THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP
Raeburn Room, Old College
16 January 2018, 10 am

AGENDA

1   Minute   **A1**
To *approve* the minute of the previous meeting held on 31 October   **A2**
2017 and to *note* the Chair's action on 22 November 2017.

2   Matters Arising   **Verbal**
To *raise* any matters arising.

3   Principal's Communications   **Verbal**
To *receive* an update by the Senior Vice-Principal.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

4   Planning Round Guidance   **B**
To *consider and approve* a paper by the Deputy Secretary Strategic
Planning.

5   Information for Staff on Guaranteed Hours Contracts   **C**
To *approve* a paper by the Vice Principal People and Culture.

6   Finance Director's Report   **D**
To *consider and comment* on updates by the Director of Finance

7   Proposed Enhancement to Paternity Pay and Leave Policy   **E**
To *approve* a paper by the Director of Human Resources.

8   Proposed enhancement to Shared Parental Leave and Pay Policy   **F**
To *approve* a paper by the Director of Human Resources.

9   British Sign Language Plan   **G**
To *approve* a paper by the Deputy Secretary Student Experience.

10   Evacuation of Disabled People in Emergency Situations   **H**
To *consider and note* an update by the Vice-Principal People and
Culture and Director of Corporate Services.

11   H&S Quarterly Report   **I**
To *consider and note* a report by the Director of Corporate Services.

12   Any Other Business   **Verbal**
To *consider* any other matters by CMG members.

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL

13   Creation of new Chairs and renaming of existing Chairs   **J1**
To _approve_.   **J2**

14   Date of next meeting
This is the final meeting of Central Management Group.
The University Executive will meet on Monday 12 February 2018 at 10
am in the Raeburn Room, Old College

15   CMG Communications   **Verbal**
To note the key messages to be communicated.

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

31 October 2017

[Draft] Minute

Present:	Vice-Principal Professor Jonathan Seckl (Convener)
	Vice-Principal Professor Jane Norman
	Vice-Principal Professor Dorothy Miell
	Vice-Principal Professor David Robertson
	Vice-Principal Professor James Smith
	Ms Sarah Smith, University Secretary
	Mr Hugh Edmiston, Director of Corporate Services
	Mr Gavin McLachlan, Chief Information Officer
	Mr Phil McNaull, Director of Finance
	Ms Zoe Lewandowski, Director of Human Resources
	Mr Gary Jebb, Director of Estates
	Ms Leigh Chalmers, Director of Legal Services
	Ms Tracey Slaven, Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning
	Mr Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary, Student Experience
	Professor David Argyle, Head of School of Veterinary Medicine
	Professor Ewen Cameron, Head of School of History, Classics & Archaeology
	Professor Jeremy Robbins, Head of School of Literatures, Languages & Cultures
	Dr Catherine Elliott, on behalf of Vice-Principal Professor Sir John Savill
	Mr Rob Tomlinson, Acting Director of Communications and Marketing

In attendance:	Professor Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations (for item 3)
	Ms Laura Cattell, Head of Widening Participation (for item 4)
	Ms Michelle Brown, Head of SRS Programmes (for items 6 and 7)
	Ms Lynda Hutchison, Senior Strategic Planner (for item 8)
	Ms Kirstie Graham, Deputy Head of Court Services

Apologies:	The Principal
	Senior Vice-Principal Professor Charlie Jeffery
	Vice-Principal Mr Chris Cox
	Professor David Gray, Head of School of Biological Sciences

1   Minute   **Paper A**

The Minute of the meeting held on 26 September 2017 was approved.

2   Principal's Communications

Senior Vice-Principal Professor Jonathan Seckl, on behalf of the Principal, reported on the following: the uncertain policy environment, with a number of consultations from the new Office for Students, which, whilst only applying to England and Wales, may influence Scottish HE developments; positive progress on the City deal; a recent successful

visit to the joint Zhejiang campus; recruitment continuing to be positive with EU admissions up 7% in all categories and progress made to the MD20 target; the USS pension scheme discussions.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

3   Public Engagement Strategy   **Paper B**

Professor Lesley McAra, Assistant Principal Community Relations, spoke to the draft strategy for engaging the wider public with research. There was a wide ranging discussion around the links between knowledge exchange and impact, public engagement and broader community engagement, widening participation and cross University co-ordination across these areas. The proposal to form a Strategic Coordinating Group was noted and following discussion it was considered that it would be appropriate for this Group to report to the Research Policy Group, rather than to the SRS committee as proposed.

CMG were supportive of the proposed Strategy and noted the need to develop robust measures for success.

4   Widening Participation Strategy   **Paper C**

Ms Laura Cattell, Head of Widening Participation, introduced a draft setting out the principal direction of the forthcoming Widening Participation Strategy. Members were supportive of the approach outlined in the draft, noting areas for further development included discussion with Development and Alumni and the Centre for Open Learning; consideration of College articulation routes; and further work on implementation including communication and prioritisation, with a further draft for consideration in the new year.

5   Modern Slavery Statement   **Paper D**

CMG discussed and endorsed the University's second Modern Slavery Statement, which reiterated the University's commitment to protecting and respecting human rights and zero-tolerance approach to slavery and human trafficking in all its forms. This would go to Audit & Risk Committee in November and Court in December prior to publication on the University website.

6   Sustainable Development Goals Accord   **Paper E**

Ms Michelle Brown, Head of SRS Programmes, reported that the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) encompass 17 topics that communicate challenges facing the world and recognise shared responsibilities in addressing them. By signing the SDG Accord, the University would be supporting the high level principles, which are in alignment with the University's Strategic Plan (2016) in relation to 'Impact for Society' and other strategies and policies of the University.   This

would be a high level commitment and would not require any additional measurement processes.

CMG endorsed the University joining the Sustainable Development Goals Accord as a signatory.

7   Strategic Plan 2016 Performance Measurement Framework   Paper F

CMG had previously considered and endorsed the performance measurement framework to assess the University's performance against the Strategic Plan 2016. At the meeting, members received a demonstration of the live dashboards that will enable drilling down into the underpinning data. The interactive Court and CMG dashboards would be published on a SharePoint based intranet site for University staff while static versions of visuals for the Court measures would be available publicly via the University's Strategic Plan website. The dashboards were based on a repository of strategic datasets which contain extracts from multiple corporate data sources, joined and transformed in the ways required for straightforward re-production of each specific performance measure. The work to define these bespoke strategic datasets complements the work being done to develop the Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) and colleagues leading and managing each of these projects are working together as the EDW project moves forward.

Members were very supportive of the work undertaken to date, recognising the importance of access to good quality, reliable data in managing and measuring strategic performance indicators.

8   Strategic Plan 2016: Final KPI Update   Paper G

CMG noted the final data and analysis for the final year of the 2012-16 Strategic Plan.

9   Finance Director's Report   Paper H

Central Management Group noted the September Management Accounts and the number of significant variances between year to date actual figures versus year to date budget. The Director Finance outlined the ongoing work to address this as part of the new three year quarterly rolling forecast process.

Central Management Group considered and approved the Criminal Finances Act statement developed in response to the Criminal Finances Act 2017 which introduced a new corporate criminal offence of failure to prevent the facilitation of tax evasion. This would be reported to Policy and Resources Committee and Audit and Risk Committee.

There was discussion of the annual Time Allocation Survey which collects data that inputs into the statutory Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) return to the Scottish Funding Council and is used in the

calculation of research overhead recovery rates. There was concern about the quality of the data and it was agreed that consideration should be given to using the academic workload allocation model to inform the TRAC return, to reduce duplication and ensure more robust data.

10 People Report   **Paper I**

CMG noted the People Report and in particular the training on managing capability; the Mentoring Connections programme; and that the University had signing up to the Technian Commitment.

11 Living wage Employer Accreditation   **Paper J**

The University has paid the UK Living Wage to directly employed staff since November 2012. In order to become an accredited UK Living Wage Employer the University must ensure that not only directly employed staff receive the UK Living Wage but also contracted staff and subcontracted staff who work regularly on University premises and work is ongoing to assure this. CMG approved the University applying for UK Living Wage Employer Accreditation.

12 Youth and Student Employment Strategy   **Paper K**

CMG endorsed the new Youth and Student Employment Strategy, noting its alignment with the new HR Strategy and University Strategic Plan, in particular the development theme of Contributing Locally.

13 University Support for the Council for At-risk Academics (CARA)   **Paper L**

CMG noted the current level of engagement with CARA and members were supportive exploring opportunities for further financial and non-financial support to increase this.

14 Lecture Capture   **Paper M**

CMG noted the update on lecture recording take-up and usage in the first two weeks of term. It was noted that there were some areas where the facility had not been used and there was discussion on how to increase take up, with further staff training considered desirable.

15 Information Security Framework   **Paper N**

CMG approved the refreshed Information Security Policy and agreed to delegate approval for the underlying Standards and Procedures to IT Committee.

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL

16 Creation of new Chairs and Renaming of Existing Chairs   **Paper O**

CMG approved the establishment of a Chair of Biomechanical Engineering in the College of Science and Engineering.

17   Principal's Strategy Group   **Paper P**

The report was noted.

18   Date of next meeting

Tuesday, 16 January 2018 at 10 am in the Raeburn Room, Old College

19   CMG Communications

The key messages arising from the meeting to be communicated more broadly were noted.

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Planning round 2018/21 Update

Description of paper
1.   The purpose of this paper is to present a summary of the 2018/21 planning round documents that have been issued to budget holders along with an update on the Scottish Government budget for noting. We also propose an amended 2018/21 planning round timetable for approval that takes into account the introduction of the new University Executive Group (UEG).

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   We ask CMG to note the contents of the paper and to approve the amended 2018/21 planning round timetable.

Background and context
3.   The University has been working for some time on moving towards a gross income and expenditure approach to budgeting and reporting. There have been two components to this work: Transparent Accounting Group (TAG) and Resource Allocation[1]. The Transparent Model (TM), based on the attribution of gross income, is now well established and is the basis for quarterly forecasts and management accounting returns that are reviewed jointly by Finance and GaSP.

4. RA2018 has also made significant progress with the development of Service Expectation Statements (SESs) increasing the transparency around the "service catalogue" provided by individual support services and the potential increase in costs driven by higher volumes of students, staff and estates. The work has also highlighted the need to ensure that we design student support services for online and part-time students to optimise student experience and cost.

5. Implementing RA2018 would have been a substantial and radical change in our approach to business planning when we are managing a number of other substantial challenges including the integration of City Deal, delivery of the Service Excellence Programme and a number of changes in the senior leadership team. We therefore refined the current financial planning aspects of the planning that focuses on incremental improvements rather than radical change and to continue the development of the SESs and review of service provision to inform the planning process.

Planning round guidance
6. We have published the following documents relating to the 2018/19 planning round:

- '2018/21 planning round: timetable and context' 26 September 2017 CMG paper – this document set out the timetable for the planning round and also set

---

[1] (previously RA2018 – named for the target baseline year)

out the context for the planning round including the refinements to the financial planning for the planning round (contained in detail in appendix 1 of the paper)

- 'Undergraduate Intake Strategy 2018-19 Scotland/EU and RUK (non-controlled funding subject groups)' 26 September 2017 CMG – this document set out the intake targets for the recruitment of full-time SEU and RUK undergraduates in the non-controlled subjects
- 'Refinements to the financial planning for the planning round' circulated 29 November 2017 – this document addressed the concerns raised at the 26 September 2017 CMG meeting regarding the financial planning for the planning round and reflected feedback from meetings between budget holders, GaSP and Finance (see Appendix 1)
- 'Thematic Vice Principals' strategic priorities 2018/21 planning round' circulated on 22 December 2017 – this document succinctly sets out the priorities of the Thematic Vice Principals that budget holders should address in their plans and reflects the development themes contained in the Strategic Plan 2016 and the Senate committees' learning and teaching strategy (see appendix 2)

7. The above documents, while recognising that there remain details to be worked through collectively, set out the approach to the planning round and are being used by budget holders to inform the drafting of their three-year plans and financial templates.

8. A 'round table' meeting was held on 8 January and attended by all budget holders, the Triumvirate and the Senior Vice Principal (representing the Thematic VPs) that identified common priorities and interdependencies, along with action points that are designed to produce a more joined-up set of plans that will contribute towards the Universities strategic goals as set out in the Strategic Plan 2016.

9. On Wednesday 10 January 2018 a meeting between College accountants, relevant Support Group staff and representatives from GaSP and Finance will meet to clarify how the finance templates are to be completed and how City Deal will be incorporated into the finance templates.

Scottish Budget 2018/19

10. The draft Scottish budget provides an increase in cash terms of £11M that represents a 0.4% cut in real terms (GSP deflator of 1.48%). Capital budgets have been reduced by 9% that should be sufficient for SFC to meet its current commitments including the Capital Maintenance Grant.

	2017-18 Budget £m	2018-19 Draft budget £m	Increase £m
Higher Education Resource	1,013.9	1,024.9	11.0
Higher Education Capital	45.5	41.3	(4.2)
Total	1,059.4	1,066.2	6.8

11. Unlike in previous years, the text of the budget does not state that they will protect the core teaching and research grants, although the cash increase and savings from the PGT funding should enable SFC to do this if it wishes. Universities Scotland is lobbying for SFC to protect the teaching grant. We anticipate increasing

pressure from the Scottish Government to deliver against Widening Participation and NHS/GP outcomes from controlled subject areas.

12. The budget is still draft at this stage, and the settlement for HE could change given the demands for resource in other departments, most notably Health. We would expect the Bill to be presented to the Scottish Parliament in late January 2018 for final scrutiny and approval in February 2018.

Planning round 2018/21 timetable
13. We are proposing minor changes to the planning round timetable to take into account the replacement of PSG and CMG meetings with the UEG meetings now scheduled for the dates of the discontinued PSG meetings for the remainder of the year. The most significant change is the proposal to bring forward by one week the deadline for the submission of the final draft plans to give enough time for scrutiny of plans and drafting of the planning paper for the 14 May UEG meeting.

Resource implications
14. There are no resource implications at this stage of the planning process.

Risk Management
15. Colleges and Support Groups should update their risk registers in light of the contents of their planning submissions, which they will submit for review by Audit and Risk Committee at the May 2018 meeting.

Equality & Diversity
16. We do not consider that an EIA is required at this stage in the planning process. The planning guidance contains strategic priorities for the equality and diversity agenda (as advised by the Vice Principal Equality and Diversity) that plans should address, and will be scrutinised as part of the review of plans as laid out in the planning timetable.

Next steps & Communication
17. The next steps in the 2018/21 planning round are set out in the Planning Timetable.

Consultation
18. Budget holders and relevant staff have been consulted on the processes for the planning round by correspondence and by meetings with GaSP and Finance.

Further information
19. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Tracey Slaven, Deputy Secretary   Jonathan Seckl
    Strategic Planning, and   VP Planning, Resources and Research
    Peter Phillips   Policy, and
    Deputy Director of Planning   Phil McNaull
    Governance and Strategic Planning Director of Finance
    9 January 2018

Freedom of Information
20. This paper is open.

2018/21 planning round: timetable and context

Description of paper

1. This paper provides an update to the 2018/21 planning round paper considered by CMG on 26 September 2017.   The position outlined in the paper has been agreed by the Planning Group and by the main budget holders following discussion on the issues of concern to Colleges. The 2018/19 planning timetable has been updated to reflect the introduction of the University Executive Group from March 2018 and guidance from Ms Somerville and the Scottish Funding Council on "intensification" of Outcome Agreements around Scottish Government priorities and particularly Widening Participation.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. CMG is asked to formally endorse the refinements to the financial aspects of the planning round, the 2018/19 planning timetable and context and to approve it for issue*.*

Background

Planning process

3. The University has been working for some time on moving towards a gross income and expenditure approach to budgeting and reporting. There have been two components to this work: Transparent Accounting Group (TAG) and a Resource Allocation Model known as RA2018.   Both components have fed into the development of the Transparent Model (TM), based on the attribution of gross income. This is now well established and is the basis for quarterly forecasts and management accounting returns.

4. RA2018 has also made significant progress with the development of Service Expectation Statements (SESs) increasing the transparency around the "service catalogue" provided by individual support services and the potential increase in costs driven by higher volumes of students, staff and estates. The work has also highlighted the need to ensure that we design student support services for online and part-time students to optimise student experience and cost.

5. However, fully implementing RA2018, including cost-driver based allocations of Support Group budgets, would be a more substantial and radical change in our approach to business planning when we are managing a number of other substantial challenges including the integration of City Deal, delivery of the Service Excellence Programme and a number of changes in the senior leadership team.   We will therefore not move to RA2018 at this time.

6. Instead, we therefore propose to refine the current financial planning aspects of the planning that focuses on incremental improvements. They do not fundamentally change our approach to the Planning Round which we will continue to base on collaborative agreement of our strategic priorities. However, we do recognise that the changes may be more challenging within Colleges if cascaded to School level.

7. We will continue the development of the SESs to inform future planning processes and the gross income attribution elements of RA2018 (the income layer of the RAM) will also be maintained as they feed directly into the Transparent Model.

Refinements to financial planning for the 2018/21 planning round

Overview
8. The new TM template will be used for financial planning and budgeting on operating income, expenditure and capital equipment; we introduced the TM template for income and expenditure successfully this year. This will effectively present the approved financial dimension of the University three year plan. An illustrative TM presentation is attached as Appendix 1 for information [need one with revised treatment of building depreciation].

> *The starting point for the business planning round is Year 2 of last year's approved 3 year plan – including income projections, successful investment bids and expenditure plans.   Main budget holders retain authority over local approaches to planning but may find it useful to replicate this principle within their areas of responsibility.*

9. Our intent is to support transparency and we will continue with the normal challenge process in the planning round; for example, "is investment turning into income?" and "are we investing enough given importance of X to strategic/financial priorities?" A sustainable financial outturn for the University, while delivering strategic priorities, has been at the core of discussions during previous planning rounds and will continue to be so.

> *The key change will be in presentation of what is approved within the budget letters.*

10. The current planning process identifies and attributes all income and makes decisions on expenditure plans based on that holistic overview.   We then, rather confusingly, decompose that decision to make a resource allocation solely in relation to those funds which flow through Budget 7 from SFC and others. This year's process is simply intended to skip that final step and confirm the levels of expenditure planned in each Main Budget area and the levels of income they are expected to support.

Link to the 10 Year Forecast
11. The budgeting framework and content will tie back precisely to the core financial record and follow the reporting structure of the Higher Education Statement of Recommended Practice (HE SORP); this small step aligns the planning framework to the management and statutory accounts.

12. The planning period will continue to be three years; however assumptions will be better integrated with the Ten Year Forecast for years 4-10. This will permit greater visibility for business cases stretching beyond the three years (e.g. the global academy for agriculture and food security).

Areas of Main Budgetary Control

13. The planning model will still comprise seven areas of budgetary control (i.e. CAHSS, CSE, CMVM, CSG, ISG, USG, BA7). We will continue work to refocus Budget Area 7 as a University corporate budget with elements associated with a single college or support group relocated to that budget. We will, however, need to manage the presentation of the City Deal as a specific layer within our Plans. The approach is outlined later in this paper.

14. We will dispense with the Resource Allocation Spreadsheet except as a historic reference tool. Specifically, this will support oversight of prior year non-recurrent (pump-priming) investments where we should expect income to increase without further increase in costs (e.g. global academy, investment in staff to allow expansion of biomedical and CSE programmes and historic investment in Voluntary Severance schemes to allow restructuring).

Income

15. All sources of income will be included and recognised in the budget area where it is earned, providing a comprehensive view of total university income. SFC recurrent grants will be attributed to budget areas in line with the current refined methodology agreed through RA2018.

Tuition Fee Attribution

16. Our original proposals included reference to the creation of an average fee model for forecasting and the allocation of in year tuition fee income through the sales ledger based on the College owner of the programme. However we recognise, from our discussion with Colleges, a concern to ensure that changes in the attribution of teaching income do not inadvertently create a disincentive to multi-disciplinary or service teaching. We will therefore retain the refined teaching income attribution methodology agreed through the RA2018 work, including the cross-teaching and service teaching components,

> *Tuition fee attribution will continue to use the existing methodology while an average fee model is developed and tested. The average fee model will not be implemented unless it meets the needs of the university at both budget holder and School levels.*

until a replacement is agreed.

NPRAS (fees)

17. The NPRAS budget allocation model for tuition fees will cease from 2018/19. With total gross income and expenditure clearly allocated where it is earned, and local recognition of the resulting surplus /(deficit) this should encourage innovation and expansion. However, in the short-term, GaSP will calculate a memorandum version of NPRAS (tuition fees) which may then be expressed as a component of approved expenditure for College (and Schools where requested). This will be based on the student number forecasts and will not be adjusted for actual performance.

18. For Support Groups we will provide a "safety net" in the form of an expectation of an increase in baseline expenditure roughly equivalent to NPRAS (tuition fees) to recognise the additional costs of student number growth. This is

intended as a transitional step as we move towards better understanding of operating costs.

Expenditure

19. Expenditure in the plans should include ALL proposed expenditure.   This reflects the attribution of all income to the main budgets.   Initiatives or investments which result in a negative impact on contribution (relatively to the year 2 starting point) because not covered by additional income generation should be supported by both a strategic rationale and a substantive business case.   An example, from previous years would be the pump-priming investment in the establishment of the Global Academy for Sustainable Agriculture.

20. Approved expenditure defines the budgetary limits associated with planned income generation for each budget holder. Expenditure outwith this plan, with the exception of restricted income, is subject to Court's approval. Budget holders have delegated authority over expenditure subject to the requirement to deliver business objectives and income targets.

21. Equipment depreciation will be charged to the equipment owner (College/SG) in their budget area. TM reports are already reporting equipment depreciation against budget areas.

22. The previous CMG paper suggested that building depreciation would also be charged to each budget area based on a simple and equitable assumption of occupancy. Annual space snapshots provided by Estates will provide a baseline for allocation of cost with future additions from Estates Capital Plan overlaid on top.   It is now clear that work in this area is not sufficiently advanced to allow attribution on a simple and equitable basis.   Building depreciation will therefore be held in Budget 7 until a new model is tested and agreed.

23. The previous CMG paper confirmed that the NPRAS space occupancy incentive scheme will no longer operate.

24. Under the NPRAS space scheme credit was given to College and Support Groups which reduced space occupancy. Conversely, College and Support Groups which increased the amount of space occupied would have an amount deducted from their budget. The amounts debited/credited were recurrent and were at the agreed annual rate per square metre. These amounts were transferred from/to the Estates and Buildings budget. Adjustments were made once each year, and used the annual space audit figures. These were produced in August each year to reflect changes in the most recent session, and following feedback from units they were agreed and finalised, and additions to /deductions from budgets would have been available in the autumn each year. Therefore changes in occupancy in a given year were reflected in recurrent budgets the following year.

25. Under the new TM presentation, given Year 2 of the last plan included the assumption that NPRAS space would apply, the equivalent amount should be deducted from planned expenditure.   The required gross expenditure on

Estates should be articulated in the CSG plan; recognising that there will be no addition as a result of NPRAS space.

Contribution

26. For the purpose of university review and reporting the Transparent Model I&E report will now focus on Contribution from each budget area. Contribution is simply the accounting term for the difference between gross income and expenditure and is needed to deliver our surplus, it does not imply an expectation that every area will produce a surplus; the Contribution level for each of the Support Groups will obviously be a negative number as they are net cost budgets Contribution levels expected as a consequence of the approved Year 2 of last year's plan will form background information for planning round conversations.

> *The planning round will agree Contribution levels for each year as our focus is to ensure that the University's strategic objectives are delivered and that we maintain a sustainable financial position across the University as a whole.*

27. For the avoidance of doubt, interest payable is charged to budget areas below contribution level and will therefore not form part of individual budget holder discussions going forward.

28. Income expectations and expenditure budgets will both be set to arrive at the approved contribution. Income growth where appropriate as well as cost control are the key determinants of increased contribution. Year-to-date progress versus budget and full year outturn will be tracked quarterly as at present.

29. As indicated above, the approved 2017/18 plan provides our starting point but total university contribution will be expected to increase to support a sustainable medium-term surplus. This reflects both our long-term sustainability objectives but also reflects the significant investments made in previous planning rounds to enable future increases in gross income. Our strategic priorities are unchanged with more transparent focus on contribution intended to support more effective and efficient use of resource. It does not indicate an intent to change the balance between teaching and research.

30. Support service costs will be attributed to Colleges on the current TAG methodology, reflecting the core cost drivers of students, staff and space. This approach makes it possible to attribute the University support costs transparently. We expect this process to be refined as we improve our understanding of how individual support services are impacted by changes in each driver and the opportunities for efficiency, through the further development of Service Expectation Statements and the Service Excellence Programme.

31. Attribution of support group costs to Colleges is reported after Contribution in the TM and will not be the basis of planning round discussions for budget holders. However, the delivery of major new investments such as DL@Scale

will be expected to include a reasonable and agreed estimate of the impact on support services (e.g. new platforms, remote student support, alternative admissions/recruitment approaches).

Special "Deals"

32. We are conscious that the existence of "Special Deals" has complicated previous planning rounds – all initiated for good reasons but which, in combination add unnecessary complexity.   The following approach has been discussed and agreed with College Accountants.

33. Centre for Open Learning (CfOL) – current arrangements provide for a central budget allocation of £1.1m to CfOL to provide pre-sessional English provision. CfOL pre-sessional provision is recognised as a University-wide service.   We propose that the resource need and service levels/anticipated volume changes should be articulated within the CAHSS plan.

34. The Business School is currently allocated gross income within the CAHSS main budget allocation.   The changes proposed will therefore not affect it. .

35. The Roslin Institute operates on a gross income model reflecting requirements from BBSRC. The changes proposed will therefore not affect it. We anticipate that the more transparent approach to recognising income and associated costs may change presentation of the Institute's performance.   The current agreement on support group contributions is due to expire in 2020. Roslin is facing a phased reductionin core funding from BBSRC during this planning roundand we will work with CMVM and the Roslin Director to make this transition as smooth as possible.

36. The Human Genetics Unit (HGU) is part of IGMM which sits in the Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences.   HGU is funded by the MRC which requires a gross reporting model. HGU appears to pay a realistic contribution to support group costs and, while external funding remains stable, no changes in the model are currently required.

37. The formulaic calculation for growth in library materials expenditure is due to be reviewed this cycle.   We will recalculate using the existing model but also ask ISG to articulate their planned expenditure in the absence of a formulaic allocation approach.

38. The overhead charge on self-funding units; eg EPCC, Lister and the estates costs paid by the Roslin Innovation Centre will be reflected in the College costs pre Contribution level and / or in Support Group cost allocation below College Contribution lines. . This will ensure that internal management reports are consistent and still allow external reports to be compiled that show fully attributed overheads to these units (ie where there may be a combination of College and Support Group overheads attributed).

Presentation of "Previously Agreed Investments"

39. Investments agreed in previous planning rounds will already have their required expenditure contained in years 2 and 3 of last year's plan.   Where

expenditure profile has changed or was intended to run beyond 2019-20, the impact of this should be identified in the plan documents. An obvious example of this relates to plans to recruit to vacancies still outstanding in the early Chancellor's Fellows tranches.

City Deal

40. The University is a major partner in the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Deal that directly references all of the projects suggested by the University under the heading of Data-Driven Innovation: World Class Data Infrastructure (described as 'data storage and analysis technology'); the Bayes Centre; the Quartermile Edinburgh Futures Institute; the Usher Institute; the National Robotarium (on which we are cooperating with Heriot-Watt University, with Heriot-Watt in the lead); and Easter Bush. The UK and Scottish Governments are keen to maintain momentum and deliver a final City Deal agreement by end of 2017 or early 2018. In principal, funding can flow when required. .

41. For governance, reporting and auditing reasons it is essential that we can identify all income and expenditure (revenue and capital) associated with City Deal from both pre-existing provision and activities as well as new provision and activities. This is to ensure consistency of reporting to Court and to Treasury.

42. The Business Planning Team in Finance will co-ordinate the City Deal overlay figures and will agree numbers with each budget holder, to avoid double count.

> *City Deal will be treated as a layer in our business planning.*

Three year quarterly rolling forecasts

43. From September 2017 we will introduce a three year quarterly rolling forecast process. In line with the current quarterly forecast cycle, budget holders will provide an indicative forecast by quarter covering three years. Only material changes will be required to the three year quarterly rolling forecast as opposed to detailed bottom-up forecasts. The intent is to improve transparency, allowing shared consideration of the potential to respond to in-year opportunities or to respond to significant changes to income or expenditure. It is not an approval process, does not remove authority from main budget holders and does not impact on ability to spend or to vire within planned expenditure as usual. The approval of the three year university plan remains a responsibility of Court. Restricted income must, as always, be applied to the purpose for which it has been provided.

44. The approved 2017/20 plan provides our starting point but we expect total university contribution to increase to support a sustainable medium-term surplus. This reflects both our long-term sustainability objectives but also reflects the significant investments made in previous planning rounds to enable future increases in gross income. Our strategic priorities are unchanged with more transparent focus on contribution intended to support more effective and efficient use of resource. It does not indicate an intent to change the balance between teaching and research

The 2018/19 planning timetable

45. Once again we will be asking Colleges and Support Groups to prepare rolling three year plans, including student number targets and financial projections. We expect the plans to be a refinement of existing plans that will take into account the context below and the detailed planning guidance that we intend to issue in January 2018 that will include up-to-date information on the Scottish Government spending review plans and indicative funding from SFC.

46. We will be asking Colleges and Support Groups to prepare their first draft plans for consideration on 28th February, allowing GaSP and Finance time to analyse the plans to inform the Planning Group meetings with Colleges and SGs held in mid-March. This process will result in well-informed Budget-Holder, Round-Table and University Executive Group (UEG) discussions.

47. The triumvirate meetings and feedback from the Thematic VPs, PSG, PRC and CMG, along with any additional iterative discussion, will allow time for Colleges and Support Groups to finalise their plans by 27 April 2018. We will present final planning recommendations to UEG in May 2018, and finalised recommendations for PRC and Court in June 2018.

48. We propose to continue with the practice of asking Colleges and Support Groups to produce final plans, and for GaSP to make recommendations for final adjustments to Contribution levels that are contingent on flexing in May for material final student intake estimates or other items, before revised plans are presented to PRC and Court in June for final approval.

49. Due to EUSA and EUSU's earlier financial year end the student bodies will prepare their plans for approval by PRC and Court in the April cycle of meetings, so that budget decisions can be made close to the start of their financial year. The plans will still undergo the same scrutiny and governance processes as undertaken in previous years.

50. The proposed planning round timetable is presented in Appendix 3.

Planning Round Guidance

51. In recent years, early in the planning round we have published the planning timetable along with guidance that sets out the external and internal factors that will influence the College and Support Group plans and sets out the broad strategic priorities that the planning process should address. This early guidance is supplemented by a more detailed Planning Guidance document issued in January that incorporates details of the UK and Scottish Governments' budgets and emerging SFC priorities, other significant external environment issues and detailed Thematic Vice Principals' priorities.

Planning round 2018/21 context

50. The planning round for 2018/21 is taking place against a background of financial challenge given the ever-present competition for direct public sector funding. The upcoming challenges associated with Brexit will also influence our planning decisions over the next three years or longer as the form of the Brexit exit terms and associated legislative changes become clearer.

51. In this context, we again ask Colleges and Support Groups to continue to address external net income generation along with the efficient and effective use of resources to ensure that their areas can continue to grow and contribute to the achievement of our strategic objectives. Plans should also take into account the evolving mitigation strategies for Brexit including accelerated partnerships with international universities (including EC institutions), increased recruitment activity for EU and International students and expanding distance learning provision and distance learning at scale. Until further clarification is received, we will assume that the number of SEU UG places are retained post Brexit.

52. The planning round guidance that we intend to issue in January 2018 will reflect the:
    - Westminster and Scottish Governments' autumn budgets;
    - SFC indicative funding, intensification of Outcome Agreements and Scottish Government priorities;
    - City Deal;
    - HE legislative changes;
    - Brexit update;
    - Increasingly competitive nature of recruitment for RUK, international and PGT students;
    - Strategic priorities of the Thematic Vice Principals
    - Agreed approach to implementation of Service Excellence

53. We will use the Round Table discussions between College and Support Groups to facilitate continuing co-operation and joint working to achieve University strategic priorities[1]. The Triumvirate meetings, informed by detailed analysis and provision of background information by GaSP and Finance along with the Thematic VPs' priorities, will ensure that plans, both individually and collectively, adequately cover the institutional strategic priorities. Plans should follow the template that we will issue to facilitate the mapping of individual plans onto the University's strategic priorities and development themes.

Resource implications
54. There are no resource implications at this stage of the planning process.

Risk Management
55. Colleges and Support Groups should update their risk registers in light of the contents of their planning submissions, which they will submit for review by Audit and Risk Committee at the May 2018 meeting.

Equality & Diversity
56. We do not consider that an EIA is required at this stage in the planning process. The planning guidance contains strategic priorities for the equality and diversity agenda (as advised by the Vice Principal Equality and Diversity) that plans should address, and will be scrutinised as part of the review of plans as laid out in the planning timetable.

---

[1] The Senior Vice Principal, representing the strategic priorities of the Thematic Vice Principals, will attend the Round Table meetings and feed comments into the Triumvirate meetings

Next steps/implications

57. The next steps in the 2018/21 planning round are set out in the Planning Timetable.

Consultation

58. The paper has been reviewed by the Vice Principal Planning, Policy and Research Policy and the Director of Finance who are content with the contents of the paper.   The six main budget holders have also been consulted.

Author
Tracey Slaven
Deputy Secretary Strategic Planning

Freedom of Information

59. This paper is open.

Annex 1: I&E Presentation in Transparent Model

Transparent Model

Planning round 2017/18 - 2019/20, presentation of 2017/18 Income & Expenditure

Illustration of Contribution by budget area after full attribution of buildings and equipment depreciation

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH												PLAN 17/18 - 2017 - 2018
	Colleges				**Support Groups**							
	AHSS	MVM	S&E	Total	CSG	ISG	USG	Total	BA7	University Total	Subsids	University Group
Income & Expenditure (£ms)												
Funding Council Grants	50.9	48.4	60.4	159.7	3.8	0.0	0.7	4.4	28.1	192.2	0.0	192.2
Tuition Fees & Education Contracts	179.2	48.0	68.6	295.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	3.3	299.2	0.0	299.2
Research Grants & Contracts	23.8	130.1	110.7	264.5	0.1	1.6	0.0	1.7	10.0	276.2	0.0	276.2
Other Operating Income	7.0	37.0	24.5	68.6	63.5	4.7	4.3	72.5	6.8	148.0	25.2	173.1
Endowment & Investment Income	2.2	3.2	0.6	6.0	0.1	0.3	1.2	1.5	6.9	14.4	(0.3)	14.1
Donations & Endowments	2.1	1.6	0.1	3.8	0.0	0.0	5.1	5.1	11.5	20.4	(1.3)	19.1
Total Income	265.2	268.3	264.9	798.4	67.5	6.6	11.3	85.4	66.6	950.4	23.5	974.0
Staff Costs	127.3	151.9	124.7	403.9	48.7	29.9	23.2	101.8	3.4	509.1	15.2	524.3
Staff Exceptional	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Operating Expenses	39.8	83.4	88.6	211.8	91.8	16.1	32.9	140.9	17.5	370.2	8.7	378.9
Depreciation *	6.7	12.1	14.0	32.8	6.6	4.6	0.7	11.9	(0.0)	44.8	1.1	45.8
Total Expenditure	173.8	247.4	227.3	648.6	147.2	50.7	56.8	254.6	20.9	924.1	24.9	949.0
Contribution	**91.4**	**20.9**	**37.6**	**149.9**	**(79.7)**	**(44.1)**	**(45.5)**	**(169.3)**	**45.7**	**26.3**	**(1.4)**	**24.9**
Contribution %	34.5%	7.8%	14.2%	18.8%	(118.0%)	(668.7%)	(403.1%)	(198.2%)	68.6%	2.8%	(6.0%)	2.6%
Attribution of Supp Grp/BA7 Costs	53.0	37.4	40.3	130.7	(88.0)	(44.1)	(45.5)	(177.6)	46.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Net Surplus before Interest	38.4	(16.6)	(2.8)	19.1	8.3	(0.0)	0.0	8.3	(1.1)	26.3	(1.4)	24.9
Interest Payable on Loans	2.1	2.2	2.1	6.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	(1.1)	13.6	(0.0)	13.6
Net Surplus after Interest	36.4	(18.8)	(4.8)	12.8	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	0.0	(0.0)	12.8	(1.4)	11.4
Surplus after interest as % of Total Income	13.7%	(7.0%)	(1.8%)	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	(6.0%)	1.2%
Gain/Loss on Sale of Assets	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	13.0	(0.0)	13.0
Net Surplus incl. G/L on Sale of Assets	36.4	(18.8)	(4.8)	12.8	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	0.0	13.0	25.8	(1.4)	24.4

* Depreciation on buildings (£33.5m) attributed to budget areas for illustrative purposes only. Methodology for attribution needs to be refined, currently based on budget area share of assignable space m2.

Thematic Vice Principals' strategic priorities 2018/21 planning round

While the University has a single, multi-year Strategic Plan the annual planning round asks individual Colleges and Support Groups to produce their own individual three-year plans. We do not produce a single, consolidated plan in the annual planning round. In that context the Thematic Vice Principals (TVPs) perform an important role in signalling cross-cutting priorities which ensure visibility and traction for university-wide themes drawn from the Strategic Plan and other significant developments, including the City Deal, Brexit, and the 'intensification' of the Scottish Outcome Agreement process.

The TVPs have met twice in the autumn on their approach to the 2018-21 planning round, and priority themes are set out in summary below, clustered under broad headings rather than specific TVP remits. In addition, the Senate Committees have also reflected on the planning round at their meetings in the autumn semester and their priorities are also set out below.

Student Experience, Teaching and Learning

The priorities of the Senate Committees are as follows:

- Enhancing the sense of shared community linking academic staff and students, and developing more effective ways of listening and responding to students' views;
- Enhancing the academic and pastoral support we give to students;
- Developing new and innovative approaches to online learning that can provide an excellent student experience to large numbers of students;
- Enhancing the development of employability skills through the curriculum;
- Developing high quality learning, teaching and social spaces for taught and research students.

These are mainly issues which signal prioritisation within existing resources (for example within workload allocation or in securing and responding to student feedback). They also align with current and future investment plans on digital education, including the Distance Learning at Scale initiative, and in ensuring that investment in student-facing facilities and services keeps pace with growth in student numbers and changing needs. We note continuing disquiet among students (and indeed staff) in catering provision outside the central area and would welcome concerted action to address this.

Student experience has been identified as the biggest internal challenge facing the University. A concerted response by Colleges and Support Groups is vital in ensuring that all the good work hitherto in addressing weaknesses in student experience is continued, and that we retain clear focus even as the next Research Excellence Framework approaches.

Student Recruitment

Future growth: While there is an emerging discussion on the pace of growth of student numbers, especially on campus, and ensuring commensurate investment in student-facing facilities and services, this should not divert focus away from ensuring we protect our position in key recruitment markets and open up new opportunities to develop market position. Colleges and Support Groups should ensure a fully coordinated approach between planned growth in student numbers, both on-campus and online, and the consequent implications for facilities and services. A clear perspective on the balance between on-campus and online growth – whether through the current online portfolio or future developments on distance learning at scale is essential. In addition, new opportunities for degree-level apprenticeships are likely to emerge in the coming year. Colleges and Support Groups are asked to consider how they could respond to such opportunities.

Widening participation: The University of Edinburgh is regularly singled out in policy and media debate – for example by the Commissioner on Fair Access – as not contributing enough in the field of widening participation. The recent announcement of 'intensification' of the Outcome Agreement process appears focused in particular on widening participation. We can expect continued challenge on this issue – and should note that perceived weaknesses in this area may make it more difficult to carry our arguments for support from Scottish Government in other areas. Against this background, and following extensive consultation across the University, a new and bolder Widening Participation Strategy has been developed and will be presented for approval in early 2018. The emergent Strategy will require substantial additional funding, but also alignment of practices and cultures across both Colleges and Support Groups. As the Strategy is finalised Colleges and Support Groups are asked to give its funding and implementation an especially high priority.

Equality and Diversity/Athena Swan
There is high external scrutiny of the quality of employment that universities offer, including lower wage employment, gender equality, race equality and other matters. It is important that we maintain a strong reputation in this area and address perceived weaknesses, not least as we move towards our re-accreditation as Athena Swan Silver. Among the measures likely to have funding implications are:

- Additional support for those on or returning from maternity (or other parental leave) to maintain momentum on research or other commitments
- Covering the costs of current participants in the Workplace Nursery Scheme who go on maternity leave while maintaining a nursery place

Colleges and Support Groups will also wish to consider making provision
- for bystander training to support dignity and respect policy (particularly in relation to sexual harassment)
- to support the implementation of the University's Gender Action Plan that addresses gender imbalances on programmes and addresses the Scottish Funding Council's Gender Action Plan, which is also one of the issues subject to 'intensification' in the Outcome Agreement process

- to ensure seamless implementation of the recommendations of the 2017 Review of Support for Disabled Students

Contributing locally

The relationship of the University and the City of Edinburgh has risen in prominence both in the context of the City Deal (and likely in other place-based funding initiatives likely to flow through the UK Government Industrial Strategy) and in growing expectations of Scottish Government and local authorities that universities contribute actively to their local communities.

City Deal: the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Deal is likely to be concluded, and Government funding commitments, clarified in spring 2018. Government funding will be for capital spending on a series of facilities to support Data-Driven Innovation across the University, and will be flanked by University spending (and leveraging of third party funding) on activity funding, in particular staffing costs to deliver research, teaching and industry engagement activity. Colleges and Support Groups should consider opportunities to align their plans to opportunities in this field, including a new round of Chancellor's Fellows and likely new opportunities to develop graduate level apprenticeship programmes with industry partners. Clear guidance on how Colleges and Schools can propose activities that can help deliver City Deal co-funding and third-party funding commitments needs to be made available by the City Deal delivery team.

Community Engagement: an enhanced commitment to community engagement can help mitigate perceptions that the University is not focused enough on the communities around it (as seen also in debate about widening participation) and open up additional opportunities to carry out research, enrich learning and teaching, and deliver knowledge exchange and impact. Colleges and Support Groups should be mindful of the ambition and commitments of the Community Engagement Strategy (https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/community-engagement-strategy_web_final.pdf) and in particular to

- put in place stronger mechanisms to capture, resource and evaluate community engagement activities, including new or strengthened partnerships with local organisations
- develop more experiential learning opportunities within and outside the formal curriculum which involve students in projects co-produced with and located in the community
- ensure that valuable work in public engagement and community engagement is recognised in academic workload planning

Influencing globally

Colleges and Support Groups should consider how best to reflect the global reputation and reach of the University across their activities. Particular priorities identified for the coming year include:

- Investing in the University's regional operation for South East Asia in China to deliver and support forward strategic engagement and partnership with China across research, industry engagement, alumni and recruitment.

- Advancing the University's strategic partnership with key universities in Europe in the context of Brexit
- Ensuring enhanced and well-coordinated support services for both University staff and partners to ensure that the University can fully leverage partnership opportunities; these services to encompass Edinburgh Global, Development and Alumni, Communications and Marketing, Research Support Office and Edinburgh Innovations
- Increasing international experiences for our students and enhancing support services in that support work, study and volunteering overseas
- Supporting our global community of staff in relation to the provision of immigration support, advice and projects that work to enable the University to attract and support a more diverse international community of staff

Digital transformation and data

The opportunities and disruptive threats for society and the economy posed by the rapid developments in AI and data science globally need to be addressed in our plans for teaching, research, industry engagement, infrastructure and for our own business.

Acting through the Alan Turing Institute and the Data Driven Innovation component of the City Deal, the University aims to make Edinburgh the leading centre for AI in the UK, as well as "the data capital of Europe".

Plans should address the following specific actions.

- Build critical mass and leadership strength, by recruiting academic staff at all levels, spanning the development of AI and data science technologies, their applications and societal impact, leveraging national fellowship schemes and Chancellor's Fellowships to attract the world's best to Edinburgh.
- Train all undergraduates in critical, quantitative and ethical reasoning to become engaged citizens in a data-rich, AI-enhanced, increasingly autonomous world, for example, by extending Our Changing World, or developing a similar course, and making it compulsory for all students.
- Actively engage with data-driven and AI-enabled organisations in both the public and private sectors, to share expertise and to access their data, including making Edinburgh the go-to and trusted place to host data sets for research and innovation.
- Become a "smart university" by adopting data analytics and AI throughout our own business to maximally exploit our own data, so to improve our efficiency, the quality of our support services and the student experience.

The Thematic Vice Principals will review draft plans as they develop in the spring. Priorities have been set out this year in a crisper style which will enable Colleges and Support Groups more easily to set out their responses/proposed actions and resourcing commitments. The relevant TVPs will be happy to address any queries budget-holders might have

Timetable 2018-21 planning Round

- Committee dates highlighted in red text

	Activity		Notes
Setting of Strategic priorities	Meet with SVP to discuss L&T Strategy issues in planning round	14 Aug	With Tom Ward and Gavin Douglas – to consider how to highlight L&T Strategy issues into the body of the planning round
	Issue finance templates	Mid Aug	After discussions with College and SG accountants/Registrars
	Meet with each of the Registrars to discuss UG student number targets and note PGT year one indicative numbers	Late Aug/early Sept	Meet with each College separately
	Thematic VPs to refresh priorities for[including early reflections on City Deal ?]	8 Sept	VPs refresh their priorities by circulation for inclusion in Sept timetable release.
	Agree UG student numbers and note PG year one indicative numbers; and	26 Sept CMG	Paper to finalise UG numbers and expected offer date profile; agreement of approach to widening access numbers.
	Agree draft timetable and outline of planning round approach	26 Sept CMG	Paper presenting proposed timetable for 2018-19 planning round and the planning round context.
	Issue planning timetable and context to budget holders	29 Sept	Subject to amendments indicated by CMG
	Westminster Govt Budget	Nov	Review for Scottish settlement and relevant UK wide issues
	Student Association/UoE Forum	10 Nov	To discuss planning issues for 2018/19
	Scottish Parliament budget published	December 14	Review for HE spend and implications
	Joint Round Table meeting	8 Jan	Heads of Colleges and SGs, Triumvirate and SVP (representing thematic VPs) to discuss progress to date on 2017/18 round and to highlight new priorities and areas requiring cooperation for the 2018/19 round, including requirements for City Deal.
	Present Planning Update to CMG	16 Jan CMG	Planning Guidance to include details from the Budget Bill, relevant UK policy decisions and Thematic VP guidance
	Issue external planning round update to PRC	19 Jan PRC	To update PRC on the external environment and how we are

			reflecting it in the planning round guidance and activities.
	Scottish Govt spending plans announced	By 31 Jan	
1st round of planning	Engage with EUSU and EUSA for their annual plans	January 2017 to 10 March	
	Colleges and Support Groups undertake internal planning process	January	
	Colleges provide student number targets for all three years (inc PG and International) to GaSP	14 Feb	To enable an agreed fee forecast to be calculated for inclusion in the Finance Templates
	Draft plans forwarded to GaSP for analysis (to include years 2 and 3 PG numbers)	28 Feb	GaSP/Finance analysis to include summary of key data and agenda for Triumvirate meetings specific for each College/SG
Strategic review and direction	Draft plans shared across Colleges/SGs/Thematic VPs and Principal	1 March	
	Student Association/UoE Forum	5 March	Discuss any outstanding planning round issues
	GaSP/Principal meeting for guidance on triumvirate meetings	5 March	To highlight key issues
	College and SG pre-meetings	Week of 5 March	To agree key data sets and flag up any initial queries re draft plans and finance templates
	TVPs meeting to discuss plans and provide feedback for Triumvirate meetings	7 March	Add relevant items onto individual College and SG agendas for Triumvirate meetings.
	Triumvirate discussion with each Plan owner	Week of 12 March and 19 March	Presentation by Plan owner and discussion based on financial analysis of plans to inform CMG discussions
	Principal and Triumvirate UEG pre-meeting	28 March	
	Update PRC on planning round issues.	6 April PRC	
	EUSA and EUSU plans to PRC	6 April PRC	
	Planning briefing post Triumvirate meetings	9 Apr UEG	Discuss feedback from triumvirate meetings to enable budget holders to finalise their plans - special one-hour meeting for planning round only
2nd round of planning	Colleges, Support Groups review and amend draft plans based on input from CMG.	13 Apr – 20 April	GaSP/finance available for advice, guidance and support.
	EUSA and EUSU plans to Court	23 April Court	Issue grant letters to EUSA and EUSU once Court approval is given.

	Draft final plans submitted to GaSP	20 April	Submit draft plans consistent with the resources available as per the March SFC Main Grant Letter
Review and refinement	GaSP/Finance analysis of draft final plans and updating of other financial projections, along with final refinements to plans and finance templates. GaSP to draft 14 May PSG paper and 30 May CMG paper	28 April- 9 May tbc	In discussion with GaSP, VP Planning, Resources and Research Policy, Thematic VPs and Finance and budget holders to agree any amendments to final draft plans.
	TVP meeting to discuss plans and feed into UEG paper	2 May	Feedback to GaSP for incorporation into 22 May PSG paper and 30 May CMG paper.
	Meeting Triumvirate/Principal – previously scheduled for 7 May	4 May	Prepare briefing of final plans and surplus position
	Any amendments to UG/PGT intakes post UCAS deadline	4 – 11 May	GaSP discussions with budget holders as necessary to reflect post UCAS deadline for responding to offers (approx. 4 May)
	Draft final plans and investments considered by UEG	14 May UEG	Full plans presented along with a GaSP and Finance overview of how the plans together address the overall strategic priorities; recommendations for strategic investments; the estimated surplus; and an explanation of adjustments for intakes, estates contributions and possible income variation from estimate. Specific sections may be included by GaSP to provide additional background information that may be of relevance to better inform decisions
Approval	Final plans recommended to PRC	4 June PRC	The paper presents to PRC for feedback and onward recommendation to Court the individual plan executive summaries; an overview of how the plans together address the overall strategic priorities; recommendations for strategic investments; and the estimated surplus.
	Final plans recommended to Court	18 June Court	Executive summary plans plus paper similar to 27 April PRC paper adjusted for decisions on 8 June.
	Issue budget letters to Colleges and SGs	By 30 June	

THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Payment of tutoring and demonstrating staff employed on guaranteed hours (GH) contracts

Description of paper

1.   This paper describes the background to the employment of tutoring and demonstrating staff on guaranteed hours (GH) contracts, highlights concerns that have been raised about current employment practices in relation to this staff group and sets out the immediate actions that need to be taken to address these issues.

Action requested/Recommendation

2.   CMG members are asked to give their full support to the recommendations in this paper and to ensure that they are implemented as a matter of urgency (i.e. within the next four weeks) in all Schools and departments for which the member has responsibility.

Background and context

3.   The University employs hourly paid staff in tutor and demonstrator roles to provide teaching for undergraduate students. Many (but not all) tutors and demonstrators are currently registered as PhD students.

4.   Following extensive negative press coverage in 2014 on the use (and misuse) of zero hours contracts by some organisations and criticism of Universities for employing teaching staff on contracts without specified hours the University introduce Guaranteed Hours (GH) contracts as a replacement for Hours to be notified (HTBN) contracts.

5.   The new GH contract was intended to give greater security and clarity to hourly paid staff. Guidance for managers of staff on GH contracts affirming the requirement to pay GH staff for mandatory training and attendance at mandatory meetings was issued in October 2015. This requirement was re-iterated in the new *Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors and Demonstrators* published in 2017.

6.   In March last year UCU submitted a casualisation claim, seeking a commitment from the University to work in partnership to address concerns about employment practices for GH staff. The University recognises the concerns raised by UCU and continues to be committed to ensuring better support for staff working as tutors and demonstrators, through improved management of GH contract processes and the embedding of the recently launched *Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors and Demonstrators*[1].

7.   CMG may also be aware that a separate piece of work is being undertaken with two pilot Schools with significant numbers of GH staff employed in a range of tutoring

---

[1] http://www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/HumanResources/Policies/Tutors_and_Demonstrators_Policy_for_the_recruitment_support_and_development_of_Tutors_and_Demonstrators.pdf

and teaching related roles, to consider the appropriateness of the use of GH contracts for delivering tutoring and teaching and to explore alternative options. That separate piece of work is not the subject of this paper.

Discussion

8.   All Tutors and Demonstrators are important and valued members of our academic community, and should have a positive experience of working at the University. During the course of partnership working with UCU on this issue, it has come to light that some Tutors and Demonstrators (both PhD students and others) still appear to be being asked to do work for which they are not paid and/or that they are being asked to undertake duties which are not consistent with the grade at which they are employed and paid and / or are uncertain what they will be paid for the work they are asked to do.

9.   This is not an acceptable position for the University and Schools and Colleges must ensure, with immediate effect,that staff employed on GH contracts are being paid at an appropriate rate and for all work (including mandatory training and attendance at meetings) that they are asked to carry out.

10. For managers and GH staff to be able to understand whether GH staff are being paid appropriately it is essential that all Schools/Subject Areas publish details of the time allocated for each work activity undertaken by GH tutors, including time allocated for training, attendance at meetings, preparation, assessment and marking.

11. By Wednesday 14 February, **ALL** Schools/Subject Areas must have published and communicated to all GH staff employed in tutoring and demonstrating roles in their respective areas a document which: (see example template at Appendix 1)

- Provides clear information on the activities that tutors and demonstrators will be required to undertake, the paid time allocated for each of these activities and the paid time allocated for supporting activities e.g. training, preparation and marking.
- Provides tutors and demonstrators with clarity on what induction and training is mandatory and ensure payment for participation in mandatory training
- Provides tutors and demonstrators with clarity on mandatory meetings and ensure payment for participation in mandatory meetings
- Ensures tutors and demonstrators are aware of their entitlement to claim sick pay and the procedure for reporting sickness absence

12. Additionally Schools/subject areas must ensure that:
- the duties that tutors and demonstrators are asked to undertake are consistent with the grade at which they are employed and paid
- tutors and demonstrators are provided with access to the appropriate tools and facilities required to carry out their roles –e.g. desk space, photocopying facilities

13. CMG is also asked to note that:
- Schools have all been asked to develop a full Tutor and Demonstrator manual by the beginning of AY 18/19. The SPS manual (as an exemplar) is at http://edin.ac/2Dd8tJv

Resource implications

14. This paper highlights published University policy aimed at ensuring compliance with employment legislation and employment good practice and at delivering a positive working experience for tutoring and demonstrating staff employed on GH contracts. Consequently there should be no additional resource implications.

Risk Management

15. This paper aims to minimise risk. Some GH staff currently appear to be being employed without proper clarity as to what work they are expected to undertake and the amount of time they can expect to be paid for carrying out that work. This lack of clarity is affecting the morale of our GH staff and creating a risk to the University's reputation as a fair and responsible employer.

Equality & Diversity

16. There is evidence that the greater proportion of current tutoring and demonstrating staff on GH contracts are female. Consequently the concerns being raised by GH tutoring and demonstrating staff have a disproportionate impact on female staff.

Next steps & Communication

17. Senior Vice-Principal, Charlie Jeffery wrote to Heads of School, Heads of College, Registrars, DOPs, Teaching Organisation staff, School Under-graduate Directors and College Deans in November and December with a reminder of the above points. CMG members are now asked to ensure that the necessary steps are taken in their own areas to ensure that the recommendations in this paper are implemented with immediate effect.

Consultation

18. The contents of this paper have been discussed with Charlie Jeffery, Senior VP. The paper reflects the contents of the Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors and Demonstrators which had widespread University consultation last year and guidance published in 2015 on payment of tutoring and demonstrating staff on GH contracts.

Further information

19. Further Information is available from Jane Norman and/or Zoe Lewandowski

20. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Jane Norman, V-People & Culture   Jane Norman
    Zoe Lewandowski, Director of HR   Zoe Lewandowski
    8 January 2018

Freedom of Information

21. This paper is open

Course Tutor Payment Rates 2016/17: Hours Allocated per Category of Activity

This Table of Rates describes the dominant categories and rates used for these purposes in SSPS. Social Work applies some variants in respect of its sessional tutors, given the duties applying to those roles are unique within SSPS.

Note 4 provides information on how tutoring contributions on Fundamentals courses can vary from the standard provisions of Table of Rates.

Category	Hours Allocated / Notes
Tutoring and Preparation	2 hours per tutorial group meeting – including preparation and administration, but not including marking of essays or exams. Where a course requires that the tutor provide marks on tutorial participation, an additional 2 hours per group will be reported for payment at the course's end.
Marking, Assessment, and Feedback Per Item of Assessment (based on maximum allowable word count as specified in course handbook)	
100 – 1000 words	2 minutes per 100 words
1001 – 1500 words	20 minutes
1501 – 2000 words	30 minutes
2001 – 3000 words	45 minutes
3001 – 4000 words	1 hour (60 minutes)
4000 – 4500 words	1 hour 15 minutes (75 minutes)
Exam Script Marking (with feedback)	40 minutes per script, including all questions. Not including take-home exams.
Post-Tutorial / Administration	2 groups pw: 1 PT/A hour additional in each of those weeks. 3 groups pw: 1.5 hour additional. 4 groups pw: 2 hours additional. Payments do not apply where the tutor role on a course does not – exceptionally – involve being available to students outside of group meeting times.
Required Meetings and Training	1 per contact hour Required meetings would include: The start of term School induction The start of term School training session A course meeting at the beginning of term A marking meeting before each assessment. End of course de-brief if required.

If you are asked to undertake an assessment that does not fit any of the categories above or which are not listed or covered in the notes below, please contact sps.tutoring@ed.ac.uk **before** submitting your task or pay claim. Notes on Table of Rates:

- "Assessment" includes essays and take-home exams, all of which are assumed to require substantial feedback to students. The word-counts indicated in the above table correlate to the word-counts as will be specified in the course guidance. SSPS rates include time specifically to

allow quality feedback to students. If any assessment does not require feedback to students, the hours allocated would be reduced except in the case of assessments of less than 1000 words, where it is already assumed that feedback is not a significant factor.

- Tutors routinely undertake mid-semester assessment work in respect of their tutorial groups, and will be expected to undertake marking in respect of the student numbers concerned. Due to the way that students sign up and are allocated to tutorials at the start of every semester, it is possible that the numbers of groups and students on the tutorial groups will vary after the start of the semester. The tutorial groups and numbers of students within them should stabilise by the end of Week 3. If there is a late cancellation of the tutorial group, the course organiser or secretary will contact the tutor to let them know.

- Tutors must also be available for the marking of exam scripts where required by the course organiser at the end of the semester.

- **Post-Tutorial / Administration**
  Post-tutorial / administration hours are not applicable to senior tutor roles.

- **Fundamentals Courses**
  Where a Fundamentals tutor is preparing for, and leading, a session in the way that course tutors do, that session will be paid at 2 hours per contact hour. Where there is no such responsibility to prepare for and lead a session, and it is just facilitation and support during the session that is needed, pay will be at 1 hour per contact hour.

  Fundamentals tutors are not normally required to provide post-tutorial / administration , and so no hours will be allocated to that end.

  Fundamentals assessments which do not fit within the categories of the Table of Rates will attract hours as follows:

Contributions to assessments on Fundamentals courses	
Blog or Online Diary Reading, Review and Feedbacks	1 hour per blog / diary per student per semester
Group Oral Presentation Written Feedbacks	30 minutes per feedback
1,500-word Essay Marking and Feedback	30 minutes per essay

- The following are exceptional tasks not usually undertaken by tutors as standard and for which there is a separate approval process. Payment for these tasks can be submitted via eTime but require that approval is sought in advance of doing so. If you are asked to undertake the tasks below and don't know who to approach to ensure approval, contact sps.tutoring@ed.ac.uk for advice:

Lecture	6 per contact hour
Hons / MSc Dissertation Supervision	6 hours
Hons / MSc Dissertation Marking	4 hours

Marking on Postgraduate course	Rates as per UG above

- If you are asked to undertake other ad hoc work requests that are not related to tutoring on course, please check with the person asking you to undertake the work as to who to approach for approval and payment. The Subject Secretary or the Research Office can also advise and help in these matters.

Sick Pay Procedure and Policy

If you are unable to undertake your duties due to ill health, you must contact your course organiser via email, and copy in the relevant course secretary, as soon as possible and no later than 9.30 am on the first morning of illness. The email must detail the specific reason for your absence; the length of time you expect to be absent; whether you intend to seek medical advice; details of the courses and tutorial times or other work you were due to undertake.

When you are well again, you must contact sps.tutoring@ed.ac.uk as soon as you are able to return to your duties.

You will be asked to complete a Return to Work form. If you have been off for **3 calendar days or more**, this should be countersigned by your course organiser.

If you have been off for **8 calendar days or more** (with Saturday and Sunday counting towards the total) you must also supply a Fit Note from your GP. Return to Work form:

www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/HumanResources/forms/Return_to_Work.doc

If for any reason absence is likely to last more than two weeks, please let us know at:
sps.tutoring@ed.ac.uk

Sick Pay

Tutors are entitled to sick pay, which will paid at the same rate as if you were well and able to carry out your duties.

Claiming for Sick Pay in eTime

When claiming sick pay in eTime, please enter the work as you would if had undertaken it. Please provide a clear description in the task description box to indicate that you are claiming sick pay. The date and time of the task should correspond to the group(s) that you were unable to attend due to ill health. Please see following link for the University of Edinburgh Absence Management Policy:

http://www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/HumanResources/Policies/Absence_Management-Policy.pdf

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Finance Director's Report

Description of paper

1. This paper summarises the finance aspects of recent activities on significant projects and initiatives updating on progress as appropriate. We also report the combined Period 4, November, Management Accounts and Quarter 1 Full Year Forecast.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. Central Management Group is asked to comment on the latest update and can use this report to brief their teams on Finance matters.

Paragraphs 3 - 20 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

21. The University continues to proactively manage its financial risk by not breaching the following minimum criterion - unrestricted surplus of 2% of gross income. The draft financial results demonstrate we do not expect this indicator to be breached. The continuing health and sustainability of the University depends upon strong direction supported by robust forecasting and we will continue to refine and challenge the assumptions underpinning the Ten Year Forecast.

Equality & Diversity

22. Specific issues of equality and diversity are not relevant to this paper as the content focusses primarily on financial strategy and/or financial project considerations.

Next steps & Communication

23. We would welcome feedback as outlined in the discussion above.

Consultation

24. The paper has been reviewed by Phil McNaull, Director of Finance.

Further information

25. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Lorna McLoughlin   Phil McNaull
    Head of FIRST Team   Finance Director

    Julia Miflin
    Management Accountant
    5 January 2018

Freedom of Information

26. This paper should not be included in open business as its disclosure could substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the University.

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Paternity Leave and Pay Policy

Description of paper
1. This paper describes the University's current paternity pay provision and recommends further enhancement to remain competitive with other Russell Group universities and support the University's application to renew its silver Athena SWANN Award due in April 2018.

Action requested/Recommendation
2. Central Management Group is asked to note the benefits provided by the University's paternity leave and pay policy and how these compare to those provided by other Russell Group universities; and to approve the recommendations to enhance the current provision.

Paragraphs 3 - 14 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management
15. Failure to address the current differential in pay could adversely impact the University's Athena SWAN application. By 'lagging behind' other Russell Group universities, there is some risk to our employer reputation as a leading exponent of family friendly policies.

Equality & Diversity
16. The proposal addresses the 'gender' based difference which exists between the first two weeks of leave taken by a 'mother' and the first two weeks of leave taken by a 'father' post the birth/placement of their child.

Next steps & Communication
Paragraphs 17 - 18 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation
19. This paper has been reviewed by the Deputy Director of HR (Employee Relations, Employment Policy, Equality and Diversity) and the recommendations have been approved by the Vice Principal, People and Culture and the Director of Human Resources.

Further information
20. *Author*
Suzanne Mackenzie
Senior HR Partner, Employee
Relations and Employment Policy
5 January 2018

Presenter
Zoe Lewandowski
Director of HR

Freedom of Information
21. This paper is closed, pending collective agreement being reached with the trade unions.

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Shared Parental Leave and Pay Policy

Description of paper
1. This paper describes the University's current shared parental leave and pay provision and recommends further enhancement to remain competitive with other Russell Group universities and to support the University's application to renew its silver Athena SWANN award due in April 2018.

Action requested/Recommendation
2. Central Management Group is asked to note the benefits provided by the University's shared parental leave and pay policy and how these compare to those provided by other Russell Group universities; and to approve the recommendations to enhance the current provision as described in Sections 13 to 17 and the proposed review of all University family friendly policies as described in Sections 19.

Paragraphs 3 - 21 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management
22. Failure to provide staff with unrestricted choice over how to pattern their enhanced leave entitlement could adversely impact the University's Athena SWANN application.

23. By 'lagging behind' other Russell Group universities, there is some risk to our employer reputation as a leading exponent of family friendly policies.

24. Employee relations wise, removal of the restriction will mitigate the risk of employees feeling aggrieved that they cannot take leave at full pay at a time more suited to their family circumstances or when their partner is more likely to curtail their maternity leave, i.e. when they have exhausted their own pay entitlement.

Equality & Diversity
25. The current restriction on when staff can take leave at full pay is at odds with the equality drivers behind the legislation, i.e. to encourage shared parenting from birth and so provide working mothers with more choice on how to structure their leave entitlement.

Paragraphs 26 - 27 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation
28. This paper has been reviewed by the Deputy Director of HR (Employee Relations, Employment Policy, Equality and Diversity) and the recommendations have been approved by the Vice Principal, People and Culture and the Director of Human Resources.

Further information

29. *Author*   *Presenter*
    Suzanne Mackenzie   Zoe Lewandowski
    Senior HR Partner, Employee   Director of HR
    Relations and Employment Policy
    5 January 2018

Freedom of Information

30. This paper is closed, pending collective agreement being reached with the trade unions.

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Terms of Reference for a proposed working group to formulate the University's British Sign Language Plan

Description of paper
1. This paper proposes to establish a University working group to prepare our British Sign Language Plan in accordance with the BSL (Scotland) Act 2015 and the proposed terms of reference for such a working group.

Action requested/Recommendation
2. Central Management Group is asked to approve the setting up of a BSL working group and the terms of reference for this piece of work.

Background and context
3. The Scottish Government passed the BSL (Scotland) Act in 2015, with the stated aim that they want to make Scotland the best place in the world for BSL users to live, work and visit. The University (as a public body) must now produce a BSL plan outlining how we will promote and support BSL users.

Discussion
4. The proposed terms of reference are attached as an Appendix.

Resource implications
5. Resource implications may include the cost of a BSL Interpreter for working group and consultation meetings with Deaf students, staff and visitors. Administrative support for meetings will be needed. Other resources include premises for meetings and the cost of refreshments (tea, coffee).

Risk Management
6. To fulfil our legal duty the University must produce a BSL plan.

Equality & Diversity
7. The plan is aimed at increasing opportunities for BSL users to engage in their course of studies and with the full student experience. The aim will also be to minimising the possibility of disability discrimination against BSL users.

Next steps & Communication
8. If approved, communication on the proposal will involve approaching potential working group members and advising of progress in the usual manner eg publication of minutes, requests for additional information etc.

Consultation
9. The paper has been prepared at the request of the Deputy Secretary (Student Experience) and has been written by Sheila Williams, Director of the Student Disability Service and Rachel O'Neill, Programme Director, MSC Inclusive Education.

Further information

10. *Authors*   *Presenter*

Sheila Williams   Gavin Douglas

Director, Student Disability Service   Deputy Secretary, Student Experience

Rachel O'Neill
Programme Director
School of Education

Freedom of Information

11. This paper is open.

University of Edinburgh British Sign Language Plan Working Group

Proposed Terms of Reference

Purpose

The Scottish Government has stated that it wants to make Scotland the best place in the world for BSL users* to live, work and visit.

The British Sign Language (BSL) (Scotland) Act was enacted in 2015 and the Scottish Government published its BSL national plan (2017-2013) on 24/10/17.

As a public body, the University must now draw up our own BSL plan.

In order to do this, it is proposed to establish a British Sign Language Plan Working Group (BSLPWG) to develop the University of Edinburgh's BSL Plan.

The working group will commence its work early in semester 2 of academic year 2017/18 and aims to produce the plan by the end of academic year 2017/18.

The working group will meet 4 times during that period.

The working group will produce a number of recommendations with regard to implementing the plan and reviewing progress.

Remit

To develop the University of Edinburgh's British Sign Language Plan, in line with the the provisions of British Sign Language (Scotland) Act 2015, the Equality Act 2010 and the Scottish national plan 2017-2023.

Aims and objectives:
- To explore the current and existing barriers to participation for Deaf students in student life and the student experience at the University of Edinburgh

- To gather and analyse quantitative and qualitative data in relation to the Deaf student experience at the University of Edinburgh

- To recommend ways of addressing identified issues and challenges for Deaf people who study, work and visit the University

- To recommend approaches to enhance the quality of UoE provision for Deaf people

- To identify any additional policy or guidance areas required to support Deaf students, staff and visitors

- To identify some quick and visible "wins" to illustrate the University's commitment to Deaf students/BSL users.

Composition/meetings
The group will be convened by Rachel O'Neill, Programme Director, MSc Inclusive Education, School of Education.

Administrative support will be required, in addition to expenses required for BSL Interpreters for meetings and consultations.

Proposed Membership
It is proposed that the working group include representation from the following areas:

The Students Association (if possible either a deaf student or a student learning BSL)
Communications and Marketing
Office of Lifelong Learning
School of Education – the School has a deaf education programme and hosts the Scottish Sensory Centre.
Human Resources – impact on employment opportunities
College representation
Student Disability Service
Third sector – possibly from Deaf Action.

Rachel O'Neill, Programme Director, MSc Inclusive Learning

Sheila Williams, Director, Student Disability Service

26/10/17

*The Scottish Government's National BSL plan refers to BSL users as "D/deaf and/or deafblind people (those who receive the language in a tactile form due to sight loss) whose first or preferred language is British Sign Language.

The Scottish Government's BSL National Plan 2017-2013 can be viewed here:
https://news.gov.scot/resources/british-sign-language-bsl-national-plan-2017-2023

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Evacuation of Disabled People in Emergency Situations

Description of paper

1.   This paper gives an update on the ongoing project to ensure the successful evacuation of people with relevant disabilities in the event of an emergency situation arising. The Paper reports on progress with the overall Disabled Evacuation Project, the sub-project on Disabled Refuges, and longer term plans to provide a sustainable focus for matters relating to disabled evacuation provision for both students and staff.

Action requested

2.   The Group is asked to note the contents of the report; which summarises the significant progress made to date to upgrade the University's physical infrastructure and procedures relating to the evacuation of people with relevant disabilities in emergency situations.

Paragraphs 3 – 23 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

24. Key risks outlined in this Paper include the need to avoid reputational, compliance, health, safety and overall financial, risks. All measures outlined are designed to reduce these risks so far as reasonably practicable.

Equality & Diversity

25. This report raises no new equality and diversity implications, though Equality legislation is a key factor in the equation as regards access and egress for people with relevant disabilities. The work outlined above is relevant to the Student Disability Review and to efforts to improve the student experience in general.

Consultation

26*.* This paper has been produced by the Director of Health and Safety in consultation with the Director of Corporate Services, key Estates colleagues, and the V-P for People and Culture.

Further information

27. *Author*   *Presenter*
     Alastair Reid   Jane Norman,
     Director of Health and Safety   V-P for People and Culture
                                            Hugh Edmiston
     11 January 2018   Director of Corporate Services

Freedom of Information

28. This paper is **closed**.

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

**Health and Safety Quarterly Report: Quarter 1:
1 September 2017 – 30 November 2017**

Description of paper
1.   This paper provides a summary of health and safety related incidents that took place during the period 1 September 2017 to 30 November 2017, as well as relevant health and safety issues and developments, to provide information and assurance to the Central Management Group (CMG) on the management of health and safety matters. It includes the Report from the November 2017 meeting of the University Health and Safety Committee.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   CMG is asked to note the contents of the report.

3.   That CMG notes the statistics included in the Appendices as illustrative of the University's accident and incident experience, and notes the issues and developments which are also described in the Report from the Health and Safety Committee.

Paragraphs 4 - 12 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk management
13. The University has a low risk appetite for both compliance risks and for people risks. Monitoring of health and safety accidents, diseases and incidents ensures that risks to health are being managed and provides an early warning of more serious issues.

Equality & Diversity
14. This report raises no major equality and diversity implications, other than those associated with disabled evacuation. A separate report on progress with the Disabled Evacuation Project, is also on the Agenda for this meeting of CMG.

Consultation
15. This paper, with minor alterations, will also be presented to the next appropriate meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee.

Further information
16. <u>Author</u>   <u>Presenter</u>
     Alastair Reid   Hugh Edmiston
     Director of Health and Safety   Director of Corporate Services
     5 January 2018

Freedom of Information
17. This paper is closed as its disclosure would substantially prejudice the legal interests of any person or organisation.

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Proposal to establish 3 new Chairs in the College of Science and Engineering

Description of paper
1. This paper outlines the case for the establishment of a Chair of Antimicrobial Resistance and a Chair of Immunology in the School of Biological Sciences and a Chair of Forest Ecology in the School of GeoSciences.

Action requested/Recommendation
2. Central Management Group is asked to approve the establishment of these Chairs.

Background and context
3. The process to create new substantive Chairs requires CMG approval. In taking this forward, Schools must seek the approval of their Head of College outlining in full the reasons for the investment and the financial implications of such a request.   This has been completed, noting the alignment of this Chair with School, College and University strategy.

Discussion
Chair of Antimicrobial Resistance
4. The School of Biological Sciences wishes to establish this strategically important, new Chair in order to place the School in a strong position to secure the major funding being made available for tackling a critical world challenge (AMR). The emergence of AMR is an evolutionary phenomenon that requires understanding of microbial genetics, molecular mechanism and systems behaviour using biophysical tools and modelling methods. Developing the next generation of therapies will also require interdisciplinary approaches combining synthetic biology with systems and evolutionary modelling. This Chair will provide intellectual vision and strategic direction for research and teaching in the field of Antimicrobial Resistance, as well as interdisciplinary leadership beyond the AMR agenda. The University of Edinburgh has developed a "Strategy for Antimicrobial Resistance Research" led by Edinburgh Infectious Diseases (EID). This Chair will fit strategically into the "Biology, evolution and physics underpinning mechanisms of antibiotic resistance" theme and allow us to strengthen links to the School of Physics, the Division of Infection and Pathway Medicine and the Roslin Institute.

Chair of Immunology
5. The School of Biological Sciences (SBS) wishes to establish this strategically important, new Chair in order to maintain and strengthen our position as a leading Immunology/Infection Research Centre in the UK. We wish to re-invigorate and consolidate immunology research with a high-profile appointment following the departure of senior academics in this area. The Institute of Immunology and Infection research (IIIR) is famous for the cross-section of fundamental research in both immunology and the biology of infectious organisms with an impact on global health/tropical disease issues. We wish to bridge these core activities in this appointment. In addition, this chair will provide leadership and be a critical driver to sustain the highly successful Centre for Immunity, Infection and Evolution and to launch bids for external consortia funding (e.g. The Wellcome-funded Global Pathogens and

Health PhD programme). This will ensure competitiveness and will emphasize our international profile. Understanding the function of the immune system is an essential component of a number of key strategic initiatives across the University of Edinburgh, including those led by Edinburgh Infectious Diseases, the Global Health Academy and the Edinburgh Cancer Research Centre. In addition, this Chair will allow us to strengthen links to the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, in particular with the MRC Centre for Inflammation Research and the Roslin Institute, with the latter in line with the strategic view of the newly-appointed director.

Chair of Forest Ecology
6. The School of GeoSciences wish to establish this new Chair for the externally appointed Director of Centre for Sustainable Forests & Landscapes, Professor Jaboury Ghazoul. Professor Ghazoul has an international research profile in the area of forest ecology and will provide intellectual vision and strategic direction for research in the field of sustainable forests and landscapes within the University.

Resource implications
7. Funding for the Chairs will be met from the appropriate School's core budget.

Risk Management
8. There are no significant risks associated with the establishment of these Chairs and risks in not making these appointments. The establishment of the Chair of Antimicrobial Resistance has been central to a large award linked to the "Building a New Biology" project, and failure to establish the Chair may have financial and reputational consequences with the funder.

Equality & Diversity
9. The appointment of Chairs is made on the basis of recruitment processes in accordance with University policies on equality and diversity.

Next steps/implications
10. If these proposals are approved, Resolutions will be drafted to formally establish the Chair.

Consultation
11. Normal consultation processes within CSE have been followed ensuring relevant colleagues have been made award of the intention to establish the requested Chairs.

Further information
12. *Authors*   *Presenter*
    Prof David Gray   Vice-Principal Professor Dave Robertson
    Head of School of Biological Sciences   Head of College of Science & Engineering
    Mike Cowan
    College HR: CSE
    December 2017

Freedom of Information
13. This paper can be included in Open Business.

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

CENTRAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

16 January 2018

Proposal to establish three new Chairs in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Description of paper
1. This paper outlines the case for the establishment of a Chair of Brain Inflammation and Repair and Chair of Translational Molecular Medicine within Edinburgh Medical School: Clinical Sciences and a Chair of Immunology and Infectious Diseases within the Roslin Institute.

Action requested/Recommendation
2.   Central Management Group is asked to approve the establishment of these Chairs.

Background and context
3.   The process to create new substantive Chairs requires CMG approval. In taking this forward, Schools must seek the approval of their Head of College outlining in full the reasons for the investment and the financial implications of such a request.   This has been completed, noting the alignment of this Chair with School, College and University strategy.

Discussion
Chair of Brain Inflammation and Research
4. The Chair of Brain Inflammation and Repair will play a key role in shaping the University's scientific strategy for neurodegeneration – regeneration research as well as leading a programme of independent research that is complementary to existing research strengths across the University's research centres. These include dementia (Edinburgh's recently awarded Centre in the UK Dementia Research Institute), ageing (MRC Centre for Cognitive Ageing and Cognitive Epidemiology), neuroinflammation (MRC Centre for Inflammation Research), stem cells and regeneration (MRC Centre for Regenerative Medicine) and the new Institute for Regeneration and Repair, with a focus on regeneration of damaged tissue and resolution of inflammation and fibrosis.

Chair of Translational Molecular Medicine
5. The Chair of Translational Molecular Medicine will play a key role in the BHF Centre for Cardiovascular Science. CVS has recently recruited a group of excellent young principal investigators who are focused on adipose tissue and metabolism, and has established successful collaborations with genetic epidemiologists and informaticians. The Chair will provide leadership in cardiometabolic research and will support translation of CVS research into patients and populations.

Chair of Immunology and Infectious Diseases
6. The Roslin Institute wish to establish this new Chair in order to provide intellectual vision and strategic direction for animal science research and teaching at the Roslin Institute and wider Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies.

Resource implications

7. The Chair of Brain Inflammation and Repair will be offered on a 0.5FTE basis with 20% of funding from an MRC Momentum Study award and the remaining 80% from the Deanery's core budget. The Chair of Translational Molecular Medicine will be funded from the Deanery's core budget. Costs are included in the 2017-18 onwards Deanery budget. Funding for the Chair of Immunology and Infectious Diseases will be met by the Roslin Institute's core budget.

Risk Management

8. There are no significant risks associated with the establishment of these Chairs.

Equality & Diversity

9. The appointment of Chairs is made on the basis of recruitment processes in accordance with University policies on equality and diversity.

Next steps/implications

10.   If these proposals are approved, Resolutions will be drafted to formally establish the Chairs.

Consultation

11. Normal consultation processes within CMVM have been followed ensuring relevant colleagues have been made award of the intention to establish the requested Chairs.

Further information

12.   *Authors*   *Presenter*
      Professor Hilary Critchley   Professor David Argyle
      Head, Deanery of Clinical Sciences   Interim Head of College, MVM
      Edinburgh Medical School

      Cat Eastwood
      College HR: MVM
      December 2017

Freedom of Information

13. This paper can be included in Open Business.