UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COURT

Minutes of meeting held on 22 March 2016

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

In attendance: Mr C Anucha, Miss M Burgoyne, Mr D Beattie, Mr A Donaldson, Mrs D Dyker, Mr L Forsyth, Mrs C Inglis, Dr H Sveinsdottir (for minutes 177-181 and 209-213), Professor Seth Kunin (for minutes 177-184), Ms S Richardson (for minutes 177-181), Very Rev Professor I Torrance and Mr B Purdon (Clerk)

Apologies for absence were received from Mr D Haywood, Professor N Hutchison and Mr B Pack.

PRESIDENT (ELECT) OF THE STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION

155 The Rector congratulated Mr C Anucha, President (Elect) of the Students’ Association on his election to the role and welcomed him to the meeting as an observer.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

156 The following declarations of interest were noted:

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

PRESENTATION ON CITY AND REGION DEAL

157 The Court received a presentation on the City and Region Deal from the Principal. The presentation highlighted the key features of the Deal for the City and Region, its objectives and its governance arrangements. Within the Deal there were a number of key areas of focus:

- Oil and Gas;
- Agriculture, Food and Drink;
- BioPharmaceuticals;
- Digital/Big Data; and
- Tourism.

158 The Court noted that the University was engaged in the first four of these areas and was committed to making these a success, working in partnership with Industry and the Robert Gordon University. As part of the Oil and Gas area, a key project would be the establishment of an Oil and Gas Technology Centre, which might be located in the harbour area of Aberdeen. It was anticipated that the University's academic expertise would have a significant opportunity to contribute to the work of that Centre and to benefit from access to the new facilities it provided. In this context, the University was keeping under review plans for a new Energy building on campus.

159 In further discussion, it was agreed that the Deal was an exciting but vital initiative for the longer term future of the City and Region to which the University, therefore, needed to contribute. As such it also offered the University significant opportunities, including the forging of new or stronger links with industry. In this respect, it was suggested that Court members should
consider how their own networks might be used to support the University's engagement with Industry. It was confirmed that the challenge of climate change facing the Energy sector would be one of the issues to be addressed through the Deal. The importance of the Deal to many of the other issues facing the University, such as its Digital Strategy, was noted. The Court also discussed the need for effective academic engagement with the project.

160 The Court agreed that as the City and Region Deal progressed it should receive, at appropriate points, updates on the University’s engagement with the project.

MINUTES

161 The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2015 were approved.

162 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

163 The Court received and considered a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided details of four incidents. The Court also received a report of the Operating Board’s consideration of the incidents which were:

- A technician in the School of Geosciences had suffered hydrofluoric acid contamination to their hand;
- A student with additional support needs had become agitated during an exam;
- A member of staff slipped and fell on entering a building and suffered a fracture to her elbow (the accident had been reportable to the Health and Safety Executive); and
- A staff member was involved in a road traffic collision while on University business.

164 The Court noted the follow up actions, where required, that had been taken to address any lessons learnt from the respective incidents.

165 The Court noted that a second ‘Health and Wellbeing Day’ would be held for staff based at Forsterhill in April. The Court also noted that all members of the Senior Management Team had undertaken a safety leadership course and were now undertaking regular safety tours in areas related to their respective roles.

STANDING REPORTS

REPORT FROM THE RECTOR

166 The Rector congratulated the Sabbatical Officers of the Students’ Association on winning the National Union of Students (Scotland) ‘Sabbatical Officer Team’ of the year award.

REPORT FROM THE SENIOR GOVERNOR

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

168 The report provided Court with an update on the progress of the Higher Education Governance Bill in Parliament and the further lobbying of the Scottish Government that had been undertaken by the Committee of Scottish Chairs in this regard.

REPORT FROM THE PRINCIPAL

169 The Principal introduced his written report (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) on recent developments within the University.
The Principal noted that the University had recently been ranked 37th in the Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) listing of the top 200 ‘most international universities’. The Principal further reported that the University’s position in another THES survey, on student experience, had been less strong. This was primarily down to the survey’s questions on the Student Union facilities and affordable campus retail facilities. It was noted that achieving a better rating in these would have resulted in the University being amongst the Top 20 universities in the UK. It was noted that the Students’ Association was continuing to develop a business case for a new student union building/facility.

In addition to research grant successes noted in the report, the Principal reported further on more recent grant successes in the College of Life Sciences and Medicine that amounted to £2M. The Principal also reported on work to enhance the profile and leadership of equality and diversity across the University and the continuing progress of fundraising being led by the Development Trust. In discussion, it was agreed that the Court would as part of the next update report from the Development Trust receive information on the fees of its investment fund managers.

In discussion, it was noted by Councillor McKail that the Principal had recently addressed the Aberdeenshire Council on developments in the University and that this had been very well received.

**REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION**

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), which included a range of activities in support of student wellbeing, academic representation for students, and the success of Raising and Giving (RAG) week.

The Court noted that following the identification of internal governance issues, AUSA’s Trustee Board had terminated the employment of their Chief Executive. AUSA had also undertaken a review of its democratic structures, moving from seven sabbatical officers to five to enable appropriate support staff to be put in place to provide more effective support to elected officers. AUSA was also in the process of reviewing its constitution, which following consideration by the student community would be brought to a future meeting of the Court for ratification.

The Court discussed the cancellation of the Torcher Parade and the reasons for this. It was noted that AUSA and the City Council were committed to working together to ensure the event could take place in 2017.

The Court discussed the report’s statistics on student wellbeing and noted that the recent death of a student was a tragic reminder of the importance of pastoral support for students. The Court noted that these were issues that the University Student Support services worked closely with the Students’ Association on and which were now also part of the remit of the Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing. It was also agreed that the University would consider how it should communicate with Court members regarding such incidents.

**TRANSTNATIONAL EDUCATION**

**REPORT ON KOREA BRANCH CAMPUS**

The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which provided an update on the proposed Korea Campus Project together with a report on the Operating Board’s earlier consideration of the project, including a copy of a report on the risks and liabilities of the project.

The Court noted that in late February the University received a request from the Ministry of Education (MoE) that the financial plan be revised. Key changes requested included (i) that CPD income be excluded from the financial plan as there had been delays to the revision of legislation in Korea relevant to CPD delivery; and (ii) that research funding be excluded from
financial plans in Year 1 of operation as the University would only start applying for research funding upon establishing the campus and applications were likely to take up to one year to be approved.

179 As a result, the University had decided that the financial plan could not on this basis be taken forward and further discussions were therefore held with Korean governmental partners in early March based around more prudent financial scenarios. Following this, Korean local government partners had indicated they would be willing to underwrite the estimated £2.5M shortfall in the most pessimistic of these financial scenarios, through a legally binding agreement, subject to the University approving such a business case by April 2016 to allow Korean partners to meet their timeframe for the project.

180 In discussion, the need for a clear statement of the benefits to the University of the project for consideration by Operating Board was noted. It was also noted that the University had reached a stage with the project where, given the continuing amount of staff time being dedicated to the project, agreement on a viable way forward was essential in order for further staff involvement in the project to be justified.

181 The Court agreed to delegate the final decision on the project to the Operating Board when it next meets on 21 April 2016, provided that the financial plan as set out in the revised paper had not been altered in any significant way and that a legally binding confirmation was received from the Korean government regarding the underwriting of the deficit of £2.5M.

COLLABORATION WITH CURTIN UNIVERSITY

182 The Court received an oral report from Professor Kunin on discussions that had taken place with Curtin University regarding the potential for future institutional collaboration across a number of academic areas. Professor Kunin also declared an interest as he had recently been appointed as Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Curtin University and would take up post from April 2016.

183 The Court noted that discussions were focused around academic collaboration in Subsea Engineering, Health Sciences and Creative Writing. The potential establishment of a Global Energy Institute with Curtin University was also part of discussions, together with trans-national programmes and joint projects and potential new opportunities for student study abroad in Asia.

184 The Court thanked Professor Kunin for the report and for his significant contribution to the University during his time as Vice-Principal.

GOVERNANCE

REPORT ON THE GOVERNANCE BILL

185 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) which summarised the main proposals of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Bill which had been passed by Parliament on 8 March 2013. The paper also summarised to what extent key issues of concern to the Court regarding the Bill, as first introduced to Parliament in 2015, had or had not been addressed through amendments.

186 The Court noted that the Bill had been amended in such a way that it largely addressed the University’s previous concerns regarding: the potential for reclassification as a government body by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) and/or loss of charitable status; restrictions on the overall size of the Senate; and the scope for future Ministerial involvement in the detailed governance of the University through the use of new powers subject only to secondary legislation.

187 The Court noted, however, that the Bill had also been amended to specify that there be election of Senior Governors and, with the exception of removing a section on there being a limit on the numbers of graduate association members, the Bill’s provisions on the composition of
governing bodies, including issues that were of concern to Court such as trade union membership, remained unchanged from the draft Bill as first introduced.

The Court noted that the existing statutory role of the Rector was unchanged by the Bill. As a consequence of this, and the introduction of election of Senior Governors, there would, once the resulting Act came into force, be at Aberdeen an election by students of the Rector and an election of the Senior Governor (who would continue to be responsible for the leadership and effectiveness of the Court) by students, staff and members of the Court.

In discussion, it was confirmed that the Act would come into force at a date that had yet to be agreed by Scottish Ministers. The current Scottish Government had previously stated that it envisaged there being a four year transitional period for universities to amend their governance arrangements to comply with the Act but that further information on whether that applied to all or only some aspects of the Act had yet to be made available and would need to be confirmed by the next Scottish Government following the Scottish Parliament elections.

It was also confirmed that, if requested by a Senior Governor, the Act required the University to give consideration to remuneration for the position but that it would be a matter for the Court to determine whether that was appropriate and at what level.

**REPORT FROM THE WORKING GROUP ON FUTURE COMPOSITION OF COURT**

The Court received a paper *(copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes)* that set out a first report from the Working Group on the Future Composition of the Court. The Group had recently been established by the Governance and Nominations Committee in light of the changes to the composition of governing bodies that would be required by the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act.

The paper proposed to Court a first set of principles that would form the basis for the development of its future composition and membership, taking into account the expected requirements of the new Bill. These were:

1) That Court should have a majority of members who are independent of any vested interest in the University;

2) That Court should aim to reflect the diversity of the University community of students and staff it governs, and should therefore target a 50:50 gender balance and a greater ethnic and geographical diversity than at present;

3) That the composition of Court should enable the appointment of members who have the requisite mix of skills and experience to allow Court to fulfil its responsibilities for the effective strategic leadership of the institution and oversight of the management of the University; and

4) That a composition that was significantly smaller than at present would be to the benefit of the effectiveness of Court.

Subject to Court's agreement of these principles, the Group further proposed that Court give consideration to a potential composition of 17 members with flexibility for this to be increased in size to 20 if and when the skills and diversity mix of independent members on Court were to require it.

The Court noted that in developing the paper, the Group had taken particular note of the current gender imbalance on Court and also of the need for Court to reflect the diversity of the University community which it governs. As such, the Group had noted that as part of any proposals for a new composition of Court, where there were members who were not appointed by the Court itself, further consideration would need to be given as to how the processes for electing or appointing members of Court ensured they supported the principles outlined above.

There followed an extended discussion, the principal points of which were:
- Members expressed differing views on the need for Court to be as small as 17 and the benefits this might bring, although the need to reduce in size to align with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance recommended maximum of 25 was accepted;
- Some members felt that the breadth of constituency representation that was currently provided for by the Court’s composition was valuable and should be retained;
- It was suggested that a significant reduction of Vice-Principal members would render the Court less able to hold the executive to account;
- Some members highlighted the importance of Senate Assessor representation as the academic voice in the governance of the University and also noted that although the Act required trade union membership of Court, a significant number of staff were not members of trade unions;
- It was noted that Aberdeenshire Council valued their Assessor representation on Court and that they did not consider officer level engagement to be a substitute for Councillor level engagement. The City Council, while valuing their links with the University through Court, recognised both the strong partnership working that existed between senior officers of the University and the Council and the overall need for Court to review its size and composition given the changes necessitated by the Act. In further discussion, it was noted that there would be no reason why the Court could not choose to appoint a Council Member to one of the appointed independent positions should the Court decide to not retain the two Assessors specifically provided for in its current composition.

196 The Court agreed:

(i) to approve the proposed set of principles as a basis for the development of a future composition of Court, with the exception of Principle (4) above on which there were diverse views. It was agreed, however, that Court needed to align with the requirements of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance in respect to its size.
(ii) That the Group should develop further proposals taking account of the discussion and any further comments that members wished to contribute directly to the Convener.

FINANCE

UPDATE ON FINANCIAL OUTLOOK AND BUDGETS FOR 2016/17

197 The Court received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) on the Financial Outlook for 2016/17 and the development of budgets for 2016/17.

198 The Court noted that a number of factors would impact negatively on the University’s financial position. The Scottish Funding Council had confirmed in late February that, in 2016/17, the University would receive 3.9% less revenue than in 2015, a figure in line with most research-led universities in Scotland. Accompanying this reduction in SFC funding were other budgetary challenges previously intimated to Court, including the increase in USS employer pension contributions, the increase in National Insurance contributions, the Apprenticeship levy and the potential for a national pay award higher than had been budgeted for.

199 The Court noted a summary of the budget position of Schools following the development of first draft budgets. Work continued on income generation, largely through student recruitment and some growth had been built into the draft 2016/17 School budgets. Progress in delivering savings had also been made, with the Staffing Strategy and Sustainability Plan having delivered savings of £8.6m and the Professional Services Review on target to deliver further savings and cost reductions.

200 Detailed planning was, however, continuing with those Schools who faced very significant deficits that might not be resolved by income generation and may require staff savings through the
Court approved JCCRA process. Further discussion with those Schools to determine savings and income growth strategies would continue and would be subject to consultation within the school and, where necessary, regarding the use of approved JCCRA processes. Savings of £2 million were anticipated in 2016/17 which in the first instance would assist in achieving the savings targets already built into the school budgets. The medium term target would be to bring these schools closer to a cost neutral position.

201 In discussion, a number of members noted that a £2M surplus was in effect a 'break even' budget and that this would not be sustainable over the longer term or sufficient to meet the investment necessary to deliver the University's strategic ambitions. The potential for further reductions in public funding beyond 2016/17 was also noted.

202 The issue of national pay bargaining was discussed and it was noted that one future model might be for a Scottish rather than UK system of national bargaining.

203 The Court agreed that it was important that there be clear communication with staff in Schools regarding their financial position and any how any issues were to be addressed.

204 The Court agreed to approve, in principle, a reduction in the University surplus for 2016/17 to an indicative level of £2 million and that further work was completed as follows:-

- The University would consider its position on national pay bargaining;
- Continued refinement of student numbers for international growth and on higher level apprenticeships;
- Complete a review of the schools with significant deficits that may not be resolved by income generation alone and where further staff savings may be required;
- Complete the Professional Services review and identify the associated budget implications;
- Recommend, via the Operating Board, the University budget, the proposed target surplus and the impact upon the 10 year plan; including details of the respective School positions; and
- Complete budgets for the lifespan of University's strategic plan, caveated by the unknowns of SFC funding.

205 The Court also, agreed, however, that prior to Court approving budgets for 2016/17 the Operating Board should also consider alternative budget proposals, that would deliver a significantly greater surplus which was more consistent with the level necessary to be financially sustainable and what the practical implications of that would be.

UNIVERSITY BONDS

206 The Court received a paper which examined the increased use of bond issues and placements by universities, particularly in England, over the past 5 years (*copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes*). The Court also received a report of the Operating Board's consideration of an earlier version of the paper which had recommended further work be undertaken on the potential use of bonds by the University.

207 In discussion, it was noted that while the University was, relative to many other universities, lowly-gear, its surplus and cash generation was also relatively lower. The need for long-term planning and the necessary rate of return for the use of bonds, which could relate to capital and non-capital projects, was also noted. Given the current challenging environment for public funding of higher education and the wider challenges of income generation in the current economic climate, a number of members were supportive of further consideration being given to the option of bonds as a means of securing investment to generate future income growth.
208 The Court, therefore, endorsed the recommendation of the Operating Board that further work be undertaken on the option of Bonds and that discrete projects should be identified that might be suitable for bond financing including an evaluation of the rate of return on investment.

SFC OUTCOME AGREEMENT 2016/17

209 The Court received a paper which set out the University’s proposed Outcome Agreement to 2016/17 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) for submission to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC).

210 The Court noted that submission of the Outcome Agreement was originally due by 1 March 2016 and that it had previously agreed to delegate approval of the Agreement to the Operating Board. However, the publication, on 19 February, of the latest SFC funding announcements necessitated a reworking of the Outcome Agreement and the University was therefore invited by SFC to delay the submission to take account of these. To accord with the revised timetable for submission to SFC, the Court was now being invited to approve the Agreement.

211 The Court noted that the 2016/17 Outcome Agreement would be the last in the SFC’s current three year cycle (2014-2017), but that SFC guidance had not changed substantially from the previous year. The 2016/17 Agreement did differ from previous years in two key aspects: institutions were being asked to report more specifically on gender and on students who had had experience of care, and this was being reflected in the University’s submission. The Court, therefore, noted that the key changes were:

- Funding for the fourth tranche of additional funded places for widening access had been cut for 2016/17, but additional funded places would be offered for Medicine;
- Funding for the fourth tranche of additional funded places for college articulation had been cut for 2016/17; and
- Funding for additional places under the undergraduate ‘Skills for Growth’ programme had been altered, allowing for 50% funding from SFC but only where universities had secured matched industrial funding.

212 In discussion, it was noted that the University continued to highlight to SFC the low number of postcode areas in the North of Scotland that met the Scottish Government definition of areas that a widening access ‘student’ might be recruited from and the implications this had for the perceived performance of the University in widening access. The Court also noted that the recent Widening Access Commission report for the Scottish Government had recommended that new targets for the number of widening access students be set for 2020 and 2025.

213 The Court approved the Outcome Agreement to 2016/17 for submission to SFC.

RENUMERATION COMMITTEE: SENIOR STAFF PAY POLICY 2016

214 The Court received a paper outlining a recommended Senior Staff Pay Policy from the Remuneration Committee (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The paper also included a proposed amendment to the composition and membership of the committee.

215 The Court approved the recommendation of the Committee that a fund of up to £100k be set aside to recognise, reward and incentivise senior members of staff. The process this year would be focused on addressing gender differentials, providing an opportunity for evidence based exceptional contribution to be recognised and to ensure there was a sufficient resource to address retention cases that may arise. The Court noted that there were 269 professorial and senior non-academic staff (grade 9) that would be eligible for consideration under the policy.

216 The Court noted that in 2015 the Remuneration Committee invited a Student Representative (AUSA President) and a Staff Representative (non-academic staff representative from Court) to meetings of the Committee on an in attendance basis. It was now proposed that these
representatives were confirmed as full members of the Committee to further demonstrate the transparent approach adopted in relation to Senior Staff Pay awards. The proposal had been endorsed, through Convener’s action by the Chair of the Governance and Nominations Committee. The Court approved the proposed amendment to the composition of the Committee to include as members the President of the Students’ Association and a non-executive staff member of Court, which for the remainder of 2016 would be Ms G Clarke and Mr B Paterson respectively.

REPORT ON DIGITAL STRATEGY

217 The Court received a paper and presentation outlining the University’s Digital Strategy (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The paper set out the competitive imperative for the University that it pursue a digital transformation in all aspects of its operation and details of what it intended delivering in each of the following five main strands:

- world class learning and student experience;
- supporting research excellence;
- our people;
- engaging with the world; and
- use of data;

218 In discussion, the Court welcomed the strategy and its ambition while also noting that a digital transformation was in large part about changing the way the University operated as an organisation and was not simply an ‘IT project’. In this regard, the Court discussed the significant degree of additional financial investment in technology and staff, as well as senior management commitment and time, that the achievement of a digital transformation would require. The Court discussed the level of spending being made in other leading universities on digital transformation and how the University would deliver sufficient investment given the current financial constraints on budgets and competing priorities. It was also noted that the University had in its academic staff a range of digital and computing science expertise which it should draw upon as it took the strategy forward. The Court also noted the importance of ensuring that all staff received appropriate training, in particular staff who were not in roles where the use of IT was routine but which would be required to access key University IT systems in the future.

219 The Court agreed that this was a significant strategic issue for the future success of the University and that due to the limited time that had been available it should dedicate further time to considering the implications of the digital strategy for the University and the risks within its implementation.

OPERATING BOARD REPORT

220 The Court received a report summarising items considered at the meetings of the Operating Board held on 25 January and 1 March 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The principal items of the report that were noted by the Court were:

- Financial planning;
- Student admissions and Project 500;
- The University’s Outcome Agreement with the Scottish Funding Council 2016-17;
- The Athena Swan Action Plan;
- Staffing matters, including the Board’s consideration of reports on the Staff Survey;
- Reports from the Capital Programme Management Committee and a report on the progress on the OneSource project; and

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

GOVERNANCE AND NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE
The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Governance and Nominations Committee at its meeting on 25 January 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In addition the Court approved the following:

On the recommendation of the Committee, two nominations for the ‘Benefactor to the University Award’ to be made to Professor D Ogston and Miss M Carlaw.

On the recommendation of the Committee, that an externally facilitated review of Court’s effectiveness should be taken forward and that the Committee develop the terms of reference for such a review.

The Court also noted that that following the nominations process for two General Council Assessor to Court positions that would be available from 1 October 2016, two nominations had been received from Mrs Shirreffs and Mr Percival. As there were only two nominations for the two positions, an election of General Council members was not required and Mrs Shirreffs and Mr Percival were appointed with effect from 1 October 2016 for a term of four years respectively.

PARTNERSHIP, NEGOTIATING AND CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Partnership, Negotiating and Consultative Committee at its meeting on 24 February 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In addition the Court approved the following:

- Amendments to the Sickness Absence Management Procedure; and
- Mobile Phones and Driving Policy. It was noted, however, that the policy available on the Court Intranet was incorrect in one respect and that the correct version approved by the Committee had included an amendment to clarify that the policy applied “while driving on University business”. The Court noted and approved the Policy as amended.

AUDIT COMMITTEE

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

RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE

The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Research Policy Committee at its meeting on 8 December 2015 and 4 February 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Student Affairs Committee at its meeting on 15 February 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the University Committee on Teaching and Learning at its meeting on 14 January and 23 February 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

ROUTINE BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A CHAIR IN NAME OF JOHN NISBET

The Court received a proposal that it establish a John Nisbet Chair of Education within the School of Education (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) and approved a draft Resolution.
for consultation with the Senate, General Council, and for public display within the University for the statutory period in accordance with the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966.

**Senate report**

231 The Court noted a report of the principal items of business considered by the Senate at its meeting of 3 February and 9 March 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

The Court, on the recommendation of the Senate, approved revisions to the University’s *Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals*.

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

- the University of Aberdeen Korea Campus Resolution regarding operational and governance arrangements;
- the Senate Effectiveness Review;
- discussions regarding Key Performance Indicators that had been established to support the Strategic Plan. The Court noted that a paper from some Senators had argued that some KPIs were inappropriate and should be removed. The Court noted that the Senate had noted the approval of KPIs was a matter for Court but that it had agreed to establish a Senate Working Group to consider KPIs. This group could make proposals for Senate to consider which, if supported, would be passed to Court for their consideration;
- discussions regarding Academic Line Management; and
- discussion regarding moderation of assessment.

**Report from the Development Trust**

233 The Court received a paper detailing the Development Trust’s performance since its last report to Court on 8 December 2015 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

**Financial management report**

234 The Court noted the Management Accounts and Reports for the period to 31 January 2016 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

**Date of next meeting**

235 The Court noted that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday 28 June 2016 at 9am.
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