2)); Secretary to the Colleges of Life Sciences and Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing (Minutes 1,2,3,4(1) & 4(2)); Ms L Paterson (PricewaterhouseCoopers), Ms T Levinsohn (PricewaterhouseCoopers), Mr A Shaw (KPMG); and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr R Burns, Mr I Stewart, and Mr KAC Swinley.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 22 May 2013.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Roll-out of Annual Leave Monitoring (Minute 5(1))

Members noted that the issue of ensuring annual leave monitoring took place for academic staff members would be addressed in part by the new Human Resources IT system. In the interim the Human Resources Director had raised the matter at a meeting of the Senior Management Team and would develop plans further in time for the start of the next annual leave cycle in January 2014.

Resolved: to note the update.

(2) Institutional Risk Register (Minute 8)

The University Secretary told the Committee that Mr Michael Timar (PricewaterhouseCoopers) had provided an update to the risk management benchmarking data presented in June. The updated comparison was tabled and members noted that the University’s scores in this revised version were on the whole in line with the sector. The University Secretary highlighted differences in the aggregation and articulation of risks and proposed that officers review the level of detail and aggregation within the existing University of Dundee Institutional Risk Register and present a revised version to the next meeting of the Committee along with a commentary as to the process for the development and use of the Register.

Resolved: to note the update.

(3) Information Security Policy (Minute 9)

Members noted that the new Chief Technology Officer, Mr Paul Saunders, planned to review further the Information Security Policy approved at the last meeting. A revised policy would be presented to the Committee during the 2013/14 academic year.

Resolved: to note the update.

3. CONVENER’S REPORT

The Convener updated members of the Committee on his discussions with the auditors and senior management since the last meeting. No serious matters had been raised and the Convener was satisfied with communications with both auditors and management.

Resolved: to note the update.
4. INTERNAL AUDITORS

(1) Payroll

The auditors presented their report. The objective of the audit was to verify that processes relating to payroll and human resources were well-designed, and that they were being followed consistently across the University. The Auditors made two moderate and three low risk recommendations, with the two moderate risk recommendations relating to the electronic filing of documentation and staff existence checks. In the medium-term, both of these would be addressed by the upgrade to the ORACLE human resources system and in the meantime manual measures had been put in place since the audit.

Resolved: to note the report.

(2) PURE

The auditors summarised their report into the University’s research information management system (PURE). In doing so the auditors highlighted areas of good practice including: positive feedback from academic staff relating to both the system and the team implementing it, good system functionality, and the potential future value of PURE as a source for financial and project status information.

The auditors made three moderate and two low risk recommendations which had been accepted by management. The moderate risk recommendations related to: future ownership and management of PURE, user buy-in and engagement in PURE, and the phase two roll-out timetable.

In response to questions the Mr Leith outlined the system’s potential in relation to the Research Excellence Framework submission, performance management, and as a research information tool. He also commented on plans for the Phase two roll-out.

The Committee expressed an interest in receiving further internal audit reports relating to the PURE system following the Phase two roll-out.

Resolved: to note the report.

(3) IT Review

The auditors presented their report into Information Security. The Committee noted that the review had taken place at the request of management and the new Chief Technology Officer, Mr Paul Saunders, and that this area constituted a high priority for Mr Saunders and his team.

The auditors made three high and seven moderate risk recommendations, all of which had been accepted by management. The high risk recommendations related to: information protection and classification, network access and end user device lifecycle. The moderate risk recommendations related to: information security training, user access and credentials, end user device policies and procedures, security configuration for end user devices, network management, network exceptions, and network security.

The Committee reviewed each of the high risk recommendations in detail, along with the corresponding management response. In outlining the responses, the Chief Technology Officer provided additional background to the issue and to the response. He accepted that some of the time-scales for full implementation of the recommendations were quite long, but indicated that this was as a result of the scale of the task and that he expected progress toward a series of milestones to be achieved in the interim period. The Committee asked that a paper be provided to the next meeting outlining these milestones and their expected target implementation dates.

In response to questions the University Secretary confirmed that the Chief Technology Officer and Chief Information Officer were responsible for ensuring that the University was adhering to required information security standards.

Members indicated that information security had been a general area of concern from previous audit report, welcomed the focus of the new Chief Technology Officer on this area and looked forward to significant progress being made in addressing the issues raised. The Committee
noted that a new structure was being put in place by the Chief Technology Officer and that there was a clear time-table for progress over the next 6-12 months. Members recognised that the Chief Technology Officer would have the full support of the University’s Senior Management Team to achieve the targets outlined.

Resolved:  (i) to request that a paper be brought to the next meeting of the Committee which outlined the key milestones toward implementation of the recommendations, along with time-frames for achieving these;

(ii) to suggest that information security be a standing item on the Audit Committee agenda, with regular progress updates being provided to each meeting; and

(iii) otherwise, 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. As part of the review the auditors considered the progress made by management in addressing 111 recommendations either outstanding at the time of the last report, or subsequently made in 2011-12. It was reported that 67 (68%) of these recommendations had been implemented, with 30 (27%) ‘in progress’ and 5 remaining ‘outstanding’. The auditor reviewed the twelve high risk recommendations which had not been completed and the Committee noted that five were now covered by the new information security review presented earlier in the meeting, five related to the iBuy project (previously known as PECOS) and two related to the asset register. The auditors told the Committee that they were satisfied with the reasons provided for the delays in these areas and would continue to monitor the recommendations.

In response to questions, the Director of Finance provided an overview of the iBuy project. Members noted that the interface and controls within the system were currently being redesigned and would be rolled out to areas where PECOS had not been previously implemented prior to their full roll-back into areas where there had been a prior implementation. The Director also told the Committee that initial discussions regarding an asset register had taken place, but that different parts of the University required different outputs from the register and a project board would be established to explore this further.

Resolved:  (i) to request that a project summary for the iBuy project be provided for discussion at the next meeting of the Audit Committee, outlining key timescales, milestones and responsibilities;

(ii) to request that an overview of asset register plans be provided for discussion at the next meeting of the Audit Committee; and

(iii) otherwise to note the report.

(5) Status Update

The auditors presented their final status report on the audit plan for 2012-13. All work had been completed.

Resolved:  to note the report

(6) 2012-13 Annual Internal Audit Report

The Committee received the auditors’ annual report on the effectiveness of the system of internal control. The auditors’ assessment was that ‘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 that the annual report be shared with Court and to suggest that management prepare a summary of the responses to the recommendations to accompany this report; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

(7) 2013-14 Internal Audit Plan

The auditors set out the proposed plan of work for the 2013-14 session and the Committee reviewed each of the audit areas within it. Members noted that the plan had been developed in consultation with officers, and that it was aligned to the risk register and areas that had been high on the agenda for discussion at the Audit Committee during the previous year. In response to questions, the auditor confirmed that KPMG undertook a reconciliation exercise each year to ensure that all areas of the risk register were covered by the internal audit plans over the course of five years. It was however noted that the topic of ‘communication’ had not been explicitly covered by internal audit, though it was an aspect of other reports such as the annual Review of Schools. The Convener expressed an interest in seeing the reconciliation between the institutional risk register and the internal audits undertaken.

There was discussion about whether seven days was an appropriate amount of audit effort to expend on core financial controls, although it was acknowledged that other audits would have financial aspects and that these aspects could be emphasised. Members noted that the internal auditors viewed the University’s existing financial controls as strong, and that, combined with the follow-up work, the internal auditors were satisfied that the financial controls were adequately audited.

The Committee asked officers to provide a report into post-investment project appraisal for large capital projects as and when appropriate.

In response to questions the University Secretary provided a brief update on student recruitment figures for 2013/14 entry. Members noted that while recruitment of Home and EU undergraduates was on target, international undergraduate recruitment had increased but remained below target and Rest of UK recruitment had proved disappointing. Members were however pleased to hear that recruitment of MD20/MD40 students to the additional widening access places awarded by the SFC appeared to be close to target levels set despite the award being made mid-recruitment cycle and being regarded as ambitious. Members agreed that the proposed internal audit on ‘International Activities – Overseas Recruitment’ should be revised to consider the broader topic of recruitment to unregulated markets.

Resolved: (i) to request a report into post-investment project appraisal for large capital projects when appropriate;

(ii) to request a report comparing the internal audit programme with the institutional risk register; and

(iii) otherwise to approve the plan subject to minor amendment.

5. EXTERNAL AUDIT

In presenting the ‘Interim Management Letter’, Ms Paterson and Ms Levinsohn highlighted the status of the external audit to date and the follow-up to recommendations from the previous year. The Committee heard that early sight of the assumptions used in calculating pension liabilities had enabled a potential issue to be resolved promptly within the audit cycle. No new control recommendations had been identified during the interim visit, and of the three recommendations made last year one had been fully implemented, one had been fully implemented but with an exception and one had been partially implemented.

Resolved: to await the presentation of the final external audit report and Financial Statements on 11 November 2013.
6. INFORMATION COMPLIANCE

The University Secretary outlined two incidents relating to data compliance and the resulting actions taken in mitigation.

The first related to non-disclosure of information to an applicant under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOI(S)A) which had been investigated by the Office of the Scottish Information Commissioner (OSIC). The University had taken a number of steps to improve processes for handling requests and, while the University was found to be in technical breach of some small element of the FOI(S)A, no further action was required.

The second incident related to a data breach. The Committee noted that, since steps had been taken to rectify the breach and all parties had been satisfied with those steps, the University had decided there was no requirement to report the breach to the Information Commissioner’s Office on this occasion.

The Committee was satisfied that appropriate action had been taken in relation to resolving these incidents.

Resolved: to note the report

7. INCIDENT OF POTENTIAL FRAUD

The Director of Finance outlined the conclusion of an investigation into an incident of potential fraud. The Director told the Committee that he was satisfied that the activities concerned had not amounted to fraud, but represented an inappropriate use of University assets. A first and final warning had been issued to the individual concerned, and the matter was subject to appeal at the time of the meeting.

Resolved: to note the report

8. WHISTLEBLOWING

The University Secretary informed the Committee of a recently made Public Interest Disclosure. The Director of Finance and Director of Human Resources had been asked to investigate the allegations made and the outcome would be reported shortly. The Committee noted that the allegations had been made anonymously and that the individual had indicated by email that they were not willing to engage further with the investigation.

The Convener asked that officers prepare a report detailing the process of the handling of the allegations to provide reassurance that the appropriate actions had been undertaken and that the investigation had been carried out in compliance with the Whistleblowing Policy.

Resolved: (i) to request a report outlining the policy, investigation and conclusions; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

9. LEGAL MATTERS

The Committee received a routine report detailing the current legal cases involving the University, including updates since its last meeting.

Resolved: to note the report.

10. HEALTH & SAFETY SUB-COMMITTEE

The University Secretary introduced the report of the Sub-Committee’s meeting on 3 September 2013. In doing so he highlighted to the Committee the report from Fife Council Enterprise Planning & Protective Services in relation to the Knockhill accident in November 2011. The Committee noted that vigorous management action in response to the accident was likely to have been critical in the decision of the Council not to proceed with prosecution.

Resolved: for its part, to note the report.
11. **INTERNAL AUDIT CONTRACT**

The Committee had, by electronic correspondence, recommended the renewal of the internal audit contract with KPMG for a period of 1 year from 31 July 2013. Members noted that the renewal had subsequently been approved by the Court at its meeting on 6 September 2013.

Resolved: to note the renewal of the internal audit contract for a period of 1 year from 31 July 2013.

12. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF REMIT AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Noting that the remit and terms of reference of the Audit Committee were a matter for the Court and that the remits and terms of references for all committees of Court would be reviewed as part of the quinquennial review of Court effectiveness, the Committee nevertheless reviewed its remit and terms of reference.

Members suggested that reference should be made to the Committee’s role in the reporting of public interest disclosures, legal matters, fraud and items under the Bribery Act 2010.

Resolved: to ask officers to revise the remit and terms of reference for the Audit Committee for the approval of Court.

[A revised remit and terms of reference was subsequently drafted and is included as an annex].

13. **AUDIT COMMITTEE TRAINING SESSIONS**

The Committee was invited to discuss potential topics for the next Audit Committee training session in November 2013. Members suggested that a session relating to the process for internal and external audits, including engagement with auditors, management processes and reporting mechanisms would be of interest. Members suggested that the session start at 12.30, and that the internal and external auditors be invited to provide comment at the session.

Resolved: to note the suggestions.

14. **PRIVATE MEETINGS**

The Audit Committee was invited to meet privately with the external auditors and separately with officers. The Committee and the external auditors indicated that a private meeting was not required at that time.

Discussions with officers focussed on the tender process for audit contracts.

Resolved: to note discussions.
Annex

Terms of Reference

CONSTITUTION AND OPERATION

Membership

- The Committee shall comprise not less than three members of the Court, all of whom shall be lay members, i.e. to the exclusion of members of staff of the University and full-time students.

- The Chairperson of Court shall not be a member of the Committee.

- The Committee may co-opt, with the approval of the Court, additional lay persons with appropriate expertise who are not members of the Court. The number of such co-opted members shall not exceed half of the membership.

- At least one member of the Committee shall have a financial or accounting background.

- The Convener of the Committee shall be appointed by the Court and shall be a member of the Court. In the absence of the Convener at any meeting of the Committee, the Committee shall appoint any of its members as Acting Convener for that meeting.

- The quorum for any meeting of the Committee shall be three members, at least one of whom must be a member of the Court.

- No member of the Committee shall concurrently be a member of the Court's Finance & Policy Committee, although the Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee may attend meetings of the Audit Committee.¹

Authority

- The powers delegated to the Committee by the Court shall be as defined in the Schedule of Delegation.

- The Committee shall have full authority to undertake and review activities associated with any matters within its terms of reference. For the purposes of such activities it shall be provided with adequate resources and full access to information and University personnel.

- The Committee shall have authority to obtain, without prior approval, legal or other independent professional advice within a financial limit determined by the Court (currently £15,000).

Proceedings

- The Committee shall meet four times annually and shall report, through submission of the minutes of each meeting, to the next available meeting of the Court.

- Each meeting of the Committee shall normally be attended by the University Secretary, Director of Finance Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs and, where business relevant to them is to be discussed, representatives of the internal and external audit services.

- The Committee’s Secretary shall normally be the Clerk to Court.

¹ A reciprocal right of attendance at meetings of the Finance & Policy Committee is granted to the Convener of the Audit Committee.
DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Effectiveness and Financial Control

• to review the robustness of financial and other control systems and to ensure that the Court’s policies on internal control are implemented by delegated officers.
• to ensure that all significant losses have been properly investigated, and that the internal and external auditors and the Funding Council have been informed if appropriate.
• to oversee the University’s policy on fraud and irregularity, and to receive regular reports on any incidents of fraud.
• to oversee the University’s policy for the prevention of bribery and corruption and the University’s gifts and donations policy and to receive reports as appropriate on activity in this area.
• to oversee the University’s corporate governance arrangements.
• to monitor, annually or more frequently if necessary, the implementation of approved recommendations arising from both internal and external audit reports and management letters.
• to monitor the effectiveness of the internal and external audit services, including attendance at Committee meetings, and promote co-ordination between the two.
• to monitor the University’s arrangements to secure value for money, whether these are made via internal or external audit or other means.

Risk Management

• to advise the Court on the effectiveness of risk management in the University, on the basis of regular reports from the Risk Management Monitoring Group and appropriate audit work.

Internal Audit

• to advise the Court on the appointment and remuneration of internal auditors.
• to consider and advise the Court on the internal audit needs assessment and the strategic and annual internal audit plans.
• to consider and advise the Court on issues arising from internal audit reports.
• to receive an annual report from the internal audit service, which should include an opinion on the degree of assurance that can be placed on the system of internal control.

External Audit

• to advise the Court on the appointment and remuneration of external auditors.
• to guide the external auditors on the nature and scope of the audit as necessary.
• to consider and advise the Court on external audit reports and management letters.
• to consider and advise the Court on the University’s annual financial statements, ensuring the proper application of agreed accounting policies.
• to monitor any advisory or other non-audit work undertaken for the University by the external auditors, to ensure that their independence is not compromised.

Other

• to oversee the University’s policy on public interest disclosure and receive reports on the outcomes of investigations of public interest disclosures.
• to receive routine reports from the University Solicitor on legal matters involving, or likely to involve, the University.
• to ensure the University’s compliance with the Funding Council’s Code of Audit Practice.
• to receive and review reports relating to audit prepared by the Funding Councils, National Audit Office, European Commission and other bodies, and to advise the Court as necessary.
• to make an annual report on the work of the Committee for submission to the Court and the Funding Council.

Last reviewed October 2013
AUDIT COMMITTEE REMIT

To advise University Court in relation to its responsibilities for:

- proper financial management;
- the effectiveness of internal control and management systems;
- safeguarding the assets of the University and public funds;
- the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the University's activities; and
- corporate governance and conduct of the University's operations.

Membership

The normal membership of the Committee is six members. All members are independent, at least half drawn from the lay membership of University Court, whence also the Convener is drawn. Remaining members are co-opted with the approval of the Governance & Nominations Committee.

In Attendance

Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee
University Secretary
Director of Finance
Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs
Internal Auditors
External Auditors
Other officers at the discretion of the Director of Finance

Secretary

Clerk to Court.

Meetings

The Committee shall meet 4 times in each session. One meeting each year will incorporate a private meeting of the Committee with the internal and external auditors without officers present.

Quorum

Three members shall constitute a quorum
A meeting of the Committee was held on 24 September 2013.

Present: Mrs C Potter (Convener), Dr W Boyd, Mr D Taylor, Mrs S Krawczyk, Professor T Harley, Professor K Leydecker, Dr A Reeves

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

Apologies: Ms S Campbell, Professor G Mires

The new Chair welcomed the new members of the Committee.

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 20 May 2013 had been approved by Court on 10 June 2013.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Statute 16 Policies

The University Secretary advised the Committee that, following the campus unions’ agreement to the newly developed suite of HR policies, the new version of Statute 16 had recently been submitted to the Scottish Government for comment and review in advance of its submission to the Privy Council. As previously discussed, it was essential to the approval process that the University was able to state that agreement had been reached with the unions on this matter prior to submitting the request for Statute 16 to be amended. The University Secretary advised that there were many precedents for similar statute changes being approved both north and south of the border.

(2) OSaR: update and revised draft paperwork

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development introduced the revision of the OSaR documentation which had been amended to reflect the Transformation agenda and to improve the communication with staff about the University’s high level aims and objectives and the way in which staff could contribute individually.

A discussion ensued which reflected a range of views and opinions about the process itself, the documentation, completion rates for OSaR meetings and the lack of a link with reward.

The Committee concluded that OSaR was a desirable process and provided it was implemented well, it was of value to the University. The Committee highlighted that particular attention should be given to the: text used in the documentation to ensure it was appropriate to academics in particular; implementation of the process by academic leaders and managers; training of reviewers; the period during the year when all OSaR meetings should be conducted in advance of the start of the academic year; consequences that should apply if managers fail to undertake their responsibilities in respect of OSaR; linking of individual objectives with organisational KPIs and individual reward and the need for Deans to be fully apprised of the content and outcome of OSaR meetings where they devolve responsibility for meetings to other senior staff.

A member of the Committee suggested that there may be certain senior staff who did not accept the University’s Transformation agenda or were unwilling to participate in the OSaR process. Another member stated that OSaR operated in a disciplined and productive way in the part of the University in which they worked. A further opinion was conveyed to the effect that it was to be expected that academic leaders and managers would engage in high quality discussions with their staff about work priorities and outcomes; set the context and communicate the areas of strategy and plans on which there would be focus. The revised OSaR documentation provided for this and proposed a period of the year during which all OSaR meetings should be conducted. Moreover, there was a direct link with reward as academic leaders and managers, as reviewers, should use the OSaR process to discuss career development and to identify staff who should be advanced for promotion.
or contribution points. Where there was devolution of responsibility for OSaR meetings a feedback loop should be established to ensure Deans were advised of the content of the meeting.

It was agreed that academic leaders and managers play a key role in the success of OSaR and the necessity to provide them with the infrastructure and tools to undertake OSaR meetings to a high standard was reiterated.

Resolved: to revise the OSaR documentation to take account of the Committee’s comments.

3. UNIVERSITY VISION AND STRATEGY

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development explained to the Committee that, as part of the University Vision and Strategy, activities were being taken forward to build leadership capability. The approach that had been taken was to work with Dr Tom Kennie, a consultant with significant experience in this field in HE. A three layer approach was being taken; firstly working with SMT; secondly with Deans and Directors and finally with identified emergent talent. The first event with SMT had taken place on 28/29 August 2013 and had been well-received. There was to be two cohorts in respect of Deans and Directors, with their programme of events beginning in October 2013 and February 2014 respectively. Consideration had still to be given to identifying participants in the emergent talent programme and a decision had not yet been made as to whether candidates would be nominated or would be allowed to self-nominate. In addition to the focus on leadership, the programme would offer participants the opportunity for self-reflection by use of a 360 degree feedback tool, as well as the opportunity to share experiences and problems.

The Committee agreed that the programme represented a valuable opportunity to the individuals participating and further discussion centred on the desirability of including a self-nomination option to the emerging talent programme and the need for an evaluation of the overall programme’s success. The usual method of evaluation would take place whereby individuals would be asked to comment on its value to them. The Committee also considered that it was essential to consider the organisational development aspect of the programme’s value to the University.

Resolved: to obtain an updated report at the next HR committee

4. FINANCIAL UPDATE

The Director of Finance reported that at the end of the financial year 2012/13 (and prior to external audit) the University’s Management Accounts showed a surplus of around £2.6m against an original budgeted surplus of around £0.5m. The budget with respect to the 2013/14 financial year had been set at break-even, but some negative variance was likely to emerge at an early stage as a result of lower than budgeted student matriculations.

For 2012/13, the Statutory Accounts required an adjustment to be made in respect of the University of Dundee Pension Scheme of £3.0m, to recognise the increase in the deficit in that pension scheme. The Director of Finance commented that this demonstrated the relentlessly increasing cost of pension schemes.

The Director of Finance also reported on the impact of pension auto-enrolment. £1m had been set aside as provision, with 50% of staff estimated to auto-enrol. To date, 46.7% of staff have opted out of auto-enrolment and of those who have opted-in, the weighting was towards the USS pension scheme. The slightly higher proportion of staff remaining in meant that the cost to the University has been £1.1m.

Members noted that it had been recent practice to include a financial update at each meeting, but that this was not a feature of the remit of the committee and that all members were fully informed about the University’s current financial position through their membership of the Court. It was therefore agreed that a financial update would no longer be a standing item on the Committee’s agenda and that the Director of Finance would only be required to attend meetings by exception for relevant items of business.

Resolved: to invite the Director of Finance to attend the Committee by exception.
5. HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(1) **Staff Survey**

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development presented the key features of the Staff Survey to the Committee and outlined the groups within the University with whom she had consulted on the output.

She explained that the plan of action was to identify 2-3 University-wide overarching themes that would be worked on at organisational level. In addition, each College and SASS would receive results from their own individual area, and they would be expected to choose 2-3 themes to address. It was acknowledged that the Staff Survey indicated that there was the need for raising awareness on certain specific matters (for example, the mechanism for reporting a health and safety incident) and that individual Directorates would undertake this. The plan was to make the full report openly available to all staff alongside a communication setting out the detailed actions being taken forward as a result of the survey.

Although not finally established, the University-wide themes were likely to focus on: Valuing People; Communication and Career Development. The approach on these issues will include open meetings and focus groups in order to engage with staff on these matters.

The Committee agreed that although action needed to be taken in certain areas, the survey had highlighted very positive results in many areas. It considered the benchmarking to be particularly useful in assessing the University’s performance against that of other HE institutions.

It was confirmed that the Staff Survey would be repeated every 2-3 years so that the University’s own data and progress can be tracked.

**Resolved:** to request that the Committee receive regular updates as to how the themes are progressed.

(2) **Pay Negotiations 2012/13**

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development reported that all three campus unions intended to ballot for strike action or action short of a strike in response to the final offer of 1% by the employers.

**Resolved:** to keep the Committee updated.

(3) **Living Wage**

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development confirmed that agreement had been reached with all 3 campus unions on 2 July 2013 that the University would pay the current Living Wage to relevant staff in Grades 1 and 2. The University had communicated that it could not commit to continuing to pay the Living Wage each year for two reasons: future affordability given the likelihood of continued rises in excess of national pay awards and its desire to retain national pay bargaining rather than moving towards a position whereby there was an element of local pay bargaining.

Subsequently, on 13 September 2013 the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development had received an email from Unison stating that it was not prepared to accept the University’s position. Therefore, the payment of the Living Wage had been placed in abeyance meantime, which left the University out of alignment with most universities in Scotland.

Committee members expressed disappointment at the current position and at Unison’s actions in first coming to agreement with the University and then withdrawing that agreement.

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development informed the Committee that the Senior Management Team would consider how the University might take this matter forward at its next meeting.

**Resolved:** to note the position and await further updates.
(4) **Recruitment**

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development presented the Annual Report on Recruitment and highlighted in particular the positive trend shown in placing staff through redeployment.

The Committee expressed the view that, rather than receiving the raw data, it would be helpful if an analysis, commentary and conclusions was provided in future iterations of the report. The University Secretary suggested that the data themselves would also be better expressed in terms of conversion rates from application to interview and appointment.

**Resolved:** to present future reports in the format requested by the Committee.

(5) **HR/Payroll System Development**

The Director of Finance advised the Committee that work had commenced on the first stage of the implementation of the new HR/Payroll system: the introduction of self-service which would allow individual members of staff to update certain elements of their personal record. The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development confirmed that HR had allocated resource to this project recently so it was anticipated that significant progress would be made over the coming months.

**Resolved:** to note the position.

(6) **Organisational and Professional Development**

The Deputy Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development summarised the Organisational and Professional Development Annual Report which encompassed staff development and development for postgraduate researchers’ activities. It was highlighted that there was a need to promote further opportunities for researcher development and target additional resources to this area for the future.

The Committee noted the OPD programme and commended it for its variety and encouragement of talent in the University.

A member of the Committee suggested exploiting the commercial opportunities inherent in the programme. The Deputy Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development stated that a certain number of places were made available to external attendees, in addition to places being offered on a reciprocal basis with other HEIs.

**Resolved:** to commend the programme.

(7) **teach@dundee programme**

The Committee received a report from the Library and Learning Centre for Educational Development. A discussion ensued relating to the possibility of making the teach@dundee programme compulsory for academic staff who had not undergone probation in recent years and, therefore, had not gained benefit from undertaking Module 1 (Facilitating Learning).

**Resolved:** to request that the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) give consideration to making the programme compulsory for relevant academic staff.

6. **CONCORDAT/HR BADGE FOR EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH**

The Committee was advised that the Staff Survey had indicated that the level of knowledge and awareness of initiatives such as the Concordat and the HR Badge for Excellence in Research was generally fairly low and that there was a reliance on particular individuals to promote these activities through groups such as the postdoctoral association. The Committee received the minute from the Concordat Steering Group together with the action plans. The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development commented that considerable effort was also being given to retaining the HR Badge of Excellence. The Committee expressed the view that better attendance at the Concordat Steering Group by permanent academic staff should be encouraged (as most of the College attendees appeared to be post-doctoral staff representatives) and consideration should be given to the effective dissemination of the information provided by such events if attendance continued to be low.
Resolved: to encourage attendance at the Concordat Steering Group meetings and to disseminate information.

7. ATHENA SWAN

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development reported that a full-time administrative resource had been appointed to support the re-application for the Athena Swan Bronze award, which would be submitted in November.

The University had also committed to a further programme: Aurora and will offer five places on this programme to women in support of their development to help address the lack of women in senior academic and administrative roles. In view of the timescale for the first cohort, it had been necessary for the women who will take advantage of the 5 places on the programme to be nominated. However, this approach would be reviewed for the next cohort.

Resolved: to note the position.

8. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development reported that the University’s Equality and Diversity Policy had been revised recently by a working group. It was also highlighted that the REF had absorbed almost all of the Equality and Diversity Officer’s time over the last year. A staff member of the Committee commented that the REF processes which had been developed in HR were exemplary.

Resolved: to note the position.

9. HEALTH AND SAFETY

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development advised the Committee that following some consultancy support, an action plan was being finalised to address certain issues arising from the recent external review of Health & Safety at the University. Already, as a result of the work carried out, it has been noted that there was greater compliance in some of the laboratories where there had been concerns. New policies were also being developed including Out of Hours Working, which involved the Director of Estates and Buildings and the mutual working relationships between the University and the NHS at the Medical School.

Resolved: to note the position.

10. LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES

(1) The Committee received approved minutes of the University/UNISON/UNITE Joint Committee meetings held on 7 May 2013.

(2) The Committee received approved minutes of the University/DUCU Joint Committee meetings held on 22 May 2013.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development referred to the recently-revised Equality and Diversity Policy (annex) and asked whether the Committee would be prepared, exceptionally to consider the document outside the meeting in order that it could be integrated into the ELIR and Athena Swan submissions the University would be making.

Resolved: that the Policy would be circulated to members after the meeting and that they would feedback any comments to the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development. A final version would then be similarly circulated for formal approval.
1. **Introduction**

- The University of Dundee, with a population of over 17,000 students and 3,300 staff, is one of Scotland’s leading Universities with an international reputation of excellence in providing a diverse portfolio of undergraduate and postgraduate courses and an excellent record in Teaching Quality and Research activities.

- The University of Dundee is a major employer in the region, attracting staff and students from local, national and international backgrounds. The institution is therefore committed to sustaining a diverse and inclusive environment in which all staff and students are treated fairly and equitably.

- This Policy is one of many policies and procedures, which the University has in place to support its commitment to an institutional Equality and Diversity strategy: [http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/](http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/).

- This Policy document sets out how the University of Dundee intends to meet its statutory obligation to satisfy the requirements of the General and Specific Duties of the Equality Act 2010.

1.1 **The University’s Aims**

- The University values and embraces diversity and inclusion among staff and students by encouraging all individuals to realise their full potential and contribute as fully as possible to the University community.

- The University aims to create conditions whereby the treatment of students, staff and applicants for employment or study, is on the basis of their relative merits, abilities and potential.

- The University aims to ensure that the Policy informs and influences the development of an inclusive culture in the institution.

- The University will work in collaboration with other institutions, partners and the local community to tackle discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, promote diversity and disseminate good practice.

- The University of Dundee will ensure that the Policy and its procedures are mainstreamed within all aspects of institutional practice.

- The University of Dundee will ensure that it complies with its legal obligations under the current legislative requirements in a clear, transparent manner.

1.2 **The University’s Commitment**

- The University of Dundee is committed to working proactively towards eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment, bullying and victimisation based on the grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief (including lack of belief), sex and sexual orientation.

- The University will promote and advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

- The University will foster good relations between people of different groups.

- The University will demonstrate and evidence due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and other relevant legislation, including reflecting the provisions of the Scottish Specific Duties.

1.3 **Scope of the Policy**

- This Policy applies to all members of the University community, both staff and students irrespective of their employment contract, including job applicants, student applicants, current and former staff and students, associate members, visitors and service providers and any other persons associated with the functions of the University.

- This Policy applies to staff in areas including but not limited to, employment, including recruitment, selection, advertising of jobs, conditions of service, benefits and pay, job evaluation, probation, promotion, training and development, health and safety, conduct at work, grievance and disciplinary procedures, dismissals, redundancies and general conduct.

- This Policy applies to students in areas including but not limited to, admissions, assessment, progression, teaching, learning and research provision, university accommodation, support services and facilities, complaints and disciplinary procedures and general conduct.
1.4 The Legal Framework

a. Equality Act 2010

The Equality Act became law on 1st October 2010. It replaces previous equality legislation and is intended to strengthen equality law and to make it more transparent and easier to understand. The Act strengthens and extends protection to cover nine protected characteristics and is relevant to the University both as an employer and as an education and service provider. The Act has also extended the definitions of discrimination.

b. Protected Characteristics

Protected characteristics are the grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful. The protected characteristics defined under the Act are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief (including lack of belief)
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

c. Public Sector Equality Duty

The University is committed to implementing the requirements set out in the Equality Duty, which is supported by the Specific Duties for Scotland. The Equality Duty requires the University to have ‘due regard’ to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- Foster positive relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it

The duty covers all the protected characteristics apart from marriage and civil partnership, for which public bodies will only have to demonstrate due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination in employment.

The Equality Act 2010 requires the University to have ‘due regard’ to these obligations throughout all its activities and functions and across all protected characteristics.

- Specific Duties for Scotland

In Scotland, the General Duty is underpinned by specific duties set by the Scottish Parliament. These specific duties commenced on 27 May 2012.

Under these duties the University will;

- Report on progress on mainstreaming the General Duty into all functions
- Develop and publish a set of equality outcomes that cover all protected characteristics
- Assess the impact of policies and practices against the needs of the General Duty
- Gather and use information on employees
- Publish gender pay gap information
- Publish statements on equal pay for gender, race and disability
- Have due regard to the General Duty in specific procurement practices
- Publish information in a manner that is accessible

d. Forms of Discrimination (Equality Act 2010)

(i) Direct Discrimination

Occurs when someone is treated less favourably than another person because of a protected characteristic they have or are thought to have or because they associate with someone who has a protected characteristic.

The new definition of direct discrimination extends protection based on association and perception, already applicable to race, sexual orientation and religion or belief, to include age, disability, gender reassignment, and sex.
a. **Discrimination Based on Association**

This refers to discrimination based on an individual’s association with another person belonging to a relevant protected characteristic.

b. **Discrimination Based on Perception**

This is direct discrimination against a person because of a belief that he or she possesses a particular protected characteristic. It applies even if the person does not actually possess that characteristic.

(ii) **Indirect Discrimination**

This occurs when a provision, criterion or practice is neutral on the face of it, but its impact particularly disadvantages people with a protected characteristic, unless the person applying the provision can justify it as a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

(iii) **Discrimination Arising from a Disability**

This occurs when a disabled person is treated unfavourably because of something connected with their disability and the treatment cannot be justified. Such discrimination can only occur if it is known that a person has a disability or it can reasonably be expected that a person is disabled. Discrimination arising from a disability may be avoided by the provision of reasonable adjustments.

(iv) **Duty to Make Reasonable Adjustments**

The Act consolidates and extends previous duties upon employers and providers of education, goods and services to make reasonable adjustments for disabled people. The duty is three fold:

- Where a provision, criterion or practice puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, reasonable adjustments must be made to avoid the disadvantage.
- Where a physical feature puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage in comparison with persons who are not disabled, reasonable adjustments must be made to avoid the disadvantage.
- Where a disabled person would, but for the provision of an auxiliary aid, be at a substantial disadvantage in comparison with persons who are not disabled, reasonable adjustments must be made to avoid the disadvantage by providing the auxiliary aid.

In addition, where requirements relate to the provision of information, reasonable adjustments include ensuring that the information is available in an accessible format.

**What is a reasonable adjustment?**

The Equality and Human Rights Commission’s (EHRC) ‘Technical Guidance on Further and Higher Education’ and ‘Employment Statutory Code of Practice’ state that the following are some of the factors which might be taken into account in determining what is a reasonable adjustment:

- whether making the adjustment would be effective in preventing the substantial disadvantage;
- the practicability of the adjustment;
- the financial and other costs of making the adjustment;
- the extent of the financial or other resources available;
- health and safety requirements, and
- the relevant interests of other people.

For example, it may be reasonable for the University to install a hearing loop system in all lecture theatres and to recruit British Sign Language (BSL) interpreters in response to individual disabled students’ needs, but it may not be reasonable to have a BSL interpreter on the University’s payroll.


(v) **Harassment**

The Equality Act 2010 outlines three types of harassment

- Unwanted conduct that has the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for the complainant, or violating the
complainant’s dignity (this applies to all protected characteristics apart from pregnancy and maternity, and marriage and civil partnership)

• Unwanted conduct of a sexual nature (sexual harassment)
• Treating a person less favourably than another person because they have either submitted to, or rejected, sexual harassment or harassment related to sex or gender reassignment

People are protected from harassment if they are perceived to have, or associate with someone with, a protected characteristic.

(vi) Victimisation

This takes place where one person treats another less favourably because he or she has asserted their legal rights in accordance with the Equality Act 2010 or helped someone else to do so. This includes making a complaint, taking legal action, providing evidence related to proceedings or alleging that discrimination has taken place.

2. Implementation

• The University community collectively shares responsibility for the successful application of this policy, whilst specific responsibility falls on staff involved in the development and support of staff and students.
• The University will strive to ensure that all staff and students have equal access to the full range of facilities, and that adjustments to working and learning practices are implemented in order to meet the needs of a diverse community.
• The University will work in partnership with the recognised campus trade unions and the Students’ Association as well as external institutions where appropriate to tackle all forms of unlawful discrimination.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

3.1 Leadership, Management, Governance and Responsibilities

In order to strive forward with the University’s commitment and vision, the University Court and those in Management and Leadership positions are required to be proactive in tackling unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations between persons of different groups.

The Policy sets out the responsibilities of all staff, students and other stakeholders.

3.2 The University Court

The University Court has ultimate responsibility for:

• Ensuring that the institution complies with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, meeting its General and Specific Duties.
• Ensuring that the commitments detailed in the Equality and Diversity Policy are implemented.
• Promoting a culture of inclusiveness in the University.

3.3 The Principal

The Principal is responsible for:

• Giving a consistent and high profile lead on issues that involve equality and diversity.
• Providing leadership in the implementation of the Policy.

3.4 The University Secretary

The University Secretary is responsible for:

• The promotion and strategic support of the policy both internally and externally to the University.
• Ensuring that equality and diversity requirements are at the core of Corporate Planning and Strategy implementation.
• Ensuring that managers fulfil their role in delivering the Equality and Diversity Policy and that related procedures are followed.

3.5 Deans/Directors/Managers

Deans/Directors and Managers are responsible for:

• Ensuring that due regard is given to equality issues in all decision making.
• Giving a consistent lead on the mainstreaming of equality and diversity requirements within all their relevant functions.
• Taking responsibility for ensuring that appropriate action is taken whenever complaints of unlawful discrimination are raised, either by the staff or students, in their Schools or units.
• Encouraging, supporting and enabling all their staff and students to reach their full potential.
• Ensuring that all staff are aware of their responsibilities and receive support, training and appropriate information in order to carry out their activities, including completing the University’s mandatory equality and diversity training programme.
• Ensuring staff and students know how to report any instances of harassment, bullying and discrimination without fear of victimisation.
• Taking appropriate action with staff or students who are acting in breach of the Policy and procedures.

3.6 The Equality and Diversity Working Group (EDWG) (a sub-committee of the Human Resources Committee)

EDWG is responsible for:
• Ongoing development and the implementation of the Policy.
• Ensuring that the Policy is published, promoted, continually assessed, reviewed and revised, and that the outcomes are published on an annual basis, accessible to all staff, students and the community external to the University.
• Ensuring that everyone within the University community is given appropriate support to enable them to implement the requirements of the Policy within their function, whatever that function may be.
• Ensuring that appropriate supportive and/or training strategies are developed and implemented accordingly.

3.7 The Equality and Diversity Officer

The Equality and Diversity Officer, is responsible for:
• Promoting, advancing and co-ordinating equality and diversity initiatives across the University for both staff and students according to legislative requirements and best practice.
• Contributing to strategy and developing plans for equality and diversity objectives.
• Producing reports to appropriate committees outlining progress and outcome.
• Updating existing policies and developing new policies according to legislative requirements and good practice.
• Co-ordinating the activities of Harassment advisors.
• Progressing action on the various equality and diversity activities.

3.8 The Head of Disability Services

The Head of Disability Services is responsible for:
• Acting as the main University contact for disability compliance issues.
• Providing advice and guidance to senior management on inclusive practice and disability-related legal requirements.
• Raising awareness of Disability Services, disability issues and inclusive practice with all members of the University community.
• Monitoring and reviewing the University’s policies and procedures in response to disability-related legislation and quality assurance requirements.
• Co-ordinating and delivering disability-related staff development opportunities.
• Producing reports for University committees as appropriate, including an annual report on Disability Services’ activities, feedback from service users and progress against key objectives.

3.9 All Teaching Staff, including on and off campus, part-time and visiting lecturers

Staff under this category is responsible for:
• Ensuring that the curriculum assessment and teaching methods are underpinned by the General Duty requirements of the Equality Act 2010, whenever reasonably practicable.
• Ensuring that classroom values and assessments promote equality of opportunity and foster good relations.
• Implementing reasonable adjustments for disabled students, including enabling access to the curriculum.

3.10 All other employees of the University

All other employees of the University are responsible for:
• Supporting and implementing the Equality and Diversity Policy.
• Ensuring that their behaviour and/or actions do not amount to discrimination or harassment in any way.
• Implementing reasonable adjustments for disabled people, including students and staff.
3.11 All members of the public, visiting or engaging with the University

All other individuals under this category are required to comply with the University’s Equality and Diversity Policy.

3.12 All Students

All Students are responsible for:

- Ensuring that their behaviour promotes positive relationships between people of different groups.
- Ensuring that they participate in non-discriminatory practices.
- Ensuring that they follow the aims of the University’s Equality and Diversity Policy

All students are also encouraged to report any incidences of discriminatory behaviour to a member of University staff.

4. Procurement

The University will comply with the statutory requirements of the Equality Act 2010, as stated in this Policy. It is a requirement of the Specific Duties (Scotland), that when institutions procure the services of other providers, where those services are equality relevant, the institution, through the Procurement department remains responsible for meeting the Equality Duty requirements of those services.

5. The Staff Experience

5.1 Recruitment

Job advertisements will use non-discriminatory language and images to attract the widest interest from suitably qualified applicants. As part of the application process, applicants will be asked to complete an equality monitoring form which will be used for the sole purpose of enabling the University to comply with its legal obligation to publish information in support of the aims of the Equality Duty. This will be made clear to candidates. Such information will not be available to recruiting managers; therefore, it will not be used for selection purposes.

5.2 Selection

Applicants will be given equal consideration by being assessed solely against the criteria for the post. Criteria for posts will be contained within the job description, person specification and any additional relevant documents attached to the post. Shortlisting will be undertaken thoroughly and rigorously based on the criteria for the post and without reference to any protected characteristic. Interview panels and appointing committees will comprise, as a minimum, mixed gender representation and will be more diverse where possible. All staff participating in such committees will have knowledge of this Policy. The University will make reasonable adjustments for applicants who have a disability or who have particular requirements.

5.3 Probation, Promotion and Retention

Committees which decide whether probationers’ appointments should be confirmed, and on the merits of candidates for promotion, will conduct their deliberations and evaluations without unlawful discrimination. All staff participating in such committees will have knowledge of this Policy. Fairness, transparency and a non-discriminatory approach to the processes for probation and promotion will contribute to the retention of excellent staff.

5.4 Terms and Conditions of Employment

The terms and conditions of employment are determined by the role the member of staff holds, and in certain respects to eligibility criteria, irrespective of any protected characteristic, part-time or fixed-term status.

5.5 Honorary and Associate Staff

Honorary and Associate staff are invited to be connected with the University wholly on the basis of the mutual benefit of the relationship without reference to personal characteristics.

5.6 Work Environment

The University recognises the different needs of members of staff, for example, religious observation, family commitments etc. and the benefits of having an appropriate work/life balance. It offers a range of specific and flexible policies: http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/work_life/ to support staff in various life event situations.

The University is committed to supporting disabled staff and will implement reasonable adjustments to their work environment to enable them to undertake their duties.
5.7 References
The University will provide a fair and factual work reference for members of staff, on request. It will relate exclusively to work performance and conduct.

5.8 Positive Action
Positive action is a range of measures allowed under the Equality Act 2010 which can be lawfully taken to encourage and train people from under-represented groups to help them overcome disadvantages in competing with other applicants.

Positive action must not be confused with positive discrimination (setting of quotas or any form of preferential treatment) which is unlawful under the equality legislation. The only exception to this is that it is permissible to treat disabled people more favourably than non-disabled people.

6. The Student Experience
The Equality Act 2010 prohibits unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation of:
• Prospective students (in relation to admissions arrangements)
• University students (including those absent or temporarily excluded)
• Former University students (if there is a continuing relationship based on them having been a student at the University).

The University is committed to ensuring that its students are free from any form of discriminatory practices by the institution or its members.

6.1 Admissions
• The University is committed to excellence in admissions and aims to attract applicants from diverse communities and backgrounds, who have the appropriate commitment, ability and motivation to fulfil their academic potential and who will contribute positively to university life.
• All prospective students will be given equal consideration during the selection process, and will not be discriminated or treated less favourably on any grounds referred to in paragraph 1.4 of this policy.
• The University will offer a supportive environment to disabled applicants and will strive to support all needs, including through the implementation of reasonable adjustments.

6.2 Selection
• All applicant selection processes will be thorough, transparent and carried out objectively, and will only address the applicant’s suitability for the programme requirements.
• All staff involved in the selection process will have an awareness of equality and diversity, and will have completed the University’s mandatory online equality and diversity training programme.

6.3 Recruitment
All communication activities and information contained in the prospectuses, websites and other promotional material used in the recruitment of students should advance equality of opportunity and make reference to this policy. All such information will be designed to be accessible and alternative formats will be provided where reasonable to meet the needs of individual disabled students.

6.4 Wider Participation
• The University is committed to widening access and participation in higher education.
• To support initiatives to promote this activity the university has a specific engagement strategy. Full details are provided on the website: http://www.dundee.ac.uk/admissions/participation/

6.5 Teaching / Learning/Assessment
• The University recognises the importance of encouraging inclusiveness in teaching and learning methods and therefore encourages all staff to promote equality of opportunity through the development of accessible curricula.
• The University will aim to ensure that criteria for assessment will be clear, transparent and consistent for all students and will reflect the principles of equality, diversity and inclusion.
• The University will ensure that staff are aware of the requirement to make reasonable adjustments to accommodate the learning needs of disabled students in line with the University’s Policy on Academic Adjustments for Disabled Students.
6.6 Facilities and Services

The University will ensure that all its facilities and provisions operate in accordance with its Equality and Diversity Policy. This includes accommodation, sports provision, IT and library facilities, catering facilities and social activities.

7. Involvement and Consultation

- The University recognises the need to have structures in place that will enable it to effectively communicate with staff and students from all equality groups at all levels within the University, and to involve and consult with those groups, where appropriate.
- The University has proactively encouraged and engaged diverse staff groups within the University to inform, shape and improve its policies and practices on equality and diversity by establishing and supporting a number of staff networks. These networks help the University to progress equality and diversity by contributing to policy development and implementation.
- The University will consult and engage on a regular basis with representatives of the recognised University Trade Unions and other stakeholders.

8. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

- The University, as a public body, is required to carry out Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) on all policies, procedures, practices and provisions.
- EIA is a way of systematically and thoroughly assessing and consulting on the effects that a proposed policy is likely to have on groups of people.
- The EIA process involves consultation with users and key stakeholders.

9. Training

- Guidance, support and training will be provided to all members of academic and non-academic staff at all levels, including senior management to ensure that the University’s commitment to equality and diversity is understood and achieved.
- A range of training opportunities and initiatives are available to ensure that members of the University community are made aware of equalities law and good practice in relation to equality and diversity.
- The training provision is delivered through a number of methods, such as mandatory online Equality & Diversity training modules as well as face to face for staff. It is planned to introduce similar training modules for students as part of the Teaching and Learning curriculum.

10. Monitoring

- Monitoring will be carried out at a number of levels to assess, review and take appropriate action as a result of the impact of the Policy. Information gathered from the monitoring process will be used in the continuous implementation and maintenance of the University’s Equality and Diversity Policy.
- The University will collect data, analyse and publish information for both staff and students annually to relevant committees.

11. Complaints/Breach of Policy

- The University is committed to creating a supportive environment and ensuring that it has appropriate mechanisms in place so that people who feel they have been affected can come forward with confidence that their complaint will be handled sensitively and without fear of victimisation.
- Complaints about any form of discrimination, harassment or bullying against staff, students or visitors will be taken seriously and could, on full investigation under the appropriate University policy, provide grounds for disciplinary action that may lead to dismissal or expulsion from the University.
- In addition to any penalties imposed by the University, individuals may also be subject to criminal and/or civil proceedings.
- The University encourages informal resolution of issues or complaints and provides trained Harassment Advisors and Mediators to support staff and students to resolve matters.
- The members of the University community have a responsibility to act in accordance with this Policy, and therefore to treat everyone with dignity and respect at all times and not to discriminate or harass other staff or students.
- Students who believe there has been a breach of this policy may raise a complaint through the Students’ Complaints Procedure. Details are available from (http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/complaints.htm)
- Staff can raise complaints through the Grievance Procedure. Details are available from the Human Resources Department (http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/policiesprocedures/grievanceprocedure-arresearchandsupportsta/)
- The University has a separate policy relating to harassment and bullying, which sets out the process for seeking support or making a complaint in relation to harassment and bullying. The Dignity at Work and Study Policy can be downloaded from http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/equality/dignity.htm, which contains the procedure for staff and students who wish to make a complaint of discrimination, harassment or bullying.
• There is a confidential support and information service available from the University’s network of voluntary Harassment Advisors.
• The confidential internal Mediation service can be accessed through http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/edr/assistance.htm
• The University will ensure that complaints are dealt with promptly and fairly.

12. Communication/Publication of this Policy
This Policy is available to all staff, students and to the wider public on the University’s Human Resources website. If alternative formats of the Policy are required, please contact the Equality and Diversity Officer at: a.trivedi@dundee.ac.uk.

13. Support and Advice
There is a range of support and advice available to members of staff and students:
• The Equality and Diversity Officer
• Disability Services
• Counselling Services
• Occupational Health
• Safety Services
• University Health Service
• Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA)
• Other student representatives (class representatives, School Presidents and the Student Representative Council)
• Human Resources Officers
• edr (Early dispute resolution)
• Harassment / Bullying Contacts
• Trade Unions

14. Other Sources of Information
ACAS: www.acas.org.co.uk
Equality & Human Rights Commission: www.equalityhumanrights.com
Government Equalities Office: www.equalities.gov.uk
Equality Challenge Unit: www.ecu.ac.uk

15. Review and Update of the Policy
• This Policy will be kept under review on a regular basis for its effectiveness and impact and may also be amended to reflect further changes in legislation by the Equality and Diversity Officer in consultation with the Equality and Diversity Working Group (EDWG) and the wider University community.
• This Policy replaces all previous Equality and Diversity policies within University of Dundee.
• Comments on the policy and its implementation should be passed to a.trivedi@dundee.ac.uk
APPENDIX 6

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

(Minute 13)

An Extraordinary Meeting meeting of the Senatus Academicus was held on 25 September 2013.

1. THE UNIVERSITY’S ALIGNMENT TO UNIVERSITY MISSION GROUPS

In his introduction, the Principal explained that the proposals contained in the paper had been considered by the Senior Management Team, the Finance & Policy Committee and the University Court and each had concluded that it would be advantageous for the University to join the 1994 Group subject to approval from the Senatus and a number of other preconditions.

On the proposal itself, the Principal described how the University had been invited to consider joining the 1994 Group of smaller research intensive universities to coincide with a re-launch and restatement of its objectives and purposes. Senate heard that Dundee had been approached as a currently un-aligned institution that had many features in common with current members of the Group – in terms of size, subject spread, research intensity, strategic fit and scale of ambition.

In terms of the current membership of the 1994 Group, the Principal acknowledged the relatively small number of institutional members, but on the related question of building a critical mass of membership the Principal reported that a number of other institutions had been invited to join in time for the re-launch and that the range of institutions would be significant.

In response to questions from Senate members the Principal explained that the Court had agreed to possible membership only if it was very clear that the new group did not define itself as second rank in terms of quality or ambition but instead aspired to lead through the highest quality teaching, research and scholarship.

Some members of Senate reported favourable experiences of membership gained at previous institutions – ranging from staff development and networking opportunities to cross-institution academic collaborations leading to higher research ratings.

The Principal noted concerns surrounding the contractual basis for membership and reassured members that membership would be approached in a spirit of collegiality and would be reviewed periodically, with input from Senate, to ensure that the University made the most of its membership.

Noting the existing strong networks within Scotland, members of Senate discussed the possible benefits of being networked with the English system and beyond – given the proposed wider European focus of the re-launched group. The Principal observed that the visibility of the University in the rest of the UK was of growing importance, particularly for student recruitment and that the University would have a strong proactive voice in the new Group and would not be content with being on the margins.

The Principal explained that membership would not alter existing strategic relationships or membership of any other group and outlined the distinction between mission groups and broader groups such as Universities Scotland where the lobbying function was clear and effective on issues where there was a broad consensus.

On the possible consequences of membership in the context of possible Scottish independence, the Principal noted that many partnerships and collaborations would have to adapt and evolve and that membership of an international group would become even more valuable in such a scenario.

From the student perspective, the President of DUSA spoke in support of the proposal and noted that DUSA would be interested in building links across the UK to counteract any perception of being isolated as a result of the Students’ Association’s non-affiliation to the NUS.

Senate concluded that the many benefits of membership, the opportunities for new partnerships, the ability to raise the profile of the University across the UK and the advantages of having a collective voice far outweighed any concerns. Members agreed, however, that membership needed to be approached in the right spirit, for its own sake and should not be seen as either a second tier grouping or as a springboard to membership of any other group.
The Principal thanked the Senatus for its views and agreed to report back on progress.

The Secretary requested members to observe confidentiality on the proposals until the University issued a press release to coincide with the planned re-launch of the Group in October.

**The Senatus decided:** to recommend to Court that the University should join the re-launched 1994 mission Group on terms agreed by the Senior Management Team.
A meeting of the Senatus Academicus was held on 9 October 2013.

1. **PRINCIPAL’S REPORT**

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

The Principal introduced the report by reflecting on progress made during the first year of the new University Strategy and Vision and reported the encouraging news that the University had re-entered the Times Higher World Rankings Top 200.

On the overall performance in league tables during the previous year, the Principal noted that the University had tended rather to maintain its position than make improvements in a way which reflected the step-change in the scale of its own ambitions, as evidenced by the Vision.

On the external environment, the Principal acknowledged a good settlement in the recent Scottish Government spending review and noted that although funding would be flat in cash terms it did demonstrate the Government’s recognition of the reputational strength of the sector and its value to the economic and cultural well-being of Scotland.

The Principal was also able to update Senate on the most recent information on student numbers and reported that recruitment related to the SFC additional funded places had been very successful in spite of some challenging circumstances. The Principal noted that whilst recruitment from Northern Ireland had held up well the numbers from England and Wales were particularly disappointing and would need to be addressed for future years.

The Principal concluded by congratulating all those responsible for ensuring the University had enjoyed a second record-breaking year of external grant capture, currently standing at over £142 million and was pleased to note that levels were high, relatively speaking, across all Colleges and subject areas.

On a final note the Principal asked Senate to join him in congratulating all those mentioned in the digest of personal achievements in his report and noted, in particular, the happy news that Deputy Principal Professor Margaret Smith had been awarded an OBE in the Queen’s Birthday Honours List.

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

2. **NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY**

Senate received a presentation from the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) on the National Student Survey, an analysis of the 2013 Survey results and associated plans for improvements.

The Vice-Principal introduced his presentation by giving a brief outline of the history, purpose and methodological approach of the Survey, pointing out in particular that:

- NSS measured the perceptions of students on aspects of their experience across six themed areas;
- The results were highly visible and were widely used as a measure of excellence in University League Tables in particular;
- The Survey included a question about satisfaction with the students’ union;
- Question 22 related to overall satisfaction (Q22) and it was this that formed the headline satisfaction score from the Survey.

The Vice-Principal then gave a brief analysis of the 2013 results, picking out that:

- The University had a relatively low response rate (66%) and that evidence across the sector indicated that this, in itself, could act to suppress satisfaction scores;
- The overall rate of satisfaction had fallen by 2% from the record-high score in 2012 (down to 88% in 2013);
- Satisfaction with DUSA remained high with the best score in Scotland;
The scores in Organisation & Management and Assessment & Feedback sections remained poor despite some small improvements.

The Vice-Principal noted that even though 12 out of 22 subject areas had improved satisfaction scores this had still led to a 10-20% drop in rankings when translated to positions in the various League Tables.

Senate was asked to note that good subject satisfaction scores seemed to be masking poor performance in other areas and that improvements across the themes were needed to make a real impact in rankings and perceptions of quality in the RUK market in particular.

The Vice-Principal then outlined a number of immediate actions that were needed to demonstrate a firm commitment to improvement on a sustained basis:

(i) Better communication with students on the importance of the Survey and positive action from the results of the Survey so as to improve response rates.

(ii) Establishing a Forum to share best practice, plan developments and provide co-ordination on enhancement activities.

The Vice-Principal concluded his presentation by indicating that the improvements needed to meet the target set out in the University strategy would be challenging but not impossible and were vital given the need to improve the quality of the student experience and to improve the external perception of the institution across the sector.

In response to questions from members of Senate who asked if there were any particular areas that were causing problems with student satisfaction, the Vice-Principal noted that a number of issues could be identified including problems with inconsistent approaches to meeting student needs across the range of services, poor communication over cancelled classes, the introduction of central timetabling, some under investment in basic infrastructure and a perception of slowness of response to student concerns.

Senate noted that good scores for particular Schools were directly related to their improvement and enhancement activities. Members of Senate agreed that all parts of the University must work hard to maintain a consistent approach to the quality of the student experience and must be prepared to set and enforce high standards.

The Senatus decided: to thank the Vice-Principal for his presentation.

3. STAFF SURVEY

The Senatus heard a presentation from the Director of Human Resources who introduced the results of the first University-wide staff survey, facilitated by an experienced external and independent partner organisation that allowed for sector comparison and benchmarking analysis.

The Director explained that the survey had focussed on staff perceptions across a range of issues related to the relationship between the individual staff member and the University both as an organisation and as an employer.

It was the University’s intention to make the results available to all members of staff. An action plan would be developed, and further analysis at College, School and Support Service level would be possible. It was hoped that similar surveys could be run every two years.

The results indicated many areas of good practice but some results were not so positive. On the whole the University was seen as a good employer and areas of strength included positive staff perceptions on equality and diversity, health and safety and institutional expectations. Areas for improvement included issues related to workload, change management, effective communication and management structures.

A small but significant number of staff reported a perception of bullying or harassment in the workplace at a level higher than the sector average; and further analysis and action in this area would be a priority.

The Director concluded the presentation by outlining the themes that had emerged in discussion with various groups as central targets for an ensuing action plan – these included valuing people, effective communication and enhanced career development. Senate was asked to note that local management would also have to take responsibility for areas of concern and prioritise action accordingly.
Members of Senate responded positively but also argued that the real value of the survey would only be seen if real, effective and targeted action followed from the results. It was recognised that the essential anonymity of the results would not allow for the kind of granularity needed to intervene in particular cases but nevertheless could be used to support individual schools or units where particular issues had been highlighted.

Members of Senate also concluded that the identification of potential problem areas should not be the primary motivation for such surveys and that the results should also help the University understand and encourage areas of success.

The Senatus decided: to thank the Director for her presentation.

4. PROFESSORES EMERITI

The Senatus decided: subject to the concurrence of the Court to confer the title of Professor Emeritus upon:

- Professor Yolande Muschamp
- Professor William Saunders
- Professor Mervyn Rose
- Professor Mark Whitehorn

5. ANNUAL REPORT TO THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL (SFC) ON QUALITY 2012/13

The Senatus received the annual report to the SFC in Academic Year 2012/13.

The Senatus decided: to endorse to Court the 2012/13 Report to the Scottish Funding Council.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 17th April 2013.

1. **ANNUAL REPORT**

   The Convener reported that the Committee’s annual report had been approved at the meeting of Court in February. In future, the Committee will report to Court after each meeting.

2. **PROJECT LICENCE APPLICATIONS**

   The Director of Biological Services reported that the project licence applications approved by the Committee at its meeting on 16th January 2013 had both subsequently been granted by the Home Office.

3. **MODE OF OPERATION OF THE COMMITTEE**

   The Convener and Named Veterinary Surgeon observed that, while the default time at which project licences would be retrospectively reviewed had been set at four years, it would of course have to be earlier for licences granted for periods shorter than five years, or for those whose holders leave the University before the licences are due to expire.

   **Resolved:** to amend the document describing the Committee’s mode of operation to include these variations.

4. **REPORT FROM THE CONVENER**

   The Convener reported that she had met the Home Office inspector on 10th April 2013 and had discussed with her the changes in the Committee’s mode of operation. The inspector stressed the need for the Committee to undertake retrospective review of project licences and to oversee the University’s procedures for delivering training and assessing competence. She was also very clear that evidence should be collected of competence in experimental design, as well as in the physical performance of interventions.

   **Resolved:** to send a copy of the Committee’s current operations document to the inspector, on the understanding that this is still a draft pending scrutiny by Court in June.

5. **APPLICATION FOR A PROJECT LICENCE**

   An application had been previously circulated to all committee members and initial reactions had been positive. Nevertheless, the meeting of the Committee provided a useful opportunity to discuss some of the issues.

   **Resolved:** to allow the email review process to complete its course, noting the requirement for study plans with retrospective reporting of actual severity.

6. **TRAINING AND COMPETENCE**

   The Committee discussed the requirement to monitor competence in experimental design, as mentioned by the Home Office inspector in her meeting with the Convener. Those present agreed that personal licence-holders would normally take the major role in designing experiments, rather than project licence-holders. The study plans already in use could be modified to capture information as to the present hypothesis being tested in a specific study and how the proposed design is best suited to testing this hypothesis.

   **Resolved:** to modify the study plan template in this fashion and to trial its use by licence-holding members of the Committee, in the first instance.

7. **REPORT ON LICENCE APPLICATIONS APPROVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING**

   The Director of Biological Services reported that three applications for amendment to project licences had been approved on the fast-track procedure, and submitted to the Home Office. A request to carry out a procedure under the Director’s own project licence had also been approved. As noted above, the review of a
new project licence was still on-going.

8. REPORT FROM THE NAMES VETERINARY SURGEON

The Named Veterinary Surgeon provided his regular report to the Committee, issues reported and discussed included: the presence of Pasteurella pneumotropica in one unit’s diagnostic samples, short-term ventilation issues within one unit, the effect of external building noise on mouse breeding, and issues regarding the maintenance of a sophisticated piece equipment. With regard to the latter item, the Named Veterinary Surgeon stressed that all such equipment should be properly maintained, most likely by taking out service contracts.

9. RETROSPECTIVE REPORTING OF ACTUAL SEVERITY

Suitable mechanisms for this were discussed, including the use of the LabTracks colony management system already installed in some resource units. The NVS observed that any cases where the applicable severity limit was exceeded should be reported to him without delay (and, of course, to the Home Office), rather than waiting for the end of the study or any annual collection of overall statistics.

Resolved: the Director of Biological Services is to present a plan for the roll-out of LabTracks in the remaining resource unit to the next meeting of the Committee. The Director of Biological Services and Named Veterinary Surgeon will revise the study plan template to capture information about actual severities and will then instruct the licence-holders to forward the completed documents to the Named Veterinary Surgeon at the end of each study.

10. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Director of Biological Services tabled the declaration of conflicts of interest that ‘named people’ under the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 are now expected to lodge with the Home Office. The Committee agreed that a simpler version could be used to capture potential conflicts of interest of all members of the Committee. In addition, specific conflicts should be declared at the start of each meeting (e.g., if a scientific member is a collaborator with the researcher whose application for a project licence is under review).

Resolved: the Director of Biological Services is to amend the operations document to include a description of how the Committee intends to manage potential conflicts of interest. The Director of Biological Services will bring a draft declaration form to the next meeting of the Committee.

11. REPUTATIONAL RISK

The Director of Biological Services tabled a report of a recent newspaper exposé of alleged malpractices in a major UK research institution. Whether or not such allegations can be corroborated, they are major reputational risks. The Committee acknowledged its important role in protecting the University’s reputation, by promoting, overseeing and documenting all the good practices that are already in place, as well as introducing new ones.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 24th July 2013.

1. **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**

   The Committee discussed the need for statistical input in the design of some types of experiment and for there to be oversight of the experimental designs described in study plans.

   **Resolved:** the Director of Biological Services, as the ‘Named Training and Competence Officer’ to scrutinise the experimental designs submitted in study plans and to seek clarification of any novel or unclear features. The Director to seek approval from the relevant Heads of College for the provision of statistical assistance.

2. **PROJECT LICENCE APPLICATIONS**

   The Committee considered an application for a project licence from a principal investigator. The applicant was then invited to make a short presentation and to answer questions.

   **Resolved:** to approve the application.

   The Committee also discussed two applications that were currently in the email review process. It was agreed that these could be approved, once the identified issues had been resolved.

3. **APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL FOR A PROJECT TO BE CARRIED OUT OVERSEAS**

   The Committee considered a proposal to carry out a project involving the use of live animals at an overseas institution. The Home Office project licence form was used as the template for the proposal, though a Home Office licence will not be applied for. The Committee also followed its usual practice of discussing the proposal in private, before inviting the researcher to present their work and to answer questions.

   **Resolved:** to approve the proposal, provided that a specific programme of work is adhered to and regular progress reports are received by the Committee.

4. **PROPOSAL TO HARVEST TISSUES UNDER A SERVICE LICENCE**

   The Director of Biological Services presented a proposal for a researcher to prepare tissues under the authority of his service project licence. The Director then left the room to allow the Committee to discuss the proposal in private.

   **Resolved:** to approve the proposal to use up to the stated number of animals.

5. **REVIEW OF THE COMMITTEE’S MODE OF OPERATION**

   The Convener reported that her review had been completed and approved by Court. The Committee’s name would change, with immediate effect, to the ‘Welfare and Ethical Use of Animals Committee’.

6. **TRAINING AND COMPETENCE**

   The Committee approved a proposal from the Director of Biological Services to set up a central register of those individuals who have been assessed as competent to carry out specific techniques unsupervised. Responsibility for the training of personal licence-holders to the required level of competence will remain the responsibility of project licence-holders, but this final assessment will normally carried out by a Named Animal Care and Welfare Officer.

7. **REPORT ON LICENCE APPLICATIONS APPROVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING**

   The Director of Biological Services reported that four applications for amendment to project licences had been approved on the fast-track procedure, and submitted to the Home Office. Four applications for project licences to authorise continuing programmes of work when existing licences expired were also approved by
email.

8. REPORT FROM THE NAMED VETERINARY SURGEON

The previous report of a bacterial contamination in one unit had been investigated and it had been concluded to be a false positive. A report for a different organism had recently been received and this was being investigated in a similar manner. A number of other animal welfare issues had arisen since the last meeting of the Committee, but all had been resolved.