

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

**BUSINESS FOR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT
to be held in the Raeburn Room, Old College
on Monday 21 February 2011 at 2.00 p.m.**

A buffet lunch will be available in the Lord Provost Elder Room, Old College from 1.00 p.m.

This meeting of Court will be preceded by a presentation by Assistant Principal Dr Sue Rigby on the Higher Education Achievement Report.

A FORMAL BUSINESS

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------|
| 1. | Minute of the meeting held on 20 December 2010 | A1 |
| 2. | Note of the electronic meeting concluded on 5 January 2011 | A2 |
| 3. | General Council Assessors | A3 |

B PRINCIPAL'S BUSINESS

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Principal's Communications | B1 |
| 2. | Vice-Principal Designations | B2 |

C SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------|
| 1. | Report of the Finance and General Purposes Committee | |
| | .1 Comments on the Report of the Central Management Group | C1.1 |
| | .2 Report on Other Items | C1.2 |
| 2. | University's draft response to the Scottish Government's Green Paper | C2 |
| 3. | The Edinburgh College of Art | C3 |
| 4. | Corporate HR Restructuring | C4 |
| 5. | Review of Effectiveness – Court Committees | C5 |
| 6. | Report from Nominations Committee | C6 |
| 7. | Report from Estates Committee | C7 |
| 8. | Draft Ordinance for the Election of Chancellor and General Council Assessors | C8 |
| 9. | Ordinance for the Regulation of Foundations, Mortifications, Gifts, Endowments and Bursaries, Use of Surplus Revenue and Alteration of Endowments | C9 |

D ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTE

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Academic Report | D1 |
| 2. | Resolutions | D2 |
| 3. | Conflict of Interest Management Plan | D3 |
| 4. | Expeditions Committee's Report | D4 |
| 5. | India Liaison Office Bank Account | D5 |
| 6. | Clydesdale Bank Account | D6 |
| 7. | Donations and Legacies | D7 |
| 8. | Use of the Seal | |

MINUTE OF A MEETING of the University Court of the University of Edinburgh held in Seminar Room 1, Chaplaincy Centre, Potterrow on Monday, 20 December 2010.

- Present:**
- The Rector (in chair)
 - The Principal
 - Professor A M Smyth
 - Mrs M Tait
 - Professor J Ansell
 - Professor D Finnegan
 - Professor L Yellowlees
 - The Rt Hon G Grubb, Lord Provost of the City of Edinburgh
 - Dr J Markland, Vice-Convener
 - Mr M Murray
 - Professor S Monro
 - Ms A Richards
 - Ms G Stewart
 - Mr D Brook
 - Ms L Rawlings, President Students' Representative Council
 - Ms S Wise, Vice-President Students' Representative Council
- In attendance:**
- Ms S Beattie-Smith, Rector's Assessor
 - Vice-Principal Professor N Brown
 - Vice-Principal Professor D Fergusson
 - Vice-Principal Professor J Haywood
 - Vice-Principal Professor A McMahon
 - Vice-Principal Professor D Miell
 - Dr K Waldron, University Secretary
 - Mr N Paul, Director of Corporate Services
 - Dr I Conn, Director of Communications and Marketing
 - Dr A Cornish, Deputy University Secretary and Director of Planning
 - Mr A Currie, Director of Estates and Buildings
 - Mr J Gorringe, Director of Finance
 - Ms E Fraser, Deputy Director of Human Resources
 - Ms F Boyd, Principal's Policy and Executive Officer
 - Dr K J Novosel, Head of Court Services
- Apologies:**
- Mr P Budd
 - Mr D A Connell
 - Dr M Aliotta
 - Professor J Barbour
 - Mr D Workman

The Court received a presentation from the Principal, the Director of Planning and Deputy Secretary, and the Director of Finance on the University's financial position. It was noted that further information would be circulated as soon as possible on the Scottish Funding Council's indicative funding announcement for the University for 2011/2012.

A FORMAL BUSINESS

1 MINUTE OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 NOVEMBER 2010 Paper A1

The Minute of the meeting held on 8 November 2010 was approved as a correct record.

B PRINCIPAL'S BUSINESS

1 PRINCIPAL'S COMMUNICATIONS Paper B1

Court noted the items within the Principal's report and the additional information on: the continuing issues around immigration in respect of students and staff recruitment; the publication of the Green Paper on higher education and discussions on the Scottish solution to University funding; student demonstrations to the fee proposals for England and the appropriate handling of the situation; and the continuing positive media coverage of University activities particularly the significant funding pledge to support the new centre researching into autism, fragile X syndrome and intellectual disabilities.

2 CHANCELLOR

Court noted that the University had now been informed that HRH, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh wished to step down from the position of Chancellor of the University with effect from 17 December 2010. As the position of Chancellor was now vacant, the General Council had initiated the process to elect a new Chancellor in accordance with the requirements of the Universities (Scotland) Acts and relevant Ordinances. Court further noted that as a result of this announcement, the current Chancellor's Assessor on Court, Lord Cameron had demitted office with effect from 17 December 2010 and that this position would remain vacant until such time as the new Chancellor had intimated their Assessor; Court would have the opportunity in due course to thank Lord Cameron for his commitment and much valued service to Court and the University.

C SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

1 REPORT OF THE FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Dr Markland presented the papers previously circulated.

Report of the Central Management Group meeting of 23 November 2010 **Paper C1.1**

Court noted the content of the report.

Report on Other Items **Paper C1.2**

The progression of the shared timetabling project was welcomed as were assurances that cognisance would be taken of the lessons learned from previous change and IT projects. Court approved the subsidiary companies and Development Trust financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2010 and further approved the letter from the University to the Chairman of USS as drafted by the Pensions' Working Party.

2 RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE END OF YEAR REPORT Paper C2

Court noted the Annual Report on the activities of the Risk Management Committee including the new issues emerging and that overall the Committee was of the opinion that the University had satisfactorily managed its key risks during the year ended 31 July 2010.

3 RISK MANAGEMENT - POST YEAR END ASSURANCE STATEMENT Paper C3

Court noted that no significant new events or issues required to be drawn to its attention since the Annual Report of the Risk Management Committee had been prepared which impacted on the ability of Court to approve the Annual Accounts for the year ended 31 July 2010.

4 AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT Paper C4

Court noted the Annual Report on the activities of the Audit Committee and in particular the opinion of the Internal Audit Service, endorsed by the Committee, on the adequacy of the University's control and governance arrangements. The continuing satisfactory performance of Internal and External Audit Services was commended by Court.

Court further noted the draft Minute of the last meeting of the Audit Committee and the Committee's comments on the Reports and Financial Statements for year ended 31 July 2010 and the Letter of Representation. It was further noted that the Audit Committee had considered in detail the External Audit's Highlights Memorandum 2009-2010 and that it was content that it represented a balanced view; no major weaknesses had been identified. The Committee would be considering the impact of the Bribery Act during 2010/2011.

5 REPORTS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2010

Paper C5.1

The Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2010 were considered in detail and Court noted the inclusion of more comprehensive Reports as now required for the sector; information on attendance at Court and Committee meetings would require to be included in respect of the 2010/2011 Reports and Financial Statements. The very positive performance of the University during 2009/2010 was welcomed with the Group Income and Expenditure Account recording an increase in income of 7% from the previous year and the achievement of a surplus of £18.3m which equated to 2.9% of turnover. The various elements contributing to the income and expenditure positions were noted. Court further noted the information contained in the Balance Sheets and the Cash Flow Statement which demonstrated the continuing strong financial position of the Group.

Court welcomed and approved the Reports and Financial Statements for year ended 31 July 2010, noting the External Auditor's report and unqualified opinion and authorised the Principal, Vice-Convener and the Director of Finance to sign the Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2010 as appropriate on behalf of Court.

Letter of Representation

Paper C5.2

Court ratified the Letter of Representation and authorised the Principal to sign the Letter on its behalf.

Review of 2009/2010 Outturn Versus Forecast

Paper C5.3

The areas of movement between the quarter 3 forecast and the outturn achieved were noted and Court commended the improvements in the forecasting process.

6 EDINBURGH COLLEGE OF ART Paper C6

- 7 COMMISSIONERS' ORDINANCE – EMPLOYMENT POLICIES** **Paper C7**
- Court had previously agreed following Privy Council approval of Ordinance 208: Employment of Academic that existing employment procedures would remain in place until such time as Court approved new employment policies and procedures. The Combined Joint Consultation and Negotiation Committee (CJCNC) had now developed and approved five new employment policies and Court formally approved these new policies as set out in the paper subject to final approval by the CJCNC following the outcome of the Unions' ballot of its members.
- 8 PERFORMANCE MONITORING**
- Strategic Plan 2008-2012 Targets – Annual Progress Report **Paper C8.1**
- Court welcomed this second performance report noting that the majority of the 33 targets within the Strategic Plan were progressing satisfactorily or had already been met. Court further welcomed the intention to produce an interim report in six months on those targets identified as requiring further work which would be considered by the Central Management Group. As part of the planning round, Colleges and Support Groups had also been asked to include actions being taken in respect of these targets. Court fully supported and welcomed this approach.
- 9 APPOINTMENT OF TRIBUNAL** **Paper C9**
- Court noted the requirement to convene a Tribunal under current employment policies to consider disciplinary charges concerning a member of the University's academic staff and approved the appointment to the Tribunal panel of Vice-Principal Professor Bownes (Convener), Professor Monro (Member of Court) and Professor Iredale (Senatus Academicus nomination).
- 10 REPORT FROM KNOWLEDGE STRATEGY COMMITTEE** **Paper C10**
- This first Court report on the activities of the Knowledge Strategy Committee since its designation as a Committee of Court was welcomed and noted. As the revised Delegated Authorisation Schedule had been approved prior to the change in status of this Committee, Court was supportive of the proposed approach to delegate to the Knowledge Strategy Committee authorisation to commit resources in respect of information technology, library and related projects (non-estates related projects) within set limits. Court approved, in principle, the proposed amendments to the Delegated Authorisation Schedule subject to any further revisions and the subsequently required alterations to the terms of reference of the Committee.
- 11 REMUNERATION COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT** **Paper C11**
- Court noted the Annual Report on the activities of the Remuneration Committee. In particular, Court noted the views of the Committee's external expert advisor and that actions were being taken in respect of the issues raised regarding equity and equality, and ethnicity and disability matters. Court further noted the continuing position in respect of the Principal's remuneration.
- 12 CORPORATE HR RESTRUCTURING** **Paper C12**
- The proposed restructuring of Corporate Human Resources to improve efficiency and effectiveness and issues around the devolved nature of the University was supported by Court. The intention to introduce a link partner model was welcomed. It was noted that

a limited number of individuals may be at risk of redundancy and that in accordance with currently agreed policies the Central Management Group would be kept fully informed of the position and would bring forward in due courses recommendations to Court on this matter.

D ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTE

1 UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVE ON UHI Paper D1

Court approved the appointment of Dr Bruce Nelson with immediate effect as the University's representative on the Board of Governors of the University of the Highlands and Islands Millennium Institute in succession to Mr Melvyn Cornish.

2 DONATIONS AND LEGACIES Paper D2

Court was pleased to note the donations and legacies to be notified received by the University of Edinburgh, Development Trust between 28 October and 30 November 2010.

3 USE OF THE SEAL

A record was made available of all the documents executed on behalf of the Court since its last meeting and sealed with its common seal.

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Note of Electronic Meeting concluded on 5 January 2011

As a result of the concerns of Court expressed at its meeting on 20 December 2010 further negotiations were initiated with the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) to reach an acceptable financial position. The Sub-Committee of the Finance and General Purposes Committee, as agreed by Court, considered and evaluated the revised proposals negotiated in detail and on 28 December 2010, by electronic correspondence, it unanimously recommended to Court that the proposed merger with the Edinburgh College of Art should proceed. By 5 January 2011, Court had confirmed that it was content and authorised that letters should be sent to the Scottish Funding Council and the Scottish Government intimating that Court unanimously approved the proposed merger with the Edinburgh College of Art based on the financial position now negotiated.

The University of Edinburgh

University Court

21 February 2011

Election of General Council Assessor

The Court will wish to note that at the General Council February 2011 Elections, Mr Alan Johnston was elected and Professor Ann Smyth was re-elected to the post of General Council Assessor on the University Court both for a period of four years from 1 August 2011 until 31 July 2015.

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2010

Principal's Report

These communications are grouped into international, UK and Scottish developments, followed by details of University news and events:-

International

India

A delegation, including the Principal and Vice Principal International, will visit India (Delhi, Bangalore and Mumbai) across 5 days from 14-18 February 2011 to celebrate the launch of the University's India Liaison Office. The delegation will include senior academics representing the best of the University of Edinburgh's research who will participate in workshops and give guest lectures. High level receptions for alumni and stakeholders in India will be hosted by the Principal and British High Commission diplomats. A full report will be available following the launch.

China

For the fourth consecutive year, the University's Confucius Institute, Director Professor Natascha Gentz, has been honoured as 'Institute of the Year'. The award was bestowed upon the Confucius Institute for Scotland by Hanban, sponsor of the global network of Confucius Institutes and Classrooms in December 2010 in Beijing.

Edinburgh Global Workshop 4 February 2011

The Internationalisation Strategy is now entering its third year of implementation. A workshop was held for university academic and support staff to review progress over the past year, showcasing staff and student examples of ownership, innovation and partnering in a global context. The workshop also aimed to look at new ways of working together to tackle the multidisciplinary themes embraced by Edinburgh Global.

Edinburgh Global Education Network (EGEN)

Cross-sector discussions have been ongoing on how Edinburgh's higher and further education institutions and secondary schools might join forces to provide enhanced opportunities for UK and international students to become global citizens. VP International met with the Education Minister, Michael Russell on 19 January and the EGEN concept was enthusiastically received. A formal launch is planned for March 2011.

UK

Higher Education in England

Both Oxford and Cambridge Universities have announced their intention to set tuition fees at the upper limit of £9,000 per annum and I would anticipate that many more English Russell Group Universities will follow suit. The government has to approve the Access Arrangements of any Institution that wishes to charge more than £6,000 the timetable for this approval is by June 2011. It remains to be seen how this situation will develop but it is clear that the political debate will continue for many months to come and that there are major implications for the Scottish Solution.

Immigration

The UKBA's Tier 4 consultation on student immigration closed on 31 January 2011. The University submitted a response along with an estimated 27,000 others and engagement and lobbying with stakeholders on this key issue continues.

National Pay Negotiations

National pay negotiations have concluded with a settlement of a 0.4 per cent rise with effect from 1 August 2010. The payment is being made following acceptance of the pay offer by national support staff unions, including UNISON and Unite.

The University and College Union did not accept this settlement, but talks have now concluded and employers are proceeding with the increase to avoid delaying payment to staff further.

Scotland

Scottish Solution

The consultation on the Scottish Governments Green Paper is now well underway. I know many of you have read the paper and we will be discussing the University's draft response in more detail later in the meeting.

The Expert Technical Group appointed to look into the financial implications of the options under discussion have begun work and the University is represented on this group by Dr Alexis Cornish our Director of Planning.

Universities Scotland

Court may have heard about the difficult situation at the University of Abertay and the suspension of the Principal Bernard King. This has led to necessary changes at Universities Scotland and Bernard has asked me to step in as Convener until the situation at Abertay is resolved. Once the situation has been resolved it will be my intention to resume my role as Vice Convener.

National Student Survey (NSS) 2011

The National Student Survey for 2011 has been launched and final year Undergraduate students across campus are actively being encouraged to complete it. The results of the survey are normally available in September and prove invaluable to the University to help inform our commitment to continuous improvement.

REF 2014

Detailed planning for the University's approach to REF2014, which Court will remember is the replacement for the Research Assessment Exercise, is well underway and is being led by the Research Policy Group reporting to the Principal's Strategy Group.

USS Pension consultation

At its meeting on the 20 January 2011 the USS Board considered the outcome of the employers consultation and has recommended some modifications to the proposed scheme changes. The revised proposals will now go forward for agreement at the USS Joint Negotiating Committee in February and if agreed will be brought into effect on 1 April 2011.

Merger with Edinburgh College of Art

Court will be aware that Cabinet Secretary Russell has given his approval for the merger subject to agreement from the Scottish Parliament. Staff from both Institutions continue to work on detailed plans for integration and there will be more on this later at Court.

Related meetings

There have been a number of high profile visits and meetings at the University in recent weeks including:

- Michael Moore MP, Secretary of State for Scotland visited the Confucius Institute in late January and we had constructive discussions on the immigration issue among other things.
- John Swinney MSP, Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Sustainable Growth joined key stakeholders to discuss the Edinburgh Climate Change Centre.
- I have been involved in a number of events and briefings around the Scottish Government's Green Paper culminating in dinner with Cabinet Secretary Mike Russell MSP and other Scottish Principals in mid January.
- Jim Mather, MSP, Minister for Enterprise, Energy and Tourism along with senior SE and NHS Lothian representatives attended the Edinburgh Bioquarter Forum Event earlier this month.
- The Chair of Iberdrola Ignacio Galan visited the University to hear about plans for the Edinburgh Climate Change Centre.
- I met with David Willetts MP, Minister of State for Universities and Science and discussed some of the University's strongest research areas and toured the Informatics Forum.

At the invitation of the First Minister I attended a dinner in honour of Vice Premier Li of the People's Republic of China in early January at Edinburgh Castle. Also at the request of the First Minister I attended a reception to mark the retirement of Mme Tan Xiutian Consul General of the Chinese Consulate in Edinburgh at Bute House.

I was delighted to host the annual Carlyle Circle party on Saturday, 22 January 2011 at Heriot Row to welcome and thank those who have pledged a legacy to the University and to present each with the newly designed Carlyle Circle pin.

University News

Chair to aid Japan-China relations A million-pound donation from Worldwide Support for Development will establish a Chair of Japanese Chinese Relations. The Handa Chair in Japanese Chinese Relations, in the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures, further cements the University's expertise in East Asian studies. The Chair is named after Dr Haruhisa Handa, chairman of Worldwide Support for Development. It will be filled by a newly appointed professor who will work closely with the Centre for Japanese Studies, the Scottish Centre for Chinese Studies and the Confucius Institute for Scotland at the University of Edinburgh.

Antonio Horta-Osorio, CEO-designate Lloyds Banking Group delivered a well attended lecture on the future of UK banking at the Playfair Library in early February. Mr Horta-Osorio is due to become CEO of Lloyds Banking Group on 1 March 2011. He is the former Chief Executive of Santander UK.

Charity backs bone fracture study Researchers at the University are to study whether drugs used to treat osteoporosis prevent bone fractures from healing. A team at the University has been awarded

more than £700,000 from Arthritis Research UK to find out if a drug called alendronate affects the healing process in people with osteoporosis who have fractured their wrists.

The Pathways to the Professions access scheme that has helped thousands of school pupils towards university places is marking 10 years of success. The Pathways to the Professions programme provides information and guidance to local pupils who are first in their family to consider university or whose schools are under-represented at university level. Would-be students can benefit from guidance and support in applying for degree programmes in law, architecture, medicine or veterinary medicine. Since 2003, some 680 students have entered the University with Pathways support.

Research in the news:

- Scientists at the Roslin Institute and Cambridge University have developed genetically modified chickens which could stop bird flu outbreaks spreading within poultry flocks. The development would protect the health of domestic poultry and could also reduce the risk of new flu virus epidemics in the human population. The study, funded by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC), is published in the journal *Science*.
- Chemotherapy that has much-reduced side-effects could be a step closer thanks to a development by University scientists. Researchers have created a tiny device that triggers reactions in cells. The technology could enable cancer drugs to be activated at the site of a tumour. This approach could help curb side-effects associated with chemotherapy such as hair loss, sickness and weakened immunity.
- An internal 24-hour clock that affects all forms of life has been identified by University scientists. The research provides important insight into health-related problems linked to individuals with disrupted clocks - such as pilots and shift workers. The findings, published in *Nature*, also indicate that the 24-hour circadian clock found in human cells dates back millions of years to early life on Earth.
- Scientists have made a key genetic discovery that could help explain how people learn language. Researchers at the University of Edinburgh have found a gene - called *ROBO1* - linked to the mechanism in the brain that helps infants develop speech. They say identifying the gene could help us explain how some aspects of language learning in infants are influenced by genetic traits rather than educational factors.

External Recognition

- A University of Edinburgh English Literature tutor has won third prize in a poetry competition run by the ESRC Genomics Network. Russell Jones' third-place poem 'Chromosome Medley' was described as an "energetic imagining of the impact of genetic choice on the past present and future." The overall winner was Edinburgh alumnus Sophie Cooke for her poem *Forward Deck*.

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Designation of Vice Principals

Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy

Court is already aware that Professor April McMahon, Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy has secured the position of Vice Chancellor of Aberystwyth University commencing 1 August 2011.

Vice Principal McMahon has an exemplary record of service to the University of Edinburgh and although we will be very sorry to see her go I am sure that Court will join me in wishing her every success with her new post.

With respect to the coming vacancy, I propose that Vice Principal Professor Nigel Brown move from his current position as Head of the College of Science and Engineering to the post of Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy from 1 August 2011.

Vice Principal Brown has indicated that he would be willing to undertake this key appointment for a period of up to two years and I therefore seek Court approval for this proposal.

Senior Vice Principal

I also propose to designate Vice Principal Brown as Senior Vice Principal. In this role he will be my official deputy and take on some of my internal University responsibilities.

I therefore seek Court approval to designate Professor Brown as Senior Vice Principal for one year in the first instance with a start date to be mutually agreed between him and myself.

Vice Principal and Head of the College of Science and Engineering

Vice Principal Brown's move will necessitate recruiting a Vice Principal and Head of the College of Science and Engineering. It is proposed that this position will be internally advertised on the basis of a one, two or three year appointment with a start date of 1 August 2011.

I am confident that there will be a strong internal field.

Vice Principal Development

I further wish to inform Court that Vice Principal Development Mr Young Dawkins has tendered his resignation as part of a voluntary severance agreement that includes a financial package. He is currently completing a six month transition period which he will undertake until 31 July 2011.

Given that we are nearing the end of a major fund raising campaign I do not propose to recommend the appointment of another full time Vice Principal Development. I suggest that the Vice Principal Development responsibilities are shared by myself and an existing Vice Principal. I therefore propose that Vice Principal, Research Training & Community Relations, Professor Mary Bownes works with Mr Dawkins during this transition period and from 1 August 2011 Development is officially added to her current portfolio.

I am sure Court will wish to join me in thanking Mr Dawkins for his commitment to the University and in particular his strategic leadership of our fundraising campaign and his personal work to secure the recent major gifts received such as the £10 million from J K Rowling for MS research and £4 million for the Edinburgh Climate Change Centre.

University Vice Principal and Principal of Edinburgh College of Art (eca)

Court is also aware of the announcement that Vice Principal Professor Ian Howard will retire as Principal of eca with effect from 31 July 2011. The planning process for recruiting a new Head is underway and this will be a joint process between eca and the University.

Professor Howard has shown great vision in his tenure as Principal of the College and excellent leadership of eca during the complex merger discussions.

I should be grateful for Court's approval of these proposals regarding new designations of Vice Principals.

TMMO'S
February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

C1.1

**Report of the Finance and General Purposes Committee
(Comments on the Report of the Central Management Group's meeting of 26 January 2011)**

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This paper comprises the Report to the Finance and General Purposes Committee at its meeting on 7 February 2011 from the Central Management Group of its meeting of 26 January 2011. Comments made by the F&GP Committee are incorporated in boxes within the report at relevant points.

Action requested

The Court is invited to note the report with comments as it considers appropriate.

Resource implications

As outlined in the paper.

Risk Assessment

As outlined in the paper.

Equality and Diversity

As outlined where appropriate in the paper.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes except for those items marked closed.

Originators of the paper

Dr Alexis Cornish
Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2011

Central Management Group

Tuesday 26 January 2011

1 RESTRUCTURING OF CORPORATE HR (CLOSED)

2 EUCLID - END OF PROJECT REPORT (Appendix 1)

CMG noted the final end of project report of EUCLID.

3 BRIBERY ACT (Appendix 2)

The actions required to be taken to ensure compliance with the new Bribery Act 2010 which comes into force on the 1 April 2011 were noted and endorsed by CMG. It was welcomed that the University already had in place a number of anti-bribery policies and procedures. The Act introduced the new crime of corporate failure to prevent bribery which also applied out with the UK and the University would require to ensure that it had adequate procedures to prevent acts of bribery by staff and individuals associated with the University. CMG noted that both the Risk Management Committee and the Audit Committee would be considering this matter further.

The Committee noted and welcomed the comprehensive proposals in respect of the Bribery Act 2010 and further noted the recently announced delay to the 1 April 2011 implementation of the Act to enable additional consultation.

4 REPORT FROM STAFF COMMITTEE (Appendix 3)

CMG noted the continuing excellent work being taken forward by the Staff Committee. The success of the leadership development programme was commended and the cost effectiveness of the professional service provided by HR as demonstrated by the benchmarking exercise was noted.

The work of the Staff Committee was commended particularly the leadership development programme and the work on reviewing and broadening performance criteria.
--

5 REPORT FROM HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE (Appendix 4)

The report from the Health and Safety Committee was noted, particularly the information on a dangerous occurrence which had resulted in no injuries and was still being fully investigated. As was to be anticipated, there had been a number of weather related incidents and it was noted that the Veterinary School was dealing with a small number of cases of parasite infections which were being actively managed.

6 FEES STRATEGY GROUP (CLOSED)

7 UPDATE ON THE DISTANCE EDUCATION INITIATIVE

It was noted that four bids had been received in respect of the fast-track process and it was anticipated that a similar process for this initiative would be operated in the following years. The transparent nature of the bidding process was commended by CMG and it was further noted that

dependent on the bids received there was an opportunity to re-profile the currently agreed funding.

The Committee was encouraged by progress to date in taking forward the distance education initiative.

8 UNIVERSITY PROCUREMENT CAPABILITY 2010

CMG welcomed the continuing success and achievements of the Procurement Office noting that the University had gained a 'superior' capability in the areas assessed by APUC Ltd against the Scottish Government Procurement Capability Assessment (PCA); an improvement on the position in 2008/2009. The Scottish Government had a strong interest in the area of best practice in procurement and achieving value for money.

9 PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE GROUPS

The new PVG Scheme, anticipated to be implemented with effect from 28 February 2011 was very much welcomed by CMG. The new legislation reduced the number of University staff now defined as being in regulated work with only a small number of positions likely to fall within the scope of the PVG Scheme. Currently, the University had to undertake a number of Enhanced Disclosure Scotland checks on staff including Court Members which would no longer be required from the end of February 2011.

The positive implications of the introduction of the Protecting Vulnerable Groups (PVG) Scheme were noted.

10 RESEARCH FUNDING SUPPORT AND STRATEGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH (CLOSED) (Appendix 5)

The EUCLID Project: Project Closure Report

Brief description of the paper

This paper is to remind CMG members that the EUCLID Project formally completed on 31 December 2010, as stated in the update report presented to CMG on 13 October 2010.

The Project Closure Report (currently draft) can be found at:

<http://www.euclid.ed.ac.uk/ed/governance/> - 1 December 2010, Paper B.

Action requested

For information.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Vice-Principal Professor Jeff Haywood

To be presented by

Vice-Principal Professor Jeff Haywood

The Bribery Act 2010

1) Introduction

This paper describes the provisions of The Bribery Act 2010 which comes into force on 1 April 2011. It consolidates the existing piecemeal legislation on bribery into one place and introduces a new comprehensive anti-bribery code. Draft guidance on aspects of the code was issued for consultation in autumn 2010, with the final version expected to be issued in early 2011. This paper also sets out the actions that the University should undertake to prepare for implementation of the Act.

2) Background

The Bribery Act is driven by the UK wishing to demonstrate that it is “getting tough” on bribery and corruption, and it aims to

- establish a culture of anti corruption in organisations including strong governance and compliance processes, and
- assist regulators and prosecuting authorities in their investigations of allegations of corruption both in the UK and overseas

As such, it is one of the most draconian pieces of anti-bribery and corruption legislation in the world. The British government wants to drive firms into radical action. According to the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) the law “will bring about behavioural change within businesses themselves and will create corporate cultures in which no form of corruption is tolerated.”

The act is primarily aimed at commercial organisations however it covers all organisations incorporated under UK law so encompasses Universities.

3) The Bribery Act 2010

The main provisions of the act are:

3.1 *Definition:*

A bribery act is undertaken where

- (a) a person offers, promises, or gives financial or other advantage to another person, and
- (b) the advantage is to induce another person to perform improperly a relevant function or activity, or to reward another person for improper performance of a function or activity.

It does not matter whether the person to whom the advantage is offered is the same person who performs the function or activity

3.2 *Offences:*

The Act contains essentially 4 offences of bribery

- active bribery (bribing someone)
- passive bribery (being bribed)
- bribery of a foreign public official
- corporate failure to prevent bribery

The first three are primarily focussed on individuals however the latter is a new crime for which the only defence is that the organisation ‘had in place adequate procedures designed to prevent a person associated with it from undertaking such conduct’

3.3 *Scope:*

The scope of the Act is very widely drawn and extends the jurisdiction of the UK prosecuting authorities. It allows for prosecution for bribery offences of:

- any body incorporated under UK law
- any body which carries on business in the UK regardless of where incorporated
- “associated persons” – being anyone performing services for or on behalf of the organisation regardless of capacity or location, with the intention of obtaining or retaining business, or a business advantage for the organisation.

Senior officers (or those purporting to be so) of the organisation may also have personal liability if an offence is committed with the “consent or connivance” of that officer.

Corporate ignorance of individual wrong-doing will provide no protection against prosecution

In essence, the offences of giving and receiving bribes and bribing foreign public officials apply to employees and persons associated with UK organisations (whether located in the UK or overseas), UK citizens, and individuals ordinarily resident in the UK regardless of where the relevant act occurs. They also apply to non-UK nationals and commercial organisations if an act or omission forming part of the offence takes place within the UK. This means that all organisations that carry on any part of their business in the UK will also be subject to the Act, regardless of where they are incorporated or formed and regardless of where the alleged bribe takes place. The corporate offence of failure to prevent bribery also applies to UK organisations or non-UK organisations regardless of where the alleged bribe takes place.

3.4 *Penalties*

The penalties under the Act are severe: unlimited fines on commercial organisations; up to 10 years imprisonment for individuals involved; debarment from tendering for public contracts within the EU. Obviously in addition to the formal penalties the adverse PR impact could be huge for organisations investigated or prosecuted.

3.5 *“Adequate Procedures”*

The Ministry of Justice undertook a consultation on what guidance should be given to commercial organisations about “adequate procedures” that can be put in place to avoid committing the corporate offence. From the draft guidance it is clear that procedures will need to be tailored to the individual circumstances of each business based on an assessment of where the risks lie. Ultimately, it will be left to the courts to assess whether an organisation has “adequate procedures” in place and it will be for the organisation to prove that it has.

The draft guidance identifies six management principles that should be considered when assessing and implementing “adequate procedures” These are:

Risk assessment – regular and comprehensive assessments of the bribery risks in the organisation’s sector and market;

Top level commitment – establishing a culture across the organisation in which bribery is never acceptable. This includes ensuring that the organisation’s anti-bribery policy is clearly communicated to all levels of management, the workforce and any relevant external bodies;

Due diligence – The organisation should have due diligence policies and procedures which cover all parties to a business relationship including the organisation’s supply chain, agents and intermediaries, all forms of joint venture and similar relationships where the

organisation conducts business. The aim is to ensure that the organisation can satisfy itself that all relationships are transparent and ethical;

Clear, practical and accessible policies and procedures – organisations should have policies and procedures covering all relevant risks such as political and charitable donations, gifts and hospitality, promotional expenses, facilitation payments and reporting suspected bribery;

Effective implementation – anti-bribery must be embedded in the organisation’s internal controls, recruitment and remuneration policies, communications and training. Mere ‘paper compliance’ will not be sufficient;

Monitoring and review – organisations must ensure that they have review mechanisms in place including auditing; that financial controls are transparent; that there are regular reviews of the policies and procedures; and should consider whether external verification is appropriate.

4) Implications for the University

The University, with its culture of self motivated academic enquiry, freedom of speech, openness, multi-culturalism, and high professional standards, has had very few issues over the years relating to fraud, or unprofessional behaviour. It already has in place a number of policies in this area, including policies on fraud, gifts and hospitality, and whistleblowing. Universities are not profit motivated although ensuring good control of the finances and delivering surpluses to allow reinvestment and growth in the infrastructure is vitally important. However the Act will push the University to establish more formal policies and processes related to anti bribery and corruption, and to be able to demonstrate their embeddedness.

The implications for the University can be considered under the six principles outlined above.

4.1 Risk assessment

There is a underlying risk of bribery wherever money changes hands or services are provided for money. In undertaking an assessment of risks, the following areas will need to be considered:

- Fee paying postgraduate and international students
- The use and control over overseas agents for student recruitment, and providers of pre-degree foundation year studies if we have any formal links. The University could be liable for the actions of an agent as an “associated person” even though we have no control over or specific knowledge of those actions (being “associated persons”)
- Partnerships for provision of teaching fee paying students (associated persons)
- Gifts received from students
- Gifts and donations to the University that have conditions attached to them. The definition of bribery in the act as a financial or other advantage being offered to induce or reward “improper performance” could give rise to issues about the propriety or performance
- Grant funded research, particularly commercial research, or research jointly undertaken with individuals in other institutions (UK and overseas) where funding is provided for the whole programme – the partners would be regarded as associated persons
- Use of cash to allow research to be undertaken in certain parts of the world
- Services procured by the University from third parties

- Political or charitable contributions made by the University (if any)
- The area of hospitality and gifts for individuals - there will be difficulty in deciding between what is reasonable and lawful and what could be construed as being an inducement or reward for improper performance. The University already has policies in this area but they will need to be reviewed. It is unlikely that any hospitality, gifts, sponsorship or the like will be considered a bribe provided that it is proportionate to the relevant business function.
- Trading activities e.g. hotels, events and conferencing, Edinburgh University Press, SSTRIC, ETTC, etc
- Intellectual property and its commercialisation
- Honorary degrees and benefactors

Proposed actions:

- 4.1.1 Provide briefing on the Bribery Act to key managers who have responsibilities for the above areas
- 4.1.2 Managers to undertake risk assessment based on the proforma used by the Risk Management Committee
- 4.1.3 Summary of responses to be provided to CMG, F&GPC and Audit Committee

Responsibility for taking forward: HR Director and Director of Corporate Services

4.2 Top level commitment

The University has policies in place covering areas such as fraud, whistle-blowing, and receipt of gifts, hospitality and other benefits. It also has relevant policies and procedures embedded within functional documentation e.g. Finance Manual, Estates policies and project processes, Procurement policies and processes etc. There is however no overall policy that addresses bribery issues.

Proposed actions:

- 4.2.1 Prepare overall policy relating to anti bribery and corruption, and obtain CMG, Audit Committee, F&GPC and University Court sign off to the policy. The policy will need to be applicable to the University itself, its subsidiaries, as well as agents, and other associated persons.

Responsibility for taking forward: HR Director

4.3 Due diligence

Whilst the University has policies and processes for procurement, rules and regulations regarding students fees (for postgraduate and overseas students), terms and conditions for research grants etc, and financial controls/reports that help point out areas of unusual activity that require investigation, its processes for assessing whether business relationships are transparent and ethical are largely not formalised. In all areas of activity, a review will need to be undertaken as to the processes for appointment of a counterparty (fee paying student, agent, research grant provider, research partner, donor, supplier etc) to assess how we satisfy ourselves of the ethical and anti-bribery credentials of the counterparty. It may be appropriate to instigate reciprocal anti-bribery and corruption agreements or incorporate anti bribery and corruption clauses / reporting into our conditions of business. Additionally for existing major counterparties, there may be a need to review current arrangements in the same light.

Proposed actions:

- 4.3.1 Establish all major counterparties with which the University has a financial or partnership relationship
- 4.3.2 Review and amend processes for appointing or establishing relationships with counterparties to incorporate processes to assess (both on appointment, and ongoing) their policies, attitudes, and compliance with anti bribery and corruption policies and the Bribery Act and Guidelines
- 4.3.3 Having amended processes for appointment or establishing relationships, review major existing relationships to assess what changes need to be made to bring them into line with the new policies and procedures

Responsibility for taking forward: Director of Finance

4.4 Clear, practical and accessible policies and procedures

As indicated above the University has policies in place covering areas such as fraud, whistle-blowing, and receipt of gifts, hospitality and other benefits. It also has relevant policies and procedures embedded within functional documentation e.g. Finance Manual, Estates policies and project processes, Procurement policies and processes etc.

Proposed actions:

- 4.4.1 Review and amend existing policies and procedures in the light of the Bribery Act and Guidance
- 4.4.2 Consult Trades Unions as part of policy development
- 4.4.3 Identify gaps in policy framework and prepare necessary additional policies and procedures
- 4.4.4 Determine the sanctions and processes to apply if there is suspicion or evidence of non-compliance with the Overall Anti Bribery and Corruption Policy and other policies
- 4.4.5 Identify whether there is a necessity to update recruitment procedures, terms and conditions of employment or any job descriptions to incorporate specific responsibilities or actions regarding anti bribery and corruption
- 4.4.6 Inform all relevant staff in the University, subsidiaries and associated persons of the new and revised policies

Responsibility for taking forward: HR Director

4.5 Effective implementation

Key implementation actions are noted above. However there will be a need for considerable communication. Individuals interfacing with funders, partners, donors, suppliers etc will need to understand their personal responsibilities and risks under the Act. Key directors and staff responsible for reviewing and updating policies and procedures will need to have a detailed briefing on the Act, Guidance, and actions they need to undertake. Staff, and associated persons will need to understand the new University overall policy and the changes in more detailed policies and procedures.

Proposed actions:

- 4.5.1 Establish briefing processes for key staff involved in reviewing and amending policies and procedures
- 4.5.2 Determine whether there is a need to establish a network of more knowledgeable advisers as we have done for dealing with FOI

- 4.5.3 Determine communication processes for academic and other staff who interface with funders, partners, donors, suppliers etc to inform them of the provisions of the Act and their personal risks
- 4.5.4 Determine what communications are appropriate for agents, partners, donors, suppliers etc
- 4.5.5 Consider inclusion in induction processes for new staff, and ongoing updating of relevant staff as case law provides further guidance on the application of the Act
- 4.5.6 Review and update advice on legal frameworks and culture in countries across the world

Responsibility for taking forward: HR Director
International Office for 4.5.6

4.6 Monitoring and review

The University has structures in place for internal audit, risk management, annual assurance, and financial reporting etc. There will be a need to assess how to incorporate monitoring of compliance with the Bribery Act and Guidance, and of the University's updated policies and procedures into those processes

- 4.6.1 Assess and implement changes to the internal audit, risk management, annual assurances processes to incorporate compliance with the Bribery Act and Guidance, and of the University's updated policies and procedures into those processes
- 4.6.2 Assess whether any changes required to the financial control and exception reporting processes

Responsibility for taking forward: Director of Corporate Services
and Director of Finance

The above individuals will take the lead in developing more detailed plans, which in turn will involve the relevant organisations within the University.

5) Conclusion

The Bribery Act will require the University to progressively tighten its policies and procedures relating to anti bribery and corruption. The Act comes into force from 1 April 2011 however the final guidance will not be available until January. The above actions have commenced with the focus being on the overall policy and areas perceived to be of higher risk. There will a programme of continuous improvement over the next year or more, to address the actions identified above. A small steering group convened by the Director of Corporate Services will oversee this programme during its initial stages, with the aim of embedding ongoing oversight into the Risk Management Committee in due course.

CMG is asked to note the implications of the Act on the University and approve the actions outlined in the paper.

Report from Staff Committee

26th January 2011

Introduction

1. This paper summarises the key issues discussed and decisions reached at the meeting of Staff Committee held on 15th November 2010.

Matters Arising

2. **Performance and Development Review Update:** Ms Gupta updated the Committee on progress with the taking forward Performance and Development Review in the College of Science and Engineering.

3. **Supporting International Staff in the University of Edinburgh:** Ms Gupta reported that following discussions between HR and the International Office, it had been agreed to create a new dedicated role to support international staff. The role would be co-located in the International office and HR to draw upon the combined expertise of both departments in a more strategic and integrated way to ensure that international staff enjoyed a positive experience of applying to and working at the University. This role would not require new funding, but would be achieved within existing staffing budgets.

4. **Pensions Update:** Ms Gupta provided the Committee with an update on the proposed changes to the Universities Superannuation Scheme. She advised the Committee that the University was following the advice of the national Employers Pensions Forum with respect to the conduct of the formal consultation process.

Main Agenda Items

Paper A: Progress Report on Leadership Development at the University of Edinburgh

5. Ms Gupta presented this paper and highlighted the following points:

- Progress since the launch of the University's overall Leadership Development Programme in 2006;
- What senior academics and senior professional services staff have gained from the various leadership initiatives;
- How this progress has been achieved;
- The funding and resource model that supports the programme; and
- The way forward for embedding leadership development across the University.

6. A detailed discussion followed on the last of these points in which Committee members observed that:

- The breadth and range of provision based on a funding envelope of £79,000 represented good value for money. It was also recognised that feedback on the programmes and provision offered had been very positive since its inception in 2006. The Committee particularly wished to acknowledge the excellent work that had been carried out by Lorna Sinclair, the Programme Director, in advancing this key strategic priority for the University.

- Dr Markland stated that even in these times of constrained funding, he did not want to see financial support for Leadership Development to be reduced.
- The Committee agreed that excellent management and leadership skills are critical in the very challenging economic climate that we are in and it was agreed that a strong emphasis needed to be placed the expectations that staff in leadership roles will undertake appropriate development activities to ensure their effectiveness. The Committee agreed that a strategy to seek to ensure that all leadership/management staff have the good access to training and development and actually take it up, was important. There was a sense that take up might be unequal at present and it was agreed to carry out further analysis of take up across the University.
- The discussion ended by proposing that more emphasis be placed on the use and application of coaching for the future and it was agreed that to explore the possibility for greater collaboration with other Universities and organisations for the mutual benefit for both parties.

Paper B: HR Performance Indicators – Benchmark Report Autumn 2010

7. Ms Gupta introduced this paper which forms one of a series of reports providing an analysis of UK level HR Performance Indicators and considers the implications of these measures in relation to the University of Edinburgh.

8. The report highlighted the following trends:

Ratio of HR Staff to Employees: the changes in the ratio of HR staff to the workforce since last year are interesting to note:

- (i) the ratio of all HR staff to all employees has changed marginally from 1:97 in 2008/2009 to 1:113 in 2009/2010.
- (ii) the ratio of managerial/professional HR staff to all employees has changed from 1:238 to 1:280, which may indicate lower staff turnover in the general workforce because of the economic climate.
- (iii) the ratio of support HR staff to all employees has also altered since last year from 1:158 to 1:189, again the change may be attributable to the same factors of a fairly static workforce.

In terms of how Edinburgh compares to the sector, the data illustrates that staffing levels are not excessive, falling below the HE sector average for all three measures reported:

- (i) The costs of the HR function at Edinburgh per employee at £289 continues to compare very favourably with the sector median of £462 and the sector average of £489, exhibiting a reduction on overall cost from last year, when it was £335 per employee. The information demonstrates that the HR function continues to represent an affordable model of staffing. It is important for the University to assure itself that HR represents good value for money and also adds value to the management of the University
- (ii) the ratio of all HR staff to all employees at 1:113 against a sector average of 1:73;
- (iii) the ratio of managerial/professional HR staff to all employees at 1: 280 compared to the sector average of 1:210;
- (iv) the ratio of support HR staff to all employees at 1:189 against a sector average of 1:136.

The University may wish to ensure that it has the right balance of professional to administrative staff in HR across the institution to establish if the breadth and range of capabilities is sufficiently aligned to the business needs of the University. If it is considered that any changes may be necessary, then these discussions will be conducted with Heads of College and Support Groups, College Registrars and Heads of HR as a matter for review in the annual planning round. The role of HR has become more strategic over the past decade and it will be important for the University to ensure that it remains competitive in a complex market.

Training and Development

9. It has been interesting to observe how different techniques and interventions have improved in popularity over time. The most popular approaches to training and development in the Higher Education (HE) sector are:

- (i) coaching, counselling and mentoring
- (ii) on the job training
- (ii) class room training¹

10. The use of all of these approaches are well established at Edinburgh particularly in relation to leadership development provision, where the use of both coaching and mentoring are particularly popular with staff such as Heads of School and other colleagues in leadership roles.

Ratio and Costs of Training and Development Staff

11. The data for this year illustrates that the proportion of training and development staff to all staff has reduced from 1:1101 to 1:1165. Similarly, the data indicates that the training spend on different categories of staff at Edinburgh is low compared to the sector median and average with :

- (i) academic managerial/professional spend per employee per annum at £300, compared with a sector average of £330 is now below the average for the sector, whereas it was higher last year and will need to be monitored;
- (ii) Non-Academic managerial/professional spend per employee per annum at £150, compared with a sector average of £343;
- (iii) Operational/support spend per employee per annum at £150, compared with a sector average of £220.

12. It would be advisable to look into the reasons for the change in staffing levels as the area of effective people development represents a major element of the University's Strategic Plan. The importance and need to foster a culture of high quality leadership and management and personal and professional development to sustain a high performance environment is evident throughout all College and Support Group Annual Plans and so it will be crucial to establish that both the level of staffing and current investment in development are at the appropriate levels to meet the University's business goals and objectives.

13. A significant degree of development does not have to be delivered by professional services staff and will be obtained through a wide range of interventions, including attendance at conferences, coaching and mentoring from experts outside the University, work-based opportunities such as project management, academic

¹ DLA Piper, HR Benchmarker 2010, HR performance indicators report, pg 61

leadership roles and serving on committees and boards. Thus, a more holistic analysis needs to take place to assess the University's commitment to investing and developing its staff.

Absence and Turnover

14. The report indicates a lower level of sickness and number of working days lost at Edinburgh at 4.03 days for all employees than the sector average 5.8 days. The data shows that at Edinburgh approximately 6.42 days working days lost per employee which compares favourably with the sector average of 8.3 days working days lost per employee.

15. The data on the length of absence periods, reveals that the length of absence for both managerial and operations staff at Edinburgh has risen since last year from: 4.8 days to 5.43 days and 4.8 days to 5.03 days respectively. These statistics still compare favourably with an HE average of 5.6 days for managerial and professional staff, but demonstrates a higher length of absence for operations staff than the sector average of 4.6 days. The area of sickness continues to be monitored closely across the University and the development of a new Absence Policy and associated management development will enhance the approaches adopted to manage absence effectively across the piece.

16. Staff turnover for academic staff has increased marginally from 5.4 % in 2008/2009 to 5.75% in 2009/2010. Conversely, turnover amongst professional services and operations staff has fallen, which is consistent with employment trends across the country. To this extent, the issue of sound processes for identifying and meeting the development needs of the workforce and assuring ourselves that such investment is having a positive impact on the performance of staff and the success of business areas will continue to be critical when finances are tight and competition is increasingly tough.

Paper C: Review of Corporate HR – Summary Paper

17. Ms Gupta introduced a summary paper setting out the case for change of the Corporate HR (CHR) structure; the principles informing the new structure; and future considerations for the HR function. A detailed discussion followed and strongly endorsed the fundamental changes proposed to ensure that the University's human resource function is structured, staffed and resourced to fulfil its strategic goals.

Paper D: EPSRC Policy

18. Professor McMahon presented this paper, in which she advised the Committee about the new policy implemented by the EPSRC from 1 April 2010, based on a definition of 'repeatedly unsuccessful' applicants for funding and set out the implications of this change in policy for the University. Professor McMahon explained that the Research Policy Group wanted Staff Committee to be informed of the changes as the other Research Councils were likely to adopt a similar 'demand management' model.

19. In the discussion that followed, Members suggested various strategies for embedding good practice across Schools and Colleges in response to and in anticipation of new policy developments at research councils and other funding bodies. An emphasis was placed on the need to ensure that any approach was sensitive to equality and diversity issues and it was felt that the University could draw

positively on the Code of Practice it had developed for RAE 2008. It was agreed that the Director of HR would take this matter forward in her regular meetings with Heads of College and Heads of HR to inform future strategies and actions.

Update on Commissioners' Ordinance and Related Policies

20. Ms Fraser provided the Committee with an oral report of progress on the development of a range of revised policies that the University was developing in partnership with its recognised Trade Unions under the new Ordinance that had recently been approved by the Privy Council and Court. It was agreed to continue to keep the Committee informed of any relevant developments as this work proceeded.

Proposal to Develop an HR Strategy

21. Ms Gupta proposed that it would be helpful to develop an HR Strategy to support the University's overall Strategic Plan and to help inform the allocation of resources. She welcomed the Committee's advice. Members strongly endorsed the proposal and Ms Gupta was tasked to develop a strategy that not only covered the period of the current Strategic Plan, but also looked beyond it.

Section B

Any Other Business

22. Professor Brown raised the issue about the impact of the Government's change in policy on the number of Certificates of Sponsorship (CoS) that had now been issued to institutions and the risk that the University did not have enough to cover new appointments as well as extensions of contracts.

NB. Since the meeting of Staff Committee a new framework was introduced by the University providing guidance on the considerations that Colleges and Support Groups needed to take into account when issuing CoS. However, the Government have changed the rules again in the last few weeks the University is now able to extend CoS without having to use a new one. This is very helpful.

Quarterly reporting period: 1st October 2010 – 31st December 2010

Accidents and Incidents

Type of Accident/Incident	Qtr 1 Oct '10 – 31 Dec '10	Qtr 1 Oct '09 – 31 Dec '09	Year to Date 1 Oct '10 – 31 Dec '10	Year to Date 1 Oct '09 – 31 Dec '09
Fatality	0	0	0	0
Specified Major Injury	2	1	2	1
> 3 day Absence	2	1	2	1
Public to Hospital	1	4	1	4
Reportable Dangerous Occurrences	1	0	1	0
Diseases	1	0	1	0
Total Reportable Accidents / Incidents	7	6	7	6
Total Non-Reportable Accidents / Incidents	112	75	112	75
Total Accidents / Incidents	119	81	119	81

Further information by College/Support Group is shown in Appendix One

The incidents reported to the Enforcing Authorities during the quarter comprise:

- Boiler silencer fan casing ripped, causing a fire involving insulation cables. No injuries resulted. Boiler maintenance company had been in attendance due to operating problems with the boiler. A full investigation is still ongoing. (*Dangerous Occurrence*)
- Research Technician assisted Vet., who was taking research blood samples from cattle and sheep over a number of days (late October to mid November) at two University farms, wearing appropriate protective clothing. Technician was subsequently unwell, and GP diagnosed cryptosporidiosis and admitted her to hospital for treatment. IP's condition was complicated by a pre-existing medical condition; she was discharged from hospital. (*Occupational Disease*)
- Visiting spectator at a football match sustained facial cuts when hit in face by a corner flag, which had been struck by a player who had missed the ball. IP attended hospital for treatment. (*Public to Hospital*).
- Employee slipped and fell on suspected black ice in the car park sustaining a fracture to right wrist. Attended hospital for treatment. (*SMI*)
- Employee slipped and fell on ice outside the Main Library sustaining a fracture to right wrist. Attended hospital for treatment. (*SMI*)
- Employee slipped and fell on the steps at the rear entrance of the David Hume Tower, injuring leg, arm and shoulder. Attended hospital as precaution. (*>3 Day Injury*)
- Employee fell from ladder when clearing snow from the top of sheets on a silage pit during icy conditions sustaining sprain injuries to right ankle. Alternative procedures for access were known to employee and refresher information has been provided. (*>3 Day Injury*)

Issues and Developments

Cryptosporidium Infections

Since the autumn, the Veterinary School has experienced a small number of cryptosporidiosis infections amongst undergraduate students, and one research technician (item 2 above) This infection, the symptoms of which are normally mild, but can be more serious in certain individuals, arises from handling cattle and sheep, and stringent hygiene protocols are in place for these activities.

Despite the development of ever tighter hygiene measures by Veterinary staff, particularly those in charge of undergraduate calf handling practical sessions, following a similar “outbreak” in 2007, a small number of cases has again arisen.

The Health and Safety Department are working closely with Lothian Health’s Public Health Team to identify the reasons for such infections continuing to arise, despite the strict implementation of measures previously agreed with Public Health.

Discussions have also taken place with another UK University which has experienced similar issues.

IOSH Managing Safely

The University has been licensed to teach IOSH (Institution of Occupational Safety and Health) Managing Safely, the first level of UK professional qualification in occupational safety and health. The course is run jointly between the Health and Safety and Estates and Buildings Departments, and replaces the requirement to buy in such courses from external providers.

The first in-house course has been held successfully, and IOSH assessors were pleased with the quality and conduct of the course. Discussions have been opened with IOSH on the University designing and providing tailored courses for the HE environment, under a joint UoE/IOSH banner.

University Occupational Physician Post

The University’s Occupational Health Physician is currently on a period of sickness absence, as he undergoes rehabilitation following orthopaedic surgery. Temporary cover has been arranged on a contract basis, with an experienced occupational health physician providing the normal one half day session per week at the Occupational Health Unit (OHU).

The current arrangement can be extended if required, and the service provided by the OHU remains virtually unaffected.

Review of Fire Safety Provision

An external review of the operation of the Fire Safety Unit of the Health and Safety Department is underway, bearing in mind that the current University Fire Safety Adviser retires at the end of July 2011. This review looks to the longer term effectiveness and efficiency of fire safety provision within the University, with a view to ensuring that we employ the best operating model, whilst managing staff retirements over the next few years, to ensure that we provide a modern and effective service.

Issues and Developments (Cont.)

ECA and HGU Mergers

The due diligence process with regard to both proposed mergers is progressing, with Aon partnership audits of both sites arranged. Staffing issues in the area of occupational safety and health at both ECA and HGU are under active consideration, and suitable models have been proposed, which can be implemented in the event that both processes go ahead.

Adverse weather

The adverse weather conditions towards the end of 2010 presented a range of challenges, though our overall numbers of slips, trips and falls accident experience over the period does not appear to have been significantly elevated. However, two such accidents led to broken bones (items 4 and 5 above).

Significant issues arose when temperatures began to thaw, as ice falling from buildings presented a real hazard – Health and Safety and Estates and Building worked closely together to manage these issues.

The experience of planning for reduced staffing levels during the flu pandemic assisted with operating under strained conditions, for periods in which substantial numbers of staff found it difficult or impossible to come in to work due to weather conditions.

CHASTE Project

Operational planning was confirmed for the final four months of the Scottish Funding Council's Co-ordinating Health and Safety in Tertiary Education (CHASTE) Project, led by the University. This includes the final series of support visits to Universities and Colleges, two seminars for both Universities and Colleges, and the formulation of a final report for the Funding Council, as well as the phased handover of a number of sub-projects, which will form legacies after CHASTE concludes on 30th April.

Alastair Reid
Director of Health and Safety
19th January 2011

Accidents & Incidents

Quarterly period: 01/10/2010 – 31/12/2010

Year to Date Period: 01/10/2010 – 31/12/2010

(First Quarter)

COLLEGE / GROUP	REPORTABLE (TO HSE) ACCIDENTS / INCIDENTS														TOTAL Non-Reportable Accidents / Incidents		TOTAL ACCIDENTS / INCIDENTS	
	Fatality		Specified Major Injury		>3 day absence		Public to Hospital		Dangerous Occurrences		Diseases		TOTAL Reportable Acc / Inc		Qtr	Ytd	Qtr	Ytd
	Qtr	Ytd	Qtr	Ytd	Qtr	Ytd	Qtr	Ytd	Qtr	Ytd	Qtr	Ytd	Qtr	Ytd				
Humanities & Social Science	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	7	7	7
Science & Engineering	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	31	31
Medicine & Veterinary Med.	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	2	33	33	35	35
SASG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
Corporate Services Group	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	3	3	34	34	37	37
ISG	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	6	6	7	7
Other Units	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
UNIVERSITY	-	-	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	112	112	119	119

* Units noted below taken from organisational hierarchy report 09/10 - http://www.planning.ed.ac.uk/edin/orghier/versions/Version12_0.xls

SASG: Student and Academic Services Group: Academic Services, Records Management, Biological Services, Careers Service, Chaplaincy, Communications and Marketing, Development and Alumni, Disability Office, EUCLID, General Council, Governance and Strategic Planning, International Office, Pharmacy, Principal's Office, Registry, SASG Business Unit, Student Counselling Service, Student Recruitment and Admissions, University Health Service.

ISG: Information Services Group: Applications, EDINA and Data Library, DCC, Information Services Corporate, Library and Collections, Infrastructure, User Services Division.

CSG: Corporate Services Group: Accommodation Services (incl Festivals Office), Centre for Sport & Exercise, Day Nursery, Edinburgh Research & Innovation (ERI), Edinburgh Technopole, Edinburgh University Press, Estates and Buildings, Finance, Health and Safety, Human Resources, Internal Audit, Joint Consultative and Advisory Committee on Purchasing, Procurement Office (inc Printing Services).

Other: Students Association, Sports Union, Talbot Rice Gallery, Associated Institutions.

C1.2

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

**Report of the Finance and General Purposes Committee
(Report on Other Items)**

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This paper reports on the meeting of the Finance and General Purposes Committee held on 7 February 2011 covering items other than the CMG report. Detailed papers not included in the appendices are available from Dr Novosel.

Action requested

The Court is invited to note the items with comments as it considers appropriate.

Resource implications

If applicable, as noted in the report.

Risk Assessment

Where applicable, risk is covered in the report.

Equality and Diversity

No implications.

Freedom of Information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Except for items 2 - 6

Its disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of any person or organisation

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2011

University Court, Meeting on 21 February 2011

**Report of the Finance and General Purposes Committee
7 February 2011
(Report on Other Items)**

1 ENHANCING STUDENT FEEDBACK: UPDATE

Appendix 1

The Committee welcomed this paper which set out the various activities being undertaken across the University and the five principal aims being adopted. The need for, and challenges of, effective communications to publicise the University's approach and to ascertain students' expectations and understanding of the various feedback mechanisms were noted by the Committee. The Committee commended the actions being taken including the dialogue with the student body to address this very complex issue. There was evidence of improvements and the Committee noted the launch of the Enhancing Feedback Website in September 2010 which had been well received and the assistance of EUSA particularly its campaign inviting students to comment on their experiences of feedback.

Enhancing Student Feedback: Update

1. Following widespread consultation within the University, at the Senate meeting on 16 June 2011 the University adopted new *Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles*.
www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Policies/Feedback_Standards_Guiding_Principles.pdf
2. Five principal aims underpin Edinburgh's strategy for enhancing feedback to students on their progress and performance:
 - a. to set out and agree University-wide standards of provision for feedback;
 - b. to clarify, with the aid of guiding principles, what is expected of the University's staff and students if feedback is to be effective;
 - c. to identify and promulgate examples of good established and innovative feedback practices;
 - d. to encourage and support efforts across Schools and Colleges to review and enhance approaches to feedback;
 - e. to be alert to wider changes in approaches to assessment which could help to facilitate high-quality feedback.
3. This paper outlines what action the University is taking to support work on enhancing student feedback. The issue is relevant to the Strategic Plan Goal 1.1 "increase the level of satisfaction expressed in the *Assessment and feedback* section of the National Student Survey and enter the upper quartile of institutions surveyed".

Publicity

4. A number of steps have been taken to publicise the University's approach to feedback.
 - a. In June, an all staff email was sent out which alerted staff to the fact that the Feedback Standards and Guiding Principles would be formally launched to staff and students at the start of 2010/11. This was to give staff advance notice to enable them to plan how best to fit this into activities. The aim was to generate a dialogue about feedback and to highlight its importance. Staff were also told that feedback bookmarks would be handed out in class to all students – undergraduate and postgraduate - to be a prompt on feedback issues.
 - b. Contacts were obtained for all Schools to enable distribution of the bookmarks. Bookmarks were sent to School contacts in August and early September. The intention was that Schools would distribute the bookmarks in a way which best suited their needs. School contacts were emailed at the start of October to check on the bookmark distribution, which it was intended should be complete by mid-October.
 - c. At the start of the academic year, a number of means were used to publicise feedback. Plasmas screens outside a number of lecture theatres (Appleton Tower, George Square Theatre, Dugald Stewart, Teviot, JCMB, Paterson's Land, and Thomson's Land) carried feedback messages from mid-September to mid-October. Articles were included in *Student* and the staff bulletin: www.ed.ac.uk/news/staff-bulletin/1.45248 The University's Enhancing Feedback website was launched on 27 September. More information on this is provided below. www.tla.ed.ac.uk/feedback/index.html
 - d. It was agreed with EUSA that to keep dialogue about feedback local and to avoid possibly inundating students with an all-student email at a very busy time of year, the

next student communication about this would be a EUSA campaign in mid-semester to follow-up on awareness-building. See below.

- e. Students have been invited to comment on their experiences of the feedback, through cards distributed by reps across campus, and through an online form www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/campaigns/feedback/. 'Feedback: Are You Getting It' is an ongoing EUSA campaign, and the comments have helped design a recent workshop delivered by the Student Vice-President (Academic Affairs) at the Inspiring Teaching Conference. In addition, the VPAA has written to every Head of School and Head of Teaching Organisation, thanking them for their commitment to enhancing feedback.

Good practice: Enhancing Feedback Website

5. The *Enhancing Feedback Website* [www.tla.ed.ac.uk/Feedback/] was launched in September 2010 with the aim of assisting individuals and groups to reappraise the provision of feedback within a course unit or programme and explore a range of possibilities for improving it. Over thirty strategies for improving feedback are explored and linked to a rich corpus of School- and subject-specific case examples drawn from across the globe. The website has been extensively publicised across the University, as well as elsewhere in the UK and overseas. Encouragingly, Google Analytics data show that by mid-January 2011, the total number of Edinburgh visitors to the site was 724, with an average viewing of 4.2 pages per visit. Overall, there were nearly two thousand visitors to the site from 66 countries, indicating its global value as an enhancement resource.

Supporting Schools and Colleges

6. Alongside the publicity and website work, the Vice Principal for Academic Enhancement has sought to maximise active engagement by Schools with the NSS findings, in three ways. First, with the support of Principal's Strategy Group, sixteen Schools with low scores on promptness of feedback are now required to monitor feedback turnaround times and report these each semester to their Honours students, their Head of College, and PSG. At the same time, a subset of eight of these Schools have been asked to draw up more stringent action plans to address other aspects of feedback where provision has been perceived as falling significantly short of the University's expectations.
7. Second, the first in a series of briefing seminars on the National Student Survey took place in December, with expert input from colleagues in GASP and Academic Registry. One important outcome is that Heads of Schools will now have access both to 2010 results by degree programme (where there has been a minimum response rate of 50% and at least 10 responding students from the programme concerned), and to information on precisely how, in the subsequent analyses by Ipsos MORI, students are categorised for analysis purposes by degree programme, by subject area and School.
8. Third, discussions have continued with all Schools on how feedback can be improved, focusing particularly on the identification and wider sharing of the many good practices to be found across the University. Recent examples which merit wider promulgation include:
 - guidance on how students following courses in the School of Social and Political Science can make the most of the feedback they receive www.sps.ed.ac.uk/undergrad/honours/feedback
 - the development within the Medical School of a systematic approach to effective feedback that spans the range of assessments and assignments commonly used in the MBChB, which is available to staff and students via EEMeC;
 - a survey in the School of Physics and Astronomy which is focused around vignettes of six contrasting forms through which feedback is typically given in the School, and which

indicates important differences between students and academic staff on what counts as 'feedback';

- new guidelines in the School of Arts, Culture and the Environment recommending that all Honours students have an opportunity to get feedback by no later than mid-semester;
- online feedback to final-year students in the School of Veterinary Medicine, which enables students to get an early indication of how well they are doing in each of their rotations (clinical placements) and to tailor their approach accordingly; and
- a forum in the School of Biological Sciences to surface and review feedback strategies in Honours courses, and which showed a wide array of strategies being pursued that can be mapped against the full range of possibilities in the *Enhancing Feedback* website.

9. Alongside the publicity and website work, the Vice Principal for Academic Enhancement held meetings with each College to discuss the approach to the NSS, and with each School to discuss measures to enhance approaches to feedback and to improve student satisfaction. The Principal's Strategy Group received reports on progress.

Wider changes in assessment

10. The Learning and Teaching Committee has a Task Group on Assessment Futures. This is considering how assessment practices and processes at Edinburgh could and should evolve over the coming decade if they are to continue to be fit for 21st-century purposes. It has just launched a consultation paper which sets out options for addressing the challenges posed by handwritten extended-prose examinations in an era of word-processing.

Lessons for the future

11. We consider the feedback campaign to have been a worthwhile activity and necessary to facilitate and support the enhancement of student feedback in the University. There are a number of lessons that we can draw on for the future.
- a. It is important to see the campaign in its entirety with a package of elements contributing to the overall aims.
 - b. There is scope to translate this approach to the implementation of other policies within the University. In doing so, we would aim to improve internal communications with staff and students, focusing on the timing of work to allow opportunities for sufficient publicity and coordination of activities. For example, while we wished to allow Schools to distribute the feedback bookmarks in ways which met their needs, it would have been helpful to give a stronger steer about the need to do this within a classroom context to promote opportunities for dialogue with students as this did not happen in all Schools.
 - c. Activities like this take non-trivial amounts of time and resources and this needs to be considered at an early stage. Funding for the bookmarks came from the Principal's Assistance Fund and the website publicity and launch were funded by the Institute for Academic Development. Task Groups are now being encouraged to think about the implications of implementation of their recommendations. However, this work raises questions of how the University effectively coordinates the budgeting for student-focussed strategy and policy initiatives.

Professor Dai Hounsell, Vice Principal for Academic Enhancement
Ms Steve Wise, Student Vice-President (Academic Affairs)
Ms Sara Welham, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services
31 January 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

**Scottish Government Green Paper
Draft Response from the University of Edinburgh**

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This paper presents the University's draft response to the Scottish Government's Green Paper 'Building a Smarter Future: Towards a Sustainable Scottish Solution for the Future of Higher Education', published on 16 December 2010.

Action requested

For information and comment.

Resource implications

Chapter 6 of the Green Paper sets out six potential funding options.

Risk assessment

The Minister stated that "it will be up to each of the parties to consider what policy it will offer in the May 2011 Scottish election, mindful that there will be a need for all of the parties to commit to implementing agreed solutions during the second half of 2011 in order to have financial effect in 2012/13". Key risks are therefore that a solution is not agreed or implemented sufficiently quickly, and that the emerging funding gap widens as a result.

Equality and diversity

Chapter 2 Learning Teaching and Access and Chapter 5 Student Support set out issues with equality and diversity implications.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? This paper should remain closed until after the submission deadline of 25 February has passed.

Any other relevant information

To be presented by Alexis Cornish, Director of Planning and Deputy Secretary

Originator of the paper

Rona Smith, Senior Strategic Planner
Dr Alexis Cornish, Director of Planning and Deputy Secretary
Governance and Strategic Planning, 14 February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

University Court

21 February 2011

Update on proposed merger with Edinburgh College of Art

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This paper updates Court regarding the process for considering the merger proposals, and for planning for the implementation of the proposed merger.

Action requested

Court is invited to note and discuss developments regarding the proposed merger with ECA.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes

The papers submitted to the 27 September 2010 meeting of Court set out the main financial and estates implications of the proposed merger.

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

The merger proposal document submitted to the 27 September 2010 meeting of Court included an assessment of the risks to successful implementation of merger.

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? Yes

The University is committed to equality and diversity for its staff and students, as is ECA. In the event of merger, all ECA staff and students will be covered by the University's E&D strategy and frameworks. In September 2010, the University and ECA commissioned an external consultant to conduct an overarching equality review of the merger proposals. The University recently commissioned an external consultant to assist heads of support services to conduct Equality Impact Assessments regarding their detailed implementation plans for merger.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Originator of the paper

Tom Ward, Project Officer

To be presented by

Vice-Principal Prof April McMahon

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Corporate HR Restructuring

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

At the last meeting of Court, a paper was presented the restructuring of Corporate HR (CHR). This paper is an update.

Action requested

As detailed in paper.

Resource implications

As detailed in paper.

Risk assessment

As detailed in paper.

Equality and diversity

Equality and diversity implications will be covered in the business case, if any arise.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Its disclosure would constitute a breach of the Data Protection Act.

Originator of the paper

Sheila Gupta
Director of HR

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Review of Effectiveness – Court Committees

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

Court at its meeting on 21 June 2010 considered and accepted the recommendations of the Group established by Court to undertake a review of the effectiveness of Court and its Committees. One of these recommendations asked that Court Committees undertake a similar review of their effectiveness and to report back to this meeting of Court.

Action requested

Court is asked to consider the Reports from Court Committees on the outcome of the reviews of their effectiveness and comment as appropriate.

Resource implications

None directly.

Risk assessment

There are potential reputation and compliance risks if Court Committees were not operating effectively.

Equality and diversity

None directly.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2011

Review of Effectiveness – Court Committees

Following the Court meeting on 21 June 2010 Conveners and Secretaries of Court Committees were asked to undertake a review of their Committee's effectiveness taking cognisance of the recently approved Delegated Authorisation Schedule and to report back to the February 2011 Court meeting. Reports have now been received from the majority of Court Committees and are attached as follows:

Audit Committee (Appendix 1)
Estates Committee (Appendix 2)
Finance and General Purposes Committee (Appendix 3)
Health and Safety Committee (Appendix 4)
Investment Committee (Appendix 5)
Knowledge Strategy Committee (Appendix 6)
Nominations Committee (Appendix 7)
Risk Management Committee (Appendix 8)

The Committee on University Benefactors, the Remuneration Committee and the Staff Committee will undertake reviews of their effectiveness in due course.

Review of Effectiveness of Audit Committee

Introduction

The Audit Committee at its meeting on 29 September 2010 agreed to undertake a review of the effectiveness of the Committee by means of a questionnaire (annex 1) to be completed by members and attendees. The final questionnaire was approved by the Convener of the Committee and was based on the suggestions contained within the paper of 29 September 2010 taking cognisance of the detailed self assessment checklist contained within the Committee of University Chairmen (CUC) Handbook for Members of Audit Committees in Higher Education Institutions. Two separate exercises were undertaken, although the same questionnaire was utilised for both, to ascertain the views of Committee Members and of those Senior Officers who are usually in attendance at Audit Committee meetings and External and Internal Audit.

Audit Committee Members – responses

- 1) There was general agreement that the overall membership of the Committee was appropriate with the correct balance of lay members of Court and external members. The reliance on the Nominations Committee to ensure that appropriate recommendations were presented to Court on Committee appointments was acknowledged and comfort was taken in the skills based approach utilised in this process. It was considered that membership could perhaps be strengthened by the inclusion of members with particular IT and legal skills.
- 2) General agreement that Committee meetings were well attended but members would welcome other senior staff being invited to attend as appropriate particularly to assist the Committee in discussions on internal audit reports. The Principal's attendance was welcomed and appreciated.
- 3) Some concern was expressed that it was more difficult for non-Court members to interact effectively with core attendees and that this could be improved by increasing the opportunity for external members to interact with the University and a more rigorous induction process. The consistent professionalism of core attendees and their ability to respond and provide information on a range of topics was commended.
- 4) Meetings were considered to be well chaired with all given an opportunity to contribute to the debate. Occasionally meetings with light agendas may have been longer than required.
- 5) Unanimous view that the Committee fulfils its current remit with suggestions that the remit on the Internal Audit Service could perhaps be expanded to include a periodic review of the provision of the service as in-house, co-sourced or outsourced and that there perhaps could be more focus on 'economy, efficiency and effectiveness'.
- 6) Relationship with Internal Audit considered good, confidence in the calibre of the work of Internal Audit and the opportunity to meet other members of the team at Committee meetings was welcomed. The new format of reporting was considered satisfactory although there were opposing views on the amount of detail being provided.
- 7) External Audit reports were clearly written and well presented and this was particularly welcomed by those from a non-financial background on the Committee. External Audit was also willing to respond to suggestions and the relationship with the Committee was considered open and constructive.

8) Members were very appreciative of the attendance of the Principal at the Committee meeting at which the Accounts were discussed; entirely satisfied with interaction.

9) General agreement that four meetings a year was appropriate and that there was always the ability to arrange further meetings if required.

10) Agendas and papers were considered to be satisfactory. The level of detail in papers was commended, allowing the Committee to focus on the correct issues although there were opposing views expressed that papers could be less detailed and data presented in summary and bullet point format.

11) The following suggestions made:

- Helpful to receive annual feedback from Convener on the effectiveness of the Committee
- While the general Court induction event was considered helpful, specific induction and seminar events for Audit Committee members would be welcomed with presentations on emerging topics particularly regulatory matters.

Senior Officers in Attendance, External and Internal Audit - Responses

Membership of the Committee was appropriate and effective. Induction of new members and ongoing training and support of continuing members was mentioned as being important to the effectiveness of the Committee. Interactions between Committee members and senior University staff are positive.

Overall, it is considered that the Committee is effective in conducting its work with regard to the annual accounts, the risk management process and oversight of internal and external audit processes. While understanding the need for the Committee to assure itself that appropriate processes are in place and that there is satisfactory performance for internal and external auditing, the view was expressed that the Committee should take a more strategic overview of important issues and risks facing the institution and determine whether these are adequately addressed through audit processes. The recent presentation by an invited member of staff to comment on the controls existing in his area was commended and similar presentations in future as a way of receiving additional assurance on controls should be considered.

Although the important nature of the Committee's work is recognised, there was some sentiment that the Committee could have fewer, shorter meetings and that the need for a post-meeting meal be reviewed. The reduction in volume of papers achieved over the past few years was helpful but further reduction may be possible while maintaining a balance between length and detail of Committee papers.

Actions

The Audit Committee at its meeting on 25 November 2010 approved the onward transmission of this report to Court. The Committee in particular noted and endorsed the helpful and timely comments on the inclusion of members with skills in IT and legal issues and the need to improve the induction process for new Committee members given the current recruitment process and that senior staff should be invited to attend meetings as appropriate to inform the Committee on matters under discussion. It agreed that appropriate actions should be taken in respect of the issues highlighted within the paper to improve the Committee's overall effectiveness and that a follow up paper should be prepared in due course.

**Review of the Effectiveness of the Audit Committee 2010/2011
Questionnaire**

- 1 Membership of Committee – any gaps?
- 2 Attendees at meetings – any gaps, attendance by other senior staff?
- 3 Interactions between Committee Members and core attendees – can this be improved, any concerns?
- 4 Chairing of meetings – any comments?
- 5 Does the Committee fulfil its remit as set out in its approved Terms of Reference?
- 6 Interaction with Internal Audit – comments?
- 7 Interaction with External Audit – comments?
- 8 Interaction with Principal and senior University staff – comments?
- 9 Frequency of meetings/schedule of work – appropriate?
- 10 Agendas, minutes, papers – content appropriate, enable right issues to be addressed?
- 11 Any other comments/suggestions?

Estates Committee Effectiveness Review

BACKGROUND

The change of name of the Estates Advisory Group to the Estates Committee and the revised terms of reference for the Committee were approved by Court on 19 October 2009. Subsequently the University Court approved a revised Delegated Authorisation Schedule (DAS) which required EC to provide a response dealing specifically with EC business. This paper dealt with:-

- schemes of delegation, authorised signatories and revisions to EC remit, including the Estates Committee Sub-Group [ECSG] to ensure that E&B business is carried out efficiently and effectively, particularly outwith the EC meeting cycle. Schemes of sub-delegations approved in connection with the revised DAS.
- Integration of IT infrastructure into estate planning.
- Revised overall project programme reporting.

The Court on 27 September 2010 approved the revised EC remit, subject to consideration of Court involvement in Estate Sub-Group business.

The Estates Committee [EC] now has been in existence since December 2009 and meets four times a year. The papers are circulated one working week in advance of the meeting.

IS EC FULFILLING ITS ROLE?

EC meets four times a year. The majority of members feel that EC is fulfilling its role but recognise that sometimes there are unhelpful discussions where there is an overlap between Finance and General Purpose Committee's role of monitoring and agreeing how much finance is available for Capital projects and policy on funding (including loans etc), and EC's role in determining how available capital money should be spent. With this in mind, FGPC has agreed to revisit the University's finance policy in the new calendar year.

Work has recently been carried out on adjusting reporting lines to allow EC to consider space issues more effectively, through Space Management Group now reporting directly into EC.

MEMBERSHIP

With the retiral of John Martin and previously Lynn Collins on the committee, the Group now lacks academic representation. There is a danger that the academic community voice may not be heard, and it is important to demonstrate appropriate levels of consultation and involvement of academic colleagues.

The EC is asked to consider a recommendation that one College representative should always be a Head of College (or his / her academic nominee); it is fully accepted that College Registrars should be encouraged to continue to participate in estates business either through direct EC membership or chairing / membership of Project Boards as appropriate.

PAPER DISTRIBUTION

Considerable effort has been made over the past two years to improve the distribution of papers.

Minutes, agendas and papers are circulated to members of the Committee and those in attendance at least five working days in advance of the meeting. From time to time it may be necessary to distribute/table late papers; this would be at the discretion of the Convener.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE ESTATES COMMITTEE PERFORMANCE

- 1 To draw a distinction between the roles of FGPC and EC. We will consider further the interaction on estate and financial strategy matters in the context of the roles and remits of FGPC and EC.
2. The other members of the Committee shall consist of: Vice-Principal of Development, Vice-Principal of Knowledge Management, Director of Accommodation Services, Heads of Colleges (or his/ her nominee). At any time, at least one Head of College will attend or be represented by an academic nominee; this will ensure that appropriate academic representation is maintained on the Committee.

It is fully accepted that College Registrars shall be encouraged to continue to participate in estates business either through direct EC membership or chairing / membership of Project Boards as appropriate.

Review of Effectiveness - Finance and General Purposes Committee 2010/2011

Introduction

At its meeting on 25 October 2010 the Finance and General Purposes Committee undertook an open discussion on the effectiveness of the Committee based on seven headings:

- 1) Membership of Committee – any gaps?
- 2) Core attendees at meetings – any gaps, attendance by other senior staff?
- 3) Chairing of meetings – any comments?
- 4) Does the Committee fulfil its remit as set out in its approved Terms of Reference?
- 5) Frequency of meetings – appropriate?
- 6) Agendas, minutes, papers – content appropriate, enable right issues to be addressed?
- 7) Any other comments/suggestions?

The following report was presented and endorsed at the meeting of the Committee held on 29 November 2010; actions would be taken to address the matters raised.

Report

The Committee acknowledged the robust and comprehensive discussion on the Finance and General Purposes Committee which had been undertaken by the Court Effectiveness Review Group and the Committee took assurances from this process. There were only two additional matters which the Committee wished to raise in respect of improving the effectiveness of the Committee and complimenting the current governance arrangements.

Firstly, the Committee commended the skills based approach to identifying members of Court Committees. It was suggested that the Nominations Committee, in bring forward recommendations to Court on appointments to the Finance and General Purposes Committee, should ensure that individuals being nominated had an awareness of financial issues and further that it would be helpful to have individuals from a business or legal background.

Secondly, it was noted that although the Committee's terms of reference allowed for an annual meeting with the Central Management Group (CMG) such a meeting had not been held; some members of the CMG did however attend meetings of the Finance and General Purposes Committee and a report of each CMG meeting was included on the agenda of Finance and General Purposes Committee meetings. There was discussion on how best to take this forward. The usefulness of the Court seminar approach was noted and the Committee suggested that consideration could perhaps be given to a similar event being organised around the Finance and General Purposes Committee remit to provide members with the opportunity to consider strategic matters along with senior officers of the University.

The Committee confirmed that it was content with current arrangements in respect of core attendees, chairing of meetings, frequency of meetings and papers prepared for these meetings and considered that the Committee fulfilled its remit in accordance with its current terms of reference.

Health and Safety Committee – Review of Effectiveness 2010

A Paper prepared for University Court following a Review of the Effectiveness of the University Health and Safety Committee carried out in March 2010

In 2006, following a requirement introduced by University Court for a review of all formal Committees, of which the University Health and Safety Committee is one, the members of the Committee were asked to complete a review of effectiveness questionnaire and the results of this were reported back to the Committee.

In 2010, this exercise was repeated. The responses indicate that Committee members are generally satisfied with the overall effectiveness of the University Health and Safety Committee. An area where the opportunity for enhancement was highlighted is the provision of further information to existing members regarding the induction and orientation which is provided to new members. An induction meeting is offered to new members on the Committee, and the summary information document given at these induction meetings, has now been circulated to all Committee members for information purposes. The offer of an induction meeting has also been extended to existing members if they felt it would be beneficial.

One comment was received questioning the training opportunities for Committee members. The induction summary document includes details on how members can access programmes of health and safety training courses and provides information on accessing our online health and safety information resources. In addition, in order to raise awareness of current and emerging health and safety issues, short presentations on topics of current importance are now made at every second meeting of the Committee, in addition to the paper reports already circulated.

Committee papers are currently circulated as paper copies to Committee members. The results of the questionnaire indicated that there remained mixed views on whether agendas, papers and minutes should be circulated electronically or as paper copies in future. Paper circulation will therefore continue as the primary mode, backed up by electronic communication between Committee meetings.

A Health and Safety Committee intranet was introduced in 2004 to provide ready access to Committee agendas, papers and minutes relating to each meeting. The results indicate that members do not wish Committee papers to be posted on the intranet, instead of being circulated to them, prior to the meeting.

Following initial discussions with the unions, the composition and remit of the Committee is under review. The outcome of this review will be presented for consideration and comment by Committee members, at the next meeting of the Committee.

Investment Committee - Remit and Effectiveness

The Committee experienced changes in its composition in the light of which it was considered premature for new members to assess its performance. Three new members joined the Committee in January 2010 and two retired in March 2010. The Committee held two regular meetings in March and October 2010. At the October meeting the Committee was asked to consider the questions listed below. The members decided that before these questions could be considered, and in order to take its strategy forward, it was essential that each member understood the others' points of view so an additional meeting took place in November 2010 at which each member gave a short presentation. One member who was unable to attend sent a written response for the other members to consider. The Investment Fund Manager and the Consultant to the Committee also gave presentations to aid discussion amongst members. The next Committee meeting will take place in March 2011 when in addition to the refreshment caused by the rotation in members the Convener will retire and the new Convener will take up his appointment. The Committee will consider its remit and effectiveness in October 2011.

Suggested questions for consideration by the Committee

- What should the composition of the Committee be and are there any gaps eg in expertise?
- Is there sufficient interaction between members?
- How effective is the Convener? Should the convener be a member of Court?
- Is the Committee discharging its remit?
- How frequent should the meetings be?
- Do the current committee papers meet the needs of members?
- When should the papers be produced and distributed?

Knowledge Strategy Committee

Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) has been in existence as a committee of Court for approximately 8 months and we have not as yet carried out a formal review with regard to its effectiveness. In presenting the case for KSC to become a committee of the Court it was noted that:

'There is an element of disjoint whereby library activities are covered by a Court Committee whilst IT-based activities (of similar importance to a University of world class standing) are not..... In order to bring some coherence to this situation and to ensure that Court has equal sight of both library and IT matters, it is proposed that Knowledge Strategy Committee should be adopted as a committee of the University Court'

and:

'This will give Court direct input to the strategic deliberations of KSC and to the governance of major IT projects overseen by the committee.'

Paper to Court, 21 June 2010 (see annex 1)

The decision to make KSC a committee of the Court was fundamentally one of effectiveness, ensuring that those matters which are critical to the academic and administrative functions of the university are transparent within the governance framework.

To date, KSC has convened on 3 occasions. The first of these was a formal meeting of the committee in September 2010, at which it was agreed that there should be an 'Away Day' to consider the various components of the university's IT strategy. This Away Day was held in January and was considered a good starting point from which to better understand the strategic direction of IT within the university; and to consider how we might compare our IT provision with that of our peers in the UK and elsewhere. An Away Day covering library matters is planned for later this year.

The third KSC meeting was with members of the university's three professional fora covering IT professionals, elearning professionals & practitioners and library, museums & galleries professionals. This gathering is aimed at sharing the proposed direction of travel on library, IT and elearning matters with the wider professional knowledge base. It also provides an opportunity for members of the fora to draw to KSC's attention matters of importance or concern.

KSC will be better placed to consider its effectiveness as a committee of the Court once a full cycle of meetings and onward reporting has been completed.

Knowledge Strategy Committee

'The University is no longer a quiet place to teach and do scholarly work at a measured pace and contemplate the universe as in centuries past. It is a big, complex, demanding, competitive business..' (OECD, 2007)

In July 2004, the first meeting of the University of Edinburgh's Knowledge Management Committee took place. Over the next 18 months, the first knowledge management strategy was developed. This changed the focus of the University, no longer seeing libraries, IT, AV and e-learning as separate entities but recognising their integral nature in the day to day operation of the University's business. As a result of the consultations associated with introducing knowledge management two major projects, *EUCLID* and the *University Website Redevelopment Project*, were proposed.

Today, Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) has oversight of those committees associated with libraries, e-learning, and IT. It also has oversight of major IT-related University projects and, in 2009, introduced a Project Framework to improve overall governance in this area. The three major projects which are currently active are *Student and Course Administration (EUCLID)*, *University Website Redevelopment Project* and *Shared Academic Timetabling*.

The Steering Group for the Review of Support Activities recognised the similarity between KSC and Estates Committee, expressing

'..strong support for the possibility of developing the existing Knowledge Strategy Committee to include external Court members and focus on funding and prioritisation of projects, as has been the case with the Estates Committee;'

Draft Report of the Steering Group for the Review of Support Activities, May 2010

At present, Knowledge Strategy Committee reports to CMG via the Vice Principal for Knowledge Management. Library Committee and UCAC are Court Committees but report to KSC. The activities covered by KSC are fundamental to the University's academic and administrative functions. There is an element of disjoint whereby library activities are covered by a Court Committee whilst IT-based activities (of similar importance to a University of world class standing) are not.

In order to bring some coherence to this situation and to ensure that Court has equal sight of both library and IT matters, it is proposed that Knowledge Strategy Committee should be adopted as a committee of the University Court. Library Committee and UCAC, along with e-learning Committee and IT Committee, would report through KSC to Court. It is not intended that we change the current status of Library Committee or UCAC, simply that we revise their reporting route.

As a Court Committee, KSC would revise its membership to include a member of Court. This will give Court direct input to the strategic deliberations of KSC and to the governance of major IT projects overseen by the committee.

Action: Court is invited to agree the proposal that Knowledge Strategy Committee become a committee of The University Court; and to approve the Terms of Reference. Court is also asked to confirm that the reporting route for Library Committee and University Collections Advisory Committee will be via the Knowledge Strategy Committee.

Review of Effectiveness – Nominations Committee 2010/2011

This report summaries the outcome of discussion at the Nominations Committee on 25 October 2010 on its effectiveness around the following themes:

Membership of Committee

The current composition of the Committee was considered appropriate with the main stakeholders on Court represented and the Vice-Convenor of Court being appointed ex officio Convenor of the Committee.

Terms of Reference

The current approved terms of reference reflected the activities of the Committee. There was evidence of a more transparent approach to the work of the Nominations Committee. The identification of external members of Court and its Committees was now undertaken by means of an external advertisement process and the Nominations Committee was involved in the resulting evaluation and selection process. The nomination of Court members to the various Committees and extensions of terms of office also increasingly took cognisance of the Court members' 'appraisal' process. Although there were challenges, the Committee continued to fulfil its main purpose as set out in its terms of reference.

Conduct of meetings

The scheduling of three meetings each academic session had been of great assistance and a pattern of work was beginning to be established. The Committee continued to be content to undertake certain matters 'by correspondence' where decisions required to be agreed in accordance with very tight timetables or where only formal approval was required of matters previously debated at a meeting of the Committee.

Agendas, minutes, papers

There was general agreement that agendas, papers and minutes were appropriate and provided the information required to enable the Committee to fulfil its remit. Of particular note was the introduction of the comprehensive document on the membership of Court and its Committees which greatly assisted the Committee in identifying future vacancies and had significantly improved the succession planning process.

Other comments

The Committee was of the view that it was operating satisfactorily.

Review of Effectiveness of Risk Management Committee

The Risk Management Committee undertook a review of its effectiveness during late 2010 culminating in a discussion at its meeting on 13 January. The review was based on a questionnaire that each member of the committee completed which served as a basis for the discussion.

The Risk Management Committee concluded that its processes enabled it to have visibility of the major risks of the University, and of the key risks within each College, Support Group, and Subsidiary Company, and to understand the main mechanisms and actions for managing the major risks. It was also satisfied that new and emerging risks were being brought to the attention of the Committee. Similarly it was satisfied that the linkages with Audit Committee operated effectively (with the Director of Corporate Services, Director of Finance, the University Secretary and Head of Internal Audit being a member or in attendance at both Committees), as did the linkage into the Central Management Group. It took comfort from the fact that the University's external auditors, KPMG, have commented positively on the Risk management processes in the University

The review highlighted three areas for future consideration by the Committee.

- 1) the Committee recognised that the awareness of risk management across the University had grown considerably over the past few years particularly amongst the more senior staff i.e. those leading schools, institutes, departments, projects etc. Given the breadth of the organisation and staff turnover, it was considered that it might be an appropriate time to review the extent of awareness again.
- 2) the Committee recognised that there were business continuity / contingency plans for many eventualities already in place. In particular it noted the work over the past 2-3 years on contingency plans for pandemic flu. It was thought it might be an appropriate time for the committee to review again the overall coverage and development of business continuity and contingency plans in the University
- 3) the Committee reflected on its processes for maintaining an up to date knowledge of risk management generally. A few years ago there were occasionally joint meetings between members of the Audit Committee and Risk Management Committee at which members were updated on external developments. The committee reflected that it might be appropriate to explore whether such a meeting should be considered again, or whether there are other mechanisms for ensuring colleagues were aware of external developments in risk management.

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Report of the Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee at its meeting on 10 February 2011 considered a number of matters and wishes to make recommendations for approval to Court as detailed below:

External Membership of Court, Audit Committee and Staff Committee (Appendix 1)

As a result of the agreed recruitment process the Committee wishes to recommend the following appointments:

Court

Dr Chris Masters and Ms Elaine Noad to be appointed co-opted members of Court with effect from 1 September 2011.

Mr David Bentley, Dr Robert Black and Mr Les Matheson to be appointed co-opted members of Court with effect from 1 September 2012.

The Committee noted that while the University had advertised for co-opted members of Court for the start of the next academic session, given the high calibre of the individuals coming forward it seemed appropriate to also recommend to Court appointments from the start of the 2012/2013 academic session. The Committee would consider how best to engage with those individuals starting in 2012 prior to their membership of Court. All appointments to be for an initial period of three years.

Audit Committee

Mr Alan Trotter to be appointed with immediate effect until 31 December 2013.

Staff Committee

Mr Alan Gibson and Mr Alex Killick to be appointed with effect from 1 September 2011 until 31 August 2014.

Membership of Committees

Audit Committee

Ms Anne Richards to be appointed Convener with effect from 1 September 2011 until 31 August 2013.

Committee on University Benefactors

The Rt Hon Lord Provost George Grubb to be appointed with immediate effect until May 2012.

Nominations Committee

Professor Stuart Monro to be appointed with immediate effect. In the capacity of Vice-Convener of Court, Professor Monro would become an *ex officio* member and Convener of this Committee on 1 September 2011.

The University Development Trust (Appendix 2)

Mr Richard Davidson to be appointed a member of The University Development Trust with effect from 1 June 2011 until 31 May 2014.

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Report from Estates Committee Meeting held on 8 December 2010

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

The paper reports on key discussions and recommendations made at the meeting of EC, held on 8 December 2010.

The issues in this report relate to the Strategic Plan enable of **Quality Infrastructure** in terms of achievement of core strategic goals contained in the University's Strategic plan 2008-2012.

In pursuing **quality infrastructure** we need to provide an estate which is capable of supporting world class academic activity in order to meet our business needs. The strategy for achieving this is set out in the Estate Strategy 2010-20 and our target is to implement this over the period of the plan.

The Court is reminded to note that copies of the EC papers and the minutes of the meeting are available to Court members on request from Angela Lewthwaite (Tel: 651 4384, email: angela.lewthwaite@ed.ac.uk) or online via the EC web-site at <http://www.ec.estates.ed.ac.uk>

Action requested

The Court is invited to note the paper and approve recommendations/endorsements contained in items 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 19.

The Court is invited to note that Item 14 contains an update on the Cramond Campus disposal.

The Court should note that CMG & FGPC have noted and endorsed the items at its meeting on 26 January and 7 February respectively. F&GPC suggested a further amendment to the composition of the Estates Committee which has been incorporated into the revised terms of reference attached as appendix 1 to stipulate that one of the Lay members of Court on the Estates Committee should also be a member of the F&GPC.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes, detailed throughout the paper.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No. It should be noted that EC papers contain, where applicable, separate risk assessments.

General:

Legislation Non-Compliance/Business Continuity – mitigated by regular assessment and update of priorities, risk register and implementation of annual major replacements/compliance programme

Capital Commitments (CAC) – mitigated by tracking via the Capital Projections Plan and regular updating in consultation with Finance and reporting to EC, CMG and Court, through to Court.

Project Management – mitigated by on going monitoring of Design Team, Contractor, Risk Register and meetings of Project Committees who in turn report significant programme/cost issues to EC etc.

Equality and Diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

None of the proposals in this paper raise issues beyond those that are routinely handled in all Estates Developments. It should be noted that EC papers contain, where applicable, separate Estates & Development assessments.

Any other relevant information

Copies of the EC papers and the minutes of the meeting are available to Court members on request from Angela Lewthwaite (Tel: 651 4384; Email: Angela.Lewthwaite@ed.ac.uk), or alternatively can be found at <http://www.ec.estates.ed.ac.uk>

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? The paper is **closed**.
Its disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of any person or organisation

All EC papers contain FOI information including reasons for closing papers.

Originator of the paper

Paul Cruickshank - Estates Programme Administrator
Angela Lewthwaite - Secretary to EC
31 January 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Draft Ordinance: Election of Chancellor and General Council Assessors

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

The arrangements to take forward the elections of Chancellor and General Council Assessors are currently governed by a very prescriptive Ordinance. The General Council wishes to explore conducting elections by means of an electronic voting process and the opportunity has been taken to review all aspects of the current Ordinance rather than propose only amendments to allow electronic voting.

The attached draft Ordinance was considered and approved by the General Council's Half-Yearly meeting on 12 February 2011 and is brought to Court for approval of the initiation of the formal eight week consultation process. There has been detailed informal discussion with the Privy Council and the Scottish Government to reach the stage where we understand that they are content with the current draft.

Action requested

Court is invited to consider the draft Ordinance and approve the commencement of the formal eight week consultation process.

Resource implications

None.

Equality and Diversity

Not applicable.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of any person or organisation

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Regulation of Foundations, Mortifications, Gifts, Endowments and BursariesBrief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

The Court at its meeting on the 8 November 2010 approved draft Ordinance 209 (appendix 2) and asked that the formal consultation process be initiated. The draft Ordinance has been considered by the Senatus Academicus and the General Council. The General Council wished clarification on how the University would monitor and ensure that any alternative use for a dormant endowment would be in the spirit of the original wishes of the donor and confirmation was given on the balances and checks in the Ordinance including the requirement to seek the views of the original donor (as appropriate) and the involvement of Senate and any other individual or body deemed appropriate by Court as well Court approval being required for the changes and this was accepted. The Senatus Academicus offered no comments on the draft.

The Scottish Government and the Privy Council were also consulted albeit they had previously confirmed that they were content with the draft as submitted to Court. As a result of this exercise the Privy Council suggested that the preamble could be significantly shortened to remove unnecessary material particularly that related to the Universities (Scotland) Act 1889 and some other changes to clarify the wording around seeking the views of the donor. Subsequent to these suggested amendments being incorporated into a revised draft Ordinance, the Scottish Government suggested that the initial section of the Ordinance was no longer required. These are largely technical issues.

Action requested

Court is invited to consider and approve the attached Ordinance (appendix 1) which incorporates all the changes suggested by the Privy Council and the Scottish Government and request that this Ordinance be submitted to the Privy Council for approval.

Resource implications

The approval of the Ordinance by the Privy Council will allow the release of significant funds.

Equality and Diversity

There are safeguards within the Ordinance to ensure that no action would be taken which would be detrimental to students.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of any person or organisation

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Academic Report

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

The paper is the Academic Report to Court providing information on the discussion which took place at the most recent meeting of the University Senate on 9 February 2011, and of the business dealt with by the electronic Senate of 18-26 January 2011.

A copy of the full minute of the Senate meeting, together with related papers, can be found as always on the Senate webpages at:

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/committees/senate/agendas-papers>

Copies of any of the presentation slides are available on request from the Senate Secretariat.

Action requested

No action is requested on this occasion. The report is for information in order to update Court on Senate activities.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Jane McCloskey
Senate Secretariat
16 February 2011

Senate Report to the University Court – October 2010

1. Summary Report from the Senatus Meeting on 9 February 2011

Part One: 'Academics for the 21st Century'

The meeting began as usual, with presentations and discussion around a particular theme. The strategic theme for the February meeting was '*Academics for the 21st Century*'. This theme was selected following discussion at a recent Senate around the theme of graduate attributes and 'Graduates for the 21st Century'. The Senate Agenda Committee had reasoned that as Senate had been giving thought to the attributes which the University might wish to develop in the graduates of the future, it would be useful to give some similar thought to the attributes of those who will teach them and lead their research. The aim of the session was therefore to consider the sorts of skills, experiences and attributes which might be required by the University's academic staff of the future.

Senate was pleased to welcome its first ever guest speaker to deliver an introduction to the session. Professor Sir David Watson, Principal of Green Templeton College, Oxford, and a leading expert in higher education management, provided a highly engaging introduction to the topic. Professor Watson began by considering some of the challenges faced by the higher education (HE) sector and how individual institutions might seek to address these. He spoke about the exceptional nature of the HE sector, highlighting three exceptional characteristics: its stability over time, the 'flatness' of its management structure, and its dual nature as a public purpose and social business. He reflected on the attributes necessary to operate successfully as a 'member' of academia and how this impacts on the way in which universities are managed. Professor Watson concluded by presenting some thoughts on a suggested list of 'ten commandments' for higher education.

Consideration was then given to the topic in the specific context of the University of Edinburgh. Vice Principal McMahon reflected on the University's Strategic Plan, identifying key priorities for the University and discussing the possible consequences of these for the academic staff. Representatives from each of the Colleges provided a brief overview of future plans in their areas and the resultant challenges both for its academic staff and for the University in supporting them. Professor Dorothy Miell, Head of the College of Humanities and Social Science (CHSS) highlighted the importance of fostering and enabling a sense of collective working, engagement and motivation in challenging circumstances, the need to enhance succession planning and support leadership roles, and the challenge of the increased diversification of the academic role. Professor Nigel Brown, Head of the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) considered the multiple roles expected of academics and the challenges that this presented. Professor David Weller, Head of the School of Clinical Sciences and Community Health, considered the changing nature of academic profiles within the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, highlighting developments such as the rise in on-line distance learning programmes, and some of the challenges inherent in the College's undergraduate teaching programmes.

The focus then moved on to how the University supports academic staff development and ways in which this might develop in the future. Ms Sheila Gupta, Director of HR, and Ms Alex Jones, Organisation Development Advisor, delivered an informative presentation on the support arranged by the University's corporate human resources for academic staff leadership development. They considered the sorts of skills which were likely to be required to be covered in future leadership and staff development provision. This was followed by a presentation from Dr Jon Turner, Head of the University's recently established Institute for Academic Development (IAD). Dr Turner gave a brief summary of the remit and current activities of the IAD and informed the Senate of a forthcoming planning review by the Institute of the support it offers to academic and teaching support, explaining the general principles behind the review and inviting input.

Senate Report to the University Court – October 2010

In discussion, members highlighted the importance of the 'personal' element in the attributes of academic staff which was something they felt to be missing in the various presentations. It was pointed out that, whilst research and teaching content is obviously very important, so too is the ability to understand the student viewpoint and to be able effectively assess and provide constructive criticism. Concern was raised about the impact of the ending of a set retirement age and this was recognised as being a major challenge facing the HE sector when considering the future profile of academic staff.

Part Two: Formal Business

i. ECA Merger Update

Senate received an update from Vice Principal Fergusson on progress on the proposed merger with Edinburgh College of Art.

ii. NSS Improvement Measures

Vice Principal Hounsell provided an update on progress made by Schools on implementing measures to improve feedback provision to students. He highlighted a number of examples of successful initiatives underway in different Schools. Professor Hounsell specified three factors which he believes are integral to achieving improvement, these being, ongoing dialogue about what it needs to make feedback work, designing in 'feedforward', and active student involvement in the interchange of feedback. Senate welcomed the positive developments in this area.

2. Summary Report of Senate Business Conducted Electronically

The Senate conducted electronic business between 18-26 January 2011. This included consideration of the following items:

- **Report from the Court meetings of 8 November, 20 December and 5 January** – Senate noted the content of the Court report.
- **Report from the Central Management Group meetings of 13 October and 23 November** – Senate noted the content of the report.
- **Draft Chair Resolutions** – No comments were received in relation to three chair resolutions presented by Court (Resolutions 1/2011 - 3/2011).
- **Update on ELIR Preparation** – Senate noted an update provided by Dr Tina Harrison on the ongoing preparations for the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) which will take place in October / November this year.
- **Membership of a Disciplinary Tribunal** – Senate noted the appointment of Professor John Iredale to serve on a staff disciplinary tribunal.
- **Report on Student Complaints** – Senate received a report on the nature and volume of student complaints received during the 2009-10 academic session.

February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Resolutions

No observations having been received from the General Council, the Senatus Academicus or any other body or person having an interest and in accordance with the agreed arrangements for the creation and renaming of Chairs, the Court is invited to approve the following Resolutions:

Resolution No. 1/2011: Foundation of a Chair of Adult Respiratory Medicine

Resolution No. 2/2011: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Biological Physics

Resolution No. 3/2011: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Mathematics of Information

Katherine Novosel
Head of Court Services
February 2011

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Resolution of the University Court No. 1/2011

Foundation of a Chair of Adult Respiratory Medicine

At Edinburgh, the Twenty-first day of February, Two thousand and eleven.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Chair of Adult Respiratory Medicine:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Chair of Adult Respiratory Medicine in the University of Edinburgh.
2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.
3. This Resolution shall come into force with immediate effect.

For and on behalf of the University Court

K A WALDRON

University Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Resolution of the University Court No. 2/2011

Foundation of a Personal Chair of Biological Physics

At Edinburgh, the Twenty-first day of February, Two thousand and eleven.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Personal Chair of Biological Physics:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to the Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Personal Chair of Biological Physics in the University of Edinburgh, which shall be established solely for the period of tenure of the Professor appointed, and on the Professor ceasing to hold office, the provisions of this Resolution shall cease to have effect, and the said Personal Chair shall thereupon cease to exist.
2. The patronage of the Personal Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.
3. Notwithstanding the personal nature of this Chair, the terms and conditions of appointment and tenure which by Statute, Ordinance and otherwise apply to other Chairs in the University shall be deemed to apply in like manner to the Personal Chair of Biological Physics together with all other rights, privileges and duties attaching to the office of Professor.
4. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 December Two thousand and ten.

For and on behalf of the University Court

K A WALDRON

University Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Resolution of the University Court No. 3/2011

Foundation of a Personal Chair of Mathematics of Information

At Edinburgh, the Twenty-first day of February, Two thousand and eleven.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Personal Chair of Mathematics of Information:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to the Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Personal Chair of Mathematics of Information in the University of Edinburgh, which shall be established solely for the period of tenure of the Professor appointed, and on the Professor ceasing to hold office, the provisions of this Resolution shall cease to have effect, and the said Personal Chair shall thereupon cease to exist.
2. The patronage of the Personal Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.
3. Notwithstanding the personal nature of this Chair, the terms and conditions of appointment and tenure which by Statute, Ordinance and otherwise apply to other Chairs in the University shall be deemed to apply in like manner to the Personal Chair of Mathematics of Information together with all other rights, privileges and duties attaching to the office of Professor.
4. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 January Two thousand and eleven.

For and on behalf of the University Court

K A WALDRON

University Secretary

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

**Management of conflict of interest: Professor Sir John Savill, Head of College of
Medicine and Veterinary Medicine**

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic
plans and priorities where relevant

Given Professor Sir John Savill's roles as chief executive of the Medical Research Council (MRC) and Head of the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine at the University of Edinburgh, both the MRC and the University of Edinburgh require robust and transparent plans for managing any possible conflicts of interest that may arise with regard to Sir John's work. A Conflict of Interest management plan for the University has been agreed by all parties at the University of Edinburgh and the MRC.

Action requested

For note by Court.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Kim Waldron
University Secretary

February 2011

Management of conflict of interest: Professor Sir John Savill, Head of College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Professor Sir John Savill took up position of chief executive of the Medical Research Council (MRC) on 1 October 2010. He also continues his role, on a part time basis, as Head of the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (CMVM) at the University of Edinburgh and honorary consultant physician at NHS Lothian, for which he is paid directly by the University.

Sir John's appointment with the MRC was in line with the Code of Practice of the Office of the Commissioner for Public Appointments (OCPA). Sir John was considered to be the best person for the role, with excellent qualifications and experience. It was Sir John's request that he continue part-time at the University of Edinburgh and that the appointment should be for three years in the first instance. As he was by a significant margin the preferred candidate, the appointments panel agreed to these conditions.

Sir John Savill and the University of Edinburgh are committed to managing all real, potential or apparent conflicts of interest with integrity, impartiality, honesty and openness.

While Sir John's dual roles at the University of Edinburgh and the MRC are in many ways an asset, robust policies and procedures are in place to manage potential conflicts.

Measures in place include:

- The Head of College (HOC) will absent himself from all University of Edinburgh and/or NHS Lothian discussions and meetings that relate to funding or funding proposals involving the MRC.
- The HOC will not have access to papers and minutes relevant to these items.
- All prospective decisions specifically concerning the MRC which would normally involve the HOC will be referred directly to the Executive Dean of CMVM at the earliest opportunity.
- An oversight group has been established to resolve issues of potential conflict (where the remediation is not obvious in advance); this consists of representatives of the University's central management team (the University Secretary and the Director of Corporate Services) and of CMVM (the Executive Dean, the Registrar and the Dean of Clinical Medicine). The committee will be quorate if one representative of each group is present. Decisions of this group will be referred to the Principal for confirmation.
- The HOC will not be an applicant or co-applicant on any funding proposal submitted to the MRC.
- Where discussions/decisions concern funding Councils broadly, the Principal and Executive Dean of CMVM will discuss with the HOC the extent to which the conflict is material and how closely Sir John should be involved, on a case-by-case basis.
- Minutes of meetings will clearly record where Sir John had a potential conflict and the action taken.
- Should any other material issue arise, not specifically defined in this plan, then any of the parties concerned should refer such a matter to the University Secretary in the first instance.

Kim Waldron
University Secretary

February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Report by the Expeditions Committee

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This paper sets out brief reports of University of Edinburgh expeditions in 2010, drawing on information submitted by individual expeditions.

Action requested

For information and approval.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Kate Heal – Convener of the Expeditions Committee
Ellie Greenhalgh – Secretary to the Expeditions Committee
February 3 2011

Report by the Expeditions Committee of The University of Edinburgh

Feedback on 2010 Expeditions

The Expeditions Committee reports its decisions to Court for homologation. This paper sets out brief reports of University of Edinburgh expeditions in 2010, drawing on information submitted by individual expeditions.

The successful annual Expeditions Committee Seminar was held again in November 2010. The seminar was attended by approximately 25 students from a much wider range of study backgrounds than usual and the programme and presentations can be viewed at: <http://www.expeditions.ed.ac.uk/>

Project Mexico

Working with Dr Anne Damon of El Colegio de la Frontera Sur (ECOSUR) in southern Mexico and Dr Graham Stone (The University of Edinburgh), the expedition's scientific aim was to investigate the effect of habitat (forest versus coffee plantation) and abiotic factors (temperature, humidity and light intensity) on the presence and abundance of euglossine bees which pollinate orchids. The results can be used to provide a better understanding of how to manage orchid reintroductions in the Soconusco region of Mexico where the research was conducted. Personal aims were to gain research experience and learn the responsibilities of independent group fieldwork as well as help the five University of Edinburgh expedition members with their future careers.

Four field sites - two coffee plantations, and two forest fragments - were selected across an altitude range of 500 to 1300 m and visited four times. At each site, three baits (dental cotton rolls), were soaked in different fragrances known to be attractive to bees, and monitored for 4 hours. Temperature, humidity and light were measured throughout. Bees were captured from the baits by hand-netting and a leg sample was taken and stored in alcohol for genetic analysis. Time of capture, type of bait, bee identity and presence or absence of pollen were recorded. Bees identified in the field were marked and released. Bees that could not be identified were stored and identified in the laboratory.

Despite time limitations, the results revealed some aspects of bee responses to habitat quality and general activity pattern preferences. Orchid bees are numerous and diverse in coffee plantations (906 specimens), compared to forest fragments (345 specimens). Sites which were geographically close showed differing dominant bee species. 5% of the bees captured carried pollen; more than found in similar previous studies in the region. Most pollen came from coffee plantations showing that bees in these areas are providing pollination services to multiple orchid species, some of which are considered threatened. Overall the results support the idea of cultivating orchids within coffee plantations as a viable system to promote long term and stable populations of orchid species.

The expedition is currently being written up as a scientific report and the data collected will be included in a larger project led by Dr Damon in Mexico. In addition, ongoing research at The University of Edinburgh aims to genetically identify the bees and the pollen collected. The expedition was executed very successfully, both from the group and individual perspectives. The aims of investigating bee behaviour and pollination interactions have yielded preliminary results of immediate value to orchid conservation and pollination ecology, in addition to serving as a foundation upon which further studies can build.

Project Madagascar

The aim of the expedition comprising four University of Edinburgh students, one student from Dundee University and nine members from WWF and Centre Ecologique Libanona Madagascar, was to carry out biodiversity research on Angavo Mountain, a sacred ancient burial site of the local Antandroy people, in south-east Madagascar. The research investigated plants, birds and lemurs and measured species richness, abundance and where possible population density. The level of disturbance by human activities, such as zebu and goat grazing, and illegal logging and hunting was also investigated.

The expedition research was conducted by four teams, each focussing on one of plants, birds, lemurs and human disturbance. The methods involved selecting sites across Angavo Mountain and carrying out surveys along transect lines within these sites using methods appropriate for the taxa under investigation. Where appropriate,

surveys were repeated to gather sufficient data for analysis. The plant research team recorded data on the richness and abundance of plant species from 16 transects at each of 6 sites on the mountain. The avifaunal research team carried out surveys more than 4 times at 10 different sites across the mountain, each survey involving walking 1 km over a period of 2 hours, twice a day. The lemur research team carried out the same frequency and distance of survey at 8 different sites across the mountain, conducting timed species counts during each survey. The disturbance research team conducted interviews in local villages with a large number of males in each village. Interviews focused on personal and public use of the forest and its resources and whether there was any impact of past, present and/or future uses on the community and the individual. The disturbance team also collected data on signs of disturbance across the mountain.

The research was fruitful and it has been requested that the raw data be passed onto WWF Madagascar. A total of 307 plant species were identified on the mountain. This includes one species previously thought to be found only in a National Park elsewhere in Madagascar, five freshwater species that were found in a rock pool in the middle of the dry spiny forest and a population of the endangered (IUCN Red List 2010) palm endemic to the south of Madagascar, *Ravenea xerophilla*.

A total of 69 bird species were recorded, 79% of which are endemic to Madagascar. During day and night transects five species of lemur were observed - *Lemur catta* (ring-tailed lemur), *Verreauxi verreauxi* (sifaka), *Lepilemur leocopus*, *Microcebus mirunus* and *Microcebus griseorifus*. Presence-absence data were collected along with data regarding the habitat and plants associated with the lemurs. Disturbance included illegal logging and hunting, collection of leaves of endangered endemic palm species, *Ravenea xerophilla*, for weaving, and cattle and goat grazing across the mountain. Analysis is ongoing to determine the species density of lemurs, birds and plants and the structure and composition of the flora on the mountain.

Project Canada

The aim of this expedition was to understand how resource selection varied between sexes of Columbian ground squirrels through observation and experimentation whilst also assisting Dr Jeffery Lane and Professor Loeske Kruuk of the Institute of Evolutionary Biology, The University of Edinburgh, in their research. The expedition was based in Sheep River Provincial Park, Alberta, on the eastern edge of the Rocky Mountains.

The research activities of the expedition, two final year Biological Science (Ecology) students, were divided between the two projects. The independent project consisted mainly of ground squirrel feeding and behavioural observations, plant identification and data management. For Dr Lane's project the team was mainly trapping, handling and processing the ground squirrels, which included ear tagging and marking individuals. The team also gained experience in scoping and practical work with enclosures and fences.

The expedition results are currently being written up as a scientific report. On a more personal basis the team gained important experience by being fully responsible for its own project, including planning, fieldwork, data management, and problem-solving. The expedition members have obviously benefited intellectually but also personally from the expedition.

Project Vaquita

The vaquita (*Phocoena sinus*) is the most endangered species of cetacean (order of marine mammals which includes whales, dolphins and porpoises) in the world, with an estimated global population of less than 250 individuals. The species is listed as Critically Endangered by IUCN and it is expected that the population will dwindle to extinction if management solutions are not found in the next couple of years. The lack of high-quality photographic images of living vaquitas is currently an impediment to conservation of the species. Based in Baja California, Mexico, this project aimed to obtain images and to evaluate the potential for using photo-identification to study the species in the northern Gulf of California. The expedition members were two final year Biological Science and Ecological Science students and a recent University of Edinburgh graduate.

From 7-24 June 2010, small-vessel surveys were conducted by the team from a shore-based station in San Felipe, Baja California. Each day, weather permitting, the team travelled offshore to the region where past vaquita sightings had been concentrated (generally between San Felipe and Rocas Consag), ranging up to 70 km from San Felipe. The team used the Pancho Villa, a 57-foot sportfishing vessel based in Puerto Peñasco. The Pancho Villa provided a stable, high observation platform. When cetaceans were observed, basic sighting data were collected (date, time, position, sighting conditions, group size, behaviour), and the team attempted to obtain photos. Of the sighting conditions recorded, Beaufort sea state was the most important.

Surveys were conducted on 15 days. Poor weather and the vessel blowing a head gasket prevented surveys on the remaining days. The team searched while moving and conducted 41 'stop and drift' searches totalling 91.5 hours of at-sea searching. The team covered 850 km during its active searches for vaquitas, but for the vast majority of this time the sea conditions were not good for sighting these elusive animals (Beaufort 3-6). Previous work indicates that almost all sightings of vaquitas are made during calm sea conditions of Beaufort 0-2. The team experienced very little of this calm weather.

The team sighted only a single group of vaquitas plus several Bryde's whales and two groups of unidentified dolphins. One group of bottlenose dolphins and unconfirmed longbeaked common dolphins were sighted. Photos were obtained of the Bryde's whales (with dorsal nicks and body scratches allowing future photo-identification of these individuals). Unfortunately no photos were obtained during the brief vaquita sighting. One interesting observation was that less fishing activity was occurring in vaquita habitat than was observed in October 2008 (when gillnet pangas and shrimp trawlers were frequently observed plying the area where vaquitas occur). The expedition's research was conducted in June, outside of the shrimp fishing season, and it was encouraging to see very few commercial fishing vessels operating in the area. The few vessels that were observed were clearly fishing for small fish near the San Felipe coastline and outside the main habitat area of the vaquita. The fishing patrol enforcement vessels of PROFEPA (The Federal Environmental Protection Agency) were observed actively patrolling the area.

In addition to the field work, the team also conducted education and public awareness activities in San Felipe. This included the following:

1. A slide-illustrated lecture on the vaquita and its conservation given at El Dorado Ranch, which was attended by about 60 people (mostly local American landowners). The lecture also included a chance for attendees to see and touch the team's life-sized model of an adult female vaquita which proved very popular.
2. The distribution of several thousand brochures on the vaquita to individuals and businesses in San Felipe (both English and Spanish versions).
3. Informal interviews and discussion with local fishermen. Some fishermen demonstrated support for the expedition and vaquita conservation. Other fishermen explained that despite fishing in the region for over 20 years they had never seen a vaquita and doubt that they have ever existed.
4. Meeting with PROFEPA personnel, who are responsible for enforcing fishing restrictions and regulations protecting the vaquita. They also had a chance to examine the team's life-sized model of an adult female vaquita.

Future planned work will include long-term photo-identification studies of the vaquitas and other cetaceans observed.

Project Huarez and Project Solomon Islands, which were approved by the Committee, did not go ahead, apparently because of funding difficulties. Due to a refusal of permits by the Malaysian economic planning unit, Project Borneo was unable to go ahead in October 2010 but has been re-scheduled in Taiwan and China for March-April 2011. The outcomes of the expedition will therefore be reported to Court next year.

Ms Ellie Greenhalgh
Secretary to the Expeditions Committee

Dr Kate Heal
Convener of the Expeditions Committee
19 January 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

India Liaison Office Bank Account

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

As part of the official accreditation process of the University's activities in India, it is necessary for a second bank account to be opened in the name of the Indian Liaison Office.

Action requested

Court is asked to approve the opening of a second bank account for use by the India Liaison Office

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

Not required

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Its disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of any person or organisation

For how long must the paper be withheld? 2 years

Originator of the paper

Alan Mackay, Director, International Office
8 February 2011

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

21 February 2011

Request for opening of Bank Account

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

This seeks approval for the opening of a bank account with the Clydesdale Bank.

Action requested

Members of Court are asked to approve the opening of the bank account.

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Originator of the paper

Elizabeth Welch
Assistant Director of Finance

The University of Edinburgh

University Court

21 February 2011

Donations and Legacies to be notified

Brief description of the paper, including statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities where relevant

A Report on legacies and donations received by the University of Edinburgh Development Trust from 1 December 2010 to 31 January 2011.

Action requested

For Information

Resource implications

None

Risk Assessment

n/a

Originator of the paper

Mrs Liesl Elder
Director of Development

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business?

No, its disclosure would substantially prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs.