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BUSINESS

DECLARATION OF INTEREST:
Any member or individual in attendance (including officers) who has a clear interest in a matter on the agenda must declare that interest at the meeting.

Note: The papers within each section of the agenda are colour-coded as follows:
For Discussion: white; Not for Discussion: fawn

BUSINESS FOR DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.45pm</td>
<td>MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: An Action Log is enclosed with the Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45pm</td>
<td>HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Reports on Accidents and Incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Future Composition of Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Appointment Process for Next Senior Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Remuneration of Senior Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm</td>
<td>FINANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Implications of FRS 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Draft Outturn – 2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>NON-EXECUTIVE MEMBERS MEETING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUSINESS NOT PROPOSED FOR DISCUSSION

MEMBERS ARE REMINDED THAT THEY CAN RAISE THESE ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND TO DO SO BY ADVISING THE CLERK ONE CLEAR WORKING DAY IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING
OPERATING BOARD REPORT

COMPOSITE REPORT FROM COURT COMMITTEES AND JOINT COMMITTEES OF COURT AND SENATE

ROUTINE BUSINESS NOT PROPOSED FOR DISCUSSION

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Tuesday 6 December 2016 at 9am-1pm followed by lunch.
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COURT

Minutes of meeting held on 28 June 2016

Present: Ms M Chapman (in the Chair), Principal, Sir Moir Lockhead, Professor A Akisanya, Mr A Arthur, Professor N Booth, Professor C Brittain, Miss G Clarke, Mr C Duncan, Mr J Hall, Professor P Hannaford, Professor S Heys, Professor J Kilburn, Mr D MacFarlane, Professor P McGeorge, Cllr R McKail, Mrs K McPhail, Ms A Minto, Mr K Murray, Dr N Oren, Mr B Paterson, Mrs J Shirreffs, and Mr D Steyn (for minutes 236-293).

In attendance: Mr C Anucha, Mr D Beattie, Mr A Donaldson, Mrs D Dyker, Mr L Forsyth, Mrs C Inglis, Professor J Paterson (for minutes 294-299 and 306-7), Mr N Qamar (for minutes 243-245), Very Rev Professor I Torrance and Mr B Purdon (Clerk)

Apologies for absence were received from Professor C Black, Miss M Burgoyne, Mr D Haywood, Cllr J Laing and Mr B Pack.

NEW AND RETIRING MEMBERS

236 The Rector noted that it was Mr Arthur, Miss Burgoyne and Miss Clarke’s final meeting as members of Court. The Court recorded its thanks to all three members for their contribution as governors and in particular for Miss Clarke and Miss Burgoyne’s service to the student community in their roles as sabbatical officers. The Court noted that Mr Anucha would succeed Miss Clarke as President of the Students’ Association on Court and that Ms J Killin, Sabbatical Officer for Welfare, would succeed Miss Burgoyne as a representative of the Students’ Association at Court on an ‘in attendance’ basis.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

237 The following declarations of interest were noted:

Mr A Arthur – Officer of the University of Aberdeen Branch of the University and College Union (UCU); and
Mr B Paterson – Officer of the University of Aberdeen Branch of Unite the Union.

PRESENTATION ON ABERDEEN FUNGAL GROUP AND MEDICAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR MEDICAL MYCOLOGY

238 The Court received a presentation on the work of the Aberdeen Fungal Group and Medical Research Centre for Medical Mycology from Professors Gow and Brown. The presentation highlighted that the level of deaths caused by fungal infections around the world exceeded those caused by malaria and several other more well known infectious diseases. The Court noted the Group was regarded as a world leading centre of research in this field and that it had a lead role in coordinating international collaboration between other global centres of excellence.

239 In discussion, the Court discussed how the University might support the Fungal Group to build on its success and, in this regard noted the importance of the University being able to respond to opportunities to appoint high quality staff as they arose.

240 The Court congratulated Professors Gow and Brown, and the Fungal Group, on their success.

MINUTES

241 The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2016 were approved.

242 The Court also noted the updated Action Log (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).
HEALTH AND SAFETY

UPDATE ON ACCIDENTS AND INCIDENTS

243 The Court received and considered a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided details of four incidents in May and two incidents in June. The Court also received a report of the Operating Board's consideration of the incidents which were:

- A member of staff slipped and fell on ice at the old Rowett site;
- The Meston Building was evacuated due to a strong noxious smell similar to that of gas;
- A student caused a release of carbon dioxide in a laboratory;
- A fire in the Chaplaincy, which appeared to be a deliberate act;
- A member of staff working in Malaysia contracted a waterborne parasite; and
- A fire incident occurred in St Mary's Building, which appeared to be a deliberate act.

244 The report from the Operating Board also included details of one other incident regarding the death of a student on campus in March.

245 The Court noted the follow up actions, where required, that had been taken to address any lessons learnt from the respective incidents. The Court discussed the work being undertaken to enhance the University's approach to mental health and wellbeing.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE EU REFERENDUM RESULT

246 The Principal provided Court with a briefing on the key issues for the University following the outcome of the referendum on the UK's membership of the EU and the steps it had taken to reassure applicants, current students and staff from the rest of the EU. The briefing was supplemented by a paper regarding the University's links with the European Union that had been circulated in Court papers prior to the referendum result (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

247 The Court noted that following discussion with the Senior Governor, the University had in light of the referendum result issued assurances to all current non-UK EU students and prospective students for 2016/17 entry that it would cover the cost of any change to their tuition fee status. The University had also assured all non-UK EU staff that there was no immediate change to their employment position and that as highly valued members of staff the University was committed to supporting them as the situation clarified.

248 The Court noted that the key issues related to future EU student recruitment, the impact on international student recruitment, staff retention and recruitment, research funding, and international reputation. In discussion, the Court was assured that through its own political networks and those of Universities UK and Universities Scotland, the University would be lobbying to emphasise and publicise the risks that faced the University from the referendum result and to ensure its interests were protected as far possible as discussions on the UK's exit from the EU progressed.

STANDING REPORTS

REPORT FROM THE RECTOR

249 The Rector congratulated all those involved in making the recent Graduation ceremonies joyous and successful occasions.

250 The Rector highlighted the success of the Students' Charities campaign in raising £120k for local charities which was a reminder of the important part the student community played in the life of the City and Region.

251 The Rector reflected that the result of the EU referendum reinforced the importance of the University as a community which celebrated diversity and of its core values of educating and informing society.
REPORT FROM THE SENIOR GOVERNOR

252 The Senior Governor introduced his report to Court (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

253 The report provided Court with an update on the Review of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance by the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) that would be undertaken by an independent steering group commencing in the summer of 2016.

REPORT FROM THE PRINCIPAL

254 The Principal introduced his written report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) on recent developments within the University.

255 The Principal highlighted in his report the University’s key priorities and how these linked to the main pillars of the Strategic Plan: People, Teaching & Learning, Research and Digital Transformation. In discussion, the Court was advised of the changes made to refocus the University counselling service to students, with the greater delivery of counselling services for staff through the Occupational Health Service and a new Employee Assistance Programme accompanied by a twenty-four hour helpline. A review of the University’s mental health strategy was also being undertaken and would report in the Autumn. The Court was also assured that the review of Professional Services was intended to ensure that the most effective support was provided to academic staff in preparation for the next Research Evaluation Framework.

256 The Principal also reported on the appointment of the new Scottish Government Ministerial team for Higher Education, the forthcoming publication of Audit Scotland’s review of Higher Education, and that a review of the Scottish Funding Council and Scottish Enterprise was expected.

257 The Principal also highlighted, from his report, the publication of a UK Higher Education White Paper, and the implications its proposal for a Teaching Excellence Framework would have for universities in Scotland.

258 The report also included updates on the outcome of a recent Scottish Funding Council Strategic Dialogue visit to the University, the May Festival, National Awards to the University’s Public Engagement team, the University’s performance in recently published League Tables, notable successes for University staff, and recent research grant awards.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION

259 The President of the Students’ Association introduced her written report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) on the recent activities of the Aberdeen University Students’ Association (AUSA),

260 The Court discussed the report’s update on student wellbeing and use of the ‘Nightline’ service. It was noted that the information gathered by the Students’ Association on mental health issues amongst students would be fed in to the work of the University’s Mental Health Working Group.

261 The Court discussed the progress of the restructuring of AUSA and that a revised constitution had been agreed by AUSA and was included separately for approval by Court as part of the agenda. The University Secretary highlighted to Court that the Audit Committee report included a summary of its consideration of the findings of the Internal Audit Review of AUSA’s Corporate and Financial Governance which had been carried out at the University’s request. The Court noted that the findings of the report were being addressed by AUSA and that the University was satisfied that good progress was being made. The Court also noted that the University had revised and strengthened the conditions of the disbursement grant it made to AUSA.
GOVERNANCE

FUTURE COMPOSITION OF COURT

262 The Court received a report (*copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes*) from the Governance and Nominations Committee with a proposal for a revised composition of Court. The proposal sought to build on the guiding principles agreed by Court and specific issues raised by members at its previous meeting of 22 March 2016. The Court noted that the proposal was for a Court of 17 members (rising to 20 only if required) as follows:

Non-Independent Members

- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one from the academic staff and one from the non-academic staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Trade Union nominated members of staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Student Members nominated by the Students’ Association (as required by the HE Governance Act)

Independent Members

- Senior Lay Member (elected as required by the HE Governance Act).
- A minimum of eight and not more than eleven Independent Members appointed by the Court at least two of whom shall be graduates of the University and appointed in consultation with representatives of the General Council.

263 The Court also noted that in developing the proposals the Committee had given consideration to the issues raised by Court in March 2016, and that as part of its recommended proposal had included measures intended to address these. In summary these were:

- A requirement that at least two independent members are graduates (and therefore members of General Council) appointed through a panel of the Governance and Nominations Committee including representation from the Business Committee of the General Council and with promotion of the vacancies to alumni.
- The establishment of a formal joint committee composed of Court, Senate and Staff Forum members to ensure there continues to be effective communication between these bodies and involving members of each. This would be in addition to the right of Senate to be consulted on Resolutions and Ordinances and to make representations to Court.
- That Court should have the flexibility to determine where it can benefit through representation from members of the two local Councils and that nominations from them for vacancies should be encouraged. The Committee had, therefore, recommended that the Court agree a protocol requiring it to notify the two local Councils of any vacancies for independent members and that discussions be held with the Councils to agree on any further mechanisms that may be helpful to ensure the University continues to work effectively in partnership with them.

264 The Court also noted a letter of representation from the Business Committee of the General Council expressing their position on the need to retain four elected General Council Assessor positions on Court.

265 There followed an extended discussion, the principal points of which were:

- That the measure proposed of a protocol to ensure the local Councils could nominate members for consideration for appointment by Court and would be routinely notified of vacancies, was a pragmatic way forward while also allowing Court to secure the greater control over its diversity and skills mix that were principles underpinning the reform of Court’s composition.
- Members expressed differing views on the rationale for and benefits of a reduction in the size of Court to the level proposed of 17 to 20. Some noted significant concern that this
would result in the loss of constituencies on Court, such as Senate Assessors, and challenged the benefit to be gained from a smaller Court and whether this reflected the model of most other Scottish universities. Other members expressed concern over the effectiveness of a body of more than 17 members, the limitations that a larger size put on the contribution of members at meetings and noted that many corporate and charitable boards were smaller in size than the model of 17 being proposed. It was suggested that if comparisons with other universities were to be considered they should be with leading universities in the world rather than just Scottish universities.

- Some members noted that they could not support proposals to remove entirely Senate Assessors from the composition of Court and it was suggested that an alternative would be to retain six Senate Assessors in a Court of 25 members. Some members also expressed concern that Court would take an in principle decision before consulting with Senate and argued that this should be done prior to the formal consultation required with Senate on the draft Ordinance which would codify any proposal agreed by Court. Some members also suggested the proposed timeframe for consultation and agreement of proposals should be longer.

- It was suggested that it would have been beneficial to have received an option which set out the minimum changes to the composition of Court that would be required to adhere with the Act.

- Some members also noted that a smaller Court would have implications for the supporting committee structure of Court and the workload of members of Court.

266 The Court agreed:

1) That the Senate Assessor members would develop an alternative proposal for a composition of Court and refer this to the Governance and Nominations Committee for consideration by 1 August 2016.

2) The Governance and Nominations Committee would consider that proposal, together with any other options it considered appropriate, and make a recommendation to Court by 1 September 2016 by circulation, with the option of ratifying the decision at the October meeting of Court.

267 In further discussion, it was suggested that a re-constituted Court should also consider whether the practice of meetings for non-executive members without executive members present should be continued.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ELECTION PROCESS FOR ROLE OF SENIOR GOVERNOR

268 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which, on the recommendation of the Governance and Nominations Committee, invited the Court to consider the implications of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act for the future appointment and election of the Senior Governor.

269 The Court noted that the paper had been informed by legal advice to the University regarding the expected commencement period for the Act and that, while that advice was subject to confirmation of the timeframe by the Scottish Government, it recommended that the University begin to put in place the procedures necessary for the future appointment through election of the Senior Governor.

270 This Court noted the requirements of the Act and the key issues that would need to be considered, including:

- The Act’s requirements for there to be a public advertisement of any vacancy for the position of Senior Governor, then scrutiny of applications against an agreed set of criteria by a committee (including a member of staff and a student) to determine which candidates go forward for election by staff, students and members of Court. The Court discussed whether the committee for this purpose should be the Governance and Nominations Committee or a committee established for the specific purpose of the appointment. It was noted that practice across the sector varied between institutions that combined the functions of a governance and nominations committee and those that had just a nominations committee.
- The development of a process for Court to adhere to the Act’s requirement that remuneration be provided where requested by the successful candidate;
- The term of office for the role of the Senior Governor and arrangements for reappointment by Court;
- Review of the University’s procedures for the removal of members of Court including the Senior Governor to ensure these adhere to the Act;
- How the Act related to the respective roles of the Rector and Senior Governor;
- That the University should review governance processes related to the role of Senior Governor for any further implications resulting from the Act.

271 In discussion, the importance of there being appropriate appointment criteria relative to the requirements of the role was noted.

272 The paper also included a recommendation from the Governance and Nominations Committee that the Court introduce a formal role of Senior Independent Member (distinct from that of Senior Governor) to serve as an intermediary between members and the Senior Governor if required and to discharge other governance functions where these could not appropriately be undertaken by the Senior Governor, such as issues regarding the appointment process for the Senior Governor.

273 The Court agreed:
- that the University begin to develop the necessary processes and procedures to comply with the Act’s requirement for the election of future Senior Governors; and
- to formalise the establishment of a position of Senior Independent Member and that the Governance and Nominations Committee develop a role description for approval by Court.
- That equality monitoring of any nominations/selection panel would also be undertaken;

FINANCE AND CAPITAL PLANNING

BUDGETS FOR 2016/17 TO 2019/20

274 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which set out a detailed budget for 2016/17 and indicative budgets for 2017/18 to 2019/20. The Court also received a report of the Operating Board’s consideration of an earlier version of the proposals in the paper.

275 The paper reflected Court’s approval in principle in March 2016, that, in light of the cut in SFC funding and other cost pressures, the University budget surplus for 16/17 would be reduced from £5.5 million to £2.0 million. The paper set out the details of a budget on this basis, including School level budgets, and reported on how to achieve the target surplus. It had been necessary to critically review staffing establishments, vacant posts and requests for additional resource with only essential requests, or those which enable growth, or improve areas with high Student Staff Ratios, being approved.

276 The Court noted that two Schools, Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition and Biological Sciences, both had significant budget issues and each School had identified savings of £1.0m and £600,000 respectively, which might require the use of the approved Joint Consultative Committee on Redundancy Avoidance process. The Court also noted that Natural & Computing Sciences had a longer term plan to save £850,000 over 3 years, with a target of £221,000 in 2016/17. The Professional Services review was on target to achieve £3.0m of recurrent savings by 2017/18.

277 The Court also noted the sensitivity and risk analysis which identified areas which were considered to be at the highest risk within the budget and the quantum of this risk. University management would maintain a clear focus on these risk areas, in particular progress against student recruitment targets for RUK and International students, through management reporting as well as maintaining a budget rigour on all cost centres.

278 The paper noted that the recent Scottish Parliamentary elections, and the subsequent multi-year spending review expected in the Autumn, were likely to have a material impact on the University’s budget in future years, and taking account of this likelihood indicative budgets
had been prepared for 2017/18 to 2019/20. Those indicative budgets showed that the University would remain at, or close to, break-even position giving limited scope for investment. To enable the University to move to, or exceed, the target surplus, or to allow the University to move quickly should the funding settlement arising from the spending review be materially detrimental to our financial position, key strategic priorities had been identified and through an increased focus on these priorities, the University would move to rationalise or capture opportunities for growth. The Court noted that the details of this would be brought to a future meeting.

279 In discussion, it was noted that the Court would receive a report on the future cashflow and debt profile of the University relative to the budget forecasts, and options for capital financing via a bond. It was noted that sustained surpluses of the level outlined for 2016/17 relative to the level of turnover and costs would not be sufficient in future years to generate the level of investment required to improve the University’s competitive position. The potential detrimental impact on the University of the UK leaving the EU was also noted and that scenario planning for a number of outcomes would be undertaken to adapt quickly to further changes, positive or negative, in the funding environment. The Court also discussed the budget position of Schools and noted that the University’s expectation was that Schools should over-time be able to achieve a break even financial position or better, although, they might require support for an interim period before they were able to do so.

280 The Court:

- Approved the detailed budgets for 2016/17;
- Noted the savings required in Biological Sciences and Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition and Natural and Computing Science and the process for achieving these;
- Noted the budget risk areas;
- Noted the indicative budgets for 2017/18 to 2019/20.
- Noted that it would receive at a future meeting a report on the projected cashflow and debt profile of the University and options for capital financing through a bond.
- Agreed that it should receive at a future meeting a report on the performance and financial position of the Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health.

Strategic Planning Forecast to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) 2015-16 to 2018-19

281 The Court approved the Strategic Planning Forecast report to SFC for 2015-16 to 2018-19 which reflected the budgets agreed by Court but presented in the format required by SFC and which had been made available on the Court Intranet prior to the meeting.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME FOR KING’S COLLEGE CAMPUS

282 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) that provided Court with an outline of the University’s proposed programme for major capital investment over a ten year period to transform King’s College Campus into a world-class centre of excellence for the delivery of teaching, learning and research.

283 The Court noted that the key projects proposed were:

- Relocation of the Law School (including Stack and parts of King’s College)
- Science Teaching Hub (Meston)
- Undergraduate Teaching Block (Taylor)
- Premium Postgraduate and Executive Education (New King’s)
- Relocation of the Business School (Johnston site)
- Oil and Gas Innovation Hub (new build)
- New Student Union (Butchart)
- Digital Transformation
- Sports Facilities

284 The Court noted that all projects proposed had support for digital transformation at their heart, and reflected the need for facilities that support delivery of an enhanced student experience
across the King’s campus. The academic focused projects would support delivery of premium-fee paying programmes; distributed, technology-enabled and distance learning; improved business efficiency; and, the urgent need for improvement and modernisation of teaching and research facilities.

285 In discussion, the Court was reminded of the reasons linked to funding and the emergence of a City and Region Deal that had led the University to reconsider its previous plan for an Energy Building. The proposal for an Oil and Gas Innovation Hub was discussed and how it would potentially link with funding streams from the City and Region Deal was also discussed. It was suggested that consideration should be given to the building being presented as an Energy Hub to take account of the growing significance of renewable energy technology.

286 In discussion, the Court noted that it had previously agreed that the Student Union project was a priority and was assured this remained the case although due to the expected build time of two to three years a two stage process involving a temporary facility in the Hub was being proposed. The need for further discussion regarding this with the Students’ Association was noted. It was also suggested that many staff had understood the project to be progressing and that consideration be given to communicating with the University community to clarify the position.

287 The Court noted the importance of ensuring that the Development Trust fundraising campaign was aligned to support the capital programme, focusing on those projects which were considered to have the most potential to engender donor support.

288 The Court noted that, informed by the discussion, the University would be developing further the prioritisation of the projects, linked to strategic priorities and business planning, with a phased capital plan linked to available income streams.

289 The Court agreed to endorse the further development of these projects as part of a prioritised and sequenced capital programme, informed by cash-flow analysis and business plans.

IMPACT OF FRS 102

290 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which set out changes to accounting policy under Financial Reporting Standard (FRS) 102, which would come in to force for the financial year ending 31 July 2016 and requiring the restatement of the 2014/15 accounts for comparative purposes. The Court also received a report of the Operating Board’s consideration of FRS 102.

291 The Court noted the Audit Committee had considered the issues arising from the new Financial Reporting Standard and had recommended the most appropriate accounting policies to be adopted by the University. The paper presented a restatement of the University’s financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2015 that resulted in a deficit of £14.3M and a reconciliation to the £3.23M historical cost surplus reported under previous accounting regulations. The paper explained that this was due primarily to the statutory inclusion of the USS pension liability and changes to the presentation of the release of revaluation reserves, which did not impact on the University’s cash holdings or liquidity.

292 The Court approved the accounting policies recommended by the Audit Committee but agreed, that due to limitations of time, there should be a further opportunity for Court to be briefed on the implications of the FRS 102 at its next meeting.

FUTURE STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF THE BUSINESS SCHOOL

293 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which summarised the ambitious and long-term vision for the Business School as a result of a strategic analysis of the sector and competitor business schools. Due to limitations of time, the Court agreed to defer discussion of the paper to its next meeting.

SOUTH KOREA BRANCH CAMPUS
The Court received a report on the progress of the Aberdeen Campus in South Korea and the basis upon which the Operating Board had approved the project under authority delegated to it by the Court (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

The Court noted the University and the Korean Partners had agreed on the following to ensure the financial sustainability of the Campus:

- As set out in the University’s application to the Korean Ministry of Education, the University of Aberdeen would make a cash contribution to the Campus project. The University would put forward £1.2M over the first two years of operation (2017: £900k; 2018: £300k);
- The Korean Partners had guaranteed that the University would recover its contribution within the first seven years of operation, as opposed to the first ten years as originally planned;
- The Korean Partners would make up to £2.5M available to the University between 2018 and 2022 to ensure sustainability of the Campus. This financial support would be twofold:
  (i) If the Campus did not perform in line with expectations, the Korean Partners would make payments to the University to ensure the University recovered its financial contribution within the first seven years; and
  (ii) Should the worst case scenario materialise, the Korean Partners would cover financial deficits.
- The financial aid would be made available between 1 March and 31 May every year from 2018;
- The partners had discussed exchange rate risks and arrangements would be put in place to ensure that any exchange rate movement had minimal impact on the project and partner financing.

The Court noted that the Operating Board had agreed that the strategic benefits of establishing a campus in Korea remained strong and, as the review process by the Ministry of Education had been successfully completed and an agreement had been reached on a financial contract for the campus which minimised the financial risks to the University, the Board had concluded that the concerns around the financial risks of the project expressed by Court in March 2016 had now been addressed. The Court noted that the Board therefore had approved, on its behalf, the University’s establishment of its first overseas campus in South Korea, with a planned opening date of March 2017.

Resolution: Governance Structure of the University of Aberdeen Korea Campus

The Court also received a draft Resolution for the proposed campus governance structure and a paper which outlined how the internal governance and committee structure of the campus would operate and interface with the University’s wider governance structures.

In discussion, it was noted that the composition of the External Advisory Committee was orientated towards the engineering/offshore industries and it was agreed that further consideration would be given to establishing a similar external advisory committee to focus on the business related programmes of the campus.

Following consideration of the proposed campus governance structure and the associated draft Resolution by Court in December 2015, and as required under the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, the Senate and the Business Committee of the General Council had received and endorsed the draft Resolution. As part of that statutory process, the Resolution has also been made available for public comment with no comments having been received. The Court, therefore, agreed to formally approve the Resolution

REMUNERATION COMMITTEE SENIOR STAFF PAY

Note by Clerk: Executive members of Court and officers in attendance, bar the Director of Human Resources and the Clerk to Court, withdrew for the duration of discussion of this item.

The Court received a report from the Remuneration Committee on the implementation of the Senior Staff Pay policy agreed by Court at its meeting of 22 March 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).
The Court noted that the Remuneration Committee had considered the gender pay gap and noted the negative variance for the institution of 10.4% between the median male professorial salary (£78,038) compared to the median female professorial salary (£71,319) which relate to non-Clinical Professorial staff. The Committee also noted that, when controlled by length of service, the gender pay gap was removed except for tenure in the role for 5 – 10 years, where a gap of 2.3% existed. In discussion by Court, the importance of ensuring that gender pay equality applied to both men and women and with appropriate consideration to performance criteria was noted. It was agreed that trend data on the impact of the voluntary severance through any loss of senior female staff would be brought back to Court.

The Court noted that the Remuneration Committee had approved recommendations for 27 consolidated salary awards. This total included a recommendation to uplift six salaries to redress the gender pay gap for those staff in post for 5 – 10 years. The total cost of the recommendations amounted to £89k (including salary on-costs).

The Court noted that the Remuneration Committee had considered the Principal’s remuneration package. The Convenor of the Committee had reported on the appraisal of the Principal and that the appraisal process received input from Court members including independent members, the student representative, the Rector and members of the Remuneration Committee. It was unanimously a positive appraisal and it was agreed the Principal had attained the eligibility to receive a bonus. The Committee discussed the matter at length and took account of the fact that the Principal had not taken his contractual bonus for the last five years. The Committee had noted reservations expressed by the Student President, however it had on balance agreed that the Principal should be awarded his contractual bonus to reflect his performance and contribution over the last five years.

BUSINESS FOR EXTENDED MEETING OF COURT

The Court received and noted a paper highlighting potential agenda items for discussion at Court’s extended meeting on Tuesday 4 October (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). Members of Court were invited to consider and suggest further areas or issues for discussion to the Clerk.

PUBLICATION OF COURT PAPERS

The Court agreed that Court papers should, in addition to being lodged in the Library for public access after meetings with appropriate redactions for confidentiality and commercial sensitivity, be also made available online on the same basis.

COLLABORATIVE ALLIANCE WITH CURTIN UNIVERSITY

The Court received a presentation from the Principal, the Vice-Principal Internationalisation and Professor Terry, Vice-Chancellor of Curtin University, on discussions between the two universities towards the establishment of a global alliance. The presentation outlined the key strengths of Curtin University, its staff and student numbers, its Australian and overseas campuses, and its financial structure. The presentation also highlighted the significant academic complementarity between the two universities and where collaborative teaching and research initiatives were underway, with considerable scope to develop further particularly in the areas of Energy, Medicine, Business and the Creative Arts. The Court discussed the strategic advantage for both universities that might be realised through a global alliance and how this might enable each to respond to the challenge of diversifying their income streams and expanding transnational education.

The Court welcomed the presentation and endorsed the continuing development of closer cooperation with Curtin University.
OPERATING BOARD REPORT

308 The Court received a report summarising items considered at the meetings of the Operating Board held on 21 April, 10 May and 6 June 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

Risk Management

309 The Board’s report to Court included a copy of the University’s new risk management reporting template and a summary of the current status of key risks for comment and review.

310 The other principal items of the report that were noted by the Court were:

- Financial planning;
- Student admissions and Project 500;
- The University’s compliance with its duties under the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015 (‘Prevent’);
- Staffing matters;
- Reports from the Capital Programme Management Committee;
- Progress of the OneSource project
- The City and Region Deal; and
- Professional Services Review.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

GOVERNANCE AND NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

311 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Governance and Nominations Committee at its meeting on 10 May 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In addition the Court approved the following:

312 On the recommendation of the Committee, the Court approved the terms of reference for an externally facilitated review of effectiveness.

313 On the recommendation of the Committee, the Court approved the reappointment of Mrs McPhail and Mr Hall for further terms of office of up to three years following the conclusion of their current terms on 31 July 2016 and 30 September 2016 respectively.

314 On the recommendation of the Committee, the Court approved a policy on gender balance for sub-committees of Court with a view to beginning implementation from 2016/17. The Court further agreed that the Senate should be invited to agree that a policy on gender balance also apply to joint committees of the Court and Senate and with implementation commencing as soon as practicable thereafter.

315 In discussion of the recommendations regarding reappointment of members and gender balance on sub-committees of Court, it was noted that the gender balance of Court itself remained an issue and that this influenced the achievement of gender balance on committees of Court. It was acknowledged, however, that in any transition to a new composition of Court, gender balance would be a key consideration in how that transition was achieved.

316 The Court also noted:

- that the Committee had endorsed the University having a neutral institutional position in the EU referendum campaign;
- that independent members were invited to submit nominations to the Clerk for a forthcoming vacancy on the Operating Board;
- that the annual governor self appraisal questionnaire would be issued over the summer, subject to the timing of the external effectiveness review, with which it would be combined if possible.
AUDIT COMMITTEE

317 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Audit Committee at its meetings on 21 April and 2 June 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

PARTNERSHIP, NEGOTIATING AND CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

318 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Partnership, Negotiating and Consultative Committee at its meeting on 12 May 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE

319 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Research Policy Committee at its meetings on 22 March and 3 June 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

320 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Student Affairs Committee at its meeting on 9 May 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

321 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the University Committee on Teaching and Learning at its meeting on 11 May 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

ROUTINE BUSINESS

AUSA CONSTITUTION

322 The Court received and approved a revised constitution for the Aberdeen University Students' Association Constitution (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). (See Minute 261 above).

CORPORATE PARENTING PLAN

323 The Court received the University’s draft Corporate Parenting Plan for approval (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

324 The Court noted that under The Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 the University, as a Corporate Parent, had a statutory duty to publish and review an action plan which detailed how it would fulfil its obligations to support care experienced applicants and students.

325 The Court approved the Plan.

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A CHAIR IN NAME OF JOHN NISBET

326 The Court noted that, having previously approved a recommendation to establish the John Nisbet Chair of Education and for the statutory process of consultation with the Senate, Business Committee of the General Council and public display to be undertaken, that this process had been undertaken and that no amendments or comments had been received. The Court, therefore, agreed to formally approve the Resolution to establish the John Nisbet Chair of Education (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

SENATE REPORT

327 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Senate at its meeting of 4 May and 8 June 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

Resolution: Changes to Regulations for Various Degrees
The Court, on the recommendation of the Senate, agreed to approve the draft Resolution 'Changes to Regulations for Various Degrees' and to do so forthwith in accordance with the provisions of Section 6 (2) of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966 so that the amended provision could be applied with effect from the start of the new academic year.

The Court also noted reports on the Senate’s consideration of:

- The John Nisbet Chair of Education;
- Academic Line Management;
- Update on Collective Agreement;
- Senate Standing Orders;
- Introduction of an online ‘Professions Skills Course’ for all level one undergraduate student;
- Professional Services Review; and
- Institutional Retention Task Force.

Vacation Powers

The Court received a paper identifying the standard delegated authority that would be used should any urgent business arise during the summer (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

Report from the Development Trust

The Court received and noted a paper providing details of the Development Trust’s performance since its last report to Court on 22 March 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

Planning: Performance Against KPIs

The Court received and noted a paper describing the progress made in the first two quarters of 2015/16 against the targets and KPIs underpinning the new University’s Strategic Plan 2015-2020 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

Financial Management Report

The Court noted the Management Accounts and Reports for the period to 30 April 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

Date of Next Meeting

The Court noted that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday 4 October 2016 at 9am.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Date</th>
<th>Minute Ref</th>
<th>Action Arising</th>
<th>Action By:-</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Internationalisation Update</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Complete: Included in the agenda for the June meeting of Court but was deferred to a future meeting due to insufficient time being available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Digital Strategy</td>
<td>Vice-Principal for Digital Strategy</td>
<td>Complete: Included as a session at the extended meeting in October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Future Composition of Court</td>
<td>Senate Assessors, University Secretary</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>273</td>
<td><strong>Establishment of an Election Process for Role of Senior Governor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Court agreed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- to formalise the establishment of a position of Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Member and that the Governance and Nominations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee develop a role description for approval by Court.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>University Secretary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Complete:</strong> Role considered by Governance and Nominations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee in September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2016</th>
<th>278 &amp; 280</th>
<th><strong>Budgets for 2016/17 to 2019/20</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To enable the University to move to, or exceed, the target surplus, or to allow the University to move quickly should the funding settlement arising from the spending review be materially detrimental to our financial position, key strategic priorities had been identified and through an increased focus on these priorities, the University would move to rationalise or capture opportunities for growth. The Court noted that the details of this would be brought to a future meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Court:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Noted that it would receive at a future meeting a report on the projected cashflow and debt profile of the University and options for capital financing through a bond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed that it should receive at a future meeting a report on the performance and financial position of the Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Senior Vice-Principal/Dir ector of Finance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In progress:</strong> Report Scheduled for December 2016 Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Senior Vice-Principal/Dir ector of Finance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In progress:</strong> Report Scheduled for December 2016 Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Head of College of Life Sciences &amp; Medicine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Complete:</strong> Report scheduled for October Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2016</th>
<th>289</th>
<th><strong>Capital Investment Programme for King’s College</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Court agreed to endorse the further development of these projects as part of a prioritised and sequenced capital programme, informed by cash-flow analysis and business plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Senior Vice-Principal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In progress:</strong> Report Scheduled for December 2016 Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Impact of FRS 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Court approved the accounting policies recommended by the Audit Committee but agreed, that due to limitations of time, there should be a further opportunity for Court to be briefed on the implications of the FRS 102 at its next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Gender Balance on sub-committees of Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Court further agreed that the Senate should be invited to agree that a policy on gender balance also apply to joint committees of the Court and Senate and with implementation commencing as soon as practicable thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of completed items available on Court Intranet or on request from the Clerk.
1.1 At its meeting on 12 September, the Board received a paper giving an update on three Health and Safety incidents and the actions taken in response to these. The reported incidents were as follows:

- A patient partner stumbled and fell on stairs at the Suttie Centre.
- A member of IT staff slipped and fell over when turning a light switch on in the Arts Lecture Theatre.
- A member of staff slipped and lost her balance, dislocated her ankle and suffered a trimalleolar fracture.

1.2 The Board noted that the Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing had identified learning points from the incidents and that further work was ongoing to address the issues raised.

1.3 The Board also noted a report of a recent incident concerning a student at Hillhead. Full details were not yet available, but it was reported that the student was in hospital and that relevant procedures had been invoked to deal with the matter. The Board asked to receive an update on this incident as soon as further information was available.
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 There are four serious incidents to report:

- A patient partner stumbled and fell on stairs at the Suttie Centre.
- A member of IT staff slipped and fell over when turning a light switch on in Arts Lecture Theatre.
- A member of staff slipped and lost her balance, dislocated her ankle and suffered a trimalleolar fracture.
- A student was taken to hospital as a result of self-inflicted injury.

1.2 This paper is for information.

1.3 Further information is available from Naveed Qamar, Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing (01224 272783, naveed.qamar@abdn.ac.uk).

2. DETAILS

2.1 On the 31st May at 1530, a volunteer patient at the Suttie Centre was descending the spiral staircase in the entrance lobby. As he was descending his heel caught on one of the steps and he fell down approximately 4 steps. During the fall, the individual grabbed for the handrail and during this he twisted his knee. As a result of the fall, he suffered a graze to his left shin and was suffering severe knee pain. He was then transferred to the hospital, by wheelchair, where it was identified that he had suffered a rupture to the right patellar tendon and was admitted for surgery. The individual has since been released from hospital with a knee brace following surgery.

The stairs were examined and found to be of solid construction, with appropriate stair nose treads and in good order with no defects. The handrail was also found to be in good condition. Alternative stairs and a lift are available for volunteer patients to access the volunteer patient area.

2.2 On June 20th, a member of IT staff was accessing a store which is at the bottom of a small flight of stairs. The light switch at the top of the stairs did not operate, and knowing that there was a linked switch at the bottom, he went to the bottom of the stairs to switch on the lights. According to him he was not aware that he was standing in some pooled water as he operated the switch for the lights, there was a flash from the switch which startled him causing him to slip and fall over straining his back and groin area.

The light circuits have been checked and tested and no faults have been found. The area at the bottom of the stairs has a history of pooling water due to a high water table and there is a sump pump installed to keep this area dry. It is understood that at the time of the incident, the pump had been switched off for reasons unknown. The pump is to be hard wired to prevent individuals from switching it off in the future.

The incident has been reported to the Health and Safety Executive in accordance with the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrence (RIDDOR) Regulations as the member of staff was off work for more than seven days.

2.3 On July 11th a member of staff went from Polwarth to IMS Atrium to get her lunch but the café was closed. She then went over to the Suttie Building café, and that was closed too. She decided to go over to the hospital shop to buy a sandwich. It had started to rain, she went up the steps outside the Suttie Building, then cut across the grass as she thought that would be quicker. There is a ‘pseudo path’ there where the grass is worn down. After about two steps on the grass, her left foot lost its grip and slid forward. She felt she was going to do the splits (and was worried she would dislocate a hip) so she put all her weight on her back foot to try to regain her balance. Her
back foot slid, she heard a loud crack and a sharp pain, and let herself down to the ground. She
knew she had broken something. There were three people from the IMS walking behind her who
assisted her. She was diagnosed with a trimalleolar fracture and also dislocated ankle.

The incident is as a result of a combination of factors. The major factor is that many people use
the route taken by the member of staff as a short cut and don’t exercise caution in inclement
weather and don’t use the recognised and purpose built pedestrian route of concrete/tarmac
pathway and steps with handrail on both sides. This is a matter to be discussed at the local Health
and Safety Committee.

2.4 On Sunday 11th September, a student in our halls of residence was injured as a result of self-
inflicted wounds with a knife. Our staff responded quickly to the incident, paramedics and police
attended the incident. The student was taken to hospital. She recovered from injuries sufficiently
after treatment to return to the residence the following day. Counselling and pastoral support
continues to be provided to the student and others closely involved in the incident.

3. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no significant resource implications.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

4.1 Risk STRA_2016_04 Health and Safety in the Strategic Risk Register refers.

5. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 An equality impact assessment is not required.

6. SUSTAINABILITY & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

6.1 There are no environmental, ethical or social implications or impacts.

7. RECOMMENDED ACTION

7.1 The University Court is invited to note the matters set out in the paper on the reported incidents.

8. FURTHER INFORMATION

8.1 Further information is available from Naveed Qamar, Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing
(01224 272783, naveed.qamar@abdn.ac.uk).

FOI Status: Open

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously considered by</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further approval required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSIDERATION BY OPERATING BOARD

1.1 The Board received and considered the Annual Health and Safety Report.

1.2 The Board noted that there had been a reduction in the number of staff injuries, and an increase in “near miss” reports, which was agreed to be a positive sign of an improved safety culture.

1.3 The Operating Board approved the Annual Health and Safety Report, 2015-16.
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper provides the annual Health and Safety report for year 2015/16. This paper is for information.

1.2 A summary of health and safety initiatives and incidents for the year is as follows:

- A strategic approach outlined for the academic year involved continuation of internal audits, review of health and safety risk register, updating of the Health and Safety Policy, development of new policies, campaigns on health and wellbeing and safety training.
  - Internal health and safety audits were carried out of two units, Aberdeen University Student Association and Aberdeen Sports Village.
  - The Health and Safety Risk Register was reviewed and will be further reviewed in the academic year 2016/17.
  - The University Health and Safety Policy has been updated.
  - New policies were drafted and adopted for safety tours and use of mobile phones and driving.
  - Health and Wellbeing campaigns were held during the year to promote use of internal facilities and to promote physical activity, good diet and nutrition, cancer awareness and smoking cessation.
  - During the year, the University invested significant amount of time and resource in providing training and developing online training.
- There was a reduction of 13% in staff injuries and an increase in near miss reports of 113%. The number of reportable injury accidents to staff during the reporting period was 5, compared to 4 in the previous year.
- There were eight fire incident logged in the year (10 in the previous year). There were no injuries from these fire incidents.

2 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

2.1 There are no significant resource implications.

3. RISK MANAGEMENT

3.1 Risk STRA_2016_04 Health and Safety in the Strategic Risk Register refers.

4. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 An equality impact assessment is not required.

5. SUSTAINABILITY & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

5.1 There are no environmental, ethical or social implications or impacts.
6. **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

6.1 The University Court is invited to note the matters set out in the paper.

7. **FURTHER INFORMATION**

7.1 Further information is available from Naveed Qamar, Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing (01224 272783, naveed.qamar@abdn.ac.uk).
1 INTERNAL HEALTH AND SAFETY AUDITS

1.1 The central safety team carried audits on the following:

- Clinical Skills Centre (CSC)
- Assisted Reproductive Unit (ASRU)
- Aberdeen University Student Association (AUSA)
- Aberdeen Sports Village (ASV)

1.2 Audit recommendations are assigned to priority categories: Priority 1, Priority 2 or Priority 3. Priority 1 recommendations are defined as major issues which result in significant non-compliance with the requirements of the University Health and Safety Policy. There were two Priority 1 recommendations in the above audit report for ASRU and three for AUSA. The ASRU priority actions have been completed. AUSA has undergone a restructure and is planning to complete all priority 1 actions in September now that a new CEO and a management team is in place.

2 HEALTH AND SAFETY RISK REGISTER

2.1 The risk of death or serious injury could arise from the University's activities unless health and safety risks are adequately controlled.

2.2 To help manage this risk, the University's Health and Safety Committee developed a Health and Safety Risk Register which breaks the corporate risk down into 28 separate risks. A summary of the entries in the Health and Safety Risk Register is in Appendix 1. All these risks are due a review by the Health and Safety Committee this year.

3 UNIVERSITY HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICY

3.1 The University Health and Safety Policy was updated in the year. The Policy has been through a due consultation process and is awaiting final approval.

4 NEW HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICIES

4.1 New policies as follows were drafted and approved during the year:

- Safety Tours Policy
- Use of Mobiles and Driving Policy

4.2 The Safety Tours Policy came into effect in March 2016. The Policy requires senior executives to carry out at least six safety tours in the academic year. A number of safety tours have been carried since March and a number of actions have been raised to address health and safety concerns or issues. The safety tours are also proving very useful in terms of recognising good health and safety practices.

4.3 The Use of Mobile Phones and Driving Policy prohibits the use of mobiles, hand held or hands free, while driving on University business. This Policy helps to reduce the risk of vehicle collisions due to distraction caused by phone conversation while driving.

5 ACCIDENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY

5.1 A summary of serious accidents in the University during 2015/16 is provided in Appendix 2.

5.2 There were four injury accidents to staff and one to a member of the public/visitor during 2015/16 which required reports to the Health and Safety Executive.
6 CONTACTS WITH THE HEALTH AND SAFETY ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES

6.1 There were no enforcement contacts with the Health and Safety Executive or the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service in the year.

6.2 There were contacts with the Health and Safety Executive for Genetically Modified Organism applications.

6.3 During the year the Health and Safety Executive informed us that they intend to carry out routine inspection in connection with our GMO authorisations and containment level 3 labs. The inspection has not taken place as yet.

7 FIRE SAFETY

7.1 The Health and Safety Committee received updates on progress with fire safety improvements following the carrying out of fire risk assessments and has been satisfied with the progress reported.

7.2 There were eight fire incidents in the year (10 in 2014/15). None of these fires caused any injury or serious damage. There were two fires started deliberately, one at the Chaplaincy and the other at St Mary’s. A person was arrested and questioned but was not charged. In all cases our fire detection and alarm systems worked well and buildings were evacuated in time. Some lessons have been learnt and as a result, security patrols were tightened up and evacuation drills increased in frequency from once a year to twice a year.

8 IONISING AND NON-IONISING RADIATIONS

8.1 The University is provided with a comprehensive radiation protection service covering both ionising and non-ionising radiation through an agreement with NHS Grampian. The agreement includes the services of a Radiation Protection Adviser and a Laser Protection Adviser. The Committee maintains a Radiation Hazards Sub-Committee to keep radiation safety matters under review and the Sub-Committee receives reports from the two advisers.

8.2 There was an inspection carried out by SEPA at Foresterhill in March. They recommended that the Foresterhill licence should include the new Rowett building and that any redundant radioactive sources be identified and disposed off.

9 GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMO)

9.1 The Committee maintains three Genetic Modification Safety Sub-Committees (covering Foresterhill, Old Aberdeen and the Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health) which review and approve research and teaching projects involving genetically modified organisms and monitor the work for compliance with agreed precautions. All the Sub-Committees have reported that arrangements for controlling work with genetically modified organisms are satisfactory.

9.10 The Health and Safety Executive approved the amalgamation of Rowett Institute and Foresterhill authorisations for GMO work after the relocation of Rowett Institute to new site at Foresterhill.

10 HEALTH AND WELLBEING

10.1 Health and wellbeing days were held at Old Aberdeen (January 2016) and at Foresterhill (April 2016). The events were well attended and staff were able to receive handy tips on diet and nutrition, physical exercise, relaxation, mindfulness, emergency first aid, cycling, jogging and running, posture, indoor plants. Height, weight, BMI and blood pressure checks were also available for staff at the events.

10.2 The University took part in World Cancer Day by raising awareness on causation of cancer, risk factors and prevention.

10.3 Smoking cessation sessions were held with the help of NHS Grampian.
10.4 The University also took part in Britain's Healthiest Workplace 2016 survey and it is due to receive a report in September. The report will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of health and wellbeing programmes and recommendations for improvement.

11  SAFETY TRAINING

11.1 Senior management team attended one day Safety for Senior Executive Course that covered corporate and personal responsibilities as well as risk assessment and risk management.

11.2 Managing Safely course for line managers has been tested and is being rolled out this year.

11.3 University has invested in online training package for all staff due to be rolled out in October once all of the technical issues have been resolved. The package includes modules on general health and safety, fire safety, manual handling, lone working, display screen equipment training and assessment, stress and resilience, wellbeing, personal safety, environmental awareness, risk assessment and travel safety.

11.4 Safe and defensive driving training has taken place for those who drive on University business. Further training is planned to cover all areas of the University.

11.5 University also provided Biological Safety; Fire Safety; First Aid; Manual Handling Training and Gas Cylinder Safety Training to key individuals.
HEALTH AND SAFETY RISK REGISTER

Note: Risks have been scored using the same 6x6 matrix which is used for the University’s corporate risk register.

Risk register at July 2016 – risk ranked in order of gross risk score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Risk title</th>
<th>Risk Score - gross</th>
<th>Risk Score - net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Construction and estate maintenance hazards</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Condition of safety critical aspects of the estate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Fieldwork hazards</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Students’ Association activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Vehicle movements on campus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Slips and trips</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Laboratory/workshop hazards</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Personal safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Halls of Residence</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Use of vehicles on the public roads</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Travel on University business</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ionising and non-ionising radiations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Genetic modification</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Printing and binding operations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Children invited onto campus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Legionella</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Work at heights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Manual handling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Asthmagens</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Work related stress</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Work placements for students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Computer workstation ergonomics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

ACCIDENTS TRENDS IN THE UNIVERSITY DURING 2015/16

1) STAFF INJURY ACCIDENTS

There were 87 injury accidents to staff recorded on the database in the year (100 in 2014/15) representing a 13% reduction in actual numbers and an 8% reduction when normalised to per thousand full time equivalent employees.

The breakdown of staff injuries by units or departments is shown below. An excellent level of reduction in injuries is shown in Medical Research Facility (93%), a good level by Estates (43%), IT Services (37%), Campus Services (25%) and there are departments with zero injuries.

The above shows increases in injuries recorded in Medical Sciences and Student Support of minor injuries. The causes of injuries to staff are various as shown below, nearly 20% being due to falls from slips and trips (an increase of 89%), 16% due to puncture or cuts from glass or needles (a decrease of 22%), 10% due to handling lifting and carrying (an increase of 28%) and 10% due to contact with hot surfaces or objects (a decrease of 18%). There were also reductions in animal bites (25%), falls on stairs (71%), hazardous substances (50%), struck by (53%).
The data broken down into staff groups or jobs types is shown below. In the year 28% of the injuries were sustained by Technical staff (down 34%), 20% by Administrative staff (up 240%), 15% by Catering staff (down 28%):

The long term trend in staff injuries is as follows. University encourages reporting of near misses and injuries. There has been a 113% increase in the number of near miss reports, a 13% reduction staff injuries and an 8% reduction in rate of injuries per thousand employees.

There were 5 injuries to staff (4 in 2014/15) that were reportable to the Health and Safety Executive as follows:

- A member of staff while cutting grass lost his balance and fell off a wall fracturing his ankles.
- A member of staff tripped on front steps of Clinical Research Centre, Royal Cornhill Hospital and fractured her ankle.
- A member of staff slipped on the floor of Regent building, falling and resulting in a fracture to her left elbow.
A member of staff was switching on lights at the stage door of the arts lecture theatre, water had accumulated in the area from recent heavy rain making floor waterlogged and slippery. As he touched the switch, there was a flash, the member of staff was startled and he fell over straining groin and back. There was no electrical fault found. A sump pump had been installed to drain the water, it was then permanently wired in to work automatically to keep the area dry.

A member of staff slipped on a ‘pseudo path’ where the grass is worn down resulting in a trimalleolar fracture and a dislocated ankle whilst walking from Polwarth to the Suttie café.

2) INJURY ACCIDENTS TO PERSONS OTHER THAN STAFF

There were 46 injury related accidents in the year to students and visitors (43 in 2014/15) representing an increase in actual numbers of 7%. While there is an increase in injuries to undergraduates of 17%, there is a 69% reduction in injuries to postgraduates. 85% of the injuries reported to undergraduates were in the lab environments with 50% due to hazardous substance contact and 35% due to needle stick or cuts due to sharp objects. The breakdown and trend is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (PUBLIC/VISITOR)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was one injury to a member of the public/visitor requiring transportation to hospital for treatment and reported to the Health and Safety Executive as follows:

- At the Suttie centre, a volunteer patient fell while descending the main spiral stairs and during the fall grabbed the handrail and twisted his knee. This resulted in a ruptured tendon in his right knee.
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FUTURE COMPOSITION OF COURT: REVISED PROPOSAL FROM GOVERNANCE AND NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper invites the Court to consider a proposal from the Governance and Nominations Committee for a revised composition of Court. The proposal is for a Court of 25 members, with an independent majority.

1.2 At its last meeting, Court considered a proposal for a Court of 17-20 members. The draft minute of Court’s discussion is attached as Appendix 1. The Court agreed in June:

- That the Senate Assessor members would develop an alternative proposal for a composition of Court and refer this to the Governance and Nominations Committee for consideration by 1 August 2016.
- The Governance and Nominations Committee would consider that proposal, together with any other options it considered appropriate, and make a recommendation to Court by 1 September 2016 by circulation, with the option of ratifying the decision at the October meeting of Court.

1.3 The Governance and Nominations Committee met on two occasions (24 August and 12 September) and has considered a proposal from the Senate Assessors a copy of which is attached to this paper at Appendix 2. The Committee also received and considered a further proposal from a member of Court for a Court of 25 members, retaining four elected General Council Assessors and four Senate Assessors.

1.4 The Governance and Nominations Committee accepted the proposal from the Senate Assessors subject to some modifications related to the wording of the proposal. The proposal approved by the Governance and Nominations Committee for recommendation to Court is for a Court of 25 members as follows:

Non-Independent Members

- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one from the academic staff and one from the non-academic staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Trade Union nominated members of staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Student Members nominated by the Students’ Association (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Four Senate Assessors, consisting of one Senator from each of the three Colleges, and one from the Business School.

Independent Members

- Senior Lay Member (elected as required by the HE Governance Act).
- Twelve independent members appointed by the Court, at least four of whom shall be members of the General Council. Aberdeen City Council and Aberdeenshire Council will be invited to nominate individuals for consideration for appointment to these positions.

1.5 The Committee confirmed that appointments to the positions of independent member would be by open advertisement, with notification of vacancies to the General Council membership who would as at present continue to be a key potential pool of candidates for appointment to Court (with the exception of those members of General Council who were current staff or students and who under current rules were ineligible to stand for election).
1.6 The Committee noted that at present General Council Assessors were, as a result of their election to Court, *ex officio* members of the Business Committee of the General Council. The Committee, therefore, noted that as a consequence of the change in the composition of Court which would cease to have elected General Council Assessors would be that the General Council would need to amend its standing orders with regard to the composition of the Business Committee. The Committee agreed to recommend there be the expectation that at least four of the independent members of Court, being members of the General Council, would also serve as members of the Business Committee of the General Council.

1.7 The Committee agreed that it would be important for Court to continue to proactively encourage nominations from the two local Councils for appointment. The Committee also agreed that there were strong links between the Senior Management of the University and the local Council at elected member and officer level which would be maintained and would ensure the University and the local Councils continued to work effectively in support of the North-East of Scotland.

1.8 **Recommendation:** The Court is invited to:

(i) Approve the proposal for a new composition of Court;
(ii) Agree that the required statutory process of consultation on the proposal and the draft Ordinance with Senate, the Business Committee of the General Council and through public display for eight weeks, is commenced. **Appendix 4**

1.9 Further information is available from Mrs Caroline Inglis, University Secretary or Mr Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Committee, 01224 273949, b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk.

2 **BACKGROUND AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE ACT**

2.1 The Court may find it helpful to note that the Act requires a governing body to include:

- a Rector; (as already provided for under existing legislation for the Scottish Ancients only);
- a “*senior lay member*” appointed in accordance with the election process required by the Act and who may not be a student of, or member of staff of, the University;
- “two persons appointed by being elected by the staff of the institution from among their own number”. The Act allows the governing body to define staff in this context as (i) academic; (ii) support staff; or (iii) all staff ie whether one or two positions are assigned to a particular category of staff. It also permits the governing body to determine the rules governing any election process. It should be noted that while Senate Assessors on Court presently are “academic staff” they are elected by Senate members and not by all academic staff. Furthermore, only Senate members may stand for election as a Senate Assessor. The University’s current processes for electing Senate Assessors does not, therefore, accord with the Act.
- one person appointed by being nominated by a trade union from among the academic staff of the institution who are members of branch of a trade union that has a connection with the institution;
- one person appointed by being nominated by a trade union from among the support staff of the institution who are members of a branch of a trade union that has a connection with the institution;
- two persons appointed by being nominated by a students’ association of the institution from among the students of the institution;
- such other persons as are appointed by virtue of an enactment or in accordance with the governing document of the institution (in Aberdeen’s case the Rector. Note also the Act removes the position of Chancellor’s Assessor from the 1889 Universities Act. It is, therefore, assumed that should Court wish to do so, a proposal to remove the position of Chancellor’s Assessor in any future composition would be accepted by Privy Council).

---

1 For information, members of Senate itself are elected by academic staff within the School that they represent.
3 CURRENT COMPOSITION OF COURT

3.1 The current composition of Court (28 members), in addition to those aspects such as the position of Rector which are required by legislation, is governed by Ordinance. That Ordinance states the composition of Court will be:

(a) the rector;
(b) the principal;
(c) an assessor nominated by the chancellor;
(d) an assessor nominated by the rector;
(e) vice-principals, not exceeding three in number;
(f) an assessor nominated by the Aberdeen City Council who shall be a member of that Council, provided always that no person may serve as such an assessor whilst he/she is a matriculated student of or holds an appointment in the University of Aberdeen;
(g) an assessor nominated by the Aberdeenshire Council who shall be a member of that Council, provided always that no person may serve as such an assessor whilst he/she is a matriculated student of or holds an appointment in the University of Aberdeen.
(h) four assessors elected by the General Council;
(i) six assessors elected by the Senatus Academicus from among those of its members holding appointments in the University of Aberdeen, of whom at least two shall be readers or lecturers;
(j) the President of the Students' Representative Council;
(k) such persons, not exceeding eight in number, of whom not more than one may hold an appointment in the University of Aberdeen, as may be co-opted by the University Court.

3.2 The Court has previously identified the need for its composition to provide for a guaranteed independent majority. At present, the composition of Court does not guarantee such a majority with only 14 members being ‘independent’ and because the Rector, Rector’s Assessor and Chancellor’s Assessor can be students, although in practice an independent majority is usually achieved by one or more of these positions being held by external members.

4 PROCESS FOR AMENDMENT OF COMPOSITION OF COURT

4.1 The Scottish Government has confirmed that, subject to Parliamentary timescales, the provisions of the Act relating to the membership of the governing body will come into force during later 2016/early 2017 with a transitional period of around 4 years from commencement ie late 2020/early 2021. Notwithstanding the fact the Act requires changes to the Court’s composition, the Court will need to seek Privy Council approval for a new Ordinance to both accord with the new requirements of the Act and to make any further changes the Court might wish to make. Under statute, prior to submission to the Privy Council a draft Ordinance must be referred to both the Senate and Business Committee of the General Council for comment and made publicly available for a period of 8 weeks. A draft Ordinance reflecting the proposal for a new composition of Court is enclosed as Appendix 4.

5 SCOTTISH CODE OF GOOD HE GOVERNANCE AND DEFINITION OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER

5.1 Notwithstanding the requirements of the HE Governance Act, the University will continue to be required by the Scottish Funding Council as a condition of grant to adhere to the principles of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. This includes that the governing body should have a majority of independent members and that normally a governing body should not exceed 25 members. The Code defines “independent” as being “both external and independent of the Institution” and in October 2013, Court agreed that the definition of an independent member was someone “who was not employed by the University nor a student of the University.”
6 PROPOSAL

6.1 The proposal is for a Court of 25 members as follows:

Non-Independent Members

- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one from the academic staff and one from the non-academic staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Trade Union nominated members of staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Student Members nominated by the Students’ Association (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Four Senate Assessors, consisting of one Senator from each of the three Colleges, and one from the Business School.

Independent Members

- Senior Lay Member (elected as required by the HE Governance Act).
- Twelve independent members appointed by the Court, at least four of whom shall be members of the General Council. Aberdeen City Council and Aberdeenshire Council will be invited to nominate individuals for consideration for appointment to these positions.

6.2 The implications of the proposal for the current composition of Court are:

- The removal of the position of Chancellor’s Assessor as required by the Act. The Act specifically provides for a Senior Lay Member. The position of Chancellor’s Assessor was peculiar to the Scottish Ancients and not found in most other universities.
- The removal of the position of Rector’s Assessor. The Committee had previously noted the fact that the Act would increase the number of student members to two, and that the Rector’s Assessor could in theory be a student.
- The removal of the three positions for Vice-Principals.
- The removal of the Aberdeen City Council and Aberdeenshire Council Assessor positions but with a requirement that the Court seek nominations from the two Councils for all independent vacancies.
- A reduction in the number of Senate Assessor positions from six to four, to be drawn one from each College and one from the Business School.
- The removal of General Council Assessor positions but with a requirement that a minimum of four independent members appointed by Court are members of the General Council.

6.3 A summary of the proposals considered by Court in June, the proposal received from Senate Assessors, and the proposal recommended here by Governance and Nominations Committee is included in Appendix 3.

7 FURTHER ISSUES: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

7.1 The Governance and Nominations Committee has given initial consideration as to whether the proposals will require any changes to the composition of the Court’s sub-committees. A summary of the Committee’s consideration of the potential changes required is included within the separate report of the Governance and Nominations Committee meeting of 12 September provided in the papers for today’s meeting.
8 NEXT STEPS

8.1 The following next steps require to be undertaken in taking forward a change to the composition of Court:

(i) subject to Court approving the proposal, the draft Ordinance will be shared for informal consultation with the Privy Council, and, as statutorily required, for consultation with the Senate and Business Committee of the General Council prior to approval by Court for formal submission to the Privy Council.

(ii) to develop the transitional arrangements to move from the current to the future composition of Court.

9 RECOMMENDED ACTION

9.1 The Court is invited to:

(i) Approve the proposal for a new composition of Court;
(ii) Agree that the required statutory process of consultation on the proposal and the draft Ordinance with Senate, the Business Committee of the General Council and through public display for eight weeks, is commenced.

10 FURTHER INFORMATION

10.1 Further information is available from Mrs Caroline Inglis, University Secretary or Mr Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Committee, 01224 273949, b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk.

19 September 2016, (Closed – until proposal is approved for further consultation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously considered by</td>
<td>24 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further approval required</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratification of the Proposal by Court for statutory consultation with Senate and Business Committee of General Council.</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Senate and Business Committee</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further approval of a draft Ordinance by Court, subject to Privy Council advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTRACT OF DRAFT MINUTE OF COURT MEETING OF 28 JUNE 2016

FUTURE COMPOSITION OF COURT

262 The Court received a report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) from the Governance and Nominations Committee with a proposal for a revised composition of Court. The proposal sought to build on the guiding principles agreed by Court and specific issues raised by members at its previous meeting of 22 March 2016. The Court noted that the proposal was for a Court of 17 members (rising to 20 only if required) as follows:

Non-Independent Members

- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one from the academic staff and one from the non-academic staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Trade Union nominated members of staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Student Members nominated by the Students' Association (as required by the HE Governance Act)

Independent Members

- Senior Lay Member (elected as required by the HE Governance Act).
- A minimum of eight and not more than eleven Independent Members appointed by the Court at least two of whom shall be graduates of the University and appointed in consultation with representatives of the General Council.

263 The Court also noted that in developing the proposals the Committee had given consideration to the issues raised by Court in March 2016, and that as part of its recommended proposal had included measures intended to address these. In summary these were:

- A requirement that at least two independent members are graduates (and therefore members of General Council) appointed through a panel of the Governance and Nominations Committee including representation from the Business Committee of the General Council and with promotion of the vacancies to alumni.
- The establishment of a formal joint committee composed of Court, Senate and Staff Forum members to ensure there continues to be effective communication between these bodies and involving members of each. This would be in addition to the right of Senate to be consulted on Resolutions and Ordinances and to make representations to Court.
- That Court should have the flexibility to determine where it can benefit through representation from members of the two local Councils and that nominations from them for vacancies should be encouraged. The Committee had, therefore, recommended that the Court agree a protocol requiring it to notify the two local Councils of any vacancies for independent members and that discussions be held with the Councils to agree on any further mechanisms that may be helpful to ensure the University continues to work effectively in partnership with them.

264 The Court also noted a letter of representation from the Business Committee of the General Council expressing their position on the need to retain four elected General Council Assessor positions on Court.

265 There followed an extended discussion, the principal points of which were:

- That the measure proposed of a protocol to ensure the local Councils could nominate members for consideration for appointment by Court and would be routinely notified of vacancies, was a pragmatic way forward while also allowing Court to secure the greater
control over its diversity and skills mix that were principles underpinning the reform of Court’s composition.

- Members expressed differing views on the rationale for and benefits of a reduction in the size of Court to the level proposed of 17 to 20. Some noted significant concern that this would result in the loss of constituencies on Court, such as Senate Assessors, and challenged the benefit to be gained from a smaller Court and whether this reflected the model of most other Scottish universities. Other members expressed concern over the effectiveness of a body of more than 17 members, the limitations that a larger size put on the contribution of members at meetings and noted that many corporate and charitable boards were smaller in size than the model of 17 being proposed. It was suggested that if comparisons with other universities were to be considered they should be with leading universities in the world rather than just Scottish universities.

- Some members noted that they could not support proposals to remove entirely Senate Assessors from the composition of Court and it was suggested that an alternative would be to retain six Senate Assessors in a Court of 25 members. Some members also expressed concern that Court would take an in principle decision before consulting with Senate and argued that this should be done prior to the formal consultation required with Senate on the draft Ordinance which would codify any proposal agreed by Court. Some members also suggested the proposed timeframe for consultation and agreement of proposals should be longer.

- It was suggested that it would have been beneficial to have received an option which set out the minimum changes to the composition of Court that would be required to adhere with the Act.

- Some members also noted that a smaller Court would have implications for the supporting committee structure of Court and the workload of members of Court.

266 The Court agreed:

1) That the Senate Assessor members would develop an alternative proposal for a composition of Court and refer this to the Governance and Nominations Committee for consideration by 1 August 2016.

2) The Governance and Nominations Committee would consider that proposal, together with any other options it considered appropriate, and make a recommendation to Court by 1 September 2016 by circulation, with the option of ratifying the decision at the October meeting of Court.

267 In further discussion, it was suggested that a re-constituted Court should also consider whether the practice of meetings for non-executive members without executive members present should be continued.
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PROPOSAL FROM SENATE ASSESSORS FOR FUTURE COMPOSITION OF COURT

The Governance and Nominations Committee proposed a 17 member court consisting of two academics (an elected member of academic staff, and a trade union nominated academic staff member). This proposal was based on the argument that a small Court is more flexible and agile, and would enable more in-depth discussion and would lead to more informed decision making. However, such a structure weakens the links between Senate and Court; dilutes academic input regarding the governance of the institution; and reduces the diversity of views that Court regularly accesses. Additionally, due to delegation of authority, Operating Board serves as an agile, flexible, small subset of Court. When scrutinising Operating Board decisions, the diversity and richness of expertise available within Court are highly beneficial. Finally, a small Court runs counter to the general trend of University governing bodies around the world (see Appendix A), suggesting that the risks of a small Court have been recognised elsewhere and avoided.

The governing body of the University should not only reflect the diversity of the institution, but also exploit this diversity, requiring representation from the wide range of disciplines that make up its academic staff. This paper proposes that Court retain six members of academic staff, made up of four Senate Assessors, an elected academic and an academic trade union representative.

The presence of six members of academic staff on Court would enable academics from different colleges to represent and provide input based on the college’s constituent Schools, which may include a wide variety of disciplines and academic traditions, and would facilitate improved feedback between Court and the colleges. Critically, by having multiple members from each college, academic input would still be possible when staff are unable to attend due to academic commitments. Finally, it will demonstrate that the University places a great emphasis on the contributions of its staff to governance at the highest level, and gives academics a strong voice in the running of their institution.

Proposed Make-up of Court Non-Independent Members
- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one academic, and one non-academic (while the HE Governance act stipulates at least two elected members of staff, it permits both to be academic or non-academic).
- Two trade union nominated members of staff (as per HE Governance Act), one from academic staff, and one from non-academic staff.
- Two student members nominated by the Students’ association (as per the HE Governance act).
- Four Senate Assessors, consisting of one Senator from each College, and one Senator from the Business School.

Independent Members
- Senior Lay Member (elected as per the HE Governance Act).
- Twelve independent members appointed by Court, four of whom shall be graduates of the University, and appointed in consultation with representatives of the General Council. To foster close links with the City and Shire, we recommend that two of the independent members are appointed in consultation with Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire councils.

Other Committees
These changes may affect the composition of various committees of Court. It is proposed that the Governance and Nomination Committee prepares another paper for Court’s September meeting detailing the composition of these committees taking account of the above proposal for the composition of Court.
Appendix A: Comparisons to Other Institutions
Scottish Ancients, comparable institutions and top institutions (including internationally). Note that non-Scotland institutions have different constraints placed on them, and it is reassuring to see that they are all broadly of the same size/composition, meaning that a shrink to 17, or of the number of senate assessors would be at odds with the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Governing Body Size</th>
<th>Academic or Senate Assessor Equivalents in Governing Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3

### Proposal for Approval:

**Court of 25 Members**

#### Non-Independent Members
- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one from the academic staff and one from the non-academic staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Trade Union nominated members of staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Student Members nominated by the Students’ Association (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Four Senate Assessors, consisting of one Senator from each of the three Colleges, and one from the Business School.

#### Independent Members
- Senior Lay Member (elected as required by the HE Governance Act).
- Twelve independent members appointed by the Court, at least four of whom shall be members of the General Council. Aberdeen City Council and Aberdeenshire Council will be invited to nominate individuals for consideration for appointment to these positions.

### Proposal to Governance and Nominations Committee as drafted by Senate Assessors

**Court of 25 Members**

#### Non-Independent Members
- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one academic, and one non-academic (while the HE Governance act stipulates at least two elected members of staff, it permits both to be academic or non-academic).
- Two trade union nominated members of staff (as per HE Governance Act), one from academic staff, and one from non-academic staff.
- Two student members nominated by the Students’ association (as per the HE Governance act).
- Four Senate Assessors, consisting of one Senator from each College, and one Senator from the Business School.

#### Independent Members
- Senior Lay Member (elected as per the HE Governance Act).
- Twelve independent members appointed by Court, four of whom shall be graduates of the University, and appointed in consultation with representatives of the General Council. To foster close links with the City and Shire, we recommend that two of the independent members are appointed in consultation with Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire councils.

### Proposal considered by Court in June

**Court of 17 Members (rising to 20 only if required)**

#### Non-Independent Members
- Rector
- Principal
- Two elected members of staff, one from the academic staff and one from the non-academic staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Trade Union nominated members of staff (as required by the HE Governance Act)
- Two Student Members nominated by the Students’ Association (as required by the HE Governance Act)

#### Independent Members
- Senior Lay Member (elected as required by the HE Governance Act).
- A minimum of eight and not more than eleven Independent Members appointed by the Court at least two of whom shall be graduates of the University and appointed in consultation with representatives of the General Council.
ORDINANCE of the UNIVERSITY COURT
of the UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
No < > [COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT]
At ABERDEEN the < > day of < >
Two Thousand and Sixteen.

WHEREAS the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, section 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part I, paragraph 1, empowers the University Court to amend the composition, powers and functions of the University Court

AND WHEREAS, the University Court deems it expedient to amend the composition of the University Court as constituted by Section 2 of and Part III of Schedule 1 to the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966 as amended by the University Court Ordinance No 133:

THEREFORE the University Court, in exercise of its powers under Section 3 of, and paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 2 to, the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966 and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf, hereby statutes and ordains:

1. Part III of Schedule 1 to the said Act of 1966 shall be amended so that the composition of the Court shall be as follows:

(a) The Rector;
(b) The Principal;
(c) The Senior Governor appointed in accordance with section 8 of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016;
(d) Two persons appointed by being elected by the staff of the University from among their own number in accordance with section 8 of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016;
(e) A person appointed by being nominated by a trade union from among the academic staff of the University who are members of a branch of a trade union that has a connection with the institution, in accordance with section 8 of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016;
(f) A person appointed by being nominated by a trade union from among the support staff of the University who are members of a branch of a trade union that has a connection with the institution, in accordance with section 8 of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016;
(g) Four Assessors elected by the Senatus Academicus from among those of its members holding appointments in the University of Aberdeen;
(h) The President of the Students’ Association;
(j) A further student representative nominated by the Students’ Association from among the students of the institution;
(k) Such persons, not exceeding twelve in number as may be appointed by the University Court, who will not be members of staff of the University of Aberdeen or a matriculated student, and at least four of which shall be members of the General Council of the University.

2. On the date on which this Ordinance comes into force, University Court Ordinance No.133 (Composition of the University Court) is revoked.

3. This Ordinance shall come into force on the date on which it is approved by Her Majesty in Council.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF these presents are sealed with the Common Seal of the University Court of the University of Aberdeen and subscribed on behalf of the said Court in terms of the Requirements of Writing (Scotland) Act 1995.
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Members of Court will recall that in August the Secretary wrote to all members advising of new information that had been received following the last meeting of Court from the Scottish Government regarding the commencement of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act, in particular its provisions for the appointment and election of Senior Governors. Members of Court were also advised that in light of this new information the Governance and Nominations Committee would consider how the University Court should now progress with the recruitment and appointment of a successor to Sir Moir Lockhead whose current term of office concludes on 31 July 2017 but who had intimated his intention to demit office at the end of 2016. Members were also asked to submit any comments on the proposed approach to the appointment process prior to the meeting of the Committee.

1.2 The Committee met on 24 August 2016 to consider the matter and agreed to recommend to Court that it should progress with an appointment of a successor to Sir Moir as Senior Governor through a process that complies with current governance best practice for higher education as set out in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, which includes the open advertisement of the vacancy and interview of candidates through a committee including staff and student members of Court.

1.3 The Committee discussed the options available to the Court and noted in particular the short timeframe within which the Court would need to take forward a recruitment process to ensure a successor to the current Senior Governor was appointed prior to the end of 2016. In this respect, the Committee was cognisant of the fact that an electoral process, rules and procedures would take a significant degree of time to develop and implement, that at this stage there was no detailed guidance at a sector level or precedent to inform the development of such processes, and that together with the practicalities of the timeframe involved, there was therefore a significant risk of processes not being subject to appropriate consultation and governance in their development or being robust in their delivery and implementation. The Committee was also cognisant that the Court would over the next three years need to transition to a new composition and membership, which represented a major governance change, and that to attempt to effect both changes simultaneously represented a further significant risk. The Committee agreed that for these reasons the level of risk prevented it from recommending to Court that implementing an electoral process was either an appropriate or practical way forward in the circumstances. The Committee confirmed, however, that the Court should make clear in any advertising material and to all applicants that the term of office was limited to a maximum of three years and that the University would in 2019 seek nominations for the position under the electoral process required by the Act.

1.4 The Committee also received a draft role description and person specification for the position of Senior Governor, and a draft advertisement. The Committee suggested some amendments to these and it was agreed the University would also confirm the wording did not run counter to best practice in encouraging diversity of applicants. That diversity review has been undertaken and is noted at section 13. The role description, person specification and draft advertisement are included as appendices to this paper for approval.

1.5 The Court is also asked to give consideration as to whether the University should engage professional recruitment consultants to support the process and promotion of the vacancy.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1.6 The Court is invited to:

(i) Agree that it should progress with the appointment of the next Senior Governor through a process that complied with current governance best practice for higher education as set out in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, which includes the open advertisement of the vacancy and interview of candidates through a committee including staff and student members of Court;
(ii) Approve the proposed role description, person specification and advertisement;
(iii) Consider the use of professional recruitment consultants to support the process.

1.7 Further Information is available from Mrs Caroline Inglis, University Secretary, c.inglis@abdn.ac.uk, tel 01224 272094.

2 COMMENCEMENT OF HE GOVERNANCE ACT AND LEGAL POSITION

2.1 On 30 June 2016 the Scottish Government announced further details regarding the timeframe for the commencement of the Higher Education Governance Scotland) Act (Appendix 1). This advised that it intends the Act to commence during late 2016/early 2017 and that provisions on the membership of the governing body will also come into force at that point but with a transitional period of four years. The update also, however, states that the Act’s provisions for the appointment of Senior Lay Members through an election will not commence until summer 2017 and that provision would be made to ensure there was no disruption to recruitment processes already underway.

2.2 The University and sector had previously expected the provisions regarding Senior Governors might commence in December 2016 or earlier. For that reason, and given the tight timescales and steps necessary to develop and introduce an electoral process prior to the current Senior Governor’s term of office concluding on 31 July 2017, Court, in June, approved that work should commence on introducing appointment and electoral processes to adhere to the requirements of the Act as soon as practicable.

2.3 However, in light of the longer timeframe that has now been announced by the Scottish Government, the University in consultation with its legal advisers and Scottish Government officials has reviewed the position. From those discussions it has been confirmed that under the timeframe for commencement of the Act intended by the Scottish Government the Court, should it so wish, could legally progress with a recruitment and appointment of a Senior Governor under either the current process as set out in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance (compliance with which remains a condition of SFC Funding) provided that process has been concluded prior to that section of the Act coming into force in summer 2017 or through the early adoption of an election process as set out in the Act. As this is substantively different to the context in which the Committee and Court previously considered the implementation of an electoral process, the Committee reviewed the position and considered proceeding with an appointment process which is consistent with the requirements of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance rather than through an electoral process. Members of Court were made aware of the new information in August and invited to submit their views on the approach to recruitment proposed here prior to consideration by the Governance and Nominations Committee.

2.4 If the current process were to be used, the person appointed would be able to serve as Senior Governor for a term of, say three years from which point the University would be required to have a Senior Governor appointed following an election in accordance with the process set out in the Act. This paper proposes that there be a three year term of appointment, with a commitment that an election under the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act for the position would be held early in 2019. This is consistent with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance norm of terms of either three or four years.

3 GUIDANCE ON PROCESS FROM SCOTTISH CODE OF GOOD HE GOVERNANCE

3.1 Main Principle 11 of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance addresses the process to be followed in the appointment of a Chair (or in the case of Aberdeen, the Senior Governor), together with further guidelines on how that principle might be adhered to in practice. An extract of this section of the Code is provided in full in Appendix 2 but the following table sets out its key provisions and how a process at Aberdeen would adhere to these.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Provision</th>
<th>Proposed Approach for Aberdeen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments of the chair, and of members appointed by the governing body, shall be managed by a nominations committee, normally chaired by the chair of the governing body (except where the committee is managing the appointment of the chair’s successor) and which includes at least one appointed staff member (that is a member of the staff of the Institution who has been elected or nominated and as a result serves on the governing body) and one student member of the governing body.</td>
<td>The composition of the Governance and Nominations Committee is fully compliant with these requirements. The Committee discussed whether the composition of the Committee was appropriate to take forward an appointments process including formal interviews. It was agreed that while the Principal would be involved in meeting candidates informally, he would not participate in the formal stages of any appointments process given that the Senior Governor would be responsible for his appraisal. The Committee agreed that as one of its independent members might not be available to participate in meetings and the need for gender balance, to recommend to Court that it co-opt Ms Kathryn McPhail as a member for the duration of the appointments process. The Committee further noted that if any member were to apply for the role he or she would not have any further involvement in the process and other members of Court would be co-opted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When selecting a new chair, a full job specification including a description of the attributes and skills required, an assessment of the time commitment expected and the need for availability at unexpected times shall be produced. In developing such a job description arrangements shall be put in place to consult staff and students before it is finalised.</td>
<td>A role description and person specification are attached for further approval by Court. Through staff and student membership of this committee and Court, there is input to the development of the role and person specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The selection process shall include a formal interview of short-listed candidates.</td>
<td>This will be part of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When vacancies arise in the position of the chair, or in any of the members appointed by the governing body, they shall be widely publicised both within and outside the Institution. In doing so, specific reference should be made to the evaluation referred to at Principle 9 and also to the desirability of ensuring the diversity of the governing body’s membership.</td>
<td>The advertisement will be made available through the website to all staff and students and publicly advertised through appropriate local and national media and other networks. The Committee and Court, by considering the role and skills required for it, has met the requirements of Principle 9. However, the current Skills Matrix of Court is attached (Appendix 5) to help further inform that consideration by Court. The person specification makes clear the Court’s commitment to diversity in its membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline (not Principle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The re-appointment or replacement of the chair of the governing body should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered carefully and in good time during the term of the appointment. There are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variations of practice in the length of term for which the chair is normally appointed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the re-appointment of a chair beyond two terms of four years, or the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent, should be regarded as exceptional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal is for a term of three years which is consistent with the Code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal arrangements should be made, through the appointed staff and student members of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the governing body, to enable the views of staff and students to be taken into account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before the final appointment is made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is considered to mean that staff and student members of the Court should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in the interview process. The composition of the Governance and Nominations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee and Court is consistent with this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 ROLE DESCRIPTION AND PERSON SPECIFICATION

4.1 The Court’s existing role description for the Senior Governor has been reviewed and updated, taking into account the guidance provided in Main Principle 7 and the supporting guidelines of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance (extract attached at Appendix 2).

4.2 This had been reviewed by the Committee and it recommends the Court approve the proposed revised role description and person specification (Appendix 3).

5 DRAFT ADVERTISEMENT AND PROPOSED PROMOTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT/VACANCY

5.1 This had been reviewed by the Committee and it recommends that Court approve the proposed wording of the draft advertisement (Appendix 4).

5.2 The advertisement has been prepared to be consistent with the guidance from the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and, in so far as is possible for a non-electoral process, the requirements for advertisement as set out in the HE Governance (Scotland) Act.

5.3 The following process for promotion of the vacancy will be taken forward subject to Court’s approval:

- Advertisement in at least one national newspaper and one local newspaper.
- Advertisement through the Public Appointments Scotland website (at no cost), Women on Boards website (at no cost) and/or Business Women Scotland and Non-Executive Directors website (at no cost).
- The vacancy will be publicised on the University’s website and through a communication to staff, students and alumni.

6 EQUALITY MONITORING OF APPLICATIONS

6.1 Although not a requirement of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, the HE Governance (Scotland) Act will in future require universities to make public a report on the number of applications received, and so far as permitted by applicants, the characteristics listed in the Equality Act with respect both to applications and applicants invited to interview.
6.2 The Committee agreed that equality monitoring of applications should be undertaken for this and future appointment processes.

7 REMUNERATION

7.1 Although not required by the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, the HE Governance (Scotland) Act will in future require the Court, if requested by the person elected to the role of Senior Governor, to pay such remuneration and allowances as it deems are reasonable and “which are to be commensurate with the nature and amount of work done by the person in the capacity of Senior Lay Member”. As is set out in a separate paper on today’s agenda, the Governance and Nominations Committee recommends that Court adopt a policy of remuneration for this role.

8 CHANCELLOR’S ASSESSOR AND COMPOSITION OF COURT

8.1 The Committee is reminded that currently there is no position within the composition of Court of 28 members specifically for a Senior Governor. This is instead simply a role that one of the independent members of Court is appointed to by Court. Recent practice has been that the Chancellor’s Assessor position on Court has, subject to the agreement of the Chancellor who appoints that individual to Court, been the ‘space’ within the composition of Court to which the Senior Governor is appointed or, if already a member, to which their membership translates.

8.2 As part of the consequential amendments of the HE Governance (Scotland) Act, the position of Chancellor’s Assessor will cease to exist and it is assumed that the Court will have until the end of the four years of transitional arrangements in late 2020/early 2021 to have formally reformed its composition through the Privy Council to include specifically a position of the Senior Governor as well as adhering to the other composition requirements of the Act.

9 PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

- It is suggested there be a period of up to a month during which the vacancy would be advertised.
- Short-listing of applications and formal interviews to be held through the Governance and Nominations Committee which includes student and staff members from Court with this expected to be in mid-late November, with a recommendation to Court’s December meeting.

10 STRATEGIC CONTEXT

10.1 This paper is not directly relevant to any specific targets within the University’s Strategic Plan.

11 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

11.1 This paper makes no request for additional resource. There will be costs of advertising any vacancy in local and national media which will be met from existing budgets.

12 RISK MANAGEMENT

12.1 As the paper outlines, it has been confirmed that it would be legal for the Court to proceed with the appointment of a Senior Governor on the basis set out above. Notwithstanding the legal position there is a risk that the Court might be perceived by some to be seeking to avoid a process of electing the Senior Governor. This could give rise to reputational issues and public/media scrutiny of the Court.
13 **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

13.1 An equality impact assessment of the role description, person specification and advertisement has been undertaken. Adjustments were made to the wording of the person specification and advertisement to mitigate against the risk of indirect bias against women in terms of the experience required and through the proposed use of women specific professional advertising networks. Further text was added to the advertisement emphasising the diversity of the University community.

14 **SUSTAINABILITY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

14.1 There are no issues to note in relation to sustainability and social responsibility.

15 **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

15.1 The Court is invited to:

(i) Agree that it should progress with the appointment of the next Senior Governor through a process that complied with current governance best practice for higher education as set out in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, which includes the open advertisement of the vacancy and interview of candidates through a committee including staff and student members of Court;
(ii) Approve the proposed role description, person specification and advertisement;
(iii) Consider the use of professional recruitment consultants to support the process.

16 **Further Information**

16.1 Further Information is available from Mrs Caroline Inglis, University Secretary, c.inglis@abdn.ac.uk, tel 01224 272094.
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Dear Professor Diamond

Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016

As you may be aware, the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 received Royal Assent on 13 April. The principal objective of the Act is to enable a framework of higher education governance that is more modern, inclusive and accountable, in line with our commitment to a fairer, more inclusive Scotland.

On 25 May my officials met with key sector stakeholders to discuss the proposed implementation plan for the Act. This was with the aim of informing the timeline for implementation to enable as smooth a transition as possible for higher education institutions and their staff and students, as the individual provisions of the Act come into force. Informed by those discussions, it is my intention that, subject to Parliamentary timescales, the Act will be commenced during late 2016/early 2017, with the provision on academic freedom coming into force from day one.

This will be followed by the provisions on the senior lay member of the governing body which will come into force during summer 2017. However, it is also my intention, in relation to these provisions, to make provision to ensure that there is no disruption of any recruitment campaign already underway.

Provisions on the membership of the governing body and composition of an academic board will come into force during late 2016/early 2017, with a transitional period of around 4 years from commencement. This transitional period aims to ensure sufficient time for higher education institutions to amend their current governance instruments in line with the requirements of the Act and to allow for the new requirements to be met avoiding, as far as possible, the need to remove existing members prior to the end of their current tenure.

Shirley Ann Somerville
The Chair

Main Principle – Number 7

The chair shall be responsible for the leadership of the governing body, and be ultimately responsible for its effectiveness. The chair shall ensure the Institution is well connected with its stakeholders, including staff and students.

Supporting Guidelines

The chair is responsible for the leadership of the governing body and ultimately to the stakeholders for its effectiveness. As chair of its meetings he/she should promote its wellbeing and efficient operation, ensuring that its members work together effectively and have confidence in the procedures laid down for the conduct of business.

The chair should take particular care that the governing body observes the principles of public life, and that committees which play a central role in the proper conduct of the governing body’s business report back appropriately. The chair should also ultimately be responsible for ensuring that the governing body operates effectively, discusses those issues which it needs to discuss, and dispatches its responsibilities in a business-like way.

Balancing the authority of the Principal with that of the governing body is critical to effective governance. The chair has a key role in making this work and it is therefore important that members should see the chair as being “independent” in character and judgment.

Through leadership of the governing body, the chair plays a key role in the business of the Institution, but should not be drawn into the day-to-day executive management. For the governing body to be effective there must be a constructive and challenging working relationship between the chair and the Principal. This relationship will depend on the personalities involved, but reports by the National Audit Office have emphasised the need for both sides to recognise that the roles of chair and executive head are formally distinct. The relationship should be mutually supportive, but must also incorporate the checks and balances imposed by the different roles each has within an Institution’s constitution.

Independent members of the governing body should also take care not to become involved in the day-to-day executive management of the Institution. This also applies to the appointed staff and student members of a governing body, except that in the course of their employment or in their activities as students they may have executive responsibilities within the Institution.
The governing body may grant delegated authority to the chair to act on its behalf between meetings. Policy on this matter should be defined in the governing body’s standing orders or equivalent. Action taken under delegated authority will normally consist of business that would not have merited discussion at a governing body meeting (such as the signing of routine documents, and detailed implementation of matters already agreed by the governing body).

Occasionally, matters may arise which are judged too urgent and important to await the next meeting of the governing body. The chair then has the option of calling a special meeting, consulting the members of the governing body by correspondence, or dealing with the matter by chair’s action. The chair should be careful not to take decisions by chair’s action where it is inappropriate to do so, and not to exceed the scope of the delegated authority granted by the governing body. Chair’s action on matters of importance should only be taken where delaying a decision would disadvantage the institution.

The chair is answerable to the governing body for any action taken on its behalf. Where chair’s action is taken, a report should be made to the next meeting of the governing body.

The governing body should appoint one of its independent members to serve as an intermediary for other members who might wish to raise concerns about the conduct of the governing body or the chair. Led by the independent member so appointed, the members of the governing body should meet without the chair present at least annually to appraise the chair’s performance.

**The role of the rector at the four ‘ancient’ universities**

19th century legislation provides that in the case of the Universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Edinburgh the rector who is elected by the students (and, in Edinburgh, by students and staff) should “preside at meetings of the Court”.

Since then, developments in the practice of good governance have led to the need for the much more extensive role of ‘chair’ described in this Code for all of the nineteen HEIs in Scotland.

A distinction therefore needs to be drawn in these four ancient universities between this extensive role of the ‘chair’ (traditionally occupied by the senior lay member, variously called senior governor, vice convener or convener), and the specific role of the rector in presiding at Court meetings.

The rector can, of course, be a candidate for appointment to the role of ‘chair’ as described in this Code. However, in the normal situation where the two roles are fulfilled by different individuals, the exact interpretation of the rector’s role in Court meetings is a matter for agreement by the Court of the individual Institution concerned. That agreement should ensure that the person appointed as
‘chair’ can properly fulfil all of his or her responsibilities. Each Court should set that agreement out clearly in a protocol - whether by way of standing orders or otherwise - and candidates for each post should be made fully aware of this in information supplied to them before their appointment or election.¹

¹ In the University of Dundee the rector is an ex officio member of the Court, but does not automatically preside at meetings of the Court. The Chair of Court is elected from among the members of the Court who are not students or salaried staff of the University.
Members

Main Principle – Number 9

There shall be a balance of skills and experience among members sufficient to enable the governing body to meet its primary responsibilities and to ensure stakeholder confidence. The governing body shall draw up and make public a full evaluation of the balance of skills, attributes and experience required for membership of the governing body, which shall inform the recruitment of independent members of the governing body. The membership of the governing body shall be regularly assessed against this evaluation. The governing body, having due regard to applicable law, shall establish appropriate goals and policies in regard to the balance of its independent members in terms of equality and diversity, and regularly review its performance against those established goals and policies.

Main Principle – Number 10

The governing body shall have a clear majority of independent members, defined as both external and independent of the Institution. A governing body of no more than 25 members represents a benchmark of good practice.

Main Principle – Number 11

Appointments of the chair, and of members appointed by the governing body, shall be managed by a nominations committee, normally chaired by the chair of the governing body (except where the committee is managing the appointment of the chair’s successor) and which includes at least one appointed staff member (that is a member of the staff of the Institution who has been elected or nominated and as a result serves on the governing body) and one student member of the governing body. To ensure rigorous and transparent procedures, the nominations committee shall prepare and publish written descriptions of the role and the capabilities desirable in a new member, based on a full evaluation of the balance of skills and experience of the governing body.

When selecting a new chair, a full job specification including a description of the attributes and skills required, an assessment of the time commitment expected and the need for availability at unexpected times shall be produced. In developing such a job description arrangements shall be put in place to consult staff and students before it is finalised. The selection process shall include a formal interview of short-listed candidates.

When vacancies arise in the position of the chair, or in any of the members appointed by the governing body, they shall be widely publicised both within and outside the Institution. In doing so, specific reference should be made to the evaluation referred to at Principle 9 and also to the desirability of ensuring the diversity of the governing body’s membership.
Supporting Guidelines

Governing bodies shall establish a nominations committee to seek out and recommend the appointment of new independent members to the governing body. Membership of the nominations committee should include the chair of the governing body (who should normally chair it, except where the committee is managing the appointment of the chair’s successor), at least three other independent members, the Principal, at least one appointed staff member and a student member of the governing body.

Vacancies for such independent members should be advertised (including a job specification and a clear indication of the skills, knowledge and experience required) within and outside the institution. Staff and students, as well as members of the governing body, should be invited to submit names to the secretary of the governing body for transmission to the nominations committee. Some institutions co-opt promising candidates for governing body membership onto committees of the governing body to establish the suitability of those concerned for membership of the governing body itself in due course.

In making its recommendations to the governing body, the nominations committee must pay regard to the balance of membership and the needs of the institution, and should keep a ‘skills register’ against which to consider the field of candidates. In addition, the issues of equality and diversity must be addressed, and a regular report should be presented to the governing body on progress made towards achieving previously established goals in regard to a balanced membership, taking account of equality and diversity requirements. Furthermore, the question of inclusion of members of the local community should also be addressed. Particular care should be taken on the appointment of all members to ensure that they understand the need to abide by both the standards expected of them under Main Principle 3 and the values of the Institution. The Equality Challenge Unit offers a range of useful resources including key guidance for governance at: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/governing-bodies-equality-and-diversity.

Continuity of membership is important to an institution, but so is the need for new blood. Independent members should be appointed for a given term, which should be renewable, subject to satisfactory performance. The renewal of any appointment should not be automatic, but should be recommended by the nominations committee as part of its report on filling vacancies – again subject to satisfactory performance. Continuous service beyond three terms of three years, or two terms of four years, is not desirable (although exceptions, such as retention of a particular skill or expertise, may be permitted). After this point members should normally retire and be replaced by new members. Such limits on periods of office should also be observed by those constituencies which elect members to the governing body. Where a member of the governing body is elected to serve as chair of the governing body he/she should automatically begin a new term of membership linked to the office.
The re-appointment or replacement of the chair of the governing body should be considered carefully and in good time during the term of the appointment. There are variations of practice in the length of term for which the chair is normally appointed. However, the re-appointment of a chair beyond two terms of four years, or the equivalent, should be regarded as exceptional. Formal arrangements should be made, through the appointed staff and student members of the governing body, to enable the views of staff and students to be taken into account before the final appointment is made.

An example of exceptional circumstances which might make it appropriate for a chair to remain beyond the recommended maximum term would be where otherwise the chair and the Principal would both leave office within a 12 month period and continuity in the chair was considered highly desirable by the governing body.

Although a number of sectors now remunerate their non-executive directors for their services, in the Higher Education sector normal practice is to pay only such incidental travelling and subsistence expenses or other allowances to members as the governing body may determine. This may include, for example, some compensation for lost income or expenses associated with caring responsibilities. In certain circumstances, however, it may be deemed appropriate to offer remuneration in the recruitment process for an independent member. Before any decision to remunerate is taken, the governing body should consider:

- the provisions of charity law;
- the implications of the decision for the division of responsibilities and overall relationship between the governing body and the executive;
- the public service and philanthropic ethos which applies generally among HE governors; and
- the need to be explicit about time commitment and to apply a formal process of appraisal and performance management to the remunerated governor(s).

Where a decision to remunerate is taken, payments should be commensurate with the duties carried out and shall be reported in the audited statement of accounts. Useful guidance on remuneration of independent members is available from the Committee of University Chairs at www2.bcu.ac.uk/cuc/publications.

Each Institution should publish on its website the wording of its standard letter of appointment for independent members and any individual letters to a chair or other independent member who is to be remunerated.
**Good Practice Examples**

In one university an extensive public campaign was used to recruit a new chair, involving the use of search consultants and an external assessor on the final selection committee.

In another, a skills matrix and person specification was drawn up for new members, and external advertisement was used to seek to ensure an appropriate balance on the governing body taking account of the need for diversity in the membership.
Senior Governor Role Description (Draft - July 2016)

The Senior Governor is responsible for the leadership of Court, for its effectiveness, its conduct and for ensuring the University is well connected with its stakeholders, including its staff and students.

In common with the other Scottish Ancient Universities, the right to preside at meetings of the Court and to exercise a casting vote is reserved to the Rector under statute. The role of the Rector, who is elected by the students of the University, in practice extends beyond these statutory provisions to include an advocacy role in which he or she works closely with the student community. Under the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016, the role of the Senior Governor is, notwithstanding the statutory right of the Rector to ‘preside’, responsible for the leadership and effectiveness of the governing body and ensuring there is an appropriate balance of authority between the Court and the Principal. Further information on how the respective roles of the Rector and the Senior Governor operate in practice are set out in a protocol available at……add weblink

Key Responsibilities

Core Role

- Responsible for the leadership of Court and that the necessary business is carried on efficiently, effectively, and in a manner appropriate for the proper conduct of public business;

- In the absence of the Rector or with his or her agreement, to chair meetings of the Court;

- To ensure the Court exercises efficient and effective use of the resources of the University for the furtherance of its charitable purposes, maintains its long-term financial viability, and safeguards its assets, and that proper mechanisms exist to ensure financial control and for the prevention of fraud;

- To ensure the Court sets the strategic direction of the University, through an effective planning and risk management process, and that the performance of the University is adequately assessed against the objectives approved by the Court;

- To ensure that Court acts in accordance with the instruments of governance of the University and with the University's internal rules and regulations.

Delivery of the Role and Responsibilities

The Senior Governor plays a central role in setting and maintaining excellent standards of governance and ensuring the Court discharges its responsibilities. He or she specifically will:

- Establish a constructive and supportive but challenging working relationship with the Principal while recognising the proper separation between governance and executive management, and avoiding involvement in the day-to-day executive management of the University;

- Act fairly and impartially at all times in the interests of the University as a whole, using independent judgement and maintaining confidentiality as appropriate. Consistent with this the Senior Governor should have no vested interest in the University, including being a member of staff or matriculated student of the University. For the avoidance of doubt, an individual who resigns their position as a member of staff on a temporary basis or suspends their studies as a matriculated student in the University for the period of appointment as Senior Governor with the intention to recommence these thereafter will not normally be considered to be independent or without a vested interest in the University;
• Command the respect of Court and facilitate the conditions for all members to work together effectively, contributing their skills and expertise as appropriate, and will seek to build consensus among them;

• Lead the process of the appointment of the Principal;

• Be responsible for appraisal of the performance of the Principal;

• Secure the recruitment of an effective group of governors;

• Ensure that there is effective evaluation and feedback on the performance of Court, its Committees, and individual governors;

• Ensure that the Court conducts itself in accordance with accepted standards of behaviour in public life, embracing selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership.

In addition, the Senior Governor will play a representative role in the life of the University, including:

• Being a member of the Scottish Committee of University Chairs;
• Generally, representing the University internally and externally with key stakeholders, including attendance at events;
• Using personal networks and influence to advance the cause of higher education generally, and the University of Aberdeen in particular;
• Involvement in the promotion of philanthropic giving.

The time commitment is likely to be some 25 to 30 days per year. It is expected that at least half of this time commitment will involve being available in person in Aberdeen, including attendance in person at a minimum of four meetings of the University Court, two meetings of the Remuneration Committee and three meetings of the Governance & Nominations Committee. While the post-holder does not need to be based in the UK, flexibility in availability and being contactable at short notice when required are expected.

PTO
Person Specification

Essential

- An individual of stature with a distinguished record of successful leadership at a senior level within a large and complex public or private sector organisation, and extensive experience of the legal, financial, business and risk management issues associated with such organisations;
- Experience of chairing board meetings and ensuring the smooth conduct of business;
- Professional experience or knowledge of financial and commercial decision making;
- Experience of leading or monitoring the delivery of large scale organisational change, capital or IT projects;
- Extensive knowledge of corporate governance issues and standards in public life;
- The ability to identify and focus on key strategic and financial issues;
- The ability to evaluate and monitor the performance of the University in a constructively critical manner, whilst mindful of the boundary between governance and management;
- A network of contacts in the business and political communities of Scotland and beyond and an understanding of the environment within which the University operates;
- A commitment to furthering the values of higher education and the mission of University;
- The ability to lead and command the respect and trust of others from a wide variety of backgrounds;
- A highly skilled communicator, with a proven track record of being effective at a senior executive level;
- The ability to establish a challenging but constructive and effective working relationship with the Principal;
- An excellent facilitator, who exercises diplomacy, sensitivity and has the ability to influence outcomes and resolve conflict.

Desirable

- Experience or knowledge of the higher education or charitable sectors;

As a member of Court the Senior Governor is a trustee of the University in its capacity as a charity and will therefore be required to confirm that he or she is not disqualified from serving as a trustee under the Charities and Trustee Investments Act (Scotland) 2005. The Court is committed to supporting the achievement of excellent practice in embedding the principles of Equality and Diversity across all of the University's activities. The Court believes that its own membership should represent the diverse nature of the University community insofar as is possible and practicable. To this end, the Court has agreed that it will seek, without prejudicing the skills and knowledge requirements of the Court, to address the current gender imbalance within its membership and will aim to achieve and maintain female representation of a minimum of 25%, with aspirations to achieve 50% over the longer term. Applications from candidates from all backgrounds would, therefore, be welcome.

To ensure independence, the Senior Governor is not permitted to hold an appointment as a member of staff of the University or to be a matriculated student of the University during their term of office as Senior Governor. For the avoidance of doubt, applications from current members of staff of the University or matriculated students or applicants for study, will not be considered notwithstanding whether they were willing to terminate or suspend their employment or studies.
Appointment of Senior Governor of the University Court

The University of Aberdeen is one of the UK’s oldest and most distinguished universities. Ranked amongst the Top 150 universities in the world, 55th in the world for research performance and in the Top 10 for UK graduate employment, Aberdeen has a diverse and vibrant community of 15,000 students, 3,000 staff and annual turnover in excess of £230million. The University plays a crucial role in shaping the educational, cultural and economic life of an internationally important region of Scotland – and it is committed to building further on its history and international reputation for teaching and research excellence through the delivery of its ambitious new strategy for 2020. This represents an environment of opportunities and challenges, for which the University is seeking to appoint an exceptional individual of stature to serve as its Senior Governor (similar to the ‘Chair’ of other universities) to lead its governing body (the Court) and to support the Principal and Senior Management team in delivering its key strategic objectives.

The preferred candidate will be an individual with a distinguished record of successful leadership at a senior level within a large and complex public or private sector organisation who is keen to support an internationally competitive research based university. The ability to identify key strategic and financial issues, a commitment to the highest standards of governance, and significant experience of chairing meetings and facilitating effective decision making are key. Candidates will have the ability to evaluate and monitor the performance of the University in a constructively critical manner, and be a highly skilled communicator who can represent the University internally and externally, promoting its interests with key stakeholders regionally, nationally and internationally. Time commitment is 25 to 30 days per year with a willingness to be available at short notice. The position is remunerated and appropriate expenses are paid.

The position is tenable for a period of three years, commencing 1 January 2017 and will be appointed by the Court. Applicants should note, however, that following the commencement of new legislation for the governance of universities in Scotland, any reappointment to the position for a second term will be subject to a competitive election by the staff and students of the University that will be held in 2019.

To express an interest in the role, please send a full CV and supporting statement by ADD DATE to Mrs Caroline Inglis, Secretary to the University, King’s College, Aberdeen AB24 3FX or to c.inglis@abdn.ac.uk. Informal enquiries should also be directed to the University Secretary. Applicants will be asked to complete an equality monitoring declaration. Reasonable expenses for attendance at interview will be paid.

For further information visit: add weblink

Promoting Diversity and Equal Opportunities throughout the University
## Skills Register of Court Members 2016

### Experience of strategic issues in a large organisation at either Board or Senior Executive Management Level gained in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill, Experience or Knowledge</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Finance, Audit and Risk Oversight, Investments, and Pensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Property, Constructions and Estates Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Human Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Philanthropic Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Marketing, Public Relations and Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Corporate Governance, Legal and Regulatory Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Oil and Gas Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Higher, Further or Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Experience and/or Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Significant Experience
2=Some Experience
3=Little or no Experience
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
UNIVERSITY COURT

REMUNERATION OF SENIOR GOVERNOR

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper outlines recommendations from the Governance and Nominations Committee regarding the introduction of remuneration for the role of Senior Governor. The recommendations follow consideration by the Committee of issues that the Court will require to address to comply with the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act’s requirements for the remuneration of the Senior Governor.

1.2 The Higher Education Governance Act requires the Court, if requested by the person appointed to the position of Senior Governor, “to pay such remuneration and allowances to the person as the governing body considers to be reasonable (which are to be commensurate with the nature and amount of the work done by the person in the capacity as senior lay member).”

1.3 The Committee noted that there were very few examples of remuneration of Chairs in the UK HE Sector but took into consideration examples of guidance on remuneration for governors/charitable trustees from the Scottish Government’s Guidance on Pay for Non-Departmental Public Bodies, the Further Education Sector, together with guidance on remuneration from the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR).

1.4 In discussion, the Committee agreed that if one of the imperatives behind the legislation was to encourage diversity of applicants, then the Court should offer remuneration of the Senior Governor role as a matter of course rather than compelling candidates to request it. The Committee also felt that remuneration strengthened the rationale for a formal appraisal process and accountability of the Senior Governor to Court. The Committee also agreed that at a future point the Court should also consider the issue of whether all governors were remunerated and to highlight this as part of the Court’s next discussion of its future composition in October.

1.5 Following discussion, the Committee agreed to recommend that Court agree:

1) To offer remuneration as a matter of course at a daily fee rate of £527 in line with Scottish Government guidance for remuneration of Non-Departmental Public Bodies.
2) That as remuneration of the Senior Governor was a requirement of the HE Governance Act, the Remuneration Committee is made responsible for reviewing the level of remuneration on an annual basis. In addition, as the Remuneration Committee is chaired by the Senior Governor consideration should be given to his or her role in that committee as a consequence of the introduction of remuneration of the role.
3) To introduce a more formal appraisal process for the Senior Governor which would be led on behalf of Court by the Senior Independent Governor.

1.6 The paper is for approval.

1.7 Further information is available from Mrs Caroline Inglis, University Secretary, 01224 272094, c.inglis@abdn.ac.uk.
2 LEVEL/RATE OF REMUNERATION

2.1 Up until now remuneration of Senior Governors has not been common practice in the Scottish university sector, with service seen as being voluntary and for the ‘public good’. It has not been the practice, therefore, for universities to set remuneration levels for governors at rates that would be determined by a ‘market’ for the skills and experience required of a Senior Governor. This makes it difficult to make comparisons with practice in other universities regarding the level of remuneration that might be appropriate.

2.2 The Scottish Government justification for the provision in the legislation in this regard was that remuneration would ensure that people from a wide variety of backgrounds would not be deterred from applying and serving as Senior Governors. This is further evidenced by the Scottish Government’s own Pay Policy for Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPB) (their Technical Guide for the 2016-17 Pay Policy for Senior Appointments http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0049/00497166.pdf) which states:

“The main objective in offering remuneration for such posts is to increase diversity. Remuneration may be proposed where it is particularly important for bodies to have representation on their board from as wide and diverse a range of candidates as possible or where there is specific need for Members to be drawn from otherwise under-represented groups.”

Further Education Sector

2.3 The Chairs of Regional Further Education Colleges are Ministerial Appointments and are remunerated. Remuneration day rates vary depending on the size of the College, from £200 for smaller institutions such as Borders College, to £265 for North-East Scotland College, to £300 for the largest colleges such as Edinburgh College. There is, however, an expectation that around 78 days of service per year will be given, meaning the annual level of remuneration ranges from £20k to £34k per annum.

Scottish Government Non-Department Public Body Remuneration Guidance

2.4 The Scottish Government’s Pay Policy sets daily fee rates based on three bands which are linked to the size and complexity to the NDPB. It suggests that fee rates should normally be between the minimum and maximum and only exceeded if it is clear that this is required in order to recruit a Chair with the necessary skills. The Financial Memorandum to the HE Governance Bill, however, cited the Band 1 ceiling level of £527 per day to estimate the cost of paying a Senior Governor. While this is greater than the Band 1 maximum, if the University were to adopt that Band 1 ceiling rate, the cost for 30 days annual time commitment would be circa £15,810 p.a. The other band rates in the Scottish Government Pay Policy are:

“The Chairs and Members Daily Fee Framework for 2016-17 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairs Banding</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Ceiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>£312</td>
<td>£470</td>
<td>£527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>£201</td>
<td>£346</td>
<td>£414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£217</td>
<td>£297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 The Scottish Government also states:

“Where a post is remunerated, it is noted that any remuneration payable is not intended to meet in full the market rate that could be commanded by the individuals concerned.”
2.6 Pension contributions are not usually permitted under Scottish Government Pay Policy on the basis that the individuals are not employees although the Scottish Government states they can be “employees for tax purposes” with payment via payroll and tax deducted at source. It is not clear how the Scottish Government’s guidance reconciles with auto-enrolment pension regulations. While further consideration will be required as to the precise contractual arrangements to be put in place it is understood that an alternative model would be that the individual appointed could be treated as someone who is self-employed and who invoices monthly for services in this regard, thereby avoiding auto-enrolment requirements.

2.7 If the Court were to follow practice set by the Scottish Government it would mean the University was following nationally agreed practice for broadly equivalent roles and would provide a benchmark to review against each year.

2.8 A further specification could be that the University only remunerated to compensate an individual or their employer for any actual loss of earnings incurred in undertaking the role up to the maximum remuneration rate available for the position.

2.9 The Court may wish to note that in contrast with the remuneration requirements of the HE Governance Act, the Scottish Government guidance for NDPBs goes on to suggest that the first question that should be considered is whether there is any need to remunerate and that Scottish Government policy is to reduce the number of public appointees and reduce payments to such appointees.

3 CHARITIES LAW

3.1 The 2005 Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act contains a number of provisions and tests which have to be considered and met by a charity before making payments or remuneration to trustees or persons connected with the charity. It specifies that remuneration of a trustee is permissible but only in certain circumstances. Compliance with legislation however, in this case the HE Governance Act, would appear to meet directly one of the ‘exceptions’ where remuneration is legal:

3.2 The Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) guidance states:

“The 2005 Act states that remuneration of charity trustees may be any direct or indirect payment or benefit, including a benefit in kind. It can be for:

- being a charity trustee
- a contract of employment
- for other services to or on behalf of the charity.

Charity trustees must act in the interest of their charity and any personal benefit, whether direct or indirect, must be treated with caution. Section 67 of the 2005 Act states that a charity trustee must not be remunerated from charity assets unless certain conditions are met.

The conditions which allow remuneration are:

- the maximum amount of the remuneration is set out in a written agreement
- the maximum amount of the remuneration is reasonable in the circumstances
- the charity trustees are satisfied, before entering the agreement, that it is in the interest of the charity for that person to provide those services for that amount
- immediately after entering into the agreement, less than half of the total number of charity trustees are directly or indirectly remunerated
- the charity’s governing document does not prohibit the remuneration of charity trustees.

There are some exceptions to meeting the above remuneration conditions”.
These being:

“These rules for paying charity trustees and connected persons do not apply if:

- there is a provision authorising payment of the charity trustees (and/or connected persons) in the charity’s governing document and this was in force on or before the 15 November 2004.
- there is legislation or an order made by the Court of Session that allows charity trustees (or connected persons) to receive payment.

3.3 The final bullet point above would apply to the University under the HE Governance Act.

4 SECTOR GUIDANCE

4.1 Both OSCR (as referred to in section 3) and the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance provide guidance on remuneration of trustees/governors and on issues which the Governance and Nominations Committee considered. Relevant extracts from that guidance are attached but the Court should note that the Scottish Code Guidance was written in a different context where remuneration would be unusual and before the HE Governance Act required it to be provided to Senior Governors if requested. The Code is under review this year and the guidance may, therefore, change particularly given the implications of the HE Governance Act.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Remuneration of the Senior Governor will be new expenditure by the University. The level of cost will depend on the rate of remuneration agreed but as noted in the paper above this could be of the level of at least circa £15k per annum.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 There is a potential reputational risk should the Court be deemed to be making excessive payments to the Senior Governor or that the decision making process for setting that remuneration is unduly influenced by the Senior Governor. This should be mitigated, however, both by setting a level of remuneration that is appropriate for the role and that can be demonstrated as such, and by having clear decision making processes in place and separation of powers.

7 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 A preliminary Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken and shows that remuneration would be a positive impact towards increasing the diversity of the pool of potential candidates. The Assessment will be further reviewed by the Advisory Group on Equality and Diversity.

8 SUSTAINABILITY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

8.1 No issues of sustainability and social responsibility have been identified.

9 RECOMMENDED ACTION

9.1 Following discussion, the Committee agreed to recommend that Court agree:

1) To offer remuneration as a matter of course at a daily fee rate of £527 in line with Scottish Government guidance for remuneration of Non-Departmental Public Bodies.
2) That as remuneration of the Senior Governor was a requirement of the HE Governance Act, the Remuneration Committee is made responsible for reviewing the level of remuneration on an annual basis. In addition, as the Remuneration Committee is chaired by the Senior Governor consideration should be given to his or her role in that committee as a consequence of the introduction of remuneration of their role.
3) To introduce a more formal appraisal process for the Senior Governor which would be led on behalf of Court by the Senior Independent Governor.
10 **FURTHER INFORMATION**

10.1 Further information is available from Mrs Caroline Inglis, University Secretary, 01224 272094, c.inglis@abdn.ac.uk.

Mr Bruce Purdon  
Clerk to the Governance & Nominations Committee  
14 Sep 2016 (V2) (Open)
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<td>Further approval required</td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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EXTRACTS FROM SECTOR GUIDANCE ON REMUNERATION

1) OSCR GUIDANCE ON REMUNERATION

“What is a reasonable amount?

What is reasonable will depend on the circumstances. The important thing is that whatever the decision is, the interests of the charity come first and you can demonstrate that.

The process for deciding the level of payment must be open and transparent and must not involve the charity trustee who is to receive payment or is connected to the person who will.

If the payment appears to be excessive, there may have been a breach of charity trustee duties, which would be misconduct.”

Good practice

• have a payment policy that makes sure any payments to charity trustees and/or connected people complies with the conditions set out in the 2005 Act
• establish a register of charity trustees’ interests
• obtain at least two separate quotes for services
• clearly minute the decision that paying a particular charity trustee or a person connected to them for services is in the charity’s interest.

If you are not sure if a charity trustee, or connected person, can be paid for services you should get professional advice.

What else do you need to know about making payments?

If you are thinking about employing a charity trustee or connected person, you must make sure that:

• there is a genuine need for a paid position or for the services to be provided
• as charity trustees, you assess any potential risks, manage any conflicts of interest and are open and transparent about the decision
• any charity trustee who has a conflict of interest is not involved in the decision
• no one individual takes a decision about employment on their own
• any payments to charity trustees are declared in the annual accounts.

We have particular concerns where the charity trustees of a charity are the people benefiting from it as private individuals, or where those benefiting most are people connected with the charity trustees such as family members or companies in which the charity trustees have an interest.

Where there is such private benefit we may need to consider whether it causes the charity to fail the charity test. This is the legal test as to whether or not your organisation can be, or remain, a charity.
2) SCOTTISH CODE OF GOOD HE GOVERNANCE: GUIDELINES TO PRINCIPLES 9-11

“Although a number of sectors now remunerate their non-executive directors for their services, in the Higher Education sector normal practice is to pay only such incidental travelling and subsistence expenses or other allowances to members as the governing body may determine.

This may include, for example, some compensation for lost income or expenses associated with caring responsibilities. In certain circumstances, however, it may be deemed appropriate to offer remuneration in the recruitment process for an independent member.

Before any decision to remunerate is taken, the governing body should consider:

• the provisions of charity law;
• the implications of the decision for the division of responsibilities and overall relationship between the governing body and the executive;
• the public service and philanthropic ethos which applies generally among HE governors; and
• the need to be explicit about time commitment and to apply a formal process of appraisal and performance management to the remunerated governor(s).

Where a decision to remunerate is taken, payments should be commensurate with the duties carried out and shall be reported in the audited statement of accounts.”

Ends
1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 With effect from the year ended 31 July 2016, the University is required to present its financial statements under FRS 102 (new UK GAAP), in line with all higher education entities reporting under the new Statement of Recommended Practice: Accounting for Further and Higher Education (the SORP). The 2014/15 financial statements must be restated for comparative purposes.

1.2 The revised accounting standards change the layout of the primary financial statements, and introduce a number of fundamental changes to accounting treatment. At the June Court, the Audit Committee’s recommended changes to income recognition and fixed asset accounting policies were approved, all other changes were statutory and must be implemented by the University.

1.3 The existing primary financial statements will be replaced as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Statement</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Expenditure Account</td>
<td>Statement of Comprehensive Income</td>
<td>The statement combines the previous Income &amp; Expenditure Account and Statement of Total Recognised Gains and Losses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Total Recognised Gains &amp; Losses</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>This statement has been combined with the Income &amp; Expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Statement of Changes in Reserves</td>
<td>Adopted to demonstrate the movement between reserve categories with the revised Balance Sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td>Statement of Financial Position or Balance Sheet</td>
<td>The presentation of the Balance Sheet remains similar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 The paper presents the University’s restated financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2015 that report a deficit of £14.964m and a reconciliation to the £3.273m historical cost surplus reported under previous accounting regulations. There are a number of assumptions to be finalised with our external auditors but these are not expected to have a material effect on the restated figures.

1.5 It must be noted that although the reported deficit is considerably worse than the previous figure, this is mainly due to the statutory inclusion of the USS pension liability and presentational changes such as the removal of the release from the revaluation reserve. These changes do not impact upon the University’s cash holdings or liquidity.

**Recommendations**

1.6 Based on the impact analysis of the items discussed below, the following recommendations have been made and the Court is invited to:

- Note the changes to the 1 August 2014 balance sheet and the 2014/15 financial statements, necessary due to the implementation of FRS102 and the new Further and Higher Education SORP.
- Note that management will continue to develop monthly management reports in line with the move to FRS102.
- Note that the University has developed the OneSource finance system in order to prepare the 2015/16 financial statements.
- Note that the University will undertake training sessions and provide guidance on the impact of FRS102 for Court, Operating Board and the Senior Management Team.
2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1 The first annual financial statements under the new accounting regime will be for the year ended 31 July 2016 with results for the year and the comparative year presented under the SORP 2015 which is based on FRS 102. The University is required to make an explicit and unreserved statement in its first set of financial statements of compliance with the SORP. The date for transition is 1 August 2014, this being the start of the earliest period of comparative information. It is therefore necessary to have a transition balance sheet as at 1 August 2014.

2.2 The Audit Committee has selected its recommended revised accounting policies and the 2014 balance sheet and 2014/15 financial statements have been restated based on the policy choices and other changes implemented by FRS102. The changes are summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Accounting Treatment Change</th>
<th>Statutory/Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) liability on the balance sheet</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment for other Pension Schemes</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Pay Accrual</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Recognition - Treatment of Exchange Transactions</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Recognition - Treatment of Non-exchange Transactions</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasing &amp; Service Concessions</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Recognition Treatment of Revenue Government Grants – Accruals method selected</td>
<td>Policy Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Capital Government Grants - Accruals method selected</td>
<td>Policy Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for Fixed Assets – moved from revaluation model to deemed cost with no further revaluation.</td>
<td>Policy Choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 The transition to the revised financial standards will be addressed in the relevant reports to Audit Committee outlined in the following timetable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Report Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPMG engaged to support FRS 102 transition</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS102 Gap Analysis and action plan produced</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial training for key Finance section staff</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Audit Committee Training</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial draft report outlining the main changes resulting from the new methods of FRS 102 implementation</td>
<td>Complete - October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify owners for action plan task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information session for Finance and Research &amp; Innovation staff</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact analysis for key risk areas (income recognition, holiday accrual and pension provision).</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Audit Committee with invitation to recommend revised accounting policies.</td>
<td>April 2015 (Report 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of new accounting policies</td>
<td>January 2016 (Report 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written accounting policies completed.</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation and delivery of appropriate training plans for Audit Committee, Court, Operating Board, Senior Management and Finance and other relevant team sections.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of all income streams for August 2014 Balance Sheet restatement.</td>
<td>Complete – subject to external audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of new written accounting policies, restatement of August 2014 Balance Sheet and presentation of restated 2014/15 Financial Statements incorporating all policy changes (USS deficit recognition, holiday accrual etc.).</td>
<td>April 2016 (Report 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of 2015/16 Financial Statements under FRS102</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **STRATEGIC CONTEXT**

3.1 The new accounting treatment is a statutory requirement and must be adopted by the University. The choice of accounting policies has an impact on the University’s annual financial results and on the comparability of the University with other similar institutions.

4. **IMPACT OF CHANGES IN ACCOUNTING POLICIES**

The implementation of FRS 102 has led to key changes in the presentation of the University’s Financial Statements. The movements in the restated transition date balance sheet as at 1 August 2014 is shown in Appendix 1 and the revised financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2015 are shown in Appendix 2.

The adjustments to the restated balance sheet at 1 August 2014 shown at 4.1 below have resulted in a reduction in net assets of £106.1m, this is predominantly presentational due to the transfer of government funded capital grants to deferred income as required following the selection of the accruals model for income recognition. The other significant movements are the recognition of non-government capital grants in Income & Expenditure reserves (£32.7m), the USS pension liability (£15.3m), the transfer of the negative goodwill arising on the acquisition of the Rowett Research Ltd from fixed assets to the income and expenditure reserve (£11m) and the initial holiday pay accrual adjustment (£4.8m).

4.1. **Transitional Balance Sheet Date – 1 August 2014**

4.1.1 The initial transfers at the transition date have a significant effect on the balance sheet and reduce the value of net assets by £106.1m. The summarised changes to the balance sheet at the transition date of 1 August 2014 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance Sheet – 1 August 2014</th>
<th>Old SORP £000</th>
<th>Restatement £000</th>
<th>New SORP £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>566,704</td>
<td>44,412</td>
<td>611,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Assets</td>
<td>35,024</td>
<td>(35,024)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets</td>
<td>50,733</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>52,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Liabilities</td>
<td>(55,705)</td>
<td>(9,149)</td>
<td>(64,854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Current Liabilities</td>
<td>(4,972)</td>
<td>(7,524)</td>
<td>(12,496)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Liabilities</td>
<td>(65,657)</td>
<td>(94,736)</td>
<td>(160,393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>(31,465)</td>
<td>(15,271)</td>
<td>(46,736)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>499,634</strong></td>
<td><strong>(108,143)</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,491</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Capital Grants</td>
<td>131,736</td>
<td>(131,736)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>35,024</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Expenditure Reserves</td>
<td>92,759</td>
<td>23,650</td>
<td>116,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaluation Reserve</td>
<td>240,115</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>240,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserves</strong></td>
<td><strong>499,634</strong></td>
<td><strong>(108,143)</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,491</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 The significant changes are

---
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• Transfer of deferred capital grant balances to Income & Expenditure reserves of £32.7m reflecting the change in treatment of non-government capital grants.
• An increase to Income & Expenditure reserves of £11m due to the recognition of the negative goodwill from the acquisition of the Rowett Research Institute Ltd.
• The transfer of government funded capital grants to long term liabilities (£94.7m) and current liabilities (£4.3m) as a result of selecting the accruals method of income recognition.
• An increase in provisions to account for the initial USS pension liability of £15.3m.
• An increase to current liabilities of £4.8m to account for the opening holiday accrual.
• A subsequent reduction to the Income & Expenditure reserves of £20.1m in respect of the USS liability (£15.3m) and holiday pay accrual (£4.8m).
• Overall the changes result in a reduction of net assets of £108.1m, largely due to the change in classification of deferred capital grants and the recognition of the USS pension liability.

4.1.3 The changes to the 1 August 2014 balance sheet also have a knock on effect to the restated 31 July 2015 balance sheet (Appendix 2), as do the transactions detailed in the restatement of the 2014/15 reported deficit.

4.2. Restated Financial Statements – Financial Year 2014-15

4.2.1 The restated financial statements result in a significant adverse change to the reported surplus/(deficit) figure with the original historic cost surplus of £3.273m being replaced with an overall deficit for the year of £14.964m. The difference in the reported deficit is due a number of changes, including some presentational changes as follows:

• The removal of the release from revaluation reserve from the Income & Expenditure account to the new Statement of Changes in Reserves
• The inclusion of items such as the unrealised gains on investments and assets, and the actuarial loss on pension schemes previously reported in the now obsolete Statement of Total Recognised Gains and losses
• The first time inclusion of the movement on the USS pension liability as well as the timing of the triennial USS valuation.

4.2.2 The restated deficit of £14.964m can be reconciled to the original historical cost surplus of £3.273m as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£000</th>
<th>£000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Cost Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously via STRGL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaluation of Investment Properties</td>
<td>(178)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaluation of Investment &amp; Endowments</td>
<td>4,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial Loss in Respect of Pension Schemes</td>
<td>(2,578)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Endowments Received</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Items/Changes to Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to USS Pension Liability</td>
<td>(13,252)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement in Holiday Accrual</td>
<td>(167)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of Negative Goodwill Release</td>
<td>(307)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of Deferred Capital Grants Released</td>
<td>(1,959)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grants Received</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>(14,532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items moved to Reserve Statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release from Revaluation Reserves</td>
<td>(5,779)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Comprehensive Income for the Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14,964)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 It is worth noting that whilst the University’s financial position looks significantly worse, both in terms of financial strength in the balance sheet and the annual reported surplus/(deficit) figure, many of the changes are presentational and there is no change to the University’s liquidity. The cash balances remain unchanged, despite a restatement due to changes in definitions for cash holdings and endowments. Management must now concentrate on developing a meaningful reporting system in to accurately reflect operational activity and financial strength, for example with a focus on Earnings before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation & Amortisation (EBITDA) that exclude exceptional and non-controllable movements such as the changes in pension liabilities and investment values.

4.2.4 Given the changes to accounting policies and the impact on the reported surplus/deficit due to the implementation of FRS102, guidance and training is required for Court members, Operating Board and the Senior Management Team. This will now be undertaken as the University has recommended accounting policies and the impact of these and the other statutory changes has been modelled.

4.3. Analysis of Impact

4.3.1 The above analysis concentrates on the financial and presentational aspects of the transition however there are wider implications to consider:

- **Management Accounting and Performance Measurement**
  The revised financial statements, especially the Statement of Comprehensive Income, will be more volatile due to the inclusion of investment revaluation and pension provision movements on the face of the accounts and the treatment of non-exchange transactions.

- **Comparability**
  As Universities have the ability to select different accounting policies for income recognition for both revenue and capital government grants and the revaluation of fixed assets, the comparison of annual financial results will become less meaningful.

- **Bank Covenants**
  The University loan facility is dependent on meeting certain financial covenants. Discussions with Barclays will be undertaken to ensure that the University addresses any consequences of FRS 102 in relation to covenants. The calculation of these figures will change significantly due to the accounting changes. Discussion with our lenders will be necessary to reach agreement on recalculation of the figures in order to protect existing borrowing rates.

- **Communications and External User of Financial Statements**
  The University must consider how to manage communication of year-on-year financial results. The changes to the financial statements will lead to volatility in results, with the potential for considerable surpluses on recognition of capital grants, to potentially large deficits with changes to pension provisions.

5. **Resource Implications**

5.1 Compliance with FRS102 will be largely undertaken by the existing finance section, with support from other relevant parts of the University and professional advice as required. The more material changes are disclosure and perception only.

6. **Recommended Action**

6.1 The Court is invited to:

- Note the changes to the 1 August 2014 balance sheet and the 2014/15 financial statements, necessary due to the implementation of FRS102 and the new Further and Higher Education SORP.
- Note that management will continue to develop monthly management reports in line with the move to FRS102.
• Note that the University has developed the OneSource finance system in order to prepare the 2015/16 financial statements.
• Note that the University will undertake training sessions and provide guidance on the impact of FRS102 for Court, Operating Board and the Senior Management Team.

7. FURTHER INFORMATION

7.1 Further information is available from David Beattie david.beattie@abdn.ac.uk or Craig Sherrit c.a.sherrit@abdn.ac.uk
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### Appendix 1 – Restated Balance Sheet – August 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old SORP £000</th>
<th>Endowment Assets £000</th>
<th>Negative Goodwill £000</th>
<th>Deferred Capital Grants £000</th>
<th>Pension Liabilities £000</th>
<th>Holiday Accrual £000</th>
<th>New SORP £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td>566,704</td>
<td>33,399</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>611,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment Assets</strong></td>
<td>35,024</td>
<td>(35,024)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>50,733</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>(55,705)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,308)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,840)</td>
<td>(64,853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>(4,972)</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,308)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,840)</td>
<td>(12,495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>(65,657)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(94,736)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(160,393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisions</strong></td>
<td>(31,465)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(15,271)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(46,736)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>499,634</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>(99,044)</td>
<td>(15,271)</td>
<td>(4,840)</td>
<td>391,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Capital Grants</td>
<td>131,736</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(131,736)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>35,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Expenditure Reserves</td>
<td>92,759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>32,692</td>
<td>(15,271)</td>
<td>(4,840)</td>
<td>116,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaluation Reserve</td>
<td>240,115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserves</strong></td>
<td>499,634</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>(99,044)</td>
<td>(15,271)</td>
<td>(4,840)</td>
<td>391,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consolidated Statement of Comprehensive Income and Expenditure
Year ended 31 July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body grants</td>
<td>80,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition fees and educational contracts</td>
<td>47,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research grants and contracts</td>
<td>62,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>41,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income before endowments and donations</strong></td>
<td><strong>232,712</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments and donations</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Share of income from joint venture</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3,150)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td><strong>230,612</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>156,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental restructuring costs</td>
<td>3,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>71,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>18,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and other finance costs</td>
<td>3,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>252,789</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Deficit)/surplus before other gain/(losses) and share of operating surplus/(deficit) of joint ventures</strong></td>
<td><strong>(22,177)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/(loss) on disposal of fixed assets</td>
<td>4,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/(loss) on disposal of non-current investments</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/(loss) on investment</td>
<td>4,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of operational surplus/(deficit) in joint venture</td>
<td>(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/Deficit before tax</strong></td>
<td><strong>(13,172)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>(568)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit) for the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>(13,740)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealised surplus on revaluation of fixed assets</td>
<td>(178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial gain in respect of pension schemes</td>
<td>(1,046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total comprehensive income for the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>(14,964)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment comprehensive income for the year</td>
<td>2,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted comprehensive income for the year</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted comprehensive income for the year</td>
<td><strong>(17,934)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(14,964)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Restated Financial Statements - 31 July 2015 continued

Consolidated and University Statement of Changes in Reserves
Year ended 31 July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income and expenditure account</th>
<th>Revaluation reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Restricted</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unrestricted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 1 August 2014</td>
<td>35,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) from the income and expenditure statement</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16,710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comprehensive income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers between revaluation and income and expenditure reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of restricted funds spent in year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comprehensive income for the year</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(12,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 31 July 2015</td>
<td>37,994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income and expenditure account</th>
<th>Revaluation reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Restricted</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unrestricted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 1 August 2014</td>
<td>35,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) from the income and expenditure statement</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(13,050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comprehensive income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers between revaluation and income and expenditure reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of restricted funds spent in year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comprehensive income for the year</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(8,470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 31 July 2015</td>
<td>37,994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Restated Financial Statements - 31 July 2015 continued

Balance Sheets
as at 31 July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consolidated 2015 £000</th>
<th>University 2015 £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>571,822</td>
<td>556,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Assets</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>43,555</td>
<td>53,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in joint venture:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of gross assets</td>
<td>20,478</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of gross liabilities</td>
<td>(9,815)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>626,317</td>
<td>610,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other receivables</td>
<td>38,183</td>
<td>38,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>1,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>7,401</td>
<td>5,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>47,229</td>
<td>45,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Creditors: amounts falling due within one year</td>
<td>67,270</td>
<td>67,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>(20,041)</td>
<td>(21,634)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets less current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>606,276</td>
<td>588,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Creditors: amounts falling due after more than one year</td>
<td>(167,134)</td>
<td>(167,134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension provisions</td>
<td>(62,556)</td>
<td>(62,556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other provisions</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net assets</strong></td>
<td>376,526</td>
<td>359,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Restricted Reserves**
Income and expenditure reserve - endowment reserve 37,994 37,994
Income and expenditure reserve - restricted reserve 0 0

**Unrestricted Reserves**
Income and expenditure account 104,197 92,859
Revaluation reserve 234,335 228,266
**Total net assets** 376,526 359,119
REPORT FROM THE OPERATING BOARD

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report summarises items considered at the meeting of the Operating Board held on 12 September 2016, including:

- University Health, Safety and Wellbeing Policy;
- Financial Planning: Draft Outturn 2015/16
- Student Recruitment Update;
- Updates on Progress towards the Strategic Plan objectives in respect of:
  - People
  - Learning and Teaching
  - Research
  - Internationalisation
- Report from the Capital Programme Management Committee;
- Progress of the OneSource project.

1.2 The following items were also presented to the Board and papers on these matters are included elsewhere on today’s agenda along with a summary of the Board’s discussion of these:

- Health and Safety:
  - Update on Accidents and Incidents;
  - Annual Health and Safety Report;

1.3 All the papers referred to in the report are available on request from the Clerk to the Operating Board.

1.4 Court is invited to note the items discussed by the Operating Board at its recent meetings.

1.5 Further information is available from Mrs Ruth MacLure, Clerk to the Operating Board (telephone 01224 273239; email r.m.maclure@abdn.ac.uk).

HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING

2. UNIVERSITY HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING POLICY

2.1 The Board received an updated University Health, Safety and Wellbeing Policy (OB16:03).

2.2 The Board noted that while the University was required to have a policy on Health and Safety, there was no such requirement for “Wellbeing”.

2.3 The Board noted that the Policy was to be subject to some stylistic amendments, following its recent consideration at the Partnership and Negotiating Consultative Committee (PNCC).

2.4 The Board noted the soft launch of the “Critical Arc” application, which allowed users to trigger an electronic “panic button” when they considered their safety to be compromised on campus, for example when working alone at night. The technology had the capability to be used more widely. The Board noted work in progress to develop guidance on working overseas.
2.5 The Board also noted the development of appropriate measures to assess progress towards an improved culture of “wellbeing”. While this was agreed to be more subjective, one such indicator might be the level of absence by staff and students due to sickness or mental ill-health.

2.6 Subject to the amendments proposed by PNCC, the Operating Board for its part, agreed to recommend to Court approval of the Policy. This is enclosed as a separate item on today’s agenda.

FINANCIAL PLANNING

3. DRAFT OUTTURN YEAR ENDED 31 JULY 2016


3.2 The Board noted that the draft outturn was subject to External Audit review and final adjustment for pension valuations. The University was reporting a £6m underlying surplus, but the combined impact of adjustments due to accounting standard FRS 102 and Exceptional Items resulted in a deficit of £7.34m.

3.3 The Board noted the University's intention to invest part of the reported surplus in projects to improve the long term sustainability of the institution, with £1m earmarked to support projects to improve income generation.

3.4 Noting that actuarial valuations were not yet complete, the Board agreed to receive a paper on Pensions at a future meeting.

STUDENT RECRUITMENT

4. UPDATE ON STUDENT ADMISSIONS

4.1 The Board received updates on admission statistics for September 2016 and the recruitment cycle for 2017/18 (OB16:06).

4.2 The following key points were noted:
   - Fundable (Home fees) undergraduate: The University would be ahead of target.
   - Non-fundable (rUK and international): Undergraduate numbers for the rest of the United Kingdom (rUK) were likely to be slightly behind the target of 250 for non-controlled subjects but had improved. International numbers were broadly on target.
   - PGT Home numbers were down and the University continued to experience a higher number of PGT international applicants who lacked funding. However, there were positive trends in particular markets, which the University sought to build upon in future.

4.3 The Board noted that the conversion rate of offers to acceptances was similar to previous years. The Board noted particular success in the recruitment of rUK students through Clearing, in a competitive market. Additional support was in place to ensure the retention of students whose first choice might not have been Aberdeen.

4.4 The Board noted that while there were early indications of a budget shortfall, this was being managed.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

5. PEOPLE UPDATE

5.1 The Board received a paper providing an update on key activities aligned to achievement of the “People” goals within the University’s Strategic Plan (OB16:10)
5.2 Professor Margaret Ross, the Vice Principal for People Strategy, was in attendance to respond to any questions on the report from members of the Board.

5.3 Professor Ross highlighted ongoing work to address issues around the mental health and wellbeing of staff and students. The Board noted that the referral route for staff counselling had been changed and services were now accessed via the Occupational Health Service.

5.4 The Board was pleased to note the recent award of Athena SWAN Bronze to the School of Psychology. The Board noted that the School of Engineering was working to address the points raised in feedback on its unsuccessful appeal.

6 LEARNING AND TEACHING UPDATE

6.1 The Board received an update on key activities aligned to achievement of Learning and Teaching goals in the Strategic Plan 2015-20 (OB16:12)

6.2 Professor Peter McGeorge was in attendance to respond to any questions on the report from members of the Board.

6.3 The Board welcomed the development of Digitally Enhanced Learning Spaces (DELS) and the potential to further develop online course provision.

6.4 The Board discussed statistics around student dropout rates and noted that improved support arrangements were now in place to address the wide range of issues that impact upon retention.

7 RESEARCH UPDATE

7.1 The Board received a paper providing an update on key activities aligned to achievement of the Research strand of the Strategic Plan (OB16:11)

7.2 Dr Elizabeth Rattray, Acting Director of Research and Innovation, was in attendance to respond to any questions on the report from members of the Board.

7.3 The Board noted in particular the development of a Grant Academy, to be led by the Vice Principal for Research. The success of the initiative would be measured through a variety of mechanisms, including the increased volume, value and success of research grant applications.

8 INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY UPDATE

8.1 The Board received an update on an update on the Internationalisation Strategy, in particular developments in transnational education (OB16:04).

8.2 Professor Alfred Akisanya, Dean for Sub-Saharan Africa, was in attendance to represent Professor John Paterson, Vice Principal for Internationalisation, who was currently overseas on University business.

8.3 Professor Akisanya reported on the main challenges facing international student recruitment, including the impact of the recent fall in oil prices and the United Kingdom vote to leave the European Union. The Board noted the benefits emerging from the Project 500 initiative, including the bringing together of Schools to direct resources in a coordinated manner.

8.4 The Board agreed the importance of transnational education (TNE) to the University’s future International profile and income stream and urged the University to take a strategic approach to its geographical foci.
8.5 The Board noted ongoing work to operationalise the University’s campus in Korea, following its formal approval and registration by the Korean authorities on 26 August. The campus was due to open to students in March 2017 and members of the Board advised taking an energetic approach to marketing in the region.

8.6 The Board noted the University’s participation in an as yet unnamed network with eight other Universities, based on the quality of their research and teaching.

PROJECT UPDATES

9. CAPITAL PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

9.1 The Board received and considered a report from the Capital Programme Management Committee (CPMC) (OB16:14).

9.2 The Board noted that work was underway to develop a sustainable funding model for consideration by Court in December, to support projects in the Capital Programme which could demonstrate and deliver a clear return on investment.

10. ONESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

10.1 The Board received and considered an update on progress of the OneSource projects (OB16:15).

10.2 The Board noted functionality issues with the HR / Payroll project which had delayed essential testing of the system through two “parallel runs” of the payroll. The Board agreed the importance of ensuring robust systems and processes were in place before going live and acknowledged that delay was not unusual in such transitions.

11. RECOMMENDED ACTION

11.1 Court is invited to note the items discussed by the Operating Board at its recent meetings.

12. FURTHER INFORMATION

12.1 Further information is available from Mrs Ruth MacLure, Clerk to the Operating Board (telephone 01224 273239; email r.m.maclure@abdn.ac.uk)
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REPORTS FROM COURT COMMITTEES AND JOINT COURT-SENATE COMMITTEES

SUMMARY
This paper brings together reports to Court from sub-committees that have met recently. The unconfirmed minutes of all meetings are available at www.abdn.ac.uk/admin/court/intranet.

This report will be treated as routine business and is not proposed for discussion unless members request otherwise and notify the Clerk one clear day in advance of the meeting.

For Approval
The following Committee reports are included for approval:

7.1 Governance and Nominations Committee CT16-17:09.1
7.2 Partnership, Negotiating & Consultative Committee CT16-17:09.2

Further Information
Further information is available from Mr Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Court, Tel.: 01224 273949 or b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COURT

GOVERNANCE AND NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper reports on issues from the most recent meetings of the Governance and Nominations Committee held on 24 August and 12 September 2016. The minutes of the meetings are available online at: www.abdn.ac.uk/admin/court/intranet. The paper includes the following items for approval:

(1) A proposed role description for the position of Senior Independent Governor; Section 2 and Appendix 1 refers.
(2) The continuing membership of Court Committees for 2016/17 and appointments to vacancies/reappointments; Section 3 and Appendix 2 refers.
(3) A recommendation to approve a nomination for the ‘Benefactor to the University’ Award; Section 4 and Appendix 3 refers. (In Confidence)

1.2 The paper also reports, for information, on the Committee’s consideration of the following:

- A summary report on responses from the Governor Appraisal Questionnaire. A copy of that report is enclosed in full at Appendix 4;
- A report on the potential implications of the proposed new composition of Court for the composition and membership of Court sub-committees;
- A draft University Corporate Governance Statement for the 2015/16 financial statements;
- Attendance at Court and key Committees for disclosure in the 2015/16 financial statements. A copy is enclosed at Appendix 5.

1.3 The Committee also considered papers on the future composition of Court, the appointment process for the next Senior Governor, and remuneration of the Senior Governor. These are enclosed as separate items as part of today's agenda.

1.4 Further information may be obtained from Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Governance and Nominations Committee, Tel. 01224 273949 or email: b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk.

For Approval

2 ROLE OF SENIOR INDEPENDENT MEMBER

2.1 The Court previously approved that the role of Senior Independent Member be formalised and invited the Committee to develop an appropriate role description. The Committee invites the Court to approve the proposed role description which is attached at Appendix 1.

3 MEMBERSHIP OF COURT COMMITTEES FOR 2016/17

3.1 The Committee received and considered the continuing membership of Court and Joint Court-Senate Committees for 2015/16 and agreed to recommend this to Court for approval. (Appendix 2) Proposals for a revised remit, composition and membership of the Research Policy Committee are enclosed as a separate paper on today’s agenda. A review of the remit and composition of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning is also ongoing and proposals will be brought to Senate and Court in the course of the academic year.

3.2 The Committee also reviewed information regarding the gender balance of the Court Committees and discussed where improvements to the current gender balance of committees were required in implementing the Court’s policy of gender balance within its sub-committees. The Committee
noted that for the Joint Committees of Court and Senate, Senate would be invited to agree that the policy on gender balance extend to joint committees.

3.3 The Committee considered current vacancies/reappointments on committees and approved the following recommendations to Court:

- **Operating Board**: To appoint Professor Nuala Booth to a vacancy for an independent member of Court. The Committee had received two nominations for the position but agreed that the Board had benefited from the skills of the incumbent as a former member of staff and, taking into account the need for better gender balance, agreed to recommend Professor Booth for appointment.

- **Operating Board**: The Committee agreed that due to the current absence of a member of the Operating Board it would be appropriate to consider co-opting another independent member to the Board on an interim basis to ensure the Board had the necessary ratio of independent to staff members. The Committee agreed to recommend to Court that Mr David MacFarlane be co-opted as a member of the Operating Board on a temporary basis with immediate effect.

- **Audit Committee**: The Committee agreed to recommend the reappointment of Mrs Morag McNeil as a co-opted member for a further term of three years and the reappointment of Professor Sir Lewis Ritchie as a co-opted member for a further term of one year.

- **Governance and Nominations Committee**: The Committee agreed that due to the current absence of a member of the Committee it would be appropriate to consider co-opting another independent member on an interim basis to ensure there was an appropriate number of members given the forthcoming role of the Committee in the recruitment and selection of the next Senior Governor. The Committee agreed to recommend to Court that Mrs Kathryn McPhail be co-opted on a temporary basis with immediate effect.

4 **BENEFACTOR TO THE UNIVERSITY AWARD – IN CONFIDENCE**

4.1 The Committee received a nomination of the Moonlight Prowl Committee for the Benefactor to the University Award – nomination enclosed at Appendix 3. The Benefactor to the University Award was established by Court to recognise and thank individuals and organisations that had made an exceptional contribution to the University whether through philanthropy or in other ways. The nomination of the Moonlight Prowl Committee had been endorsed by the Development Trust’s Stewardship Committee.

4.2 The Committee noted the significant fundraising that had been undertaken by the Moonlight Prowl Committee, the benefits this had provided to medical research at the University and to raising awareness of breast cancer. The Committee agreed to recommend to Court that the Moonlight Prowl Committee receive the Benefactor to the University Award.

For Information

5 **REPORT ON GOVERNOR APPRAISAL**

5.1 The Committee received a summarised and anonymous report of the responses to the Governor Appraisal Questionnaire. The paper also reported any consistent issues that had been highlighted in responses together with any further issues that had been raised by individuals (without being attributed). A copy of that report, updated to include further responses received from members since the meeting, is enclosed at Appendix 4.

5.2 The Committee noted that the key issues emerging from the report related to:

   (i) Agenda management and effective conduct of Court business/discussion.
   (ii) Whether there were adequate opportunities for Court members to meet and canvass opinion with one another.

5.3 The Committee discussed whether in addition to effective agenda time management, meetings should be extended in length although it was suggested this could result in items later in the day not receiving the same level of focus as those taken earlier in the meeting. In addition, it was
noted that only a few members had disagreed with the statement/question and that during the past year the issue of the future composition of Court had taken a significant amount of agenda time. It was suggested that both these points needed to be considered when interpreting the results of the questionnaire.

5.4 The Committee noted that options to enable more opportunities to canvass opinion with one another could include introducing either a dinner or a buffet/visit to part of the University the evening before Court meetings.

6 IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED COMPOSITION OF COURT FOR COMMITTEES

6.1 The Committee received and considered a paper which set out the potential implications of the proposed new composition of Court for the Court’s sub-committees.

6.2 The Committee noted that the following issues would need to be considered further subject to approval by Court of the new composition:

- Operating Board: The composition currently included 3 Senate Assessors, one from each College which would need to be reviewed in light of the proposed new composition which included a Senate Assessor from the Business School. In further discussion, it was agreed that following agreement of a new composition of Court, the Operating Board should review its composition in general and against a skills matrix to determine if it remained appropriate.

- Governance & Nominations Committee: The Committee noted that its composition included one Senate Assessor position. The Committee agreed that given the further constituencies of staff that would in the future be included within the composition of Court, it would be appropriate for the composition of the Committee to reflect that and for the position currently reserved to a Senate Assessor to be for a ‘Non-Executive Member of Staff on Court’

- Remuneration Committee: There were no immediate issues resulting from the composition of Court changing, however, the Committee noted that consideration would need to be given to whether in light of remuneration of the Senior Governor under the HE Governance Act, it remained appropriate for that individual to chair the Remuneration Committee.

- Student Experience Committee: The Committee noted that the Student Experience Committee’s composition included the Rector’s Assessor ex officio a position on Court that would be removed under the proposals being considered. Further consideration would need to be given as to whether the Court wished to retain three nominated representatives or whether an independent member and Rector as members were sufficient.

7 CORPORATE GOVERNANCE STATEMENT FOR ANNUAL REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

7.1 The Committee received a draft of the University’s Corporate Governance Statement, for inclusion in its annual accounts and set out how the institution has applied the principles of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. The Committee noted that this was a reporting requirement of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) which as a condition of funding expected institutions to comply with the Principles of the Code and follow closely the guidelines. The Committee, therefore, also received a benchmarking report of the University’s compliance with the Code.

7.2 The Committee considered the University’s Corporate Governance Statement, which had been amended to reflect significant developments over the past year (between 1 August 2015 and 31 July 2016), prior to its further consideration by external auditors and Audit Committee as part of the audit process. The Committee noted that the benchmarking of compliance highlighted two areas of non-compliance with Principles within the Code these being the role of the Rector as Chair and that the current composition of Court exceeded the recommended maximum of 25 and did not provide for a guaranteed majority of independent members.

7.3 The Committee approved the statement subject to it including reference to the Court’s intention in its future composition to work towards a 50:50 gender balance.
8 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AT COURT AND KEY COMMITTEES FOR DISCLOSURE IN REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

8.1 The Committee received and noted an attendance record at meetings of Court and selected key Court Committees during the period 1 August 2015 to 31 July 2016 which would be published as part of the University’s annual accounts. A copy is enclosed at Appendix 5 and members are asked to review this for accuracy and advise the Clerk of any corrections required.

9 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no immediate resource implications arising from recommendations in this paper.

10 RISK MANAGEMENT

10.1 There are no risk issues arising from recommendations within this paper.

11 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

11.1 Not required.

12 SUSTAINABILITY & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

12.1 There are no matters regarding sustainability or social responsibility arising from the recommendations in this paper.

13 RECOMMENDED ACTION

13.1 The Court is invited to approve:

   (1) A proposed role description for the position of Senior Independent Governor; Section 2 and Appendix 1 refers.
   (2) The continuing membership of Court Committees for 2016/17 and appointments to vacancies/reappointments; Section 3 and Appendix 2 refers.
   (3) A recommendation to approve a nomination for the ‘Benefactor to the University’ Award; Section 4 and Appendix 3 refers. (In Confidence)

14 FURTHER INFORMATION

14.1 Further information is available from Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Governance and Nominations Committee, Tel. 01224 273949 or email: b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk.

[19 September 2016] [version1] [Part Closed – Section 4 until recipients informed]
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

ROLE OF SENIOR INDEPENDENT MEMBER

Role of the Senior Independent Member

The role of the Senior Independent Member has been established to enhance the governance of Court, to support the Senior Governor, and to lead for Court on matters where it would not be appropriate or feasible for the Senior Governor to be involved. The Scottish Code of Good HE Governance recommends that such a role should be established and undertaken by one of the independent members of the governing body. The Senior Independent Member will, therefore, be appointed by Court from amongst its independent members other than the Senior Governor or Rector.

1) To be available to members of Court or Executive Officers as an intermediary if they have concerns which contact through the normal channels of the Senior Governor/Vice-Chair or Principal have failed to resolve or for which such contact is inappropriate;

2) To act as a sounding board for the Senior Governor;

3) To attend sufficient meetings of the Court to enable them to obtain a balanced understanding of any issues raised by members;

4) To lead meetings of the non-executive members when the Senior Governor is not present;

5) To lead the review of the performance of the Senior Governor, informed by feedback from both members of Court and the executive, to discuss the outcomes of that review with the Court and the Senior Governor;

6) To exercise on behalf of Court oversight of the election process for the appointment of the Senior Governor as required;

7) To deputise for the Senior Governor where required.

Time Commitment

The expected time commitment is approximately 5 days per annum rising to 10 days in a year where an election of a Senior Governor process is required.
## MEMBERSHIP OF COURT COMMITTEES AND JOINT COURT-SENATE COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Committee</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Male:Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>Two independent members of Court (including Convener)</td>
<td>Mr K Murray (Convener)</td>
<td>5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Mr D MacFarlane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two external members appointed by Court on the advice of the Governance &amp; Nominations Committee in consultation with the two lay members.</td>
<td>Mr A R McNiven</td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Prof Sir Lewis Ritchie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Ms L MacFarlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Ms M McNeil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Mr P Milne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB Committee may also co-opt additional members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Nominations</td>
<td>Four independent members, one of whom to be Convener (The Convener not to be Senior Governor or Convener of Operating Board)</td>
<td>Mr J Hall (Convener)</td>
<td>6:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Mr B Pack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Sir Moir Lockhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Mrs J Shirreffs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Ms K McPhail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Senate Assessor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The President of the Students’ Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Board</td>
<td>Four independent members of Court, including the Convener, appointed by Court on the recommendation of the Governance &amp; Nominations Committee (independent being defined as external to, and not employed or remunerated by the University). The Convener of the Board to be an independent member of Court but not being the vice-Chair of Court.</td>
<td>Mr B Pack</td>
<td>8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappoint</td>
<td>Ms A Minto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint Professor N Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed to co-opt Mr MacFarlane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed to co-opt Mr MacFarlane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed to co-opt Mr MacFarlane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed to co-opt Mr MacFarlane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment to be agreed by Professor Black or Professor Delibegovic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Senate Assessors to Court, one from each College, to be agreed by the Senate Assessors on Court.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Principal, Senior Vice-Principal, the University Secretary and the President of the Students’ Association are ex officio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ex officio:**
- Principal
- Professor J Kilburn
- Mrs C Inglis
- Mr C Anucha
Remuneration Committee

- Senior Governor (Convener)
- Four independent members
- A non-executive staff member of Court
- The President of the Students' Association

Sir Moir Lockhead
Mr B Pack
Mrs K McPhail
Mr C Duncan
Mr D Steyn
Mr B Paterson
Mr C Anucha

6:1

Research Policy Committee

Following recommendations from the Professional Services Review, the composition and membership of this Committee is under review and proposals for a revised Committee remit, composition and membership are included as a separate paper on today’s agenda.

Student Experience Committee

- Independent Member of Court (Convener)
- Rector (ex officio)
- Rector’s Assessor (ex officio)
- Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching)
- University Secretary
- One academic member of staff with an interest in the Undergraduate Student Experience nominated from each College
- One academic member of staff with an interest in the Postgraduate Student Experience nominated from each College
- Director of Academic Affairs
- Director of Student Life
- Equality and Diversity Adviser

Mrs J Shirreffs
Ms M Chapman
Mr D Haywood
Professor P McGeorge
Mrs C Inglis
Professor R Wells
Professor J Morrison/Dr A Amason
Professor S Davies
Professor B Connolly
Professor J Masthoff
Professor B Naphy
Dr G Mackintosh
Mr L Forsyth
Ms J Chalmers

10:12
Commented [PBW1]: As part of recommendations from the Professional Services Review the composition of this committee is under review. Proposals for the new composition and membership of the Committee will be brought forward separately to the Senate and Court in the course of the academic year.
## Nomination for the award of Benefactor to the University

### PARTICULARS OF PERSON(S)/ORGANISATION NOMINATED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full name (including titles):</th>
<th>Moonlight Prowl Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Address:                              | Moonlight Prowl  
Solas House  
Fraserburgh  
Aberdeenshire  
AB43 8XP |
| Profession or Occupation:             | Charitable Committee               |
| Partnership/Company name (if applicable): | N/A                               |
| Work Tel. No.:                        | N/A                                |
| Home Tel. No.:                        | N/A                                |
| Email address:                        | margaret-jane.cardno@aberdeenshire.gov.uk (Email address of the Chair of the Committee, Margaret-Jane Cardno) |
| Form of Contribution (i.e. benefaction to the University, and associations with University of Aberdeen) | The Moonlight Prowl is a charitable committee of seven ladies based in Fraserburgh, Aberdeenshire. So named by the ladies after their principal fundraising event 'The Moonlight Prowl', which sees the residents of Fraserburgh and supporters take to the streets of the town for an evening walk of 6 or 13 miles to raise funds in aid of breast cancer research at the University of Aberdeen in partnership with the breast clinic at Aberdeen Royal Infirmary.  
Since its inception in 2005, the Moonlight Prowl has supported the work of Professor Steven D Heys, Head of School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition and his team investigating the causes, prevention and treatment options for breast cancer. The ladies have supported the research for 10 consecutive years, going out with a bang in 2015, the year of their 10th anniversary and the final Moonlight Prowl. To date their efforts have led to a grand fundraising total of over £800,000- an outstanding amount raised by such a small committee from such a small town.  
Their tireless commitment to supporting the University has facilitated the purchase of a number of crucial machines enabling researchers to investigate the multiplication of cancer cells in the body, the large scale study of 2000 ladies to investigate the links between diet and breast cancer occurrence, a weight loss programme to promote healthy lifestyles among patients, the connection between omega 3 intake and a reduced risk of breast cancer and, finally, the development of support programmes for those diagnosed as well as their families. |


Their contribution to the University, however, goes beyond their donations to the research to their strides to raise awareness of the world-class medical research being conducted at the University. In its peak year 1,500 ladies took part in the walk, not to mention the local community involvement, which sees the whole town supporting the event each year. They encourage the researchers to attend the walk and the event has become a favourite of Principal Sir Ian Diamond who has attended in the past.

Whilst the Moonlight Prowl event is finished now, the Committee will continue on and are in the process of planning their next fundraising endeavour in aid of University cancer research.

Whilst Margaret-Jane Cardno is the Chair of the Committee and the main contact, the effort is equally spread among the seven ladies of the committee so it is important to recognise their Committee as a whole rather than the Chair alone.

Supporting Statement

To whom it may concern,

It gives me great pleasure to support the application for the Fraserburgh Moonlight Prowl to be considered for the award of Benefactor to the University.

I have had the honour of working with the Fraserburgh Moonlight Prowl Committee for the last 10 years as they have actively supported research within the University of Aberdeen and in particular clinical research into breast cancer.

This group of individuals have worked together giving many hours of their own time and have motivated a huge number of people in Fraserburgh to come and support research at the University of Aberdeen. A particular element of the way they have done this is by undertaking the Fraserburgh Moonlight Prowl, which is a walk of up to 13 miles carried out in the evening, in darkness and supervised and facilitated by many members of the public and as a result have raised more than £800,000.

It is not just the financial aspect, but it is the way in which their work has galvanised the community to support the University of Aberdeen and its research portfolio in breast cancer. The work that they have funded has been wide-ranging but has had a focus on nutrition and the prevention of breast cancer and has enabled and developed several Ph.D. students but also has facilitated the integration of work carried out at the Rowett Institute with that carried out on the Foresterhill site.

This is an unrivalled contribution over a sustained period of time by a community of a most unassuming nature, and whose efforts have made a huge difference to research here, but also to furthering public engagement to a scale which I do not think is replicated.

I unreservedly support this application for the Fraserburgh Moonlight Prowl.

Professor Steven D Heys MD,PhD,FRCS(Glas, Ed,Eng)
Head, School of Medicine, Medical Science and Nutrition

Nominated by: Professor Sir Ian Diamond, Principal and Vice-Chancellor

Date: 19/04/2016
The Governance & Nominations Committee will make recommendations to Court following consideration of nominations. The number of distinctions conferred each year will be dependent on the merits of the nominations received, but it is anticipated will be in the order of one or two in an academic year as deemed appropriate by Court. The names of those recommended for this distinction shall be confidential until approved by Court, and the offer accepted by the candidate.

For further information, please contact the Director of Development, Mrs Liz Bowie at e.bowie@abdn.ac.uk or on tel. 01224 274198.
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
UNIVERSITY COURT

SUMMARY REPORT OF GOVERNOR APPRAISAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper reports on the responses to the Governor Appraisal Questionnaire. The paper is for information.

1.2 The questionnaire was issued in early August to the 24 non-executive members of Court in office during 2015/16 with a response date of 19 August, with reminders and an extension issued to Friday 26 August. Members were asked to answer a series of statements on their role, Court procedures, and Governor Development by using a ranking from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). At the time of writing 17 of the 24 Members have completed the Questionnaire.

1.3 A summary of responses, including comparison with 2015, 2013 and 2012, is enclosed. (Note: It was agreed in 2013 to move to a biennial questionnaire, hence there is no data for 2014). In overall terms one question Q B1 had an average rounded score of less than 4, while Q B6 was scored 3.5. There were five further questions where the average before rounding was below 4 and these are discussed further below at section 2.

1.4 The key issues that have been highlighted by the responses overall relate to:

   1) Agenda management and effective conduct of Court business/discussion. This is evidenced by the responses and comments to Questions B1, B2 and B5.
   2) Whether there are adequate opportunities for Court members to meet and canvass opinion with one another. Q B6

1.5 Further issues that were noted from individual responses are set out at section 3. Although not a consistent issue, a small number of members felt that Court papers were too long and that the information was not always summarised and presented as effectively as it could be. The University will consider options to improve the presentation of information to Court and ensure the issues raised are also considered as part of the forthcoming externally facilitated effectiveness review of Court which will commence in the autumn.

1.6 Any issues raised by governors which relate to them specifically and which are considered to need further discussion will be brought to the attention of the Senior Governor as appropriate.

1.7 Further information is available from Mr Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Committee, b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk 01224 273949

2 KEY GENERIC ISSUES

2.1 One question had an average rounded score of less than 4 these being B1 (score of 3.1), while B6 was very close to having an average rounded score of less than 4 (score of 3.5). There were five further questions with an average before rounding of less than 4. These were:

   A5 3.9
   B2 3.6
   B3 3.9
   B5 3.7
   B7 3.8

2.2 B1 The Court uses its time effectively – time available is allocated to the most important issues.

2.2.1 Av Score was 3.1, with 12% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement, 24% agree/strongly agree with the statement. The average score in 2015 was 3.6 and 3.8 in 2013.
2.2.2 A significant number of members expressed the view that the time for discussion of key issues at meetings of Court had been inadequate. A number of members felt the agendas were crowded. Some members questioned the need for a presentation at the start of the meeting and felt this time early in the agenda would be better focused on key issues, with a presentation (if at all), held later in the agenda. A number of members highlighted the importance of the role of the Chair in regard to time management of the agenda and in managing the number of members contributing to discussion of agenda items. Some also felt members themselves had to focus the contributions they made to discussions. These issues were also referred to in responses to QB2 and QB4.

2.3 **B6 There are adequate opportunities to meet and canvass opinion with fellow Court members.**

2.3.1 Av Score was 3.5, with 12% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement, 59% agree/strongly agree with the statement. The average score in 2015 was 3.6 and 3.7 in 2013.

2.3.2 The outcome is broadly similar with 2015 and 2013 but remains one of the lowest scoring sections of the questionnaire and has not improved although the score in 2012 was 3.1. However only two members disagreed with the statement. While only a few members added comments, it was not clear whether members simply had no view positive or negative on this question, felt there should be more opportunities provided by the University, or as some comments suggested, this was a statement that members did not currently engage extensively with one another on issues privately or by e-mail outside of meetings. Some members noted that their location limits their opportunities to meet in person.

2.3.3 It should be noted that in response to the 2013 result in relation to this question, the University sought the views of Court members on how best to facilitate further opportunities for members to interact and as a result it was agreed to introduce Court visits or tours in the afternoons following meetings. As is discussed further below, the uptake of these tours has been low and consideration might be given as to whether these continue or are instead replaced with a social event for non-executive members the evening before meetings of Court.

2.4 **A5 I have a sufficient understanding of the key strategic issues facing the University and the Court is adequately informed of progress against these to enable me to undertake my role as a Court member effectively.**

2.4.1 Av Score was 3.9, with 0% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement, 71% agree/strongly agree with the statement. The average score in 2015 was 4.0 and 4.3 in 2013.

2.4.2 The outcome is very close to 2015 with 79% of responses agreeing with the statement and no respondents disagreeing.

2.5 **B2 The issues I feel are important are discussed at meetings of Court.**

2.5.1 Av Score was 3.6, with 6% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement, 65% agree/strongly agree with the statement. The average score in 2015 was 3.9 and 4.1 in 2013.

2.5.2 While the outcome is similar to 2015 many members linked their responses to this question with their responses to B1 in the sense that because of issues with time management of the Court agenda, discussion of important issues on the agenda has been insufficient.

2.6 **B3 The need for constructive challenge is understood and accepted by both governors and the executive.**

2.6.1 Av Score was 3.9, with 6% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement, 76% agree/strongly agree with the statement. The average score in 2015 was 3.8 and 4.3 in 2013.

2.6.2 The score has improved marginally on 2015 and the majority of responses agreed with the statement and only one disagreed.
2.7 **B5 The meetings and business of Court are effectively conducted and in a way which encourages an appropriate degree of transparency and engagement and in which I have confidence.**

2.7.1 Av Score was 3.7, with 6% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement, 71% agree/strongly agree with the statement. The average score in 2015 was 4.0 and 4.4 in 2013.

2.7.2 Many of the comments made with regard to this statement were linked back to responses to B1 with regard to how meetings were conducted and agenda management.

2.8 **B7 There are adequate opportunities to see management in action and to assess performance.**

2.8.1 AV Score 3.8, 6% disagree/strongly disagree, 65% agree/strongly agree. The average score in 2015 was 3.6 and 4.1 in 2013.

2.8.2 The score has improved on 2015 and as only a few members provided comments with regard to this question it is difficult to offer insight into whether there are issues to be considered further. The majority of responses agreed with the statement and only one disagreed.

3 **Further Issues for Consideration**

3.1 A number of individual points were noted in the comments sections from members including:

- One member felt Court should move to full use of an electronic board papers system and stop circulating printed papers.
- Format of papers – three members felt the papers for Court were too long and two members felt they did not always effectively summarise key information for members. One member suggested that presenters should present only key information in bullet point format in a powerpoint slide, supported by shorter papers with an appropriate executive summary and the decision the Court was being asked to make.
- One member was concerned that only a very small number of members took up the visits to academic departments that were organised to coincide with Court and the impression this formed with staff.

4 **NEXT STEPS AND FOLLOW UP ACTIONS**

4.1 It is suggested that the issues raised should inform the forthcoming effectiveness review of Court and any recommendations it may make.

4.2 The issue of agenda and time management at Court meetings was, however, a consistent concern and the University will review the structure of the Court agendas and make the Rector aware of the issues that have been raised. A further option would be to extend the duration of meetings of Court.

4.3 The University will also consider how it can shorten papers and improve the presentation of key information for governors.

4.4 Other actions that could be taken forward are:

- Invite Court to consider whether in principle it would wish to cease using hard copy papers and move to the use of electronic board paper systems.
- Introduce a social event before each meeting of Court, potentially the evening before meetings, either for all members of Court or for non-executive members of Court.
- Discontinue the practice of arranging tours of academic areas after each meeting of Court.

5 **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 Not applicable at this stage.

6 **RISK MANAGEMENT**

6.1 Not applicable.
7 **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

7.1 Not required.

8 **SUSTAINABILITY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

8.1 Not required.

9 **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

9.1 The paper is for information.

10 **FURTHER INFORMATION**

10.1 Available from Mr Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Committee, b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk 01224 273949

Mr Bruce Purdon
Clerk to the Court
19 September 2016 (V1) (Open)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously considered by</td>
<td>Governance &amp; Nominations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further approval required</td>
<td>No but to be reported to Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 October 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION A: THE ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2013†</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2016 Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>I have a clear understanding of the Court’s responsibilities and obligations.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>I have a clear understanding of my individual responsibilities as a Court Member.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>I have a clear understanding of how my role as a Court member differs from that of management.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>I have sufficient opportunities to contribute to the development of the University’s strategy.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>I have a sufficient understanding of the key strategic issues facing the University and the Court is adequately informed of progress against these to enable me to undertake my role as a Court member effectively.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION B: COURT PROCEDURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2013†</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2016 Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>The Court uses its time effectively - time available is allocated to the most important issues.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>The issues I feel are important are discussed at meetings of Court.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>The need for constructive challenge is understood and accepted by both governors and the executive.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>There is appropriate opportunity to participate in discussion at Court meetings.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>The meetings and business of Court are effectively conducted and in a way which encourages an appropriate degree of transparency and engagement and in which I have confidence.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>There are adequate opportunities to meet and canvass opinion with fellow Court members.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>There are adequate opportunities to see management in action and to assess performance.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>There is effective communication with Court members.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>I am encouraged to actively engage in the business and life of the University outside of Court meetings.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION C: GOVERNOR DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2013†</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2016 Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>My individual training or development needs in support of my role as a governor are being met.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>My skills and expertise are being used effectively by the University either on Court, within the wider committee structure or through other means.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† No Questionnaire was issued in 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>University Court (4 in year)</th>
<th>Audit Committee (5 in year)</th>
<th>Operating Board (8 in year)</th>
<th>Remuneration Committee (2 in year)</th>
<th>Governance and Nominations Committee (3 in year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms M Chapman</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Sir Ian Diamond</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Moir Lockheed</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor J Kilburn</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor P McGeorge</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor P Hannaford</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Haywood</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor R McKail</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J Laing</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Duncan</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Arthur</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Shirreffs</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor N Booth</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor A Akisanya</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor C Black</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor N Hutchison</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor J Skakle</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor C Brittain</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor S Heys</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr N Oren</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss G Clarke</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 of 8</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Anucha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Hall</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 of 8</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms K McPhail</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs A Minto</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr K Murray</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 of 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Pack</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Paterson</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Steyn</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D MacFarlane</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms L Macfarlan</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Sir Lewis Ritchie</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A McNiven</td>
<td>2 of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs M McNeill</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Milne</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mrs C Inglis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 of 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Secretary is a member of the Operating Board but not a member of the Court, Audit Committee, Remuneration Committee and Governance and Nominations Committee.
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN
UNIVERSITY COURT
PARTNERSHIP, NEGOTIATING AND CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper reports on issues arising from the most recent meeting of the Partnership Negotiating and Consultative Committee held on 8 September 2016. The draft minutes of the meeting are available at www.abdn.ac.uk/admin/court/intranet.

1.2 The University Court is invited to note the report from the Partnership Negotiating and Consultative Committee.

1.3 The report includes the following items for approval:
   - Health, Safety and Wellbeing Policy
   - Lone Working Policy
   - Overseas Travel Policy

1.4 Further information is available from the Clerk to the Committee, Catherine Cook, HR Specialist Services Partner, email: c.cook@abdn.ac.uk telephone (01224) 273413 or Mrs Debbie Dyker, Director of Human Resources, d.j.dyker@abdn.ac.uk tel 01224 273732.

For Information

2. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES REVIEW

2.1 The Committee received an oral update on the Professional Services Review.

3. PAY NEGOTIATIONS

3.1 The Committee received an oral update on the Pay Negotiations. The unions were in dispute over the pay award and Unison, Unite and EIS all had ongoing ballots for industrial action. The Universities and Colleges Employers Association had advised that despite this, institutions could now pay the pay award of 1.1 %, and the unions' views on this were sought. Unison and Unite felt it would be inappropriate not to pay the award and the University and College Union (UCU) would not comment as they were in dispute.

4. VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE UPDATE

4.1 The Committee received an oral update on Voluntary Severance. The Voluntary Severance Scheme was open to staff in the School of Medicine, Medical Science and Nutrition. The closing date was 30 September. However there had been fewer applications than hoped at that point. There would be further discussions through the Joint Consultative Committee on Redundancy Avoidance (JCCRA) including consultation over criteria for compulsory redundancy.

5. TERMS AND CONDITIONS REVIEW

5.1 The review was progressing well with initial discussions focusing on intellectual property and then other terms and conditions. Once any changes were agreed these would be brought back to Senate.

6. EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND MENTAL HEALTH

6.1 There were two groups working on employee engagement with members from across the University. There was in addition a Mental Health working group. The groups were working on various themes including a Mental Health and Wellbeing strategy and a Healthy Working policy.
7. HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICIES

7.1 HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING POLICY

7.1.1 The existing, Health and Safety Policy had been revised to reflect the current approach and commitment of the University (copy attached at Appendix 1).

7.1.2 The revision included a new title, Health, Safety and Wellbeing. This was to reflect that all three aspects were closely aligned. The University was keen to ensure that it not only complied with the minimum requirements of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act and associated Regulations, it does all that is reasonable to provide for the wellbeing of staff and students.

7.1.3 The revision redefines the title and role of the Local Safety Advisers (LSAs).

7.1.4 The revision also sets out University's arrangements for managing health and safety, as required by law, in a methodical way. It sets out the roles and responsibilities on the basis of health and safety being a line management responsibility and that each individual has a responsibility and a role to play.

7.1.5 The Committee received the amended policy. The Court is invited to approve the amended policy, attached as Appendix 1.

7.2 LONE WORKING POLICY

7.2.1 The Committee received this as a new policy which replaced the previous guidance document. The Policy included a definition of a lone worker and a requirement to undertake a risk assessment to comply with statutory requirements. The findings of the risk assessment would determine the measures necessary for lone working. A template risk assessment was included in the guidance.

7.2.2 The Committee received the policy. Court is invited to approve the policy, available for review at www.abdn.ac.uk/admin/court/intranet.

7.3 OVERSEAS TRAVEL POLICY

7.3.1 This Committee received this new policy for approval. The Policy had been updated to include good practice found in some departments and schools of the University. It had also been updated to include a requirement to carry out a risk assessment for specific types of trips and general advice and guidance. The guidance included a template risk assessment.

7.3.2 The Committee received the policy. Court is invited to approve the policy, available for review at www.abdn.ac.uk/admin/court/intranet.

7.3.3 Further information on these policies is available from Naveed Qamar, Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing, telephone (01224) 272783 email: Naveed.qamar@abdn.ac.uk

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no resource implications arising directly from this paper.

9. RISK MANAGEMENT

9.1 There are no risks arising directly from this paper.

10. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

10.1 An Equality Impact Assessment is not required.
11. **Sustainability & Social Responsibility**

11.1 There are no issues relating to sustainability or social responsibility arising directly from this paper.

12. **Recommended Action**

12.1 The University Court is invited to note the report from the Partnership Negotiating and Consultative Committee and approve the recommendations at section 1.3.

13. **Further Information**

13.1 Further information may be obtained from Catherine Cook, Clerk to the Partnership Negotiating and Consultative Committee, (01224) 273564 or c.cook@abdn.ac.uk or Mrs Debbie Dyker, Director of Human Resources, d.j.dyker@abdn.ac.uk, tel 01224 273732.

21 September 2016
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UNIVERSITY HEALTH, WELLBEING AND SAFETY POLICY

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The attached Policy is an update of University University Health and Safety Policy with a revised title of Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy.

1.2 The Policy has been through the due consultation process and has been approved by the University Health and Safety Committee and University Management Group (UMG). At the Partnership, Negotiating and Consultative Committee (PNCC) and the Operating Board, changes were requested to make ‘wellbeing’ more embedded in the Policy and those changes have been made.

1.3 The document is submitted to the Court for approval.

1.4 Further information is available from Naveed Qamar, Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing (01224 272783, naveed.qamar@abdn.ac.uk).

2. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

2.1 There are no significant resource implications beyond time commitment for planning and implementation where required.

3. RISK MANAGEMENT

3.1 Risk STRA_2016_04 Health and Safety in the Strategic Risk Register refers.

4. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 An equality impact assessment is not required.

5. SUSTAINABILITY & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

5.1 There are positive environmental, ethical and social implications and impacts from the effective implementation of the Policy.

6. RECOMMENDED ACTION

6.1 The Court is invited to approve the Policy.

7. FURTHER INFORMATION

7.1 Further information is available from Naveed Qamar, Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing (01224 272783, naveed.qamar@abdn.ac.uk).
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1. HEALTH, WELLBEING AND SAFETY POLICY

Draft document for comment

Please note that this draft document is circulated for comment and feedback purposes only.

When published in its final form, it will be issued as a Policy document, with a briefing issued to all relevant managers

Synopsis

This document sets out the University of Aberdeen Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy. This Policy applies to all employees of all Schools/Departments.

This document is the property of University of Aberdeen. It shall not be reproduced in whole or in part without written permission from the Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing.

Approval

Approved by:

Date: ___________________ 1.
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3. **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

3.1 The University of Aberdeen is committed to the health, wellbeing and safety of those who work, study or visit at the University. This Policy states this commitment and outlines the responsibilities and arrangements to ensure that this commitment is implemented in a manner which ensures that this commitment is made good.

3.2 The University of Aberdeen has updated the current Health and Safety Policy to include Wellbeing as it is being increasingly recognised that the working environment can have a significant impact on the wellbeing of individuals. The wellbeing of individuals depends on the interaction of the individual’s social, physical and psychological resources and their context. The University of Aberdeen recognises that wellbeing at work arises from the interaction between the worker and the workplace and as a result, the University of Aberdeen will strive to ensure that work and study at the University will positively impact on the wellbeing of individuals.
# 4. DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>An activity, process or substance which has the potential to injure or cause harm to an individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>The probability of somebody being harmed by the hazard and how serious the harm could be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>The process of identifying hazards, evaluating the risk from the hazards, deciding upon and implementing appropriate controls to reduce the risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>A formal critical examination of the workplace to identify hazardous conditions and implement corrective actions and to improve operations and conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>A systematic examination of the efficiency, effectiveness and reliability of the health and safety arrangements and drawing up plans for corrective action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>An event which results in injury or ill-health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>An event not causing harm, but had the potential to cause injury or ill health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>Any work carried out off-site by staff or students for the purpose of teaching, research or other activities while representing the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Surveillance</td>
<td>An ongoing series of health checks to detect ill-health effects at an early stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. HEALTH, WELLBEING AND SAFETY POLICY

We are fully committed to the health, wellbeing and safety of our colleagues and students and we will do all that is reasonable to make good our commitment.

The University’s Strategic Plan 2015-2020, places people at the heart of its vision. Our mission is to be recognised globally for our research and teaching, and to provide a learning and working environment that enables all members of our community to realise their potential. We will support this ambition by ensuring that the health, wellbeing and safety of our whole community of staff, students and visitors remains paramount.

The University Court has overall responsibility for setting and reviewing the University’s Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy and ensuring its effective implementation across the University.

In accepting this responsibility, the University will:

- Recognise that health, wellbeing and safety is a core and integral aspect of good institutional management
- Delegate responsibility for health, wellbeing and safety management throughout the University and support those with such responsibilities through the provision of appropriate training, professional development and central support
- Ensure that all senior University personnel and managers are aware of their responsibilities for health, wellbeing and safety and that they promote positive attitudes and provide active leadership.
- Embed, maintain and promote the highest standards of health, wellbeing and safety, and aspire to be leaders in this respect in the higher education sector
- Establish a system of performance monitoring and audit to monitor compliance with University, sector and legal standards
- Ensure a collaborative approach is developed and maintained for the effective resolution of health and safety issues between Trade Unions, staff safety representatives and University management
- Provide appropriate resources to ensure that a safe and healthy working environment is provided and maintained.

Professor Sir Ian Diamond

Principal and Vice-Chancellor

Day, Month, Year
6. POLICY

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR HEALTH, WELLBEING AND SAFETY

6.1 University Court
The University Court has ultimate responsibility for overseeing health, wellbeing and safety matters at the University and ensuring that good governance is practised.

6.2 Operating Board
The Operating Board plays a key role in providing leadership and strategic direction for health, wellbeing and safety concerns and ensuring that these matters are effectively integrated into management thinking and decision-making at all levels of the University. The Operating Board has delegated authority from the University Court to set and periodically review the University’s Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy and to take action to ensure its effective implementation in academic Schools and across Professional Services.

The University’s Health and Safety Committee reports to the Operating Board.

6.3 University Management Group
The Principal has overall responsibility for the implementation of the Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy.

Collectively, it is the responsibility of the University Management Group to play a lead role in championing the health, wellbeing and safety culture within the University. These senior managers have a key role in actively promoting and reinforcing the Health, Wellbeing and Safety policy by their actions.

Alongside the Principal, the University Secretary, Vice-Principals, Heads of Schools and Professional Services Directors are responsible for the embedding and implementation of the Policy in their areas, and for providing individual and collective leadership for health, safety and wellbeing matters more generally. They are responsible for dissemination through the College and School structure and across Professional Services of an effective system for ensuring the health, wellbeing and safety of staff, students and members of the public.

The University Secretary will convene the University Health and Safety Committee and is also the member of the University Management Group charged with overseeing the University’s arrangements for the management of health, wellbeing and safety.

6.4 Heads of School and Professional Services Directors

It is the responsibility of the Heads of School and Professional Services Directors to play a key role in championing health, wellbeing and safety within their respective School or Directorate. They are expected to set a clear leadership example and to promote high standards of health, wellbeing and safety. They must promote a culture of continuous improvement in health, wellbeing and safety and empower staff to take responsibility for health, wellbeing and safety matters as part of their everyday activities.
Heads of School and Professional Services Directors are responsible for ensuring that all activities under their control are conducted in compliance with the relevant statutory provisions and in accordance with the University’s Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy.

This will be achieved by:

- Developing a local Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy
- Preparing, maintaining and reviewing relevant risk assessments and the implementation and maintenance of relevant controls
- Ensuring effective procedures for emergency response and ensuring that staff are aware of any actions required by them
- Ensuring that staff understand their Health, Wellbeing and Safety responsibilities
- Ensuring staff are trained and competent for performing their duties
- Ensuring that contractors employed can meet the University’s health and safety standards and they are monitored to ensure these standards are met
- Ensuring that appropriate arrangements are in place for consultation on health, wellbeing and safety matters, where necessary by formation of a local health and safety committee
- Ensuring that all accidents and near misses which have, or had, the potential to cause injury, impaired health, environmental damage or damage to property are reported, investigated and that appropriate corrective actions are implemented
- Setting a clear leadership example and actively promoting a high degree of health, wellbeing and safety awareness throughout the School or Directorate Service
- Appointing an appropriate number, dependent on the size and risk profile of the School or Directorate, of Local Safety Coordinators
- Communicating and cooperating with the Central Health and Safety Team, Estates Directorate and other shared building occupiers
- Reporting annually on the health, safety and wellbeing activities and performance of the School or Directorate.

6.5 Supervisory Staff

Individuals with responsibility for managing or supervising other employees, contractors, students or visitors, no matter the duration, are responsible for the health, wellbeing and safety of those under their care or control.

This will be achieved by:

- Ensuring that staff and students understand their responsibilities for health, wellbeing and safety
- Ensuring that staff are trained to an appropriate level to enable them to conduct their work safely
- Allocating work to only those who are competent and capable of conducting that work safely
- Ensuring that work areas are kept clean and tidy; that emergency equipment and escape routes are kept clear and free of obstructions
- Maintaining plant and equipment to a safe operational standard in line with our legal requirements, University policy and the manufacturer’s guidelines
- Taking appropriate precautions for the purchase, use and disposal of equipment or substances to prevent injury or damage to health
- Reporting and investigating near misses and accidents and ensuring that any corrective actions are implemented and that any modifications to working practices are brought to the attention of those that may be affected
- Involving staff and students in maintaining and improving safety performance
• Promoting a high level of safety awareness and setting a clear example of health, wellbeing and safety leadership.

6.6 Staff

All staff have a responsibility for their own health, wellbeing and safety and to contribute to an institutional culture that supports health and safety.

They can achieve this by:

• Cooperating with managers and supervisors in health, wellbeing and safety matters
• Understanding the actions required of them in emergency situations
• Ensuring that their workplaces are kept tidy and that emergency escape routes are kept clear and unobstructed
• Reporting to their supervisor any accident, near miss or dangerous situation which they become aware of.

6.7 Local Safety Coordinators

Local Safety Coordinators are formally appointed by the Head of School or Professional Services Director to assist with the implementation of health and safety arrangements. The main task is to assist the Head of School or Director on health and safety matters and to liaise with the Central Health and Safety Team for advice and support.

Where required, the Local Safety Coordinator will receive training appropriate to their role and the risk profile of their School or Directorate.

Local Safety Coordinators will:

• Set a clear leadership example and actively promote a high degree of health, wellbeing and safety awareness throughout the School or Professional Service
• Assist the Head of School or Director in implementing the institutional Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy and their local arrangements
• Assist the Central Health and Safety Team with safety audits, inspections, accident investigations, etc.

6.8 Central Health and Safety Team

The Central Health and Safety Team provides specialist advice and support to Schools and Directorates and actively leads and promotes health, wellbeing and safety across the University.

The Team will support the University by:

• Providing leadership and direction on all health, wellbeing and safety matters
• Promoting a strong and consistent health, wellbeing and safety culture across the University
• Improving the University’s management systems and procedures for health, wellbeing and safety to achieve best practice in the Higher Education sector
• Providing suitable and sufficient specialist advice to support Heads of School and Directors in the implementation of their duties
• Monitoring and auditing compliance and performance to continually improve the health, wellbeing and safety across the University
• Acting as a focal point for reporting and communicating on health, wellbeing and safety across the University.
6.9 University Health and Safety Committee

The University Health and Safety Committee’s remit is to ensure that a collaborative approach is taken to the management of the health, wellbeing and safety of all at the University. Where necessary it will advise, recommend and decide upon measures taken to improve health, wellbeing and safety at the University.

Specifically, it will:

- Advise the Operating Board on matters relating to general Health, Wellbeing and Safety policy
- Recommend to the Operating Board actions necessary to implement Health, Wellbeing and Safety policies and campaigns
- Monitor the extent of compliance with the University Health, Safety and Wellbeing Policy and recommend actions to address areas of non-compliance
- Maintain standing sub-committees to consider matters in relation to the use of ionising and non-ionising radiation and work with genetically modified organisms
- Provide a forum for discussion and consultation on health, wellbeing and safety matters
- Promote continuous improvement on health, wellbeing and safety matters
- Report at least three times a year to the Operating Board.

The composition of the Committee will include:

- Operating Board appointees
- Nominees from each of the Colleges
- Representatives from appropriate Professional Services Directorates
- Representatives from Trade Unions with negotiating rights
- Representatives from AUSA.

6.10 Specialised Committees

In addition to the University Health and Safety Committee, the University maintains a Radiation Hazards Sub-Committee and three Genetic Modification Safety Sub-Committees.

These Committees address, review and where necessary approve any work with both ionising and non-ionising radiation and lasers, and genetically modified organisms respectively.
7. **OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE AND COUNSELLING**

The University provides an Occupational Health Service, which all members of staff are entitled to consult on health related matters. Staff are encouraged to discuss issues relating to work with their line managers, but can consult the Occupational Health Service at any time for medical advice and assistance. The service is staffed by professional occupational health advisers, and consultations are held in strict medical confidence.

The Occupational Health Service will also provide support and guidance to University managers in relation to matters related to the health and fitness to work of their staff members.

The Occupational Health Service will also provide health surveillance to staff members and postgraduate students based on the outcome of risk assessments.

The University also provides a Counselling service for staff that aims to:

- help share problems, or issues that are causing distress,
- enable individuals to reach a greater understanding of themselves,
- help work through problems to find resolutions, and
- undertake consultancy, training and support for staff.
8. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR HEALTH, WELLBEING AND SAFETY

The University has a number of organisational units that include, but are not limited to: Colleges, Schools, Research Institutes, Centres, and Professional Services Directorates. Within each of these discrete organisational units, a number of functional teams and disciplinary ‘departmental’ identities also continue to exist.

For the purposes of this document the main organisational units will be referred to as Schools (i.e. academic sections led by a Head of School), and Directorates (i.e. Professional Services functions led by a Director).

It should be noted that where inter-disciplinary research teams (e.g. Research Institutes or Centres) or functional areas within a Professional Services Directorate operate autonomously or do not fit into the School or Directorate framework, the appropriate ‘lead’ in those areas will be deemed to have the responsibility of a Head of School or Director as outlined below.

This document is a support document which provides a framework that each of these organisational units will be required to implement in order to manage health, wellbeing and safety in that functional area. This is to be regarded as a minimum, and where necessary, Heads of School or Directors should implement further local arrangements applicable to their specific risks and operations.

8.1 Policy

In addition to the overarching University Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy, each Head of School or Director must prepare a local Health, Wellbeing and Safety policy which outlines the organisation and arrangements they have put in place. It should include the procedures which are outlined in the rest of this document. It must be signed by the Head of School or Director, reviewed annually and brought to the attention of all staff in that area.

The local policy will typically include the following:

- A statement of local policy, reflecting the University’s overarching policy and outlining the expectations of the School, Institute or Directorate in respect of health, wellbeing and safety and local commitment and support in respect of this.
- An organisational structure of how health, wellbeing and safety is managed at a local level
- An explanation of the role and function of those with management or supervisory positions with regard to safety management
- An explanation of the role and function of any individual with specific safety responsibilities or duties
- Local arrangements for consulting on safety, either via a specific local safety committee or at management meetings
- Details of the practical arrangements and procedures in place for management of risks generated from the School or Directorate’s activities.
8.2 Organisation

Heads of School and Directors are ultimately responsible for the management of health, wellbeing and safety in their area. Appropriate delegation via the line management chain will, however, be undertaken. As a result, individuals in a School or Directorate who manage staff, organise work, or have a supervisory role will be responsible for doing so in a safe manner.

In addition, each Head of School or Director must ensure that a suitable number of roles are identified, with appropriate responsibilities assigned, to ensure that the management of health, wellbeing and safety is devolved throughout their area. These roles may be administrative, support or may be specialist depending on the specific requirements of the School or Directorate. If a safety role forms a major part of an individual’s duties, then this should be incorporated into that individual’s job description. Care should be taken when allocating roles in respect of existing responsibilities and workloads. Dependent on the nature of the role, it may be necessary to include safety elements into the functions of a particular post to ensure that these considerations are built into the functions of the School or Directorate.

Examples of specific safety roles that may be identified are given below.

8.2.1 Local Safety Coordinator

Depending on the School or Directorate’s risk profile Heads of Schools or Directors will appoint one or more Local Safety Coordinators (LSC) to assist them in the safe running of their area.

The Central Health and Safety Team is to be advised of the appointment of an LSC. Where multiple LSCs are appointed, one should take a lead role in communication with the Central Health and Safety Team.

The role of the LSC is:

- To assist and advise the Head of School or Director on health and safety matters
- To liaise with the Central Health and Safety Team on all health and safety matters and to provide a focus for health and safety in the School or Directorate
- To deal with straightforward requests for health and safety advice and resolve simple health and safety enquiries and issues at local level
- To assist in coordinating audits, inspections, investigations and other health and safety initiatives
- To monitor compliance with safety policies and plans
- To assist in coordinating implementation of University requirements, and assist in ongoing management of these requirements pursuant to implementation.

All staff will also have access to Wellbeing Coordinators.

8.2.2 Floor Checkers

Floor Checkers are appointed by Heads of School or Directors to assist with:

- The evacuation of buildings following activation of the fire alarms
- Reporting the status of fire zones to the person in charge of the evacuation.
At no point should Floor Checkers put their own safety at risk during an evacuation. Due to the diverse organisation of Schools and Directorates, alternative arrangements to Floor Checkers may be put in place to allow effective evacuation of buildings.

8.2.3 First Aiders

Schools and Directorates are required to make adequate provision for first aid for staff and extend this provision to students and visitors. Schools and Directorates must ensure that staff appointed as first aiders receive adequate training, with the minimum being an approved course via a recognised first aid training provider.

Where a School or Directorate has identified risks to health that may require more than ‘standard’ first aid response e.g. hazardous chemicals, hazardous fieldwork, etc. then appropriate specialist training and first aid provision for those activities must be provided.

8.2.4 Radiation Protection Supervisors

Where a School or Directorate undertakes work with ionising radiation, there is a requirement under the Ionising Radiations Regulations that one or more suitable persons must be appointed as the local Radiation Protection Supervisor and their names recorded in the local rules applicable to that area.

The duties of the local Radiation Protection Supervisor are:

- Identification and registration of radiation workers
- Distribution, collection and administration of dosimeters
- Local training for radiation workers
- Supervision of ‘Controlled’ and ‘Supervised’ radiation areas
- Administration of classified radiation workers – annual medicals and dose reports
- Record keeping – ordering, usage and disposal records
- Local rules and risk assessments
- Investigation of accidents involving radioactive sources.

8.2.5 Laser Protection Supervisors

Where a School or Directorate undertakes work with Class 3 or Class 4 Lasers, a Laser Protection Supervisor must be appointed if the Laser Protection Adviser considers it necessary and this appointment must be confirmed in writing. The Laser Protection Supervisor are responsible for the control and safe use of the laser in the area specified in appointment letter, including training and quality assurance checks where required.

8.2.6 Other Roles

As part of the risk assessment of their activities, Heads of School and Directors may identify additional roles that require the appointment of individuals with specific training e.g. biological safety advisors or rescue teams trained in the use of breathing apparatus or in undertaking rescue at height, etc.

Schools and Directorates must ensure that these individuals are trained appropriately, including refresher training where necessary and that any specialised equipment is purchased, and where required, inspected and maintained as necessary.
8.3 Local Health and Safety Committees

While the University Health and Safety Committee is considered to meet legal requirements, it is recognised that for certain Schools or Directorates a local Health and Safety Committee may be needed. This is likely to apply to larger Schools and Directorates or those where the risk profile requires dedicated scrutiny. Where a dedicated committee is deemed to be not required, health, wellbeing and safety should be included on agendas of meetings which involve representation from across the School or Directorate in order to ensure that discussion takes place around any areas of concern and solutions identified and implemented.

The local Committee will:

- Assist local managers in the development of workable and effective policies, procedures and arrangements
- Identify and support development of effective local procedures for any areas of risk identified
- Monitor and review the local policies, procedures and arrangements to ensure they are still suitable and sufficient
- Be chaired by the Head of School or Director (or a senior deputy) and will consist of representatives from all the various disciplinary or functional groups within the School or Directorate.

8.4 Multi-User Buildings

In many situations within the University, buildings are occupied by staff who are employed within different Schools or Directorates and there is a joint responsibility to establish suitable arrangements for safety management within these buildings. Building users must ensure there is close liaison and consultation between the various occupants, especially so for arrangements that affect the building as a whole e.g. fire safety arrangements, first aid provisions, etc. A Building User Group should be formed by the lead occupier to achieve joint arrangements. All building occupiers should contribute to the development of local procedures.

8.5 Planning for Health and Safety

Schools and Directorates are expected to plan their health and safety activities, including setting objectives and targets, and planning activities to meet those objectives and targets. These plans should include:

- Identification of arrangements for the local implementation of new University Health and Safety Policies
- Process for carrying out inspections and risk assessments
- Arrangements for any occupational health surveillance
- Safety induction training, safety training and refresher training, etc.

Heads of School and Directors should ensure adequate resources (time, budget and staff allocation) for health and safety.
8.6 Risk Assessment

Schools and Directorates must have in place procedures to identify hazards and undertake risk assessments for their activities and implement any corresponding control measures. These procedures must be documented and must make clear the responsibility of staff to risk assess activities conducted by the School or Directorate.

Significant findings from risk assessments must be recorded and communicated to those undertaking the work.

Further information on the process for conducting a risk assessment and assessment templates for generic activities can be found on the Central Health and Safety Team web pages.

8.7 Equipment Maintenance and Examination

There shall a collaborative approach between the University’s Estates Directorate and other Directorates and Schools as follows:

- Estates is responsible for maintaining the fabric and services of the buildings. No inspection of or alteration to the fabric or services of any building should be made without first consulting the relevant Estates Clerk of Works for that building. This is to ensure that, amongst other essential precautions, asbestos is not disturbed.
- All faults with the fabric or services of the building should be reported to the Estates Fault Desk, either by phone or online.
- Equipment contained within buildings that Estates is responsible for will be examined and maintained as part of Estates planned programme.
- Maintenance and inspection of other equipment within buildings that Estates is not responsible for, will be the responsibility of the relevant School or Directorate, unless other arrangements have been formalised.

8.8 Information, Supervision and Training

All individuals who visit or work at the University of Aberdeen will require relevant information on the risks they may face while at the University and how to avoid harm while on campus. This information can be shared in a number of different ways.

- Visitors – must be provided with information e.g. evacuation routes, muster points, first aid arrangements, etc. This should be provided as an introductory safety briefing at the start of a meeting or session.
- Contractors – in addition to the information provided to visitors, contractors shall be given information such as on how to minimise risk to staff and students from their activities and to reiterate that work on the fabric or services of University buildings can only be conducted following consultation with the relevant Estates Clerk of Works and the University’s Asbestos Coordinator
- Students - shall be given information on emergency arrangements, evacuation routes, etc. If they participate in practical work, including fieldwork, they shall be given further, more specific information.
- Staff (including postgraduate students) – There shall be a training plan in place for staff and postgraduate students who must be provided with adequate health and safety training. This applies both to induction to the University and on being exposed to new or increased workplace risks.
Information can be provided as lab briefings, lab handouts, departmental codes of practice and other appropriate means. Training can be achieved through formal training courses, but ‘on-the-job’ training is also essential.

8.9 Accident / Near Miss Reporting and Investigation

The University of Aberdeen requires that all accidents and near misses are reported without prejudice. This is to ensure that investigations can take place to determine whether the safety arrangements have broken down, to learn lessons and, where necessary implement improvements to prevent recurrence of the accident.

- All accidents and near misses, and incidents of work related ill-health must be reported as soon as possible via the University's online reporting system
- Schools and Directorates must investigate all accidents or near misses to a level appropriate to the nature of the accident in order to determine the root cause of the accident, to learn lessons, and to take appropriate measures to minimise a recurrence of the accident
- The Central Health and Safety Team may request additional information from Schools or Directorates about accidents and may take the lead in investigating certain accidents, dependent on the severity of the accident.

8.10 Monitoring and Review

In order to ensure that any management systems and arrangements are continuing to function as intended, regular monitoring is required to ensure that the system is working. All Schools and Directorates shall ensure that periodic inspections and reviews or audits are planned and carried out to check and ensure that safety management systems are effective and are working properly.

8.10.1 Inspection

Inspections include physical inspections of work areas including the physical structure of the building, housekeeping, working practices, etc. They should normally be conducted by two or three people. It is beneficial for those persons responsible for managing the area to be present, both to ensure expected practices are in operation and to show management commitment to safety.

For low risk environments, e.g. offices, annual inspection is suitable, but for higher risk environments e.g. laboratories or workshops, there should be two or three inspections per year.

Actions arising from inspections shall be recorded. Timescales and responsible persons shall be identified to close out these actions and they should be followed up to ensure satisfactory closure. Findings and actions arising from inspections should be reported to the Head of School or Director and to the next appropriate safety committee or management meeting where health and safety is an agenda item.

8.10.2 Audit

The Central Health and Safety Team will conduct audits of Schools and Directorates on a programme based on the perceived risk profile of Schools and Directorates. The audit will concentrate on ensuring that Schools and Directorates are complying with both the health and
safety management arrangements as laid out in the University Health, Wellbeing and Safety Policy and the local Policies implemented by the Schools and Directorates.

8.10.3 Review

Although the Central Health and Safety Team arrange and conduct audits of the health and safety management systems of Schools and Directorates, each School or Directorate shall annually review its progress towards meeting its health and safety objectives. A local report on health and safety performance, in a format to be specified by the Health and Safety Committee, must be returned to the Committee on an annual basis.
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SUMMARY

This report brings together items of business that are to be considered as routine business for approval or for information.

This report will be treated as routine business and is not proposed for discussion unless members request otherwise and notify the Clerk one clear day in advance of the meeting.

For Approval

The items which are for approval are:

8.1 Annual Report on Institutional Led Review of Quality
8.2 Changes to the Committee Structure Supporting Research

For Information

The items which are for information are:

8.3 Promotion and Contribution Award Exercise 2016 Outcomes and Equality Monitoring
8.4 Report from the Development Trust
8.5 Year End Management Report (Separately enclosed)

Further Information

Further information is available from Mr Bruce Purdon, Clerk to the Court, Tel. 01224 273949 or b.purdon@abdn.ac.uk
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper comprises the ‘Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality, 2015–2016’, which is due to be submitted to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) following approval by University Court. It is a requirement of the SFC that the Report is approved by the governing body of the University.

1.2 Attached with the Paper is the ‘Annual Statement of Assurance’ (Appendix I), which the SFC requires the governing body of the University to sign. Additional information (Appendix II) is also provided to Court regarding the arrangements in place for quality assurance and enhancement of institutional provision in support of their confirmation of the required statement.

1.3 The paper is for approval. The Annual Report is to be submitted to the SFC by 30 September 2016; the SFC permit the signed Annual Statement of Assurance to follow later if necessary due to the timing of governing body meetings.

1.4 Further information is available from Professor Peter McGeorge, Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching), email: mcgeorge@abdn.ac.uk, tel: x2248).

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 An ‘Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality’ is required by the SFC as a condition of grant to ensure (i) that provision is of an acceptable quality and (ii) that all institutions have an appropriate strategy for quality enhancement. SFC guidance states that the Report should include the following:

- A list of subject areas that were the subject of internal reviews during the academic year.
- A list of subject areas that were the subject of review by other bodies (eg professional or statutory bodies (PSBs)) during the academic year.
- The ways in which support services were included in the review process.
- The role and nature of student involvement in the review process.
- The outcomes of subject review, whether carried out internally or by PSBs, indicating whether provision was approved and, if not, what actions are being taken to address issues raised.
- The key messages deriving from and action taken as a result of monitoring and analysis of performance indicators and other collected data, including feedback from students and other key stakeholders.
- Any significant issues relating either to development needs or to the identification of good practice the institution has identified as a result of the review process.
- A forward plan or calendar of future reviews for the following academic year.

3. STRATEGIC CONTEXT

3.1 The ‘Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality’ is required by the SFC as a condition of grant. It is a requirement of funding that the Annual Report be endorsed by the University’s governing body. In addition, the governing body must provide the Council with a signed ‘Annual Statement of Assurance’ (Appendix I). This is a statement that confirms that the University’s governing body has considered and is satisfied with the arrangements the University has in place to maintain standards and assure and enhance the quality of its provision. Appendix II outlines the mechanisms by which the Court assures standards and quality at the University of Aberdeen.
4. **DISCUSSION**

4.1 The ‘Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality’ must show that the University’s provision is of an acceptable quality and that it has in place an appropriate strategy for quality enhancement. The paper therefore reports on the University’s mechanisms for quality assurance and review, such as Internal Teaching Review (ITR), reviews by Professional and Statutory Bodies (PSBs), plus other developments that have occurred over the last academic year.

5. **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 N/A

6. **RISK MANAGEMENT**

6.1 The ‘Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality’, endorsed by the University’s governing body, is required by the SFC as a condition of grant.

7. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

7.1 N/A

8. **SUSTAINABILITY & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

8.1 N/A

9. **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

9.1 The Court is asked to approve the content of the Annual Report and to note the content of Appendices I and II. The Annual Report must be submitted to the SFC by 30 September 2016, and the SFC permit the signed Annual Statement of Assurance to follow if necessary.

10. **FURTHER INFORMATION**

10.1 Further information is available from Professor Peter McGeorge, Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching), email: mcgeorge@abdn.ac.uk, tel: x2248).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously considered by</td>
<td>University Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further approval required</td>
<td>University Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 SUBJECT REVIEW AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

1.1 Internal Teaching Review
The University of Aberdeen’s process for periodic subject review is termed ‘Internal Teaching Review’ (ITR) and has been a feature of the University’s quality assurance procedures since 1994, with the process having evolved over that period to reflect ongoing changes in the external and internal drivers for quality assurance and enhancement. Schools are subject to ITR every sixth year, with the review covering the previous five years. The documentation submitted by Schools includes a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and an action plan identifying points for improvement. The Final Report resulting from an ITR is a constructive commentary that identifies specific commendations and recommendations. Schools are asked to provide a formal Response to the Final Report, which is considered by the University’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). Schools are then asked to provide a One-Year Follow-up Report indicating the progress that has been made. All Final Reports and Responses are published on the University’s web pages. As part of the University’s ongoing wider review of its quality mechanisms, the ITR process and documentation is being reviewed, with the intent to have greater emphasis on enhancement of quality and the student experience. As a result of this ongoing programme, a revised Annual Course Review (ACR) process was introduced in 2012–2013 and a new Annual Programme Review (APR) in 2014–2015. During 2016-2017 it is intended that a new process of ITR will be developed, that allows Schools more explicitly to draw upon the ACRs and APRs they have completed during the period of ITR review, to provide a greater enhancement focus to the process and to reduce the bureaucratic burden of ITR on Schools.

1.2 Student involvement in Internal Teaching Review
Students are a central part of the University’s ITR process and to the wider quality processes within the University. The University encourages Schools to involve their students in the preparation of their SED, and to make the Final Reports and School Responses available to their students. ITR panels meet with all levels of undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students studying with the School that is being reviewed, as well as with students who undertake the role of Class Representative or School Convener. The University has a longstanding partnership with the Aberdeen University Students’ Association (AUSA), and all ITR panels include a student member of Senate, who is a senior representative from AUSA with responsibility for academic affairs. This student panel member is trained alongside staff panel members and plays a full role on the panel, usually taking the lead when the panel meets with students. Student members also form part of any Panel considering validation or accreditation as part of our collaborative activities with other institutions.

1.3 Internal review of professional services
ITR includes the review of professional services as an integral part of the process. Panels meet support staff from the School and topics for review also cover services provided by the central Professional Services departments such as the Centre for Academic Development, Student Advice and Support, the Registry, Library, Estates, and IT Services. Specifically, the SED asks Schools to consider the ways in which they have interacted with our various professional service departments and to comment on whether there is anything further these support agencies could do to assist Schools in promoting high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement. Any comments on professional services in the ITR reports are considered by the QAC and responses and action plans sought from the relevant Professional Services department.
Additionally, as was reported in the 2014/15 report, a process and supporting documentation for a periodic review of Professional Service areas was developed which it was planned would be ratified in 2015/16 with a pilot being undertaken. Due to a wider institutional review of Professional Services taking place in 2015/16, the new periodic review process has yet to be piloted.

1.4 Business Improvement activities

The University has an on-going programme of reviews of the effectiveness and efficiency of its professional services departments by way of one-day workshops facilitated by the University's Business Improvement Team. Over the last academic year, such activities have included helping the Business School to review processes for monitoring student absence, with the aim of streamlining and simplifying the process, and in so doing allow for more proactive student monitoring and support. The Business Improvement Team has also worked to improve Schools’ usage of the Disabilities Database in order to increase consistency in its use to ensure that students’ disability provisions are met without delay. The Personal Tutor administrative team has also worked with the Business Improvement Team to improve the allocation process of assigning students to Personal Tutors, and allow students to choose their appointment times to fit their schedule rather than have them randomly assigned.

2  INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEWS, 2015–2016

2.1 During academic year 2015–2016, ITRs were conducted in the following areas:
- School of Geosciences, College of Physical Sciences, September 2015;
- School of Natural and Computing Sciences, College of Physical Sciences, November 2015;
- School of Divinity, History and Philosophy, College of Arts and Social Science, March 2016.

2.2 School of Geosciences, College of Physical Sciences, September 2015

The Panel’s overriding impression was that the School of Geosciences provides an extremely supportive environment for students. The range of degree provision is considered more than adequate, and the quality of teaching and supervision, particularly at postgraduate taught (PGT) level is excellent. It was clear to the Panel that the School administrative and technical staff are extremely dedicated and contribute hugely to the support provided to students, and this was confirmed by students with whom the Panel met. Postgraduate research students were particularly appreciative of the support provided by their supervisors. There is a strong research culture evident within the School, and PhD students felt included within this ethos. The Panel did note however that there was clearly scope for individual disciplines to work much more closely together, particularly in regard to administrative processes, with differences in approach appearing to result in unnecessary duplication of effort.

2.3 Department of Chemistry, School of Natural and Computing Sciences, College of Physical Sciences, November 2015

The Panel commended the quality of teaching and learning in the department. The Panel was heartened by the positive response from students toward the department and commended the existence of a keen sense of collegiality amongst all staff in respect of the pursuit of a high standard of student experience. The Panel commended the commitment of staff and were encouraged to note this commitment recognised by the undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students interviewed. The Panel noted a number of instances of good practice, including the breadth of teaching methods, the flexible approach to learning, the work of the department in supporting students undertaking programmes outwith Chemistry, and the
measures and philosophy the department has in place to fulfil the requirements of the Equality Act (2010). In particular, the Panel commended the work done by the School in supporting students with disabilities. The Panel did note a degree of isolation within the department from both the School of Natural and Computing Sciences, of which it is part, and the University as a whole and thus recommended that work to improve these relationships be undertaken.

2.4 School of Divinity, History and Philosophy, College of Arts and Social Science, March 2016

The Panel was impressed with the commendable breadth of courses offered across the School, and noted that students appreciated the opportunities made available to them. All Panel members were exceptionally impressed by the recently developed distance learning PhD programme, with distance PhD students speaking enthusiastically about their studies, their supervisors and the level of support they receive. The School was also commended for the information sessions made available to potential Honours students for guidance in considering Honours options, the range of assessment types available across courses and for the innovative efforts made by academic staff in regard to small group teaching and for their endeavours toward fostering reflective thinkers within the student body. The Panel did note that while disciplines within the School had introduced some excellent examples of good practice, in terms of both subject delivery and assessment, these are not systematic or well developed across the School despite proving successful. The Panel recommended that the School work to roll out such instances of good practice more widely.

2.5 Outcomes of Internal Teaching Reviews

The panels of all ITRs conducted during 2015–2016 were satisfied with the academic standards and the overall quality of learning opportunities provided, and that sound systems of course and programme review were in place. No significant issues relating to development needs or to the identification of good practice the institution have been identified as a result of the review process. All undergraduate and postgraduate degrees offered by the Schools were therefore recommended for revalidation to the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC).

Recommendations made by the ITR panels in their Final Reports focus on the enhancement of aspects of provision, and highlight specific areas for commendation or recommendation. Schools are asked to consider these and provide a formal Response, stating relevant actions to be taken or fully considered reasons should the panel’s recommendations be thought to be inappropriate. The Final Reports and School Responses are considered by the University’s QAC, and particular areas of good practice or of concern are reported to the University Committee on Teaching & Learning. During academic year 2015-2016, the QAC reviewed the reports, and responses thereto, of the Schools of Medicine & Dentistry and Geosciences together with the one-year follow up reports of the Schools of Engineering, Language and Literature, Law and Social Science. The responses of the School of Divinity, History and Philosophy and that of the department of Chemistry, reviewed in academic year 2015–2016, will be considered by the Quality Assurance Committee early in academic year 2016–2017, with the respective one-year follow-up reports being due early in 2017-2018.

2.6 Forward plan of Internal Teaching Reviews, 2015–2016

During academic year 2016–2017, ITRs will be conducted in the following areas:
 School of Psychology, College of Life Sciences and Medicine, October 2016;
 Business School, November 2016;
 School of Education, College of Arts and Social Sciences, March 2017.

3 REVIEWS BY PROFESSIONAL AND STATUTORY BODIES, 2015–2016

During 2015–2016, reviews by professional and statutory bodies were conducted in the following areas:

3.1 Business School
The Business School’s MA Accountancy programmes were reviewed by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland (ICAS) in June 2016. Subject to minor subject amendments being introduced in the relevant modules, ICAS confirmed the MA Accountancy degrees receive full accreditation for the ICAS Test of Competence subjects. An interim review is scheduled for 2018.
3.2 School of Education
The Bachelor of Arts in Childhood Practice was successfully re-accredited by the Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC) in January 2016. The next inspection will take place in January 2019.

3.3 Dentistry, School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
The division of Dentistry has been visited by the General Dental Council (GDC), each year since the inception of the new Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) programme, as is the normal practice for a new programme. The last visit from the GDC to Aberdeen was in May 2016. The School anticipates the GDC report on the visit to arrive in October 2016.

3.4 School of Law
The LLM Law with English Law for graduates and the LLB Law with English Law and European Legal Studies were successfully accredited by the Joint Academic Stage Board (JASB) in June 2016. Consistent with new JASB procedures, JASB will no longer undertake separate accreditation reviews, but will instead request the Law School share with them its future internal teaching reviews; the next ITR for the School is scheduled for 2019.

4 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

4.1 All Schools are required to provide an account of registrations (including admissions, progression and retention), degrees awarded, course pass rates, and first destinations of leavers during ITR, with course registrations and pass rates specifically being considered annually as part of annual course and programme monitoring procedures. The University Committee on Teaching and Learning and Senate consider reports that monitor UG student progression and withdrawals (together with numbers of academic appeals, disciplinary hearings and academic complaints).

4.2 The University pays close attention to non-continuation data particularly amongst our full-time undergraduate population. Annually non-continuation data is analysed in detail and considered by Senior Management and Schools, with regard to level of study, student domicile, incoming qualifications, and entry route (summer school, access, clearing).

4.3 The University continues to collect and make extensive use of data from students. These data include survey and focus group data obtained for specific purposes, for example evaluation of blended use of one of our Futurelearn MOOCs in on-campus undergraduate courses, and the impact of commuting on learning outcomes. The University also routinely collects data annually from a variety of sources including the National Student Survey (NSS), the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), and the student Barometer. Data at the individual course level is obtained through ongoing quality enhancement and assurance processes, including the university wide Student Course Evaluation Form (SCEF) and Staff-student Liaison Committees. Following review of the outcome of two years of pilots by the Higher Education Academy we also adopted the United Kingdom Engagement Survey (UKES) with level one and level three undergraduates in 2016. To make the best use of these data to enhance the student experience responsibility for the collection and analysis of the NSS, PTES, UKES, and PRES is now centralised in the University's Centre for Academic development. This has enabled a consistent approach to analysis and dissemination of performance indicators, associated staff development activities, and facilitates support for evaluation of the student experience and pedagogical research. Targets for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) derived from these surveys are now integrated into the school planning cycle.

4.4 The Vice-Principal for Learning and Teaching meets regularly with each Head of School to facilitate communication and dialogue across the institution about strategic priorities, enhancement initiatives, and to discuss School level metrics including NSS and retention data, and those relating to the KPIs within the institutional strategic plan.

5 ONGOING DEVELOPMENT

5.1 Introduction of a new Common Grading Scale
5.1.1 In September 2014 the University implemented a new Common Grading Scale along with a new Grade Point Average system for determination of honours classification and progression and award of postgraduate taught degrees. The changes were introduced to ensure that the processes of assessment are conducted in a fair, consistent and transparent manner across the whole University; of particular relevance given the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of many of the University's programmes. The revisions were made partly in response to external examiner
feedback and common recommendations made in ITRs. With the new system having just completed its first cycle, an analysis of degree awards is currently underway, to determine the impact of the new system. Alongside this, a review of the use of the new common grading scheme is also being undertaken to ensure that the new marking scale is being used fully and appropriately across the university.

5.2 Feedback and Assessment

As is the case across the sector, survey assessment and feedback scores are lower than we would wish and we have established a Feedback and Assessment Task Force to lead developments in this area. To date the Task Force has focused on dissemination of best feedback practice (including electronic marking), managing both staff and student feedback expectations (especially in regards to promptness), and developing a better dialogue with students about the feedback they receive and the ways they can use it. The Task Force has also looked closely at increasing the diversity of assessments at the University, and developing better pathways for student feedback. In response to the latest NSS scores, the Task Force is currently formulating both short- and long-term strategies for improving feedback, and there will be a best practice workshop for diverse assessments in the autumn.

5.3 Positive Outcomes

5.3.1 With graduate employability in mind, a new professional skills course, led by the Careers Service, has been embedded in all first year degree programmes. The online course, which can be done at a student’s own pace, has three components covering (i) Developing Graduate Attributes; (ii) Health, Safety and Wellbeing; and (iii) Equality & Diversity. The course comprises a range of delivery methods including videos, quizzes, and case study scenarios. Completion of the course will be included on the students’ transcript provided on graduation. Building on this course, a level two course was piloted to all level two students in 2015-16 and this course is now available to all level 2 students as an optional course.

5.3.2 The Careers Service is also working with academic colleagues to pilot a new work-related learning course in the coming academic year. This innovative course requires students to secure their own placement, part-time work or personal development project which is approved by their academic school. An underpinning part of the course encourages students to reflect on their personal and professional development and to make connections between their degree programme and the world of work. Specifically the course will provide opportunities for the University to offer degree programmes with different forms of external engagement and for all students to have access to work-related learning opportunities during their studies. The pilot course will be rolled out in 2016-17 in four Schools, with the Careers Service providing support to students on the course working closely with academic colleagues. To support this, the development of a Work-Related Learning Policy will be taken forward to ensure that academic support is appropriate and that roles and responsibilities are clear to all stakeholders.

5.4 Student Retention

Work focused on improving student retention is being led by an institutional Retention Task Force. An institutional-wide Induction Group has been established including representatives from the Students’ Association, the Directorate of Student Life and Schools, which has led to a more integrated approach to induction across the University. The process of student withdrawal has been reviewed; in addition to revisions to the withdrawal form and guidance provided to students, a protocol is being developed for Schools to use to follow up on students who have withdrawn but who wish to have continued interaction with their Schools. The University has also purchased a retention tool that uses historic retention data from the past 5 years to predict whom of the incoming 2016-17 cohort (level 1 and direct entrants) are most at risk of not completing their studies. Two Schools (Divinity, History & Philosophy and Natural & Computing Sciences) will be piloting the system in the coming year.

5.5 Online Provision

Significant focus is being given to enhancing the online provision offered by the University. Important educational goals are associated with online delivery including, supporting changes in pedagogic practice, providing flexible learner journeys to meet the needs of a heterogeneous student population and widening participation. In addition, national and international demographics, barriers to on campus recruitment such as immigration, also mean it is critical that the University increases its online provision. These developments will take a number of forms – in- house developments using the University’s VLE, developments taken forward with the support of external partners and development of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOcs) with our partner FutureLearn which serve as ‘tasters’ of full online programmes to attract applicants. Institutional resources to support this work
are being enhanced through the recruitment of six Graduate Trainees who will undertake training programmes supported by the School of Education, the Centre for Academic Development and IT Services.

5.6 Digitally Enhanced Learning Spaces
Two new digitally-enhanced learning spaces (DELS) have been created through re-development of two teaching rooms. These rooms have been designed with the goal of enabling new methods of teaching and learning as part of the University’s wider steps towards digital transformation, including video-conferencing and multiple audio-tracking cameras, modernised lecture capture, and the ability for users to display their device screens wirelessly to any of the screens within the room. Within these DELS, the wide range of technology has been designed to facilitate the increased use of personal devices by students. Furthermore, the rooms will enable meaningful distributed learning, by providing a fully integrated and comparable experience for both local and distance students as well as offering the opportunity to easily bring in live external contributions from our partners. Future rooms are being planned in other buildings as part of the wider institutional capital plan.

5.7 Personal Tutors

While the initial introduction of personal tutors used a common approach across the University, feedback indicated that there may be a need for a more tailored approach by Schools as to how the system should operate. Through the Senior Personal Tutors Forum, each School has developed their own Personal Tutor Statement setting out how the system will operate in their specific area. Differing approaches are now in place with seven schools now allocating students to tutors on a discipline rather than school basis whilst others have chosen to maintain a school based focus. The move to discipline allocation has meant more varied tutor loads. All Schools are continuing to meet students in September and January with some including additional meetings for first years in November and March and for year 3 students in March. In addition, students may meet separately with their tutor outwith these formal meetings if required. The changes made as a result of the School Statements will be kept under review by the Senior Tutors Forum.

Professor Peter McGeorge
Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) University of Aberdeen

Further information is available from Ms Katja Christie, Academic Services, Registry, University of Aberdeen, Regent Building (F17), Regent Walk, Old Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 3FX e: katja.christie@abdn.ac.uk; t: 01224 273401
On behalf of the governing body of the University of Aberdeen, I confirm that we have considered the institution’s arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for academic year 2015–2016, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

Signed for and on behalf of the University Court of the University of Aberdeen,  
at: Aberdeen  
on: the 4th day of October 2016

by: ......................................................................................................................................................

[Name and designation of the signatory]

THE UNIVERSITY COURT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN, a charity registered in Scotland, No. SC013683, University Office, King’s College, Regent Walk, Aberdeen, AB24 3FX, (‘Aberdeen’)
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THE UNIVERSITY’S ARRANGEMENTS TO MAINTAIN STANDARDS AND ASSURE AND
ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF ITS PROVISION

The University Committee on Teaching and Learning (UCTL) has strategic oversight of all aspects of teaching and learning and the wider student experience. This includes responsibility for the assurance of the quality of the University’s educational provision (particularly in relation to the design, implementation, evaluation and review of mechanisms for quality assurance), for the enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning, and for the safeguarding of academic standards. The UCTL is a joint committee of Senate and Court and reports to both regularly. It is chaired by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and its membership consists of the Deans of Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate provision, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean for Quality Assurance and Enhancement, and the Conveners of UCTL Task Forces (retention, Feedback and Assessment and Positive Outcomes), with senior representatives from the Directorates of Academic Affairs and Student Life. The UCTL considers reports from three sub-committees, the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC), the Undergraduate Committee and the Postgraduate Committee. The UCTL devolves responsibility to the QAC for the operational oversight and monitoring of the mechanisms that assure the quality and maintenance of standards across all taught provision, including postgraduate taught elements of research provision. The regular monitoring and oversight of the operation of these mechanisms by the QAC is reported through to the UCTL, and UCTL have overall responsibility for assuring these, implementing any changes to address significant issues and/or to enhance the provision. UCTL then reports on its activity to Senate and the Court, and the Court thereby has opportunity to consider these arrangements and satisfy itself of their sufficiency. The mechanisms include the following:

**Internal Teaching Review (ITR)** is the University’s system of periodic review of Schools’ teaching and learning provision and is also the process by which a Schools’ programmes are revalidated. ITR provides a formal opportunity for a School to reflect on and critically evaluate its learning and teaching provision and for the University to satisfy itself that quality and standards are being maintained and that issues are being addressed.

**Annual Course and Programme Approval (SENAS).** Course and programme proposals are submitted via SENAS forms which are designed to ensure conformity with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF), European qualifications frameworks, and QAA guidelines for programme specifications. School SENAS forms are considered at College level to ensure alignment with School and College policy and resource; QAC reviews SENAS to ensure conformity to institutional regulations and practice, and compliance with the QAA Quality Code and SCQF.

**Student Feedback** on taught courses is gathered primarily via an annual online ‘Student Course Evaluation Form’ (SCEF) exercise, and twice-yearly ‘Staff–Student Liaison Committee’ (SSLC) meetings. Research student feedback is collected via annual questionnaire and six-monthly monitoring reports and forms a component – along with External Examiner comments – of our Annual Course reviews. Whilst the expected, and minimum, methods for Schools to gather student feedback are the SCEF exercise and SSLECs, Schools are encouraged to consider different and innovative methods to give students the opportunity to provide feedback. Several Schools have courses which make use of mid-term SCEF to identify any issues which could be acted upon before the course ends, whilst others hold student focus groups and informal feedback sessions to allow students to express any concerns or raise issues with the staff throughout the academic year. Large level 1 courses often use Personal Response System (PRS) handsets to get immediate feedback on how the course is going and our School of Education provides opportunities for students across all Education programmes to contribute online to a synchronous student forum via our VLE as a means of eliciting further student feedback.

**External Examiners** play a major role in verifying standards and monitoring the quality of our provision. Examiners report annually, with their Reports and Responses to them by the Heads of School being considered by the QAC before being returned to External Examiners.

The University's **Degree Regulations** specify the criteria for our awards. Specific assessment policy and practices are set out in the University’s Academic Quality Handbook (AQH) and conform to the SCQF and QAA Quality Code. The University employs a number of mechanisms related to ensuring the standards of its awards, including clear guidelines in regard to the procedures to be followed in instances of student misconduct (including plagiarism), medical and other extenuating circumstances; and student appeals.
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CHANGES TO THE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE SUPPORTING RESEARCH

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper presents to Court proposals for a revised committee structure supporting research and REF preparations. The proposals reflect the organisational changes following the devolution of budgets to School level and incorporate recommendations made by the Professional Services Review.

1.2 The proposed structure merges the remits and functions of the current Research Policy Committee with those of the Advisory Group for Research Ethics and Governance and the institutional level REF Steering Group. The institutional Research Policy Committee will interact with School Research Committees on matters of strategy, policy, governance and general research performance.

1.3 The current ethics committees at College level will remain in place and report directly to the Research Policy Committee which will review the activities of the ethics committees regularly.

1.4 In addition, it is proposed to create Main REF Panel Committees, led by the Deans of Research, to support REF preparations. These will ensure the effective management of preparations at unit of assessment level, given that these do not map on to the school structure, ensure consistency of strategy and approach across main panels and the institution and enable the sharing of good practice in REF preparations.

1.5 In order to support the creation and operation of a Single Graduate School for Postgraduate Research Students the creation of a Postgraduate Research Students Committee is proposed, under the convenership of the new Dean of Graduate School. It will report to the Research Policy Committee, ensuring that issues relating to the provision of doctoral study are considered by the committee alongside other research-related issues.

1.6 Court is invited to approve the proposed committee structure. The proposals will also require approval by the University Senate. If approved by Senate, it is proposed that they should come into effect after the Senate meeting on 2 November to be in place for the next meeting of the Research Policy Committee on 14 November.

1.7 Further information is available from Professor Bryan MacGregor, Vice-Principal for Research, e-mail: b.d.macgregor@abdn.ac.uk; ext. 3831; Dr E Rattray, Acting Director Research & Innovation, e-mail e.rattray@abdn.ac.uk, ext. 4369 or Mrs Marlis Barraclough, Senior Policy Advisor, Research & Innovation, e-mail: m.barraclough@abdn.ac.uk, ext. 3787.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 In June 2015, Court agreed that budgets should be devolved to School level. It further agreed to a review of the Professional Services, with a view to aligning them with the new organisational structures and to identifying £1m savings in 2015-16 and £2m in 2016-17. A Research Support Working Group was established to look at processes and structures that support research, including the committees that inform strategic planning and support research activities within Schools and institutes.

2.2 The Research Support Working Group was chaired by the Vice-Principal for Research, Professor Bryan MacGregor. During its deliberations, it consulted widely with the researcher community and with members of the Professional Services and held a number of business improvement workshops. It reported to the Professional Services Project Board in January
2016. The final report was published in May and endorsed the recommendations on the committee structure made by the Research Support Working Group.

3. **Professional Services Research Support Working Group**

3.1 The Research Support Working Group considered options to reduce the number of committees supporting research and PGRs. It looked at removing committees at College level following the devolution of budgets to Schools, and considered the merger of a number of committees to reduce the number of meetings across the institution.

3.2 The Group further agreed that each member of RPC should be a School Research Director or equivalent to ensure effective flow of information from School level committees to institutional committees and vice versa and that total membership of the RPC should be broadly proportionate to the number of academic staff in each school. The committee structure should support strategic planning and monitoring at School level and REF planning at unit of assessment level and recognise that these are not necessarily compatible. The new structure and meeting schedule should allow for the timely dissemination of information and discussion of issues prior to Court and other senior management meetings to ensure that RPC can be consulted effectively.

3.3 It recognised that the preparation of REF submissions, support and oversight of selection decisions and development of impact case studies along main REF panel lines would be more effective as units of assessment do not map on neatly to school structures and to ensure consistence of approach across main REF panels.

4. **New Structures**

4.1 The Research Support Working Group recommended the following:

- merger of the remit of current Research Policy Committee with those of the Advisory Group for Ethics and Governance (AGREG) and the REF Steering Group

- support of REF preparations across Units of Assessment (UoAs) to develop and implement submission strategies to the main REF panels. The Panel Committees will be chaired by the Deans of Research and supported by the College Administrative Officer. They will report to the Research Policy Committee.

- The Panel Committees will take the lead in REF preparations, under the convenership of the Deans of Research, and working closely with colleagues in Research & Innovation and the Planning Office. This will free up School Research Committees to focus on other research related issues such as, research performance, horizon scanning, research governance, funder policies and priorities and others.

- ethics boards and committees currently at College level will continue to review applications. In the revised structure they will report directly to the Research Policy Committee, with ethics a standing item on the agenda. The chairpersons of the ethics committees will be invited to attend the Research Policy Committee to present an annual report

- creation of a Postgraduate Research Students Committee with a remit to oversee the creation of the new Graduate School for Research Students, and to consider institutional strategy and policy related to doctoral study and to review performance in terms of recruitment and completion.

4.2 The proposed remits and memberships for the committees are shown at Annex A. They will be reviewed annually at the start of each academic year.

4.3 Annex B provides an overview of the committee structure.
4.4 Heads of School, School Directors of Research and School Administrative Officers were invited to comment on the proposals.

5. **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no additional resource requirements arising from the proposals.

6. **RISK MANAGEMENT**

6.1 The risks associated with research in the Corporate Risk Register were combined into one single register, STRA_2016-07, and approved by Operating Board and Court in June 2016.

6.2 The revised committee structure supports good governance and transparent decision making across the new organisational structure.

7. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

7.1 An equality impact assessment is not required. At its meeting in June 2016, Court agreed to achieve gender balance on its committees. The current gender balance for the proposed membership of the Research Policy Committee is 11 men and 12 women (48%/52%).

7.2 The Research Policy Committee will have oversight of policy and practice of equality and diversity issues relating to research, particularly those in support of institutional Athena Swan awards.

8. **SUSTAINABILITY & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

8.1 There are no sustainability or social responsibility issues arising out of the proposals presented in this paper.

9. **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

9.1 Court is invited to approve the proposed committee structure, remit and membership.

10. **FURTHER INFORMATION**

10.1 Further information is available from Professor Bryan MacGregor, Vice-Principal for Research, e-mail: b.d.macgregor@abdn.ac.uk; ext. 3831 or Mrs Marlis Barraclough, Senior Policy Advisor, Research & Innovation, e-mail: m.barraclough@abdn.ac.uk, ext. 3787.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously considered by</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further approval required</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex A**

Proposed Committee Remits and Memberships for research related committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: A Strategy and Policy committee to drive and support the University’s overall Research Objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Vice-Principal Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by: Senior Policy Advisor, Research &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports to: Senate; Operating Board via UMG; Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Committees: Life Sciences &amp; Medicine (Panel A) REF Committee; Physical Sciences &amp; Engineering (Panel B) REF Committee; Social Sciences (Panel C) REF Committee; Arts &amp; Humanities (Panel D) REF Committee; Postgraduate Research Students Committee, Ethics Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaces with: Internationalisation Strategy Committee; School Research Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers to Senior Vice-Principal, College Administrative Officers and Business Development Officers for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remit: <em>(To be reviewed annually at first meeting of committee cycle)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing, and driving strategy across the University’s research activities to meet institutional targets and Strategic Plan Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring and review of the effectiveness of the University’s Research KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight of research risk management including assurance as to health and safety matters relating to research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight of research ethics and governance issues; developing and reviewing institutional policy on research ethics and governance; receiving reports from Ethics Boards and Committees; undertaking ethics health checks within Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing strategic direction for the University’s Impact agenda (academic and non-academic) as defined across the sector (e.g. REF and RCUK) and promotion of good practice and development of impact KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receiving reports from Panel Research Committees on significant research activities within the Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring and review of impact of research investment and identifying new areas for strategic investment to match institutional priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring success of research grant applications to external income programmes, overheads and value of research and commercialisation initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight of institutional outcome and, developing submission strategy and monitoring of preparations for Research Excellence Framework and other research performance exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight of equality and diversity issues relating to research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight of establishment and operation of institutional Graduate School or Doctoral College; development and review of policies relating to doctoral training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight of institutional responses to external research consultations and initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convener: Professor B MacGregor, Vice-Principal (Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership: Mrs K McPhail, Member of the University Court Professor D Johnson, Director of Research, School of Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professor N Mauthner, Director of Research, Business School
Professor D Tetzlaff, Director of Research, School of Geosciences
Professor P Ziegler, Director of Research, School of Divinity, History and Philosophy
Dr L Colucci-Gray, Director of Research, School of Education
Professor D Pokrajac, Director of Research, School of Engineering
Professor P Schell, Director of Research, School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture
Professor P Beaumont, Director of Research, School of Law
Director of Research, School of Natural & Computing Sciences
Professor L Phillips, Director of Research, School of Psychology
Professor B Hayes, Director of Research, School of Social Sciences
Professor G Macfarlane, Institute of Applied Health Sciences (incl. HERU, HSRU)
Professor P Fowler, Institute of Medical Sciences
Professor R Patey, Institute of Education for Medical and Dental Sciences
Professor P Haggarty, Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health
Professor M Campbell, Professor M Brown, Dr R Neilson, Deans of Research
Professor J Masthoff, Dean of Graduate School
Professor M Ross, Head of College of Arts & Social Sciences
Professor P Hannaford, Head of College of Life Sciences & Medicine
(23 members)
(or designated deputies)

In attendance: Director of Research & Innovation
Officers, as appropriate
Conveners of Ethics Committees (3) (first meeting of session each year)

Quorum: 50% of formal membership
Four meetings per session

PROPOSED

LIFE SCIENCES & MEDICINE (PANEL A) RESEARCH COMMITTEE; PHYSICAL SCIENCES & ENGINEERING (PANEL B) RESEARCH COMMITTEE; ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH COMMITTEE (PANELS C AND D) RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Chair: Dean of Research
Supported by: College Administrative Officer
Reports to: Research Policy Committee
Interfaces with: School Research Committees
Papers to School Administrative Officers for information

Remit: (To be reviewed annually at first meeting of committee cycle)

- REF preparations: co-ordination of submissions to Main REF Panels, with particular regard to panel specific requirements and ensuring consistency of approach across the submission
- Monitoring research and impact performance across Units of
Assessment

- Supporting and enabling peer review of research applications and outputs within disciplines and across disciplines for multi-disciplinary research
- Enabling discussion/co-ordination of resource and facilities planning across School boundaries (including core facilities)
- Supporting doctoral training across related disciplines; sharing of good practice in generic skills training, supervision and PGR student support
- Supporting Schools in the review of PhD studentships
- (In conjunction with the Graduate School) contribute to PGR skills training

Membership:
Dean of Research (Convener)
Head of College
School Directors of Research or Unit of Assessment Leads

Attending Officers:
College Administrative Officer (Clerk)
Impact Officer/PERU representative

PROPOSED
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS COMMITTEE

Chair: Dean of Graduate School
Supported by: Graduate School Manager
Reports to: Research Policy Committee
Interfaces with: Postgraduate Taught Students Committee; School Research Committees; School Graduate School Committees, Internationalisation Committee

Remit: (To be reviewed annually at first meeting of committee cycle)

- Development and implementation of institutional policies to support postgraduate research provision within the University of Aberdeen, including increase of postgraduate research student numbers in line with the institutional Strategic Plan, improvement of completion rates and enhancement of both postgraduate research student and supervisor experience; oversight of admissions processes
- Development of strategies for external promotion of doctoral studies at the University of Aberdeen
- Monitoring recruitment, retention and completion of postgraduate research students
- Supporting doctoral training across related disciplines; sharing of good practice in generic skills training, supervision and PGR student support
- Supporting Schools in the review of PhD studentships
- (In conjunction with the Graduate School) contribute to PGR skills training
- Horizon scanning for external studentship opportunities; institutional strategy relating to Doctoral Training Centres (or equivalent)

Membership:
Dean of Graduate School (Convener)
PGR representative from each School (2 from Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition)
| Postgraduate research student representative from each School ((2 from Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition)

Attending Officers:
SRAS/Admissions representative
Registry representative
Marketing representative
PERU representative
Researcher Development Unit representative

| PROPOSED

| SAMPLE ETHICS BOARD REMIT – PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

| Chair: |
| Supported by: College Administrative Officer |
| Reports to: Research Policy Committee |
| Interfaces with: School Research Committees; School Graduate School Committees |

Remit: *(To be reviewed annually at first meeting of committee cycle)*

- Formally delegate to academic staff in disciplines/schools the authority to assess and review research proposals.
- Report regularly to the Research Policy Committee on how the requirements of the University Research Framework on Ethics and Governance are met by the Schools of Engineering, Geosciences and Natural and Computing Sciences.
- Review complex cases that are considered too difficult or controversial for a single member of staff to assess unsupported.
- Identification of staff training and development needs in relation to research ethics and governance

The Board will meet at least twice a year, with additional business to be undertaken by correspondence as appropriate

| Membership: |
| Convener |
| School representatives/School Ethics Officers |
| Director of Research |
| Business Development Officer |
| IT Services Representative |
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This paper is to advise the University Court of the outcomes from the Staff Promotion Committee which met on 30 June 2016.

1.2 The University operates an annual Promotion and Contribution Award Exercise. The Staff Promotion Committee has delegated authority from the University Court to consider recommendations on promotion and contribution awards from all Promotion Sub-Committees and to approve recommendations on behalf of the University Court.

1.3 The Staff Promotion Committee met on 30 June 2016 and the University Court is invited to note the recommendations, attached as Appendix A, from the Staff Promotion Committee in relation to the 2016 Promotion Exercise.

1.4 The University is committed to monitoring the outcomes of the annual Exercise from an equality perspective and this paper provides a summary in relation to the equality strands of gender, ethnicity and disability. A detailed breakdown of results is attached as Appendix B.

1.5 Further information is available from Mrs Debbie Dyker, Director of Human Resources (telephone 01224 273732, email d.j.dyker@abdn.ac.uk)

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Promotion Procedure has been developed, and is regularly reviewed, through an ongoing process of positive partnership working with our Campus Trades Union representatives. These reviews previously resulted in predominantly stylistic amendments being made to the Procedure to clarify the operation of various aspects of the process. However, a fundamental review of the Promotion Procedure was undertaken ahead of the launch of the 2016 Exercise. This enhanced the current criteria used to assess applications for promotion and streamlined the process to enhance its efficiency and effectiveness.

2.2 The outcomes which are brought forward in this paper relate to the Promotion Exercise 2016 for Academic and Academic Related Staff seeking promotion from Grades 5 to 9. Applications for promotion from members of Support Staff (Grades 1-4) are considered under revised Procedures which were launched in June 2013.

3 STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The Strategic Plan 2015-2020 states People Goal 2 is “To attract and retain staff and students to a globally significant international institution strengthening capacity and excellence, in Aberdeen or another University location”. The annual Promotion Exercise is a key factor in ensuring that this takes place.

4 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

4.1 Gender

4.1.1 Promotion applications by gender were split 56% female and 44% male. The overall gender profile for Academic and Academic Related staff eligible for promotion comprises 55% female members of staff and 45% male members of staff. Whilst all staff are eligible to apply from their first day in employment they may apply their own eligibility criteria such that individuals, in consultation with their Head of School, will time their applications when they believe they will be
most successful or can demonstrate that they can meet the promotion criteria fully. The overall success rate by gender equality strand within the exercise is 59% for males and 54% for females. This has increased slightly for males from last year's exercise when the success rate for males was 58% and dropped for females from last year's exercise when the success rate was 58%. In this year's exercise 46 women and 39 men were successful with their applications compared to 60 women and 56 men last year.

4.1.2 A higher volume of applications for contribution awards were received from female members of staff than males (69% female and 31% male). The success rate in the Contribution Award Exercise (including non-consolidated payments) was higher for men than women (80% male and 55% female).

4.2 Ethnicity

4.2.1 Promotion applications by ethnicity were 3% BME (Black and Minority Ethnic), 92% White and 5% undisclosed. The overall ethnic profile for Academic and Academic Related staff eligible for promotion comprises 10.8% BME members of staff, 84.5% White members of staff and 4.7% of staff who have not disclosed this information. Therefore, the proportion of applications received from BME applicants is lower than the current ethnic profile of the cohort. The overall success rate by ethnicity equality strand within the Exercise was slightly higher for BME members of staff (60% BME, 57% White, 50% undisclosed).

4.2.2 Applications for contribution awards were 0% BME, 97% White and 3% undisclosed. The success rate in the Contribution Award Exercise (including non-consolidated payments) varied across the different groups (BME N/A, 61% White and 0% undisclosed).

4.3 Disability

4.3.1 The outcome of applications in relation to the disability equality strand is skewed as a result of the number of individuals who declare their disability status. Within the current eligible Academic and Academic Related cohort, 3.2% of applicants did not declare their status. The overall profile from those who declared their status within the cohort is 2.7% disabled and 94.1% non-disabled. 2.7% of the staff profile eligible for promotion have declared a disability. The overall success rate is 67% for disabled applicants and 57% for non-disabled applicants. However, due to the low reporting levels of disability status, these statistics are difficult to interpret.

4.3.2 There were no applications for contribution awards from those who declared their disability status. There were no applicants who did not disclose their status in this regard. The success rate in the Contribution Award Exercise (including non-consolidated payments) is 63% non-disabled. However, again, due to the low reporting levels of disability status, these statistics are difficult to interpret.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The financial cost of the increases to salary budgets have been taken into consideration at School/Section level. The total cost to the University of this year's exercise is £376,132 including National Insurance and Pension contributions. This is £143,282 down from £519,414 last year.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 No areas of significant risk have been identified.

7 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 An Equality Impact Assessment was conducted on the Promotion Procedures. The production of these statistics forms part of the ongoing equality monitoring process associated with the annual Exercise.
8 SUSTAINABILITY & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

8.1 There are no issues related to sustainability and social responsibility arising directly from this paper.

9 RECOMMENDED ACTION

9.1 The University Court is invited to note the recommendations from the Staff Promotion Committee.

9.2 The University Court is also invited to consider the statistics associated with the 2016 Exercise and to note that further discussion will take place in appropriate forums, including Partnership and Negotiating Consultative Committee and the Advisory Group on Equality and Diversity. Any actions identified will be taken forward as part of the HR and Equality & Diversity Strategies.

10 FURTHER INFORMATION

10.1 Further information is available from Mrs Debbie Dyker, Director of Human Resources (telephone 01224 273732, email d.j.dyker@abdn.ac.uk) and Catherine Cook, HR Specialist Services Partner (telephone 01224 273413, email c.cook@abdn.ac.uk).

12 September 2016 version 1 Open

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previously considered by</th>
<th>Staff Promotion Committee</th>
<th>30 June 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further approval required</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following promotions were approved at the Staff Promotion Committee held on 30 June 2016 and will take effect from 1 August 2016.

**Personal Chair**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Tina Hunter</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hazel Hutchison</td>
<td>School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Philip Ziegler</td>
<td>School of Divinity, History &amp; Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Lusseau</td>
<td>School of Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Benjamin Martin</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Marco Thiel</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Wamberto Vasconcelos</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Readership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Beth Lord</td>
<td>School of Divinity, History &amp; Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Wheatley</td>
<td>School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Zeray Yihdego</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Dana Dawson</td>
<td>School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Graeme MacLennan</td>
<td>School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sarah Woodin</td>
<td>School of Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Angel Cuesta Ciscar</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Zur Izhakian</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Nir Oren</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Healy</td>
<td>School of Geosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Matteo Spagnolo</td>
<td>School of Geosciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senior Lectureship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Tatiana Argounova-Low</td>
<td>School of Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Gearoid Millar</td>
<td>School of Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Marta Trzebiatowska</td>
<td>School of Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Amy Bryzgel</td>
<td>School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Helen Lynch</td>
<td>School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Catriona A MacDonald</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Rachel Shanks</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Smith</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Paula Sweeney</td>
<td>School of Divinity, History &amp; Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Karolin Hijazi</td>
<td>School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Flora Groning</td>
<td>School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Samantha Miller</td>
<td>School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Margaret Jackson</td>
<td>School of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jean-Baptiste Gramain</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Frank Guerin</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richard Hepworth</td>
<td>School of Natural and Computing Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kate Britton</td>
<td>School of Geosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sumeet Sunil Aphale</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Euan Bain</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Davide Dionisi</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Mehmet Emin Kartal</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lectureship

- Mrs Anna Bokedal   School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture
- Dr Stuart Durkin   School of Social Science
- Dr Amy Irwin       School of Psychology
- Dr Vasilis Louca    School of Biological Sciences
- Dr Amudha Poobalan  School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Dr David Muirhead  School of Geosciences

### Senior Research Fellow

- Dr Sandra Telfer    School of Biological Sciences
- Dr Thomas Baddeley  School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Dr Scott Clunas     School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Dr Colin Marshall   School of Natural and Computing Sciences

### Research Fellow

- Dr Diana Feliciano  School of Biological Sciences
- Dr Kathryn Banister School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Dr Lionel Broche    School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Dr Ahtsham Ishaq    School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Dr Sarah Nicoll     School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Dr Alice Toniolo    School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Mr James Christie   School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Dr Morag Douglas    School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Mr Vibhor Gupta     School of Natural and Computing Sciences
- Dr Shona Rhydderch  School of Natural and Computing Sciences

### Academic-Related Promotions

- Mrs Susan Blaney    School of Biological Sciences
- Dr Lynda Constable  School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Dr Eduardo de Paiva Alves School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Dr Wendy Pickford   School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Mrs Amelia Rudd     School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Dr Elaina Collie-Duguid School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Mrs Lynne Lumsden   School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Ms Louise Cotterell  School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Mrs Jenna Reynolds  School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition
- Mrs Annette Raffan  School of Biological Sciences
- Mrs Holly Spence    School of Biological Sciences
- Mrs Audrey Innes    School of Geosciences
- Miss Elizabeth Naessens School of Geosciences
- Mrs Catherine Holmes School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture
- Mr Iain Cameron     IT Services
- Mr Devender Narula  IT Services
- Dr Heather Doran    External Relations
- Mr Nicholas Edwards  Academic Affairs
- Ms Sarah James      Academic Affairs
- Miss Fiona MacAskill Human Resources
- Mr Andrew Millington IT Services
- Mrs Jill Murray     External Relations
- Mr Christopher Osbeck Estates
- Dr Anpu Varghese   Research & Innovation
- Mrs Katherine Robertson Student Life
- Mr Neil Stanfield   IT Services
## College of Physical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIRS</th>
<th>READER</th>
<th>SENIOR LECTURER</th>
<th>LECTURER</th>
<th>SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW (G8)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G7)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G7)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G8)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G9)</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION (includes one-off payments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## College of Arts & Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIRS</th>
<th>READER</th>
<th>SENIOR LECTURER</th>
<th>LECTURER</th>
<th>SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW (G8)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G7)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G7)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G8)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G9)</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION (includes one-off payments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## College of Life Sciences & Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIRS</th>
<th>READER</th>
<th>SENIOR LECTURER</th>
<th>LECTURER</th>
<th>SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW (G8)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G7)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G7)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G8)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G9)</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION (includes one-off payments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Professional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIRS</th>
<th>READER</th>
<th>SENIOR LECTURER</th>
<th>LECTURER</th>
<th>SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW (G8)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G7)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G7)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G8)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G9)</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION (includes one-off payments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Related Grade 9</td>
<td>Academic Related Grade 8</td>
<td>Academic Related Grade 7</td>
<td>Academic Related Grade 6</td>
<td>Academic Related Grade 5</td>
<td>CONTRIBUTION (includes one-off payments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ALL COLLEGES AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIRS</th>
<th>READER</th>
<th>SENIOR LECTURER</th>
<th>LECTURER</th>
<th>SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW (G8)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G7)</th>
<th>RESEARCH FELLOW (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G6)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G7)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G8)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RELATED (G9)</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION (includes one-off payments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Promotion Statistics - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSM</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contribution Awards - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Promotion Statistics - Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>BME</th>
<th></th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contribution Awards - Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>BME</th>
<th></th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Promotion Statistics - Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Disabled</th>
<th></th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contribution Awards - Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Disabled</th>
<th></th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>Number Successful</td>
<td>% Successful</td>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>