UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COURT

Minutes of meeting held on 26 March 2013

Present: Sir Moir Lockhead (Chair), Principal, Rector (Dr M Mackie), Dr A Baxter, Dr C Brittain, Ms J Craw (part of meeting only), Cllr B Crockett (part of meeting only), Miss A Deseilligny, Mr C Duncan, Professor P Hannaford, Mr G Hunter, Professor N Hutchison, Professor S Logan, Professor P McGeorge, Mr D MacFarlane, Cllr R McKail, Ms K McPhail (by telephone), Mr K Murray, Mr B Pack, Mr B Paterson, Mrs J Shirreffs, Dr J Skakle and Dr N Vargesson.

In attendance: Mr S Cannon, Ms I Bews, Mrs C Inglis, Ms J Sewel and Mr B Purdon (Clerk).

Apologies were received from Mr A Arthur, Professor P Edwards, Mr J Hall, Professor S Heys and Mr D Steyn.

MINUTES

168 The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2012 were approved.

PRESENTATION ON RESEARCH THEME: ENVIRONMENT & FOOD SECURITY

169 The Court received a presentation on the research theme, Environment & Food Security from Professor Pete Smith, Leader of the Research Theme. The presentation highlighted that the work programme of the Theme was organised around responding to three major global environmental challenges: Food Security, Environmental Change and Sustainable Natural Resource Management. The presentation also highlighted the University’s collaboration with the University of Dundee and The James Hutton Institute in the Scottish Food Security Alliance.

170 The Court discussed a number of aspects of the three global environmental challenges that the Theme was seeking to respond to including the objectives of the Theme in terms of external research funding and the level of resource it had to achieve those objectives. The Court also discussed the links that the Theme was developing with key companies in the food industry.

171 The Court agreed that it should receive an update on the progress of the Theme in the latter part of academic year 2013/14.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

HEALTH AND SAFETY UPDATE

172 Mr Cannon introduced a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided Court with information on accident data for the calendar year 2012 and the key points regarding the circumstances of two “near miss” incidents; one during the construction of the Sir Duncan Rice Library involving sub-contractors, and the other involving an incident in the King’s Pavilion swimming pool, a facility operated by staff of the Aberdeen Sports Village. These reports had previously been reported to the Operating Board in December 2012.

173 The Court agreed that it should receive updates on accidents at each meeting, notwithstanding the Operating Board’s delegated responsibility to monitor health and safety management.
Mr Cannon introduced a paper *copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes* which set out how the University gives effect to its Health and Safety Policy.

In discussion, it was noted that the Court had overall responsibility for University health and safety and that it had delegated authority to the Operating Board to set and review health and safety policy. The Health and Safety Committee routinely reported to the Operating Board. It was noted that, notwithstanding these arrangements the Court could request that the Operating Board consider whether health and safety policies should cover specific areas. The Court noted that the University was reviewing whether there were risks that required policies to be developed in relation to reverse parking and the use of hands-free mobile telephones whilst driving and that the outcomes of these reviews would be reported to the Operating Board.

The Court noted that the University was reviewing its health and safety relationship with arm’s-length organisations. Although such organisations were separate to the University, this distinction would not be necessarily apparent or accepted by staff, students and members of the public. As a result, a failure within these organisations to adequately manage health and safety could also damage the University’s reputation.

The Court noted that the University was implementing measures to enable information on the location of staff and students while overseas on University business to be readily available in the event of any major incidents occurring in-country.

**REPORT FROM SENIOR GOVERNOR**

The Senior Governor welcomed Dr Brittain to his first meeting of Court as a Senate Assessor. The Senior Governor also noted and welcomed that Mr Hall and Ms McPhail had agreed to serve on Court for further terms of three years respectively.

The Senior Governor, on behalf of Court, congratulated Professor Sir Ian Diamond on the award of a knighthood in the New Year Honours list.

The Senior Governor also welcomed the election of HRH The Duchess of Rothesay as Chancellor of the University.

The Senior Governor noted that the Remuneration Committee was due to meet following the meeting of Court and that it would consider the determination of the senior staff pay policy for the forthcoming review of senior staff salaries. The Committee would also consider progress in addressing the gender pay gap amongst professorial and senior staff salaries. A further report on the outcome of the University’s equal pay audit would be brought to the next meeting of Court. The second meeting of the Remuneration Committee would take place in May at which time the Committee would consider recommendations from the Principal with regard to senior staff remuneration levels.

The Senior Governor also highlighted to Court that the University was from 1 May 2013 required to comply with legislation for the auto-enrolment of staff in pensions and that this required careful management and implementation.

The Senior Governor advised Court on meetings that had taken place between non-executive members of the Court and equivalents from RGU.

The Senior Governor also reported on progress in the development of a Scottish Code of Good HE Governance by a steering group established by the Scottish Committee of University Chairs.

**REPORT FROM PRINCIPAL**

The Principal also welcomed the election of HRH The Duchess of Rothesay as Chancellor and noted that an installation ceremony would take place in June.
The Principal provided Court with an update on student applications for 2013/14 and noted that at this stage of the process the numbers were positive although there remained a significant challenge of converting applications to admissions.

The Principal noted that the University had performed well in the National Student Survey, with overall satisfaction ratings reaching the Top 10 of institutions.

The Principal reported on the progress the University was making in the development of online education, particularly in relation to Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs); and Postgraduate provision in Oil and Gas Engineering. In discussion, it was recognised that the Court should be cognisant of the current debate of whether online education posed a fundamental risk to the long-term future of traditional campus based universities. The Court noted that it would discuss online education further at its next meeting.

The Principal reported to Court on a number of other developments including, the agreement for industry funding for new postgraduate scholarships in Energy and recent staff and student successes.

**REPORT FROM THE RECTOR**

The Rector introduced his report to Court (*copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes*). The Rector noted that the paper that had been tabled at the previous meeting on the issue of the Court’s previous consideration of charging fees to Rest of UK students had been useful, however he remained of the view that the philosophical question of whether it was right to charge students fees had not been central to the previous discussions.

The Rector noted the plan to incorporate a performance space in the University’s Capital Plan. The Rector reported that the late Rector’s family were planning a memorial show at His Majesty’s Theatre, the proceeds of which would be donated to Aberdeen University pancreatic research but that public appeal for funding for a University performance space may also be made. In discussion, the Court noted that it would be important that any approaches to potential donors be coordinated with the University Development Trust.

The Court noted that the Rector’s report raised concerns that had been expressed to him regarding changes proposed to the Centre of Lifelong Learning. In discussion, the Court noted the changes followed a review by the University of how it could best achieve its challenging widening participation targets. It also noted the review had included wide consultation. In response to a question from a member of Court as to whether the decision was a matter for Court it was agreed that it was an operational matter rather than a decision regarding the University's strategic objectives in widening participation.

**STRATEGIC PLANNING & RISK**

**UPDATE ON TOP 3 RISKS**

The Court received and noted an update (*copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes*) on progress made to mitigate the risks with the 3 highest risk scores on the Corporate Risk Register these being:

- Failure to establish an appropriate market share of the international student population;
- Failure to meet the RUK population target;
- Failure to improve Research performance in relative terms;

In discussion, the Court noted that the University was implementing the Internationalisation Strategy and Business Plan and there was evidence that these measures were beginning to have a positive effect with international applications for Postgraduate Taught courses increasing by 1,000 on the previous year. The Court also noted progress with the review of programmes, increased investment in the International Office, the establishment of a partnerships team, in-country staff in priority markets, development of transnational education opportunities in India, Sri Lanka, China, Kazakhstan and Malaysia, and the introduction of a new postgraduate application system to expedite offer making.
Professor Hannaford introduced a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which summarised the progress of the University’s preparations for submission to the Research Excellence Framework 2014. (See Minute 228).

In discussion the Court noted that the REF submission was expected to involve smaller numbers of staff than that submitted to the equivalent Research Assessment exercise in 2008. This was due to a higher degree of selectivity which was expected to lead to a higher quality profile. The Court discussed the benefits of introducing an annual review of academic performance within academic units and noted that this was being considered. The Court also discussed the issues that would need to be considered by the University in the context of the Research Excellence Framework exercise post 2014.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Ms Inglis introduced a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided an update in relation to recent staff recruitment activity, staffing levels and staff turnover within the University.

In discussion of the academic recruitment campaign, it was noted that, in future, information could be provided regarding the period from which a position had been vacant. The Court noted that some academic appointments could take a significant period of time to recruit a suitable candidate, particularly in a niche area.

The Court noted that due to the strength of the local employment market, turnover in non-academic staff was a challenge which the University was seeking to address through a number of initiatives to make the University an ‘Employer of Choice.’

UPDATE ON FUNDRAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

Professor Haites introduced a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided an update on Development Trust activities since September 2012. The Court noted that since April 2010 £35.7M had been raised; the number of gifts had risen by 10% in the last year; and the number of new donors had increased by 5%. The Court also noted that there had been an increase of 12% in gifts from existing donors.

The Court also noted updates on development activities internationally and changes to the governance of the Development Trust.

FINANCE

SFC FUNDING ALLOCATION

The Court noted a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided a summary analysis of the indicative funding allocation to the University from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) for 2013/14. The Court noted that the key points of the allocation were:

- In line with the Cabinet Secretary’s guidance, SFC has been asked to secure real-term efficiencies of 2% and therefore, on the basis of an inflation assumption of 2.5%, core teaching funding had increased by 0.5%.

- As anticipated, the teaching grant had reduced to reflect the removal of the second tranche of RUK places.

- The teaching grant included 1) additional funding for teaching expensive subjects to RUK students; and 2) the additional funded places allocated to the University for widening access, for articulation and for priority skills.
- SFC’s research allocation to the sector had increased by 2.5%. Changes to research income weightings in the Research Excellence Grant model had resulted in smaller increases to the universities of Aberdeen, Dundee, Glasgow and Edinburgh.

- The University’s indicative number for full-time undergraduates in the non-controlled subjects had been revised. The temporary increase of 300 for 2012/13 had been removed but the University would receive a permanent increase of 125, plus an increase of 173 to allow it to recruit students to fill the additional funded student places awarded to certain areas. (See Minute 228).

**ACCOUNTS COMPARISON**

203 Ms Bews introduced a comparative analysis (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) of financial and other indicators from the 2011/12 annual accounts of the Scottish Sector and selected competitors in the UK Sector benchmarked against those of the University. (See Minute 228)

204 The Court noted that in relation to the main financial indicators the University remained in a relatively strong position with all indicators being better than or close to sector averages. The Court discussed where the indicators suggested challenges for the University, particularly in relation to international tuition fee income.

**POST-16 EDUCATION BILL**

205 Professor Logan introduced a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided a briefing on the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill. (See Minute 243)

206 The Court noted that the key issues arising from the Bill for Higher Education were in relation to new powers for Ministers and the Scottish Funding Council in governance, widening access and in reviewing the pattern of provision across the sector.

207 The Court also noted and discussed concerns that both Universities Scotland and the Scottish Committee of University Chairs had raised regarding the Bill in evidence submitted to the Scottish Parliament’s Education and Culture Committee. The Court noted that University Management had endorsed the Universities Scotland submission to the Stage 1 consideration of the Bill and that the Senior Governor had endorsed the submission from the Scottish Committee of University Chairmen. These had been requested by the Education and Culture Committee in January 2013.

208 The Court also noted that the Bill could potentially result in greater intervention in the affairs of universities by Government and that it was not evident how the Bill would enable universities in Scotland to perform better internationally. The Court agreed that the University should consider a set of international benchmarks that it could use in future discussions with Government and the SFC to illustrate the international context in which universities such as Aberdeen were competing in.

**REPORT FROM THE OPERATING BOARD**

209 The Court received a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which summarised items considered at the meetings of the Operating Board held on 29 January 2013 and 5 March 2013.

**NURSERY**

210 The Court noted that the new Nursery had proceeded to Stage D in the design process, and, as previously agreed, the Project Board had submitted an update report to the Board to request the final budget. The Board had been advised that since the indicative £2M had been included in the 10-Year Plan in 2010, detailed design work and benchmarking to other facilities had been carried out. Following this work, the cost included in the Stage D report was £2.269M. The £269K difference related to:

- issues with site conditions, and the remedial work required to address these (£80K);
The aspiration for the Nursery to achieve Passive House status, which would also lead to recurrent savings (£60K);
- fully addressing user needs and ensuring building functionality, as the outline design which had informed the indicative budget of £2M had not addressed in detail a number of requirements. In addition, since 2010, VAT had increased to 20% (not 17.5%), resulting in an additional £50K approximately (total difference £130K);

211 The Board had noted that site conditions would need to be resolved before any building could be located in the area and that the number of suitable spaces available for building projects adjacent to King’s College campus was very limited. The Board had agreed that the building should aim for Passive House status.

212 The Court noted that the Board had:
- Approved, for its part, a budget increase of £140K;
- After requesting that additional information on the need for a further £130K be provided to the Convener and Senior Vice Principal, and that authority be delegated to them to agree whether to recommend to Court this budget increase; the Senior Vice Principal and Convener had subsequently agreed to recommend to Court a budget increase of £269K for the Nursery, resulting in an overall budget of £2.269M.

213 The Court approved a budget of £2.269M for the new Nursery.

**Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health**

214 The Court noted that the Board had received an update on the tender process for the main contract for the construction of the new Rowett building. The Court noted that this had been a lengthy and complex process carried out with legal advice, and that a preferred contractor had been identified, although its costs exceeded the budget by £1.4M.

215 The Court noted that the Board had considered the impact of delaying a decision on the tender until the next Court meeting on 26 March 2013, and the risk that the University and the contractor would not be able to complete negotiations within the agreed tender acceptance period. This could have resulted in a period of negotiation with the successful contractor, where the contractor would be free to vary the tender figure and potentially increase the tender amount. If an agreed negotiated position could not be reached with the successful contractor, the whole tender process would expire which could have resulted in having to re-run the tender process.

216 The Court noted that the Board had, therefore, agreed that this matter should be considered under the delegated powers provided by the Court in March 2011, whereby decisions on financial or estates matters that would otherwise require Court approval, but which for reasons of urgency could not be deferred to the next meeting of Court, could be delegated to a small group consisting of the Senior Governor, the Convener of the Operating Board, the Principal and Senior Vice-Principal or three of the four should one be unavailable. This procedure had been adopted and the selection of the preferred contractor for the RINH and the revised budget had been approved.

**Rowett Estate**

217 The Court noted that the Board had received an update report, and a more detailed presentation at its meeting on 5 March, on the disposal of the Rowett Estate the approval of which was the responsibility of the Rowett Research Institute Board of Trustees. The disposal was progressing in three stages in line with the approved strategy:

- **Hopcroft**: The developer had lodged a planning application in early January.
- **Rowett North**: The University was continuing with negotiations in relation to two different but potentially highly complementary and attractive opportunities for the site.
Rowett South: The site had been presented to the market, a closing date set and submissions received. Shortlisted bidders had been interviewed on 17 January 2013. These interviews had resulted in the identification of two parties and further detailed investigation of these parties, their terms and the delivery models was being progressed.

The Operating Board had noted that approval of the disposal plans for the Rowett Estate was the responsibility of the RRI Board, which was meeting on 14 March 2013.

Balgownie

The Board had noted that approval had previously been granted for the disposal of the Balgownie walled garden and adjacent steading which extended to 3.26 acres. Following an open market tendering exercise a shortlist of two house builders resulted, and the preferred bidder had been selected. Proceeds were anticipated around the middle of 2014.

Budget/Planning Assumptions

The Court noted that the Board had received and approved the planning assumptions that would be adopted in developing budgets for 2013/14, and indicative budgets for 2014/15 and 2015/16. Assumptions were conservative in relation to international and rest of UK recruitment, but would be refined as the admissions cycle progressed. Budgets would be presented to the Operating Board for approval in May 2013, and to Court in June 2013.

Student Population Planning

The Court noted that the Board had received and considered reports on admissions for 2013 entry. Overall, applications for undergraduate entry were up by 7.7% compared to a national increase of 3.41%. Given the need to bring the Scottish/EU population back within Scottish Funding Council limits, undergraduate recruitment was being carefully monitored and the intake requirements for Scottish/EU students had been significantly reduced compared to previous years. The Board had noted the need to manage the impact of the planned reduced intake on individual disciplines, which was being kept under review.

Health and Safety Committee

The Court noted the Operating Board had received and considered reports from the Health and Safety Committee. The Court noted that these reports had included consideration of, a report on the University’s process for auditing and improving its health and safety systems; an update on a review of the University’s relationship with arms-length organisations in the context of health and safety; and a report on an incident in the King’s Pavilion swimming pool which was operated by staff employed by the Aberdeen Sports Village.

Aberdeen Sports Village

The Court noted that the Board had received and considered a progress report from the Aberdeen Sports Village (ASV) Monitoring Group.

Centre for Lifelong Learning

The Court noted that the Board had received an update, for its information, on a review of the University’s Centre for Lifelong Learning.
EXPENSES AND BENEFITS POLICY

The Court noted that the Board had approved revisions to the University’s expenses and benefits policy, which had been updated to reflect current tax legislation and to clarify areas of ambiguity.

STUDENT RESIDENCES

The Court noted that the Board had approved student residence fee rates for 2013/14, which had been approved by the Student Affairs Committee. In doing so, the Board had noted that the fee increases of up to 1.8% had taken into account:

- Disruption to the Hillhead site during refurbishment
- The University’s operational requirements
- Comparability with other institutions

OTHER MATTERS REPORTED TO THE BOARD

The Court noted that the Board had received updates on:

- Research Excellence Framework (See Minutes 195-196)
- The University’s web development project;
- Immigration matters in relation to staffing, including amendments to internal processes which had resulted from mock audits and recent changes to regulations by the UK Borders Agency.
- SFC Funding Allocation (See Minute 202)
- University Accounts Comparisons (See Minutes 203-204)
- Management Accounts (See Minute 266)

REPORTS FROM COURT COMMITTEES

AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Court noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) of the principal items of business considered by the Committee at its meeting of 24 January 2013. The Court also approved or noted the following:

Internal and External Audit Contracts

The Court noted that the Audit Committee had received a paper on the timescale for the reappointment and tendering of Internal and External Audit Services.

The Court, on the recommendation of the Audit Committee, agreed to reappoint Mazars as Internal Auditor for a further year, from 1 August 2013 to 31 July 2014.

The Court, on the recommendation of the Audit Committee, agreed to reappoint KPMG as External Auditor for a further year, from 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2014.

Annual TRAC Return, 2011-12

The Court noted that the Committee approved the Annual TRAC Return, 2011-12 for submission to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC).

3-Year Internal Audit Plan

The Court noted that the Audit Committee had received and noted the Internal Audit Strategic Plan, and that the Strategy had been drawn up with reference to the University’s Corporate Risk Register, which had also been received for information.
Internal Audit Reports

The Court noted that the Committee had received and approved the following Internal Audit Reports as follows:

- IT Incident and Problem Management
- IT Security and Policy Awareness

Whistleblowing and Fraud Reports

The Court noted that the Committee had received and considered reports regarding two incidents of fraud.

Governance and Nominations Committee

The Court noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) of the principal items of business considered by the Committee at its meeting of 29 January 2013. The Court also approved or noted the following:

Membership of Court

The Court on the recommendation of Governance and Nominations Committee agreed that Mr James Hall be reappointed for a further term of three years as an independent co-opted member of Court with effect from 30 September 2013.

The Court on the recommendation of the Governance and Nominations Committee, agreed that Mrs Kathryn McPhail be reappointed for a further term of three years as an independent co-opted member of Court with effect from 1 August 2013.

Response to Consultation on Draft Scottish Code of Good Governance

The Court noted that the Committee had received a paper regarding the development of a Scottish Code of Good HE Governance.

The Court noted that the Committee had approved, subject to minor amendment, the University’s evidence submission to the Consultants on the Discussion Document received by representative members of Court and the University community at a meeting on 11 December 2012. The Committee had noted that the submission was consistent with the position agreed by Court in March 2012 on the recommendations of the Von Prondzynski Review of Governance.

The Court noted that subsequent to the meeting of the Committee, the University had been advised that a Draft Code of Governance would be published for consultation in the Spring.

Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill

The Court noted that the Committee had received and noted a paper which had provided a briefing on the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill which had been published by the Scottish Government on 28 November 2012. (See Minutes 205-208)

Policy on Funding from Tobacco Companies

The Court noted that the Committee had considered a report on a decision of the University’s Advisory Group on Research Ethics and Governance not to accept funding from a tobacco company for a research project.
The Court noted that the Committee had considered that the University did not have a formal policy on funding from tobacco companies, although it had not in the past accepted funding from tobacco companies. The Committee had discussed in depth the issues around adopting a formal policy noting that the existing ethical approval process had worked effectively in the current case. On balance, the Committee agreed that a formal policy was not necessary and that it was preferable for each case to be considered on its merits, either through the existing research ethical approval procedures, or via the Committee’s own remit to consider matters likely to give rise to significant public interest or reputational risk.

Update on Development Trust Donations Policy, Scrutiny Procedures and Reports on External Funding Awards/Donations to the University

The Court noted that the Committee had discussed a paper providing an update from the Development Trust on the systems being established to enhance its governance and scrutiny procedures for donations; together with reports on research grants and contracts awards over £500k received by the University in 2012, and awards over £500k received by the University in 2012 from the Development Trust.

Changes to the FRC Corporate Governance Code

The Committee had noted a paper regarding changes to the Financial Reporting Council Corporate Governance Code which would take effect from financial year 2013-14.

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, INCOME-GENERATION & COMMERCIALISATION

The Court noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) of the principal items of business considered by the Committee at its meeting of 15 February 2013.

STUDENTS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Court noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) of the principal items of business considered by the Committee at its meeting of 18 February 2013.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING & LEARNING

The Court noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) of the principal items of business considered by the Committee at its meeting of 23 January 2013.

ROUTINE BUSINESS NOT PROPOSED FOR DISCUSSION

VICE-PRINCIPAL APPOINTMENTS/RENEWALS OF TERMS OF OFFICE

The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) recommending extensions to the periods of appointment of the Vice-Principal (Teaching & Learning) and the Vice-Principal (External Relations) for a period of three years to 31 July 2016 respectively.

In discussion, it was noted that the paper did not include any detail to inform Court’s consideration of the recommendations, for example on roles and performance. It was also noted that the Court was to receive in June, further information on the senior management structure. It agreed that this should include information on the roles of Vice- Principals and how their performance was monitored and appraised.

The Court agreed to defer a decision on the appointments pending receipt of the further information regarding the senior management structure. The Court also noted that the University was taking forward the recruitment of a Vice-Principal for Internationalisation.

OUTCOME AGREEMENTS

The Court received and approved the University’s draft Outcome Agreement (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) with the Scottish Funding Council for 2013/14.
MUSEUMS ACCREDITATION: STRATEGY AND COLLECTIONS POLICY

The Court received and approved a Museums Strategic Plan and Collection Development Policy for 2013-18 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

GAELIC LANGUAGE PLAN

The Court received an approved the University’s first Gaelic Language Plan and Gaelic Language Policy, which would ensure the University would meet its statutory obligations under the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005.

SENATE

The Court received and noted a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) from the Senate meeting of 6 February 2013. In addition, the Court approved the following items of business referred to it:

Draft Resolution No 257 of 2013 [Changes to Regulations for Various Degrees]

The Court approved, on the recommendation of the Senate, the Draft Resolution No 258 of 2013 [Changes to Regulations for Various Degrees] and agreed to forward it to the General Council and to make it generally available in terms of Section 6 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966.

Second Chair of History: Amendment of Title

The Court approved, on the recommendation of the Senate, the Draft Resolution ‘Second Chair of History – Amendment of title’ referred to in Ordinance No. 515 (Aberdeen No. 103) (Chairs in History) to: The Hector Boece Chair in History. The Court noted that in accordance with the provisions of Section 6(2) of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, the Senate agreed to pass the draft Resolution forthwith.

Amendments to the Policy on Undergraduate Student Progress

The Court, on the recommendation of the Senate, approved revisions to the Policy on Undergraduate Student Progress.

Amendments to the Policy on Appeals and Complaints

The Court, on the recommendation of the Senate, approved revisions to the Policy on Appeals and Complaints.

Proposed Change to the University Chapel Committee

The Court noted that the Senate, had approved the proposed changes to the University Chapel Committee.

Enhancement-led Institutional Review

The Court received and noted progress made in preparation for the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) in October/November 2014.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

Draft Resolution No 271 of 2012 [Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Non-Academic)] and Draft Resolution No 272 of 2012 [Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Academic)]

The Court noted that the draft Resolution No 271 of 2012 [Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Non-Academic)] and Draft Resolution No 272 [Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Academic)] had been approved by the Senate.
The Court approved the Resolutions, subject to any further comments being received from the Business Committee of the General Council. *Note by Clerk:* Subsequent to the meeting, the Resolutions were approved by the Business Committee at its meeting of 25 April 2013.

**MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS**

The Court noted a summary of the Management Accounts for the period to 31 January 2013. *(See Minute 228)*

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of Court would be held on Tuesday 25 June 2013 at 9.00am.