UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COURT

Minutes of meeting held on 11 December 2018

Present:  
Ms M Chapman (in the Chair for minutes 50 to 82), Professor G Boyne, Professor N Booth, Mrs D Connelly, Mr C Duncan, Professor M Delibegovic, Mrs J Fernandes, Mr J Hall (except for minutes 60 to 67. In the Chair for minutes 83 to 114), Mr D MacFarlane, Mr I Mackay, Mrs K McPhail, Dr M Mills, Ms A Minto (for minutes 50 to 82), Mr L Ogubie, Dr N Oren, Mr B Paterson, Mr I Percival, Professor J Schaper (for minutes 50 to 95), Dr R Shanks, Mrs J Shirreffs, Dr D Steyn (for minutes 50 to 67) and Dr D Watts.

In attendance:  
Mr D Beattie, Mr A Donaldson (for minutes 68 to 77), Professor P Hannaford, Mrs C Inglis, Professor M Campbell (for minutes 85), Professor A Speight (for minutes 83 to 84), Dr H Sveinsdottir (for minutes 94 to 98), Professor R Wells (for minutes 68 to 81), Very Rev Professor I Torrance Kt, and Mr B Purdon (Clerk).

Apologies for absence were received from Mr M Gilbert, Ms L Jack and Ms L Menzies.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

50 No declarations of interest in the agenda were noted. The Chair, however, invited members who might have an interest or potential conflict in the matter of the appointment of the Senior Governor to consider recusing themselves from the meeting for the discussion of that item.

MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

51 The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 October 2018 were approved.

52 The Court noted the updated action log (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In discussion, it was also noted that the conflict management training provided to staff in student facing areas had been well received and would continue to be provided to relevant staff in the future.

GOVERNANCE AND NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: ROUTINE REPORT

53 The Court received a report of the principal items of business considered by the Governance and Nominations Committee at its meetings held on 12 November and 22 November 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) together with recommendations for approval by Court.

54 The Court discussed the consideration that had been given by the Convener and the Committee to suggested alternative wordings and more substantive amendments to the Standing Orders referred to it by two members following the last meeting. The Court also discussed the Committee’s reasoning on why, following that consideration, it had concluded that the proposed amendments it had originally made remained appropriate. It was proposed, however, that the Committee should in the course of 2019 undertake a more substantive review of the Standing Orders.

55 The Court approved the following:

1. The appointment of two alternate independent members to the Governance and Nominations Committee being Mr Steyn (alternate to Mr Gilbert) and Mrs McPhail (alternate to Mr Hall);
2. The re-appointment of two external members of Audit Committee, Mrs Macfarlan and Mr Mline, with effect from 1 January 2019 for a period of three years.
3. Amendments to the Standing Orders of Court, which would, in accordance with Standing Orders, be formally adopted at the next meeting of Court.
4. That the Governance and Nominations Committee should undertake a more substantive review of the Standing Orders in 2019.

MODERN SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING STATEMENT

56 The Court received an updated Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Court was advised that a member of Court had proposed some amendments to the statement, which were presentational rather than substantive, and that the management team were content to accept these. The Court agreed to approve the statement with the proposed further amendments subject to these being circulated to the Court.

REPORT FROM THE PRINCIPAL

57 The Principal provided an oral report in which he noted that while it was disappointing that some members of a distinguished medical research group were to leave the University, the resource would be reinvested in the School of Medicine, Medical Science and Nutrition. The Principal also highlighted the further investment that was being taken forward in approximately 50 new academic posts. In discussion, it was confirmed that the investment in new academic staff would be focused on areas that demonstrated the greatest potential to meet the criteria for investment, in particular growth, and that, therefore, the distribution of investment would not necessarily be evenly spread across Schools. The aspiration was, however, to generate growth that could enable further investment in the future in staff and facilities across the Schools.

INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY: NEXT STEPS

58 The Court received a presentation from the Principal which, following the discussion and suggestions received at the institutional strategy 'away day' meeting in November, considered how the University would take forward the next steps in the development of a new Strategy. The Strategy would run from 2020 with a twenty year horizon, which would align with other regional organisations such as the City Council. It was proposed that this be taken forward through four workstreams based on the University’s foundational purpose, these being: inclusive, interdisciplinary, international and, as a cross-cutting stream, sustainability. The workstreams would be coordinated by an overarching steering group which would report to the Senior Management Team, who in turn would report to Court. It was envisaged that the workstreams would be composed of individuals from across the community and that there would be, through digital technology and other appropriate routes, the ability for anyone in the internal, alumni or external community to engage and contribute to the discussions.

59 In discussion, the Court endorsed the proposed approach while noting the following:

1. To incorporate culture as a key component of the cross-cutting workstream of sustainability.
2. In welcoming the proposal to plan over a twenty year timeframe, Court emphasised that it would, therefore, be important to ensure that the remit of the workstreams included the consideration of how the internal and external context of higher education would change in that time and the consequences of this for strategy.
3. That a stakeholder map would be developed to inform the process and that this would be provided to Court at a future meeting.
4. That an update to staff from the discussion would be issued and shared with members of Court.

PROCESS FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF THE SENIOR GOVERNOR

60 The Court received a report from the Governance and Nominations Committee on the process for the appointment of the Senior Governor (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Committee’s membership had, as requested by Court, been amended to provide for gender balance. The Committee’s report invited Court to consider:
• The role, eligibility and relevant criteria which applicants must meet in order to stand in the election required by the new governance legislation;
• A copy of the draft advertisement of the role;
• A set of rules to govern the application and election process;
• The timeline for the process and holding of the election;
• The remit, composition and membership of the Appointment Committee within the process. This also included the Committee’s consideration of a motion from Senate on its composition, a copy of which was received by Court.

61 The Court discussed the Committee’s consideration of the composition of the Appointment Committee and the proposals that had been received from Senate in this regard. The paper outlined the Committee’s rationale for concluding that the Senate proposals were inappropriate and ineffective for the type of process concerned. The Committee had agreed, however, to recommend to Court that it extend the composition to include two further Senate members (increasing its size from 9 to 11 members). These should be gender balanced and at least one should be drawn from the Forsterhill campus. The Committee had discussed whether the positions should be elected by Senate but it was agreed that this could delay the process. The Committee, therefore, had agreed that it would be appropriate for the proposer of the Senate motion and the Senate Assessor on Court from Forsterhill to fill these additional positions. The Convener was instructed to write to Senate members to advise them of the Committee’s recommendation to Court and to invite them to consider the proposed appointments. It was reported orally that, this having been done, the outcome had been a substantial majority of responses from Senate in favour of the proposed approach and nominees.

62 The Court discussed and approved a suggested amendment to the eligibility rules that a restriction preventing individuals who were governors of other universities from serving as the Senior Governor be extended to cover individuals holding a position with any higher education provider.

63 The Court also discussed whether, in the context of the requirements of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, there should be a restriction on the period of office that a Senior Governor could serve if they had already been an existing independent member of the Court. It was proposed that the rules should state that if an independent member had served six years or more on Court, they should be ineligible for the role of Senior Governor. It was noted the Committee had considered this issue and that the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance did permit service beyond nine years on Court but that such an individual, if elected as Senior Governor, might be restricted in the number of periods of office they could then serve, depending on the circumstances. On balance, the Committee had concluded that it was consistent with the Code and prudent to allow some flexibility in this regard, noting also that it would be for the electorate to decide which candidate was successful.

64 Following discussion, the Court agreed to:
1. Approve the role, eligibility and relevant criteria;
2. Approve the application and election rules;
3. Note the outline timeline for the process;
4. Approve the remit of the Appointment Committee and its final composition and membership, including the recommendations of the Committee with regard to the Senate motion;
5. Note that the Appointment Committee would now take forward the process. As part of this, the Court also noted the Committee had agreed that the University should engage recruitment consultants to support the process where appropriate and external election management professionals to provide the online voting platform and issue the ballot to electors.
6. Receive regular updates as the process progressed through its different stages.
ORAL REPORT FROM EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

65 The Court received an oral report from the Convener of the Remuneration Committee with regard to its consideration earlier that day of the remuneration to be offered for the role of the Senior Governor. The Court was reminded that it had in 2016 agreed a level of remuneration for the role of Senior Governor. At that time, remuneration of such roles was not common practice in the Scottish university sector. Since then, a number of institutions had considered the issue and the Committee had taken that practice into account in considering the level of remuneration to be offered to the next Senior Governor and the level of time commitment required.

66 The Committee, therefore, recommended a daily rate of £400 which was mid-way between the lower and upper bands within the Scottish Government Non-Departmental Public Body Remuneration for Chairs (Band 1). The Committee also recommended that, having taken practice in the sector and feedback from the current Senior Governor into account, the time commitment for the role should be circa 50 days per annum.

67 The Court approved the recommendations of the Remuneration Committee.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND FINANCIAL STRATEGY

BORROWING AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

68 The Court received a paper detailing a medium term borrowing and financial strategy for the University (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes), which was supplemented by additional information in a presentation.

69 The paper and presentation reviewed progress against the University's break even target in 2019/20 and assessed the risks associated with achieving this target. It identified the need to invest in the University's infrastructure and set out a financing strategy and a process for obtaining the funds for investment through additional borrowing, via a private placement or bond. The report also discussed the internal controls over expenditure associated with borrowing and tracked how the University's cash balances were forecast to move over the next 10 years.

70 In discussion, the Court was advised of additional cost pressures that made the existing financial strategy of achieving a break even position by 2019/20 very challenging. The Court was advised that the achievement of break even through staff cost savings would carry significant risks to the delivery of income growth, in particular with regard to REF income, and would be inconsistent with the Court's agreed strategy for investment in academic growth. It was, therefore, proposed to achieve break even over a two year period by 2020/21 rather than in 2019/20.

71 The Court discussed extensively the revised financial strategy and proposals for borrowing. In broad terms the Court was agreed that it was imperative to future income growth that there be investment in the estate in the medium term, in particular to enhance and maximise the attractiveness of facilities for teaching, learning and recreation to current and future students. Equally, however, the Court was cognisant of the fact that the future repayment cost of borrowing had to be planned for, so as to ensure that the University's financial sustainability in the future was not put at an inappropriate level of risk. The Court emphasised that the proposals for additional borrowing were of very significant importance and, therefore, a clear set of covenants around the use of the funds, forecast income growth performance and the commencement of the repayment of borrowing should form part of the information upon which a final decision to proceed with a bond or private placement was taken by the Court.

72 On this basis, the Court:

1. Noted the progress towards the previously approved break even target in 2019/20 and the updated risk assessment associated with achieving this target. The Court agreed, that in order to ensure that academic activity underpinning growth was
protected, to revise the target date of achievement of break even (as a minimum) to 2020/21, with a revised budget forecast of a £3m deficit in 2019/20.

2. Noted the new work underway to provide an alternative pension guarantee for UASLAS from the current asset based guarantee.

3. Approved additional new net borrowing of £50 million, noting that in practice, this will involve borrowing of up to £60 million via a private placement and earmarking £10 million for the repayment of the first tranche of the Barclays loan in 2021, subject to appropriate covenants being considered and approved by Operating Board and Court at extraordinary meetings to be held in January 2019.

4. Agreed that the covenants should include criteria or tests to assess the ability of the University to continue to service its debt, whilst still maintaining adequate cash flows to meet other operating requirements; and, that the new borrowing be used to invest in the upgrade of teaching and learning facilities on the King’s campus on the condition that investment projects can demonstrate the potential to generate a positive cash return on investment and to contribute to the repayment of the borrowing.

5. Agreed (subject to Court’s further approval of the covenants) that due to the need to respond to time sensitive bids for borrowing rapidly, to delegate to the Bond Working Group the final decision on the rate and length of borrowing and any options to defer drawdown.

6. Noted the 10 year cash flow plan and that due to spending on the Science Teaching Hub, cash was predicted in 2019/20 to fall below the minimum holding as agreed by the Audit Committee.

7. Noted that cash levels will be further impacted by any new borrowing and that attaining a future break even position was key to cash generation and consequently the cash available for investment.

**SCIENCE TEACHING HUB**

The Court received a paper with proposals for the Science Teaching Hub project to proceed to the construction phase *(copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).* The Court noted that:

- The current project budget, agreed by Court in June 2018, was £37.7m. The University was currently finalising the cost of the project with the main contractor via a tendering process involving various work packages, in advance of the construction phase. Based on the costs received to date the projected cost was expected to exceed the total project budget by 1.2% (£444K inc. VAT). However, there was a high level of confidence that following completion of a cost evaluation exercise the resultant cost projection would return to within the agreed budgetary parameter.

- It was expected that the cost evaluation exercise would conclude in December 2018, thereby allowing the contractor to begin construction by the last week in February/first week of March 2019.

- The project contingency was 1.4% (£500K inc. VAT); however, based on the contractual arrangement in place with the main contractor, the cost of construction will be set at a guaranteed maximum price (GMP). As such, the University would not be subject to the risk of cost escalation during construction. Therefore, the contingency would only be required should the University seek to change project scope after final sign off; in such an event, any change with potential cost implications would be managed closely via the Project Board, through a formal change control mechanism.

- Funding was in place for the project to proceed, as part of the wider institutional 10-Year Capital Plan considered by Court earlier in the agenda.

In discussion, a number of concerns, as reported to some members, were expressed around the process through which the project had been governed and consulted upon, in particular with regard to whether the detailed design of the building met the needs of users and the information and reporting of decisions made regarding these.

It was suggested, that the project should not progress further until these reported concerns had been resolved. The Court was, however, assured that the Project Board included representation from each user area and that it had taken all key decisions with regard to the development of the project, informed by extensive consultation and discussions that had been
undertaken over the previous two years. That consultative process would continue during the construction phase and would seek to explore further how the functionality of the building would work in practice, taking into account the need to teach in new ways. The Senior Vice-Principal and Vice-Principal (International Partnerships) would, however, engage further with relevant members of Court and/or the staff concerned to reassure them with regard to the process that had been undertaken and how this would continue during the construction phase. The Court also, noted, there would be inflationary cost implications from any delay in proceeding to the construction phase.

76 The Court agreed:

1. To approve that the project proceed to the construction phase, subject to projected costs meeting the budget of £37.7M agreed by Court at its meeting in June 2018. It was further noted that if projected costs could not be brought within budget, the project would not proceed, and the Project Board would revert to Court on next steps.
2. That Senior Management would engage further with relevant members of Court and/or staff regarding the project planning process and provide reassurance to Court on this matter at its next meeting.

77 Dr Oren expressed his dissatisfaction with the assurances provided and, therefore, withheld his assent to the decision of Court.

INTERNATIONALISATION

KOREA CAMPUS UPDATE

78 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which reported on developments since its last meeting with regard to the proposed campus in Hadong, South Korea. The Court also received an oral update on developments since the paper had been written.

79 The Court discussed the key issues highlighted in the paper and the reported subsequent developments. It was noted that these had been the subject of regular reports to the Senior Governor and Chair of the Operating Board. The Court endorsed the proposed approach towards the further discussions with partners and with regard to seeking further legal advice.

PROPOSED TNE PROJECT IN SRI LANKA - UPDATE

80 The Court received and noted an update paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) on the development of a healthcare education partnership in Sri Lanka to deliver in Aberdeen and in Sri Lanka the MBCchB degree programme. This highlighted that the first stage in accreditation of the programme from the General Medical Council had been completed.

QATAR CAMPUS UPDATE

81 The Court received and noted a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which reported on the activities of the University of Aberdeen campus in Qatar. The report noted in particular that discussions with the Qatar Government in regard to a site for a new campus were underway.

STATUS OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF IRISH AND SCOTTISH STUDIES

82 In response to a question from a Senate Assessor regarding the Research Institute of Irish and Scottish Studies, it was agreed the Senior Management team should provide a written response outwith the meeting.

STUDENT RECRUITMENT 2018/19

83 The Court received a paper detailing the outcome of student registrations and their budgetary implications for 2018-19 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The paper reported that there had been encouraging growth in almost all student categories for 2018/19
compared to October 2017. Overall institutional growth was 2.5%, with the PGT and PGR population growing by 18.5% and 6.5% respectively. Fee income was projected to increase by £7.4M, or 12%, on financial year 2017/18, although the overall budget target was not projected to be met by £1.089M, due to projected shortfalls in UG RUK, PGR international and PGT home fees against target. Mitigating actions had, therefore, been discussed with those Schools that had the largest projected shortfalls on fees and an estimated £500K of cost savings had been identified. The Operating Board had agreed that £600K of the University’s £2.3M contingency budget be earmarked toward mitigating the remaining fee shortfall, until recruitment for January 2019 was confirmed, and a revised forecast became available in February 2019.

84 The Vice-Principal (Student Recruitment) also outlined in brief (due to limitations of time) the key priorities for further growing student recruitment that he had identified since his appointment in November.

UPDATE ON REF

85 The Court received a paper which provided an update on the Research Excellence Framework 2021 (REF2021) preparations (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). This included a report on the development of a draft University Code of Practice with regard to the REF 2021 submission, which would be shared widely with the academic community, with Senate and the Partnership and Negotiating Consultative Committee before its submission to Court for approval. The Court also discussed the current expected number of REF eligible staff and how this compared to REF 2014, noting the plans that were being progressed to strengthen this.

FINANCE AND ANNUAL REPORTS

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS FOR YEAR END 31 JULY 2018

86 The Court received and approved the Annual Report for the year to 31 July 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

87 The Court noted that the University group results reported a surplus of £9.7m for the year ended 31 July 2018. The operating deficit before movements in the value of investments, property and pension liabilities was £7.5m. Included in this, however, were exceptional items such as the impairment of Crombie and Johnstone halls and the movement in various provisions. After adjusting for such items the results reported an underlying deficit of £3.9m.

EXTERNAL AUDITORS’ REPORT AND REPRESENTATION LETTER

88 The Court received and approved the External Auditors’ Annual Report for 2017-18, which provided an unqualified audit opinion, and the Management Representation Letter (copies filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

89 The Court received and approved the Audit Committee’s Annual Report for 2017-18 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which would be included in the annual financial reports to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC).

INTERNAL AUDITORS’ ANNUAL REPORT

90 The Court received and approved the Internal Auditors’ Report for 2017-18 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Court noted the work that had been undertaken with regard to cyber security and it was agreed to clarify outwith the meeting whether this had included a ‘mock cyber attack’ on systems.
GOING CONCERN REPORT

91 The Court received and noted a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which had been approved by the Audit Committee and provided an outline of the University’s net current liability position, projected cash flows and short-term financing risks, demonstrating its ability to continue on a going concern basis.

92 In discussion, it was agreed that consideration would be given in future reports as to the period of time that the going concern assessment should be made against.

UPDATE ON USS

93 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided an update on the continuing discussions regarding the valuation of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS). The paper focused on the publication of the recommendations of the Joint Expert Panel (JEP) and the outcome of a subsequent consultation with employers regarding these. The Court noted that the University was broadly supportive of the JEP position although it maintained that the current level of employer contributions to the scheme was the maximum it could afford. The paper also reported on the announcement by USS that it intended to carry out a further valuation of the scheme as at 31 March 2018.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS REPORT FOR 2017/18

94 The Court received a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) detailing the bi-annual update on institutional performance under the strategic planning process to the end of the 2017/18 cycle, against each of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that underpin the University’s Strategic Plan 2015-2020.

95 In discussion, it was noted that the University would, as part of the development of its next Strategic Plan KPIs, review the research grant income per FTE metric, including whether this should be more ambitious given current performance. It was also noted that while the Court had agreed to revise the basis for ‘RAG’ ratings, performance in some, while short of target, had been very close to target in terms of head count and the RAG rating of amber should be seen in that context.

RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE

96 The Court received a paper on risk management and the institutional Strategic Risk Register (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The paper highlighted that five risks were above the tolerance threshold: Financial Sustainability; Internationalisation; Research Performance; Staff Recruitment and Retention; and Student Recruitment. The paper also outlined the issues impacting upon each risk area and the key mitigating actions being undertaken as a result.

97 In discussion, clarification was provided with regard to the steps undertaken to ensure that appropriate management of third party agents in student recruitment was in place and that University standards and ethics were observed when such agents acted on its behalf. It was also requested that future reports more clearly explained that international campuses were included in the risk register and that, if further campuses were opened overseas, that the University’s standards of health and safety extended to these.

98 The Court approved the updated Strategic Risk Register.

OPERATING BOARD REPORT

99 The Court received and noted a report from the Operating Board, outlining the main business considered at its meeting on 13 November 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Court also noted that the Operating Board had agreed that, with effect from
January 2019, the number of its meetings would be reduced to four per annum, to align with Court, with the option to convene additional meetings by teleconference as and when required.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

AUDIT COMMITTEE

100 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by Audit Committee at its meeting on 1 November 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

101 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by Student Experience Committee at its meeting on 27 September 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE

102 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by Research Policy Committee at its meeting on 28 September 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

103 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by University Committee on Teaching and Learning at its meeting on 31 October 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

ROUTINE BUSINESS

PROMOTIONS PROCEDURES FOR 2018/19

104 The Court received and approved changes to the staff promotions procedures and associated documentation for staff at Grade 7 and above for the 2018/19 exercise (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

ANNUAL REPORT ON PROCUREMENT

105 The Court received and approved an Annual Procurement Report for the period 1 January 2017 to 31 July 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes), noting that this was a legislative requirement and would be submitted to the Scottish Government.

STRATEGIC INVESTMENT FOR ACADEMIC GROWTH

106 The Court noted an update on the implementation of proposals for strategic investment in academic growth (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The paper detailed the following key points:

- The outcome of discussions with each School on REF preparations and the allocation of new funding from SFC for research;
- The composition of the Principal’s Advisory Group (PAG) that Court agreed should manage the strategic investment fund;
- The process for identifying and evaluating the strategic areas for investment;
- The process that the PAG was taking forward to invite proposals for investment, the criteria against which these will be evaluated, and the milestones against which successful proposals would be monitored over the three year return on investment period;
- The implementation of asset sales, including a recommendation agreed by the Operating Board, that one asset with revenue streams now be held in reserve rather than sold.
SFC OUTCOME AGREEMENT

107 The Court noted a report on the process being undertaken for the development of the University’s 2019/20 Outcome Agreement with the Scottish Funding Council (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

ANNUAL REPORT ON REDUNDANCY ACTIVITIES

108 The Court noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) detailing the management of redundancy activities undertaken by Human Resources for the period of 1 December 2017 to 30 November 2018.

SENATE REPORT

109 The Court noted a report from the Senate meeting of 10 October 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). This included a motion from Senate to Court regarding the composition of the Appointment Committee for the Senior Governor (See Minutes 60-64).

REPORT FROM THE DEVELOPMENT TRUST

110 The Court noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) from the Development Trust on the fundraising activities undertaken since the last meeting of Court.

HEALTH, WELLBEING AND SAFETY REPORT

111 The Court noted a report on Health, Wellbeing and Safety (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT

112 The Court noted the Monthly Management Report for the period to 31 October 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

ATTENDANCE OF SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM AT MEETINGS OF COURT

113 The Court agreed that members of the Senior Management Team should be invited to be in attendance at future meetings to enable them to hear the discussion and to respond to questions regarding their areas of responsibility where necessary.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

114 The Court noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on Tuesday 26 March 2019, with an extraordinary meeting proposed for Saturday 26 January 2019.

Maggie Chapman

26/1/2019

Date approved