

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

BUSINESS FOR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT to be held in the Raeburn Room, Old College on Monday 20 February 2012 at 2.00 p.m.

A buffet lunch will be available in the Anatomical Museum, Old Medical School, Teviot Place
from 1.00 p.m.

This meeting of Court will be preceded by a presentation on widening participation delivered by Vice-Principal Professor Mary Bownes and Ms Kathleen Hood, Head of Widening Participation.

A FORMAL BUSINESS

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------|
| 1. | Minute of the meeting held on 12 December 2011 | A1 |
| 2. | Minute of meeting of Court Sub-Group held on 26 January 2012 | A2 |
| 3. | Student and staff social provision at King's Buildings | A3 |
| 4. | Rectorial Election 2012 | A4 |
| 5. | Rector's Assessor | A5 |

B PRINCIPAL'S BUSINESS

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Principal's Communications | B1 |
| 2. | Designation of Vice-Principals | 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. | Report of the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland | C2 |
| 3. | New Strategic Plan – progress report | C3 |
| 4. | Report from Estates Committee | C4 |
| 5. | University of Edinburgh Regents | C5 |
| 6. | Enhancing Student Support Project | C6 |
| 7. | Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund – update report | C7 |
| 8. | REF Code of Practice | C8 |
| 9. | Investment Proposal | C9 |

D ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTE

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------|
| 1. | Academic Report | D1 |
| 2. | Resolutions | D2 |
| 3. | Naming of Building | D3 |
| 4. | Constitution of Edinburgh Consortium on Rural Research | D4 |
| 5. | Donations and Legacies | D5 |
| 6. | Use of the Seal | |

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

MINUTE OF A MEETING of the University Court of the University of Edinburgh held in the Mary Kinross Room, Queen's Medical Research Institute (QMRI), on Monday 12 December 2011.

Present:

Rector (in chair)
 The Principal
 Sheriff Principal E Bowen
 Mr A Johnston
 Professor A M Smyth
 Mrs M Tait
 Dr M Aliotta
 Professor J Ansell
 Professor D Finnegan
 Professor S Monro, Vice-Convener
 Professor J Barbour
 Mr P Budd
 Mrs E Noad
 Ms A Richards
 Mr M McPherson, President Students' Representative Council
 Mr M Williamson, Vice-President Students' Representative Council

In attendance:

Senior Vice-Principal Professor N Brown
 Vice-Principal Professor D Miell
 Vice-Principal Professor L Yellowlees
 Vice-Principal Professor Sir John Savill
 Vice-Principal Professor C Jeffery
 Professor J Seckl
 Dr K Waldron, University Secretary
 Mr N Paul, Director of Corporate Services
 Dr A Cornish, Deputy University Secretary and Director of Planning
 Mr A Currie, Director of Estates and Buildings
 Mr J Gorringer, Director of Finance
 Ms S Gupta, Director of Human Resources
 Ms F Boyd, Principal's Policy and Executive Officer
 Dr K J Novosel, Head of Court Services

Apologies:

Ms S Beattie-Smith, Rector's Assessor
 Professor A Harmar
 The Rt Hon G Grubb, Lord Provost of the City of Edinburgh
 Dr C Masters
 Mr M Murray
 Mr D Workman
 Mr D Brook

Court received a presentation from Vice-Principal Professor Sir John Savill and Professor Jonathan Seckl entitled 'An overview of activities in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine'.

A FORMAL BUSINESS

1

MINUTE OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2011

Paper A1

The Minute of the meeting held on 7 November 2011 was approved as a correct record.

2 MATTERS ARISING

Court noted the current position in respect of nursery provision at King's Buildings and that proposals would be considered by the Estates Committee in the New Year and thereafter reported to Court.

Court further noted concerns raised in respect of student catering and other facilities at King's Buildings. There was discussion on the on-going building developments at King's Buildings and the improvements already undertaken and it was agreed to investigate if further short-term measures could be implemented.

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 successful Christmas Carol Service; the University's rugby team win over the team from the University of St Andrews at a special match hosted by London Scottish rugby club; the progress in taking forward a Personal Tutor system as a new approach to providing academic and pastoral support to students; the current position in respect of establishing a new office in Latin America; the very successful monitoring visit by the Scottish Funding Council in respect of the merger with the Edinburgh College of Art; the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review; and the current encouraging student application levels for 2012/2013 particularly international students.

2 DESIGNATION OF VICE-PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Paper B2

On the recommendation of the Principal, Court approved: the proposals to take forward the process to identify successors for the separate functions of Senior Vice-Principal and Vice-Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy on the retirement of Professor Nigel Brown in late summer 2012; the extension of the current remit of Assistant Principal Dr Sue Rigby and to revise her designation with immediate effect to Assistant Principal for Student Progression and Taught Postgraduate Programmes; and the extension of the term of office of Assistant Principal Professor Asif Ahmed until 28 February 2014.

C SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

1 REPORT OF THE FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Professor Monro presented the papers previously circulated.

Report of the Central Management Group meeting of 14 November 2011

Paper C1.1

Court noted the planning round assumptions and the indicative uplift to core budgets for 2012/2013. Court was very supportive of the project to take forward enhanced guidance on academic promotion in respect of excellence in learning and teaching and welcomed the detailed information on the restructuring of Development and Alumni and the success of the current fundraising campaign. In accordance with the new staff Appeals Process, Court noted that for the period 1 April until 30 June 2011, 5 appeals against dismissal had been lodged, 3 had been heard of which none had been upheld. It was further noted that this information would in future be routinely reported to Court via the Staff Committee.

Court approved the Subsidiary Companies Financial Statements 2010/2011 and noted the remaining items particularly welcoming the introduction of Chancellor's Fellowships.

2 RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE END OF YEAR REPORT Paper C2

Court noted the Annual Report on the activities of the Risk Management Committee which had included identifying new risks emerging during 2010/2011 and reviewing the risk registers of Colleges and Support Groups. Overall, the Committee was of the opinion that the University had satisfactorily managed its key risks during the year ended 31 July 2011. In particular Court noted the year end questionnaire and assurance map relating to version 8 of the University Risk Register. In respect to the former it was confirmed that the information on question 6 referred to specific isolated incidents and that overall there had been no significant breakdown in relationships with students or student representatives.

3 RISK MANAGEMENT – POST YEAR END ASSURANCE STATEMENT Paper C3

It was noted that no new risks required to be drawn to the attention of Court since the completion of the Risk Management Committee's Annual Report which impacted on the ability of Court to approve the University's Annual Accounts for the year ended 31 July 2011. Court further noted the information on the Edinburgh College of Art and on the Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund and the University's position following the merger on 1 August 2011.

4 AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT Paper C4

Court noted the Annual Report on the activities of the Audit Committee during 2010/2011 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 and the decision to continue to annually assess performance.

The Report also provided assurance to Court in respect of the Edinburgh College of Art and the Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund Annual Accounts particularly the information contained in the annexes. The Convener of the Audit Committee further intimated that she had now had confirmation from the Edinburgh College of Art's Internal Audit Service that there were no further matters which required to be reported which impacted on the ability of Court to approve the Edinburgh College of Art and the Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund Annual Accounts for the year ended 31 July 2011.

Court further noted the draft Minute of the last meeting of the Audit Committee and the Committee's comments on the Annual Accounts for year ended 31 July 2011 and the Letters of Representation in respect of the University, Edinburgh College of Art and the Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund. It was further noted that the Audit Committee had considered in detail External Audit Highlights Memoranda in respect of these three Annual Accounts and that it was content that they represented a balanced view. It was agreed to consider further whether it would be helpful for the External Audit highlights memoranda to be presented to Court.

Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2011**Paper C5.1**

The Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2011 were considered in detail. Court noted the inclusion of three new subsidiary companies: Flowave TT Limited, Old College Capital LLP and Research into Results Limited, the new requirements in respect of heritage assets and the additional information on members' attendance at Court and Committees. Court welcomed the very positive performance of the University during 2010/2011 with the Group Income and Expenditure Account recording an increase in income of 2.6% from the previous year and the achievement of a £42.2m retained surplus which equated to an appropriate 6.5% of turnover. The movements in income streams compared to the previous year were noted, particularly the increase in tuition income from full-time students charged overseas fees and the decrease in income from research grants and contracts. Court further noted the movements in expenditure costs and the tight control maintained particular in staffing expenditure in anticipation of funding reductions. The balance sheets confirmed an improved position from the previous year with the total net assets being recorded as £1.540bn for the Group. The very strong group cash flow position was also noted.

Court welcomed and approved the Reports and Financial Statements for year ended 31 July 2011, noting the External Auditor's report and unqualified opinion and authorised the Principal, Vice-Convener of Court and the Director of Finance to sign the Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2011 as appropriate on behalf of Court.

Letter of Representation**Paper C5.2**

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

Review of 2010/2011 Outturn versus Forecast**Paper C5.3**

The areas of movement between the quarter 3 forecast and the outturn achieved were noted and Court further noted the pattern of improvement achieved during the year across the University, most significantly in the corporate area.

Draft US GAAP Accounts**Paper C5.4**

It had previously been reported that the University required to prepare a set of Accounts in accordance with the US Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (US GAAP) by 31 January 2012. Court noted the current draft Accounts prepared in accordance with the US GAAP and the on-going work to complete the final audited Accounts.

In order to meet the deadline, Court approved the establishment of a Sub-Group of the Audit Committee to consider the Accounts, Letter of Representation and the Report from the External Auditor in detail to enable this Sub-Group to then make recommendations to a Sub-Group of Court which would include members of the Finance and General Purposes Committee as time constraints did not allow for a separate meeting of Finance and General Purposes Committee. Court approved the establishment of Court/Finance and General Purposes Committee Sub-Group and its membership: Professor Monro, Mr Murray and Mr Workman. Court delegated to this Sub-Group approval on its behalf, having considered the recommendations of the Audit Committee Sub-Group, of the final US GAAP Accounts noting that Court had now approved the Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2011 prepared in accordance with the UK Statement of Recommended Practice: Accounting

for Further and Higher Education (SORP 2007) and applicable accounting standards. Court further delegated authority to the Court/Finance and General Purposes Sub-Group approval of the Letter of Representation associated with the US GAAP Accounts.

6 EDINBURGH COLLEGE OF ART

Edinburgh College of Art - Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2011 Paper C6.1

Court considered in detail the Report and Financial Statements for the Edinburgh College of Art for the year ended 31 July 2011, noting in particular the unqualified audit opinion contained in the Auditor's Report to Court. Court further noted the consolidated income and expenditure account which recorded the income received from the Scottish Funding Council in respect of the merger and the achievement of a £8.2m operating surplus.

Court approved the Report and Financial Statements for the Edinburgh College of Art for year ended 31 July 2011 and authorised the Principal, Mr Workman and the Director of Finance to sign this document as appropriate on behalf of Court.

Letter of Representation - Edinburgh College of Art Paper C6.2

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

Trustee's Report and Financial Statements – Edinburgh College of Art, Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund Paper C6.3

Court considered in detail the Trustee's Report and Financial Statements for the Edinburgh College of Art, Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund for the year ended 31 July 2011, noting in particular the unqualified audit opinion contained in the Auditor's Report to the Trustee, the statement on the intention to transfer the Edinburgh College of Art Prize Fund and other specific endowments into the University's endowment portfolio and the £4.05m total value of the Fund as at 31 July 2011. Court in its capacity of holder of the Edinburgh College of Art Prize Fund and other specific endowments approved the Trustee's Report and Financial Statements for the Edinburgh College of Art, Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund for the year ended 31 July 2011 and authorised Mr Workman to sign this document on its behalf.

Letter of Representation - Edinburgh College of Art, Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund Paper C6.4

Court in its capacity of holder of the Edinburgh College of Art Prize Fund and other specific endowments approved the Letter of Representation and authorised Mr Workman to sign this document on its behalf.

7 PERFORMANCE MONITORING

Strategic Plan 2008-2012 Targets – Annual Progress Report Paper C7.1

Court welcomed this third report on progress towards achieving the targets set in the current Strategic Plan noting that the majority of targets were on track with four having already been met and exceeded. Court further noted and welcomed the actions being taking forward to address those targets which were not progressing as well as anticipated particularly the work on improving the student experience and the new approach currently being progressed to introduce a Personal Tutor system as previously intimated. It was also confirmed that in taking forward the development of the next Strategic Plan it was anticipated there would be fewer more focused, specific and

measurable targets.

8 STRENGTHENING THE ACADEMIC RELATIONSHIP WITH HERIOT-WATT UNIVERSITY Paper C8

Court was very supportive of the proposals to strengthen the already existing collaboration arrangements between the University and Heriot-Watt University and it approved the establishment of a joint high-level Strategy Group to take this forward including the membership and remit of the Group. It was further noted that this Group would report back to both institutions in July 2012.

9 REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE Paper C9

On the recommendations of the Nominations Committee the following appointments were approved:

Committee on University Benefactors

Sheriff Principal Edward Bowen to be appointed with immediate effect until 31 July 2014.

Finance and General Purposes Committee

Mr Les Matheson to be appointed from the start of the 2012/2013 academic year for three years until 31 July 2015.

Ethical Fundraising Advisory Group

Professor Stuart Monro to be appointed with immediate effect until 31 July 2014.

Employment Related Appeals

Sheriff Principal Edward Bowen to be appointed with immediate effect for as long as he remains a member of Court.

10 UNIVERSITY'S DRAFT RESPONSE TO THE SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT'S 'LEARNERS AT THE CENTRE' CONSULTATION PAPER Paper C10

Court welcomed and approved this well drafted document noting that EUSA would be submitting a separate response.

D ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTE

1 DONATIONS AND LEGACIES Paper D1

Court was pleased to note the donations and legacies to be notified received by the University of Edinburgh, Development Trust between 1 and 30 November 2011.

2 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.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

MINUTE OF A MEETING of a Sub-Group of the University Court of the University of Edinburgh held in the Lee Room, Old College on Thursday 26 January 2012.

Present: Professor S Monro, Vice-Convener (in chair)
Mr M Murray
Mr D Workman (via conference call)

In attendance: Dr K Waldron, University Secretary
Mr J Gorringer, Director of Finance
Ms E Welch, Assistant Director of Finance
Mr G Bailey, Senior Financial Accountant
Dr K J Novosel, Head of Court Services

1 INTRODUCTION

It was confirmed that Court at its meeting on 12 December 2011 had agreed to the establishment and membership of this Sub-Group and had delegated to this Sub-Group approval on its behalf, of the final US GAAP Accounts. Court further had asked this Sub-Group to consider the recommendations of the Audit Committee Sub-Group in respect of the US GAAP Accounts and for this Sub-Group to also approve on its behalf the Letter of Representation associated with the US GAAP Accounts. It was noted that Court at its meeting on 12 December had considered and approved the Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2011 prepared in accordance with the UK Statement of Recommended Practice: Accounting for Further and Higher Education (SORP 2007) and applicable accounting standards and that these approved Reports and Financial Statements formed the basis for the preparation of the US GAAP Accounts.

There was confirmation that Mr Workman was participating as a member of this Sub-Group via conference call.

2 REPORT FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE SUB-GROUP

Paper 1

The Sub-Group considered the paper and noted that at the time of the meeting of the Audit Committee Sub-Group on 23 January 2012 there had been some matters which were outstanding and clarification was on-going around some technical matters particularly related to the external audit opinion. As a result of further discussions at the Audit Committee Sub-Group revised papers had been circulated on the 24 January 2012 and thereafter the Audit Committee Sub-Group had been content, following confirmation of an unqualified audit opinion, to recommend to Court approval of the US GAAP Accounts and the Letter of Representation.

The Court Sub-Group noted the report of the Audit Committee Sub-Group and the assurances provided.

3 CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, JULY 31 2011 (US GAAP ACCOUNTS)

Paper 2

It was noted that this was the first time that the UK HE sector had prepared accounts in

accordance with US GAAP requirements and that this had proved challenging for all those involved including the External Auditor.

The Court Sub-Group considered and approved the Consolidated Financial Statements for the year to 31 July 2011.

4 RECONCILIATION BETWEEN UK GAAP AND US GAAP ACCOUNTS

Paper 3

The main differences between UK and US accounting requirements as set out in the External Auditor's Highlights Memorandum were noted and that there had been further detailed information considered by the Audit Committee Sub-Group. The process undertaken to reconcile the accounts prepared in accordance with the two accounting practices was also noted including the additional information required to be obtained to prepare the US GAAP Accounts.

5 LETTER OF REPRESENTATION

Paper 4

The Court Sub-Group considered the Letter of Representation and on the recommendation of the Audit Committee Sub-Group approved the document and authorised the Vice-Convener of Court to sign the Letter on behalf of the Court.

6 ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

It was noted that a collection of documents would now be collated to send to the US Department of Education including the now approved Consolidated Financial Statements for the year to July 31 2011 (US GAAP Accounts) and the Letter of Representation along with information on the US loan administration audit for both ECA and the University together with corrective action plans.

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

Student and staff social provision at King's Buildings

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

The paper provides Court with an update on plans for new nursery and catering facilities at King's Buildings. Provision of excellent social facilities for students and staff is an important element of the University's strategic plans.

Action requested

Court is asked to comment on and note the progress report.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes

As detailed in the paper.

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

There is a clear risk of reduced student and staff morale, with possible medium-term impact on recruitment, if we do not provide good student and staff social facilities.

Equality and diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? Yes

While nursery facilities will benefit both mothers and fathers, their provision will be particularly beneficial to female staff and students with childcare responsibilities.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Its disclosure would substantially prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs

The Paper should be withheld until the date of closure of the Ashworth catering facility has been confirmed and conveyed to the provider.

Originator of the paper

D B Nelson
Registrar, College of Science and Engineering
14 February 2012

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

Rectorial Election 2012

The Rectorial Election 2012 was due to be held electronically from 8 to 9 February 2012. In the event only one nomination was received and considered by the Scrutinising Committee on 11 January 2012. The Scrutinising Committee confirmed that the nomination was valid and consequently Mr Peter McColl was duly declared Rector elect following an uncontested election. Mr McColl will officially take up office from 1 March 2012.

Dr Alexis Cornish
Deputy Returning Officer
February 2012

The University of Edinburgh

University Court

20 February 2012

Rector's Assessor

The Court is invited to note that the Rector elect has appointed as his Assessor Ms Sarah Beattie-Smith with effect from 1 March 2012.

Ms Beattie-Smith has been the Assessor for the current Rector since 7 September 2009. She studied Sculpture at Edinburgh College of Art, graduating in 2006 and went on to serve two terms as President of the Students Union, leading campaigns, representing the student body on the Board of Governors and strengthening the College's position within the National Union of Students. In 2008, Sarah was elected to the Steering Committee of NUS Scotland which she chaired for two years.

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2012

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

Principal's Report

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

International

Latin America

As Court will be aware the University is opening an office to support our engagement with Latin America. Recruitment for the Head of Office post is underway and an International Dean will also be appointed to support strategic development in the region.

The Director of the International Office visited Brazil, Mexico and Colombia in January 2012 for further discussions and to scope the most appropriate location for the office or offices.

India

In January 2012, scientists from the University, the Indian Institute of Science (IISc) and the National Centre for Biological Sciences (NCBS) held an Edinburgh Bangalore Life Science Symposium to discuss topics such as autism, stem cell research, infectious diseases and memory loss. The event in Bangalore built on connections previously formed between the three institutions.

I attended many of the events which were very successful and also visited the United Theological College which has long-term links with New College and signed a Letter of Intent with the Indian Department of Biotechnology.

While in India I also visited the Madras Christian College in Chennai and signed an MoU with the Indian Institute of Technology Madras, met with the Vice Chancellor of the University of Calcutta and in New Delhi had meetings with the Dean of Maulana Azad Medical College and officials from the Ministry of Science and Technology.

.

Africa

Professor Paul Nugent and Dr Thomas Molony represented the University in Dar-es-Salaam at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the independence of Tanzania on 7 December 2011.

North America

The special relationship with North American institutions was further consolidated by the formal launch of the North America Liaison Office within the International Office in the Playfair Library in January. This office will coordinate activities in and concerning the United States and Canada. Professors Frank Cogliano and Brendan Corcoran have been designated Deans International (North America). In support of the launch, the University is offering five new undergraduate scholarships (Principal's North America Scholarships) worth £5,000 per year to students from North America.

International Visits to the University in December 2011 and January 2012

- National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Japan

- University of Toronto
- University of KwaZulu Natal, South Africa
- Yale
- University of Melbourne
- Head of Romanian Academy of Medical Sciences
- Iraq Embassy
- South China University of Technology
- Aarhus University, Denmark
- Fulbright Scholars
- Australia National University
- Foreign Office Minister for Afghanistan
- NUI Galway

Related meetings

In addition to my participation in the Indian activities I have chaired a number of panels of the French equivalent to REF, the IDEFI, during January and February. This is proving very worthwhile and a great complement to the knowledge gained through my work with the German Excellence Initiative.

I was also very pleased to welcome to the University the first delegates on an intensive two week programme on “Low Carbon Economic Policy and Implementation” delivered by the Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Innovation and the Business School. The 25 delegates are senior Chinese Officials from the Chinese National Development and Reform Commission and the UK Foreign & Commonwealth Office.

UK

Pay Settlement

The national pay negotiations between the Universities & Colleges Employers’ Association and the Higher Education trade unions reached an acknowledged conclusion in January. The final settlement, a consolidated increase of £150 on each spine point, has been implemented to all eligible staff from January 2012.

Scotland

University Applications Figures

The University has very positive UCAS applications figures to report with overall undergraduate applications up by 15% compared with last year. This is particularly notable in comparison to the sector wide figures which show a drop of 7 per cent.

Applications are up by 15 per cent from those living in Scotland, 3 per cent from England and 23 per cent from Wales. The only decrease in applications is from those living in Northern Ireland. Our European Union and overseas applications have also risen by 24 per cent and 33 per cent respectively.

Constitutional Change Consultations

I’m sure that Court will be aware that consultation exercises are currently taking place by both the UK and Scottish Government on questions related to constitutional change. Professor Charlie Jeffery, Vice Principal Public Policy, is leading on these for the University and I am sure you will have the opportunity to discuss this at the coming Court Seminar.

European Investment Bank Loan Funding

Court will be pleased to note that the agreement to borrow £50 million from the European Investment Bank (EIB) was sealed at an event in the Playfair Library Hall on the 23rd January 2012. This is a significant and most welcome arrangement with the funds being used for capital projects across the University.

Director of Finance

Some Court members may be aware of Jon Gorrings' decision to demit office later this year. Jon has been an exemplary Director of Finance for the University and he will be very much missed. We are already working to recruit a replacement who we aim to have in post in good time to enable some overlap with Jon.

Bongo Club

Court may have seen the recent publicity concerning the Bongo Club who have leased part of Moray House from the University for a number of years. The decision has been taken as a lease has expired on the current premises used by the Office of Lifelong Learning (OLL) but also because of a pressing need to bring together the separate sections for the OLL in an improved space. The location within Moray House is the most appropriate solution available to the University. We have been in communication with the Bongo Club on this since November of last year and have also given them more notice than we are contractually obliged in order to accommodate their Festival programme. We will continue to provide what support is available to us to aid their search for new premises.

Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR)

Court will be pleased to learn that the ELIR review led by Assistant Principal Tina Harrison has resulted in an outcome of 'confidence' with no caveats, the highest level of outcome possible. The draft report has now been received for checking of factual accuracy and the overall outcome will not change between the draft and the final report. The final report will be received by the University in April 2012 and will be presented for information to the May meeting of Court.

Loyal Address

Court will no doubt be interested to note that the University has been invited to present a Loyal Address to Her Majesty The Queen on the occasion of her Diamond Jubilee at Buckingham Palace at the end of March.

Related meetings

Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Sustainable Growth John Swinney has attended a number of events at the University recently and earlier this month Dr Andy Kerr and myself met with Mr Swinney to update him on the plans and progress with the Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Innovation. Mr Swinney was most helpful and there are likely to be further discussions on this.

I also met Cabinet Secretary Mike Russell on a number of occasions and the First Minister at the recent National Economic Forum on Youth Employment.

I had a successful meeting with the Rt. Hon. David Willetts MP, Minister of State for Universities and Science in January to discuss strategy on large European funding bids. We also welcomed the Minister to the University last week for the launch of Hector Phase 3 and Blue Gene/Q computers.

University News

Low Carbon Enterprise & Innovation Showcase The Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Innovation (ECCI) held a very successful showcase event in January for businesses, investors, entrepreneurs, senior corporate executives and policy makers from across Scotland and Europe. The keynote introduction was given by Minister for the Environment & Climate Change, Stewart Stevenson MSP.

Major boost for company creation The University has secured a major investment deal to commercialise its research. Investment firm MTI is to invest in companies and commercialisation projects emerging from three universities - Edinburgh, Manchester and University College London. MTI will create a new venture capital fund, called the Orion Fund, which will invest up to £150 million into ventures at the three institutions.

Postgraduate funding boost The University is to benefit from a UK-wide investment of £67 million in postgraduate training and development in the biosciences. The funding from the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) includes around £10.2 million for 102 studentships in Scotland.

Of this, around £7.2 million will go to the EastBio partnership, with 72 studentships over three years. The partnership incorporates the Universities of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Dundee and St Andrews.

Research in the News:

- Researchers from the University will use a software technique called **text mining to survey thousands of digitised documents**. Historians and computing experts will use bespoke software to trawl thousands of historic documents for details of trade movements between Britain and the rest of the World in the 19th century. The project will detail the economic and environmental impact of shipping valuable commodities such as building materials, tea, fruit, and spices.
- **Protein study helps superbug battle** - Scientists have shed light on the way superbugs such as MRSA are able to become resistant to antibiotics. Researchers have mapped the complex molecular structure of an enzyme found in many bacteria. These molecules - known as restriction enzymes - control the speed at which bacteria can acquire resistance to drugs and eventually become superbugs.
- **iPad game to help children with autism** - Children with autism as young as 18 months could be helped to improve their socialising skills thanks to a new iPad app. Education and Informatics researchers from the University of Edinburgh have collaborated on the game, the first ever attempt to fuse autism research with iPad gaming. FindMe is a simple game that challenges children to find an onscreen character in different scenarios. Using the iPad's touch screen, players simply tap the character to move onto the next, more complex level.
- **Scientists map frontiers of dark matter** - University astronomers have helped to map dark matter on the largest scale ever observed. Their findings reveal the Universe as an intricate web of dark matter and galaxies spanning more than one billion light years. An international team of researchers including Dr Catherine Heymans from the University studied images of about 10 million galaxies in four different regions of the sky.

External Recognition:

- Leading historian Professor Tom Devine has been awarded the **RSE Beltane Senior Prize for Public Engagement 2012**. The award recognises excellence in engaging the public with academic research. Professor Devine was the Sir William Fraser Professor of Scottish

History and Palaeography at the University of Edinburgh until this year. He now holds the post of Senior Research Professor in History, focusing on new research and supporting Scotland's future generation of history researchers.

- Mike Elsby, Professor of Economics, has received a **Philip Leverhulme Prize** worth £70,000 which recognises and rewards outstanding scholars of international standing who have the potential to achieve even more.

Royal honours for staff

A number of University staff and associates have been recognised in the **New Year's Honours List**:

- Alan Bundy, Professor of Automated Reasoning, was awarded a CBE for services to computer reasoning.
- Stuart Haszeldine, Scottish Power Professor of Carbon Capture and Storage, received an OBE for services to climate change technologies.
- Mr Brian Cameron, Technical Support Officer with the School of GeoSciences, was also honoured with an MBE for services to science engagement in Scotland.
- Mr Gordon MacKinlay, Child Life and Health Senior Lecturer, was awarded an OBE for services to paediatric surgery.
- Professor Ursula Martin, a Visiting Professor with the School of Informatics, received the CBE for services to computer science.
- Dr Frances Dow, Honorary Fellow in History, was awarded a CBE for services to UK/US relations and the Marshall Scholarships.
- Dr James Roy Robertson MBE, part-time Reader in General Practice with the Centre for Population Health Sciences, earned the LVO.

The University of Edinburgh

University Court

20 February 2012

Vice Principal Designations

Senior Vice Principal and Vice Principal Planning, Resources & Research Policy

Given the retirement of Professor Nigel Brown later this year I now request Court to appoint an existing Vice Principal as Senior Vice Principal and to permit me to advertise internally a 0.5 FTE as Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy.

In order to be as expeditious as possible I wish to request Court to appoint Vice Principal External Engagement Professor Mary Bownes as Senior Vice Principal. Vice Principal Bownes currently manages her full time wide ranging portfolio with great skill and dexterity. She is a very experienced member of the senior team with over 9 years at the senior level of the University and I feel will make a valuable contribution as Senior Vice Principal. Vice Principal Bownes will work with Senior Vice Principal Brown to ensure a smooth transfer at a point to be agreed and finalised later this year.

The internal recruitment exercise for the role of Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy will start in late Spring which will again allow good time for a full handover period. To confirm that the Vice Principal with this designation will lead CMG and is anticipated to be the CMG nomination on the Finance & General Purposes Committee.

Vice Principal Academic Enhancement

Some Court members may be aware that Professor Dai Hounsell, Vice Principal Academic Enhancement, intends to retire in late 2012. I am sure that Court will join me in acknowledging the great service that Professor Hounsell has given to the University of Edinburgh including his current work on the new personal tutor system.

The Vice Principal Academic Enhancement is a critical role for the University and for this reason I wish to request Court's permission to undertake an internal recruitment exercise to appoint a successor. Again I see this starting in late Spring to allow good time for a smooth transition period.

When appropriate it is the intention to update the designated Authority Schedule as detailed below:

Authorised deputies in the absence of the Principal:

Interaction with the Scottish Funding Council, UK Research Councils and the Scottish Government – Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy in consultation with the Director of Planning.

Interaction with Charities and EU funding bodies – Senior Vice Principal or relevant Head of College.

Interaction with the Russell Group and UUK - Senior Vice Principal.

Interaction with Scottish Enterprise – policy matters: Director of Corporate Services; specific projects - Director of Finance.

Interaction with Universities Scotland, Universitas 21, the press and media and EUSA – University Secretary.

Interaction with the City of Edinburgh Council – Director of Corporate Services.

Interaction with LERU (League of European Research Universities) – Vice Principal International.

Major Gifts – Vice Principal External Engagement.

REF - Vice Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy.

Interaction with Scottish Parliament and MSPs – Vice Principal Public Policy.

Interaction with Quality Assurance Agency – Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance.

Recruitment and retention of key College staff – relevant Head of College in consultation with Senior Vice Principal.

Recruitment and retention of key Support Group staff – University Secretary.

Response to emergencies with clear health and safety aspects – Director of Corporate Services.

Matters normally requiring the Principal's approval, not covered above, which clearly relate to the remit of a senior officer (Head of College or Support Group or Vice Principal) – the relevant senior officer in consultation with the University Secretary, Senior Vice Principal or the Director of Corporate Services as appropriate.

Response to all other events requiring urgent action not covered above and coordination of interactions and responses with multiple dimensions – University Secretary or Senior Vice Principal as appropriate.

I seek Court's approval for these changes.

TMMO'S
February 2012

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

**Report of the Finance and General Purposes Committee
(Comments on the Report of the Central Management Group's meeting of 25 January
2012)**

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 6 February 2012 from the Central Management Group of its meeting of 25 January 2012. Comments made by the F&GP Committee are incorporated in boxes within the report at relevant points.

Action requested

The Court is invited to approve the revised terms of reference for the Health and Safety Committee and to note the remaining items 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 2012

Central Management Group

25 January 2012

1 PROPOSAL FOR SPECIAL FEE INCENTIVE SCHEME FOR ONLINE DISTANCE LEARNING PROGRAMMES

The proposal to treat fee income from students on ODL programmes as defined in the paper whether DEI funded or not commencing after 2011/2012 or later outwith NPRAS was approved; fee income would be allocated on a non-recurrent basis, 80% to the College of the School owning the programme and the remaining 20% split across the three Support Groups in the proportions detailed in the paper.

2 QUARTERLY HEALTH AND SAFETY REPORT (Appendix 1)

CMG noted the report which highlighted no specific areas of concern.

The Committee noted the benchmarking work underway in respect of the number of incidents reported.
--

3 HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE: TERMS OF REFERENCE (Appendix 2)

CMG endorsed the proposed amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Health and Safety Committee and recommended approval to Court.

The Committee recommended to Court approval of the proposed amendments to the terms of reference of the Health and Safety Committee which were largely minor changes to membership.

4 CHANGES IN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT LAW AFFECTING UNIVERSITY PURCHASING

CMG noted the revised threshold levels for advertising in OJEU and that approval continued to be required from the Director of Procurement for plans of purchases of over £50,000 to ensure appropriate procurement practice. CMG further noted the current consultation on draft EU Directives.

5 SHARED ACADEMIC TIMETABLING PROJECT – UPDATE (Appendix 3)

There was strong support for the important work being taken forward by this project. It was suggested that further consideration could perhaps be given to having available learning space from 8.00am and at weekends; it was confirmed that this issue had been raised and that further information was being sought before exploring this further. It was also suggested that it may be helpful to undertake an equality and diversity impact assessment.

The Committee welcomed this progress report from the shared academic timetabling project, endorsed the suggestions of the Central Management Group to extend the time of available learning space and noted the importance of this project to improving the student experience. It was further noted in taking this project forward specific support had been provided to ECA and that the CMG would continue to monitor this project and report thereon to this Committee and Court.

6 FEES STRATEGY GROUP REPORT (CLOSED)

Health and Safety Quarterly Report 2011/2012

Appendix 1

Quarterly reporting period: 1st October 2011 – 31st December 2011

Accidents and Incidents

Type of Accident/Incident	Qtr 1 Oct '11 – 31 Dec '11	Qtr 1 Oct '10 – 31 Dec '10	Year to Date 1 Oct '11 – 31 Dec '11	Year to Date 1 Oct '10 – 31 Dec '10
Fatality	0	0	0	0
Specified Major Injury	1	2	1	2
> 3 day Absence	1	2	1	2
Public to Hospital	4	1	4	1
Reportable Dangerous Occurrences	0	1	0	1
Diseases	0	1	0	1
Total Reportable Accidents / Incidents	6	7	6	7
Total Non-Reportable Accidents / Incidents	116	112	116	112
Total Accidents / Incidents	122	119	122	119

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

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

- Undergraduate tripped on kerb twisting ankle. IP attended hospital for treatment. *(Public to Hospital)*
- Undergraduate inserted glass pipette into pipette filler. The pipette shattered in IP's hand resulting in lacerations and nerve damage to hand and fingers. IP attended hospital for treatment. Students have been demonstrated correct technique and consideration is being given to the use of plastic pipettes where appropriate. *(Public to Hospital)*
- Employee was struck on head and neck by table which had been propped up against a wall during a furniture moving operation. The IP had pushed a chair against the wall which then caused the table to fall. IP was unconscious briefly and was taken to hospital as a precaution. *(SMI)*
- Undergraduate was sitting at a bench then stood up quickly, and struck her head on the support bracket of an electrical supply box, positioned on the wall. IP felt dizzy and nauseous and was taken to hospital as a precaution. *(Public to Hospital)*
- Postgraduate was splashed on face and neck by solution of dichloromethane, resin and dilute acid, whilst mixing a solution. The cap of the container came off due to build-up of pressure, causing a small amount to be released. IP washed area for 10 minutes and was taken to hospital as a precaution. The risk assessment for this activity has been updated and full face masks are to be used when volatile substances are being mixed in sealed containers. *(Public to Hospital)*
- Employee caught two fingers in the door when leaving a room and sustained a severe cut to index finger causing damage to the bone. IP was taken to hospital. The door was not defective and is not fitted with a door closer. *(>3 Day Injury)*

Accidents & Incidents

Quarterly period: 01/10/2011 – 31/12/2011

Year to Date Period: 01/10/2011 – 31/12/2011

(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	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	6	6	7	7
Science & Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	34	34	36	36
Medicine & Veterinary Med.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	33	33	33
SASG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
Corporate Services Group	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	3	40	40	43	43
ISG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
Other Units	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
UNIVERSITY	-	-	1	1	1	1	4	4	-	-	-	-	6	6	116	116	122	122

* Units noted below taken from organisational hierarchy report 03/08/11 - <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/governance-strategic-planning/organisational-hierarchy/current-org-hierarchy>

SASG: Student and Academic Services Group: Biological Services, Communications and Marketing, Development and Alumni, Governance and Strategic Planning, Student and Academic Services, Student Recruitment and Admissions, Student Services

ISG: Information Services Group: Applications, Digital Curation Centre, EDINA & Data Library, Information Services Corporate, Infrastructure, Library and Collections, User Services Division

CSG: Corporate Services Group: Accommodation Services, Centre for sport and Exercise, Corporate Services Group, Edinburgh Research and Innovation, Edinburgh University Press, Estates and Buildings, Finance, Human Resources, Internal Audit, Procurement Office (inc. Printing Services)

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

REPORT FROM THE MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE, HELD ON THURSDAY, 13TH OCTOBER 2011

1. FRINGE / FESTIVAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ARRANGEMENTS

Significant improvements in planning and implementation for festival events have taken place since 2009, when Sygma Safety Ltd., a specialist event health and safety consultant were initially contracted. Improvements include communication and cooperation between the relevant groups / stakeholders, pedestrian / traffic interface in and around Bristo Square and the introduction of Venue Standard Operating Procedure documents for all relevant buildings.

The University's focus on fringe / festival issues and the utilisation of Sygma Safety's services has helped to ensure the University is in a stronger position in overseeing the management of health and safety within University buildings during festival events. The services of Sygma Safety have been retained for another 3 years by the Festivals Office to offer continuing expert assistance during the immediate run up to and for the duration of the August fringe / festival events.

2. UNIVERSITY EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBERS

The University's emergency procedure is being reviewed for those circumstances involving a casualty who requires medical attention. In such circumstances the emergency services telephone operator requires to speak directly with the person dealing with the casualty in order to receive ongoing information on the status of the injured person, and to give specific advice on how to assist them, before further medical assistance arrives. Discussions are taking place between Health and Safety, Security and Telephones to identify the most effective means of achieving this.

3. ACCIDENT IN OLD COLLEGE

An accident which took place earlier this year involving a child, who was a guest at a wedding in the Playfair Library, Old College resulted in the child sustaining a fracture to her leg. This accident was reported to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and an inspector from HSE visited the site as part of their formal accident investigation. The HSE Inspector found no fault with the arrangements in place in the Playfair Library for the wedding in question. The University's liability insurers also carried out an accident investigation, and concluded that they would seek to repudiate any civil claim for damages made in relation to this unfortunate incident.

4. RADIATION PROTECTION UNIT ANNUAL REPORT 2010/2011

The University Radiation Protection Adviser (URPA) presented the Radiation Protection Unit (RPU) Annual Report 2010/2011. There were no serious incidents or personal doses in excess of the derived maximum permissible limits during this reporting period.

A number of routine visits were made by the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and by the Counter Terrorist Security Adviser from Lothian and Borders Police.

RADIATION PROTECTION UNIT ANNUAL REPORT 2010/2011 (cont.)

The URPA discussed the number of new and modified applications for Radioactive Substances Act Certificates currently being processed, noting the significant time resource required by the RPU to prepare these applications, and the significant timeframe required by SEPA to process them.

An online web training package for Radiation Protection Supervisors (RPSs) is currently under development. It was noted that the RPU loaned a number of pieces of radiation equipment at short notice to Japan for monitoring purposes following issues with the Fukushima nuclear reactor site.

5. AON PARTNERSHIP AUDITING PROGRAMME

The next phase of health and safety audits undertaken by Aon Risk Services, in partnership with the Health and Safety Department, will consider the risks associated with international travel. This exercise will consider risk assessments, travel insurance and travel arrangements as well as the potential for coordinating travel with sustainability issues and has had key input from the Director of the International Office.

6. CASE OF REPORTABLE DISEASE

The Occupational Health Manager noted a case of occupational asthma which was reportable to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations (RIDDOR) 1995.

7. HSE VISITS

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) has made a number of visits to the University in the last few months. An HSE Inspector from the Field Operations Division, carried out a formal accident investigation into the accident in the Playfair Library, Old College (item 4. above). An HSE Occupational Hygienist visited a number of Schools as part of an information gathering exercise, on control of work with nanoparticles and nanotubes, which the HSE is conducting across UK universities. A Visiting Officer from the local Edinburgh HSE office, carried out a satisfactory slips, trips and falls visit to Easter Bush Veterinary Centre, taking the opportunity afforded by a previous RIDDOR Reportable accident, to demonstrate their expertise in this area.

An HSE Biological Agents Unit (BAU) Specialist Inspector visited all of the University's working Containment Level (CL) 3 laboratories, the highest level of containment operating at this University. Reports from this visit have now been received from the HSE. The interface between local operation of the CL3 facility, and Estates and Buildings' responsibility for ventilation which is part of the fabric of the building, was highlighted as an area which had potential for improvement.

In April 2012 the HSE will introduce a charging regime for visits which result in enforcement action, for example a letter or a Prohibition / Improvement Notice being served on an organisation.

8. UNIVERSITY WATER POLICY

The University's drinking water policy introduced in 2009 is currently being reviewed. The University has retained the services of Dr. Nick Hill from the Water Hygiene Centre to advise on all aspects of water management and work has begun on revising the University's arrangements, including those for the routine microbiological testing of drinking water together with maintenance, inspection and temperature testing.

9. BIOSAFETY TRAINING INSTITUTE

The University of Edinburgh's Biosafety Training Institute (BTI), an accredited biosafety training centre formed originally as a strategic alliance between a number of Scottish Universities, under the banner of the CHASTE Project, continues to offer 5-day Level 1 biosafety training courses. These courses are now UoE/BTI branded, have been well attended and have received very positive feedback. A number of candidates, who also fulfil specified criteria on length of experience, have gone on to register with the Institute of Safety in Technology and Research (ISTR) as Biosafety Practitioners. Further courses are planned and work continues on presenting part or all of the accredited course as an e-learning package.

The future arrangements regarding the accreditation of this Level 1 course are under review by the Institute of Safety in Technology and Research (ISTR). A Level 2 Biosafety Professional accreditation scheme is also under development by ISTR.

10. EDINBURGH COLLEGE OF ART

The Committee was informed of the health and safety arrangements in place following the merger with the Edinburgh College of Art. The College of Art previously had a part-time Safety Adviser, and this role will be advertised shortly following the resignation of the previous post holder.

Consideration will be given to the appointment of an academic member of staff from the College of Art, on Health and Safety Committee, to increase the representation from those working within teaching / research.

The University of Edinburgh

Central Management Group

25 January 2012

Revised Terms of Reference for the University Health and Safety Committee

Brief description of the paper

This paper sets out proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference for the University Health and Safety Committee. Discussions with Trade Union colleagues over the last two to three years, coupled with a further Review of Effectiveness of the Committee, have indicated the need for these revisions.

As a requirement of University Court, in order to ensure a consistent format is used on all corporate Committees, the University Health and Safety Committee is required to use a recommended format for the Terms of Reference. The Director of Health and Safety produced the original Terms of Reference for the University Health and Safety Committee in liaison with the Policy and Planning Section, in April 2007.

In light of the agreement by the Committee to the changes to the membership proposed at the last meeting, the Terms of Reference for the University Health and Safety Committee has now been amended to include these changes.

The most significant changes are:

1. The number of Trade Union places on the Committee increases from 3 to 4, to continue to accommodate all of the Unions with which the University negotiates, with the addition of a seat for a representative from the Joint Union Liaison Committee (JULC)
2. One additional management representative has been added to the Committee to represent the Student Services area.
3. The University Radiation Protection Adviser will no longer be a member of the Committee, but will be asked to attend and report, as will other similar senior specialists from the Health and Safety Department, as and when required.

The proposed new Terms of Reference are presented with all amendments highlighted.

Action requested

CMG is requested to note the content of this paper, and to recommend to Court approval of the revised version of the Health and Safety Committee's Terms of Reference.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

No direct resource implications.

Risk Assessment

Not relevant.

Equality and Diversity

No particular equality and diversity implications attach to the above.

Any other relevant information

None

Originator of the paper

Alastair G. Reid, Director of Health and Safety, 3rd October 2011

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

1. Purpose

To **contribute to the development of** policy, and monitor performance in all areas of occupational safety and health within the University.

2. Composition

2.1 The Committee shall be comprised as follows:

- (i) Ex-officio members: The Director of Corporate Services (Convener), Director of Health and Safety, Deputy Director of Health and Safety, Occupational Health Manager, and the Physician in Charge of the University Health Service.
- (ii) Subject area representatives – University staff with particular expertise or interest in health and safety matters to reflect the range of disciplines within and hence the risk profile of, the University: **biological / biomedical sciences, physical sciences, veterinary sciences, catering / residences, information technology, estates and buildings, and low risk (office type) environments.**
- (iii) Trade Union representatives: Each of the three recognised Trade Unions (UCU, UNISON and UNITE) will nominate one representative to be a member of this Committee; **one additional joint representative of the three recognised trade unions will also be nominated by the Joint Unions Liaison Committee (JULC).**
- (iv) Up to **four** management representatives. These currently come from the following areas; Estates and Buildings, Human Resources, **Student Services.**
- (v) A representative of the Students' Association. This will normally be the President of the Students' Association who will remain a member of the Committee for the length of his/her term of office.
- (vi) A legal expert specialising in occupational safety and health.

2.2 Membership is compliant with the requirements of the Safety Committees and Safety Representatives Regulations.

2.3 All non-ex officio members of this Committee will be invited to join the Committee by the Convener and will be appointed for a period of three years, renewable up to a normal maximum of two consecutive terms of office.

2.4 The Director of Corporate Services shall be the Convener of this Committee. **The Director of Health and Safety will deputise as the Convener should the Convener be absent for the duration of the meeting.**

2.5 The **Director** / Deputy Director of Health and Safety shall act as Secretary to the Committee.

2.6 All members of the Health and Safety Committee are expected to comply with the University's Code of Conduct as set out in the University's Handbook and

declare any interests which may conflict with their responsibilities as Members of the Health and Safety Committee.

- 2.7 Other individuals from within or outwith the University may also be invited to attend meetings from time to time to provide the Committee with information on specific items on the agenda.

3. Meetings

- 3.1 The Committee will meet as required to fulfil its remit and will meet at least twice in each academic session.
- 3.2 Minutes, agendas and papers will normally be circulated to members of the Committee at least five days in advance of the meeting. Late papers may be circulated up to two days before the meeting. Only in the case of extreme urgency and with the agreement of the Convener will papers be tabled at meetings of the Committee.
- 3.3 Non-contentious or urgent matters not on the agenda may be considered at a meeting subject to the agreement of the Convener of the meeting and the majority of members present.
- 3.4 Papers will indicate the originator/s and purpose of the paper, the matter/s which the Committee is being asked to consider and any action/s required and confirm the status of the paper in respect of freedom of information legislation.
- 3.5 Eight members of the Committee shall be a quorum. This number must include the Convener or the Director of Health and Safety.
- 3.6 A formal minute will be kept of proceedings and submitted for approval at the next meeting of the Committee. The draft minute will be agreed with the Convener of the Committee prior to circulation and in the case of the absence of the Convener at a meeting the Committee member appointed to act as Convener for the duration of that specific meeting.
- 3.7 Where necessary the Committee may also function between meetings through correspondence and any decision(s) taken formally ratified at the next meeting of the Committee.

4. Remit

- 4.1 To oversee the implementation and operation of the University's health and safety policy and arrangements, to ensure that key risks are identified, and that appropriate control measures are implemented.
- 4.2 To ensure that a suitable health and safety management structure is in place within the University, to maximise the protection of the health of staff, students and visitors.

- 4.3 To encourage the sharing of best practice within the University community with regard to occupational safety and health, and **wellbeing**, and providing a forum for discussion of issues of concern.
- 4.4 To monitor health and safety performance throughout the University, to ensure satisfactory legislative compliance.
- 4.5 To ensure that senior management is fully informed with regard to significant issues and developments in occupational safety and health, to ensure compliance with legislative and common law requirements.

5. Other

- 5.1 The Committee will from time to time undertake a review of its own performance and effectiveness as part of the overall review of Court and its Committees and report thereon to Court.
- 5.2 In order to fulfil its remit the Committee may obtain external professional advice as necessary.
- 5.3 Reports on the main points discussed at each meeting will be provided to the subsequent meeting of the Central Management Group and thereafter reported to the Finance and General Purposes Committee and Court.
- 5.4 Membership of the Committee will be published on the University's website in accordance with the University's agreed publication scheme.

Shared Academic Timetabling Project – Update
D. Laurenson, L. Bondi and M. Ritchie; 13th January, 2012

Status update

- The project has successfully completed the procurement phase (STU192) of the Shared Academic Timetabling Project with a contract being awarded to Scientia Ltd to supply Syllabus Plus Enterprise and consultancy services. The total contract value over 5 years is £390,328 which is within the overall budget of £400,000.
- Recruitment has been completed for the new Timetabling Unit in Academic Registry. The team are Scott Rosie (Timetabling & Learning Space manager), Ben Poots (Timetabling Support manager), Robert Garnett (Timetabling Support Senior Administrator) and Carol Anne Marshall (Timetabling Support Administrator).
- In preparation for implementation, room data have been collected in cooperation with the schools to augment the room information currently held in EBIS. School contacts have been identified, and detailed data for course teaching events, in addition to those listed in DRPS, is currently being collected.
- Details of interfaces required with external systems, e.g. the Student record system, Estates room data, Staff records and the College of MVM room booking and course systems, are being analysed.
- A Business User group and a Technical User group have been set up to strengthen communication links with schools.
- The timetabling policy has been approved by the Curriculum & Student Progression Committee on November 24th.
- The development environments have been set-up for Information Services, and for the Timetabling Unit. These are being used for development work and demonstrations.

Future plans

- User training is planned for February, close to the Go-Live date. Users will be able to work with the room and class information that has previously been supplied to the project during this training.
- The system is planned to go live on 26th March, 2012 to deal with bookings for the academic year 2012/13, and the summer of 2012.
- On 28th May, EBIS room booking will be switched off.
- The Extended Implementation phase will follow on immediately from the Minimum Change phase, and will aim to provide personalised timetables for students, improved course planning tools, a replacement for Timetab with more complete information, and reporting tools for gathering management information.

Risks and Issues

The risk log lists 20 specific risks to be managed. Of these, the following are currently flagged as being Amber, and are being mitigated by reducing the risk wherever possible.

Risk	Impact	Probability	Mitigation
Data quality and size of data collection and integration task is too large	Medium	Medium	Minimise data collection in transition year to essential data items. Resources are available to support implementation at School level including data entry tasks
Data integration with existing systems is too complex	Medium	Low	Detailed analysis of integration tasks to confirm requirements. Use of less frequent or less complex solutions favoured for minimum change implementation

Edinburgh College of Art requires extra support - as still catching up after recent Merger	Medium	Medium	Provide additional support to ECA to complete room data collection and activity data collection
Resource conflict within IS Apps	High	Medium	Timetabling is flagged as a priority 1 project and action has been taken to protect all IS project resources. There are however a number of concurrent priority 1 activities within IS, thus IS resourcing will continue to be closely monitored.
Delays in completing work required to integrate system with the University of Edinburgh authentication solution EASE	Medium	Medium	Monitor progress at Oxford University, who are developing a similar solution for implementation in March ahead of the UoE go live. Scientia have agreed that will withhold the November 2011 contract payment while this work is incomplete.
Client compatibility issues with Windows XP PCs and Apple Macintosh computers	Medium	Medium	Coordinate with Window 7 depolyment team, and school Computing Officers, to prioritise timetable application users. Testing of Apple Macintosh clients to be carried out within IS and through the Technical User group members.

The risk log is reviewed by the project team every week and by the project board when it meets (approximately every six weeks). On reviewing the risk log, and project status, the December meeting of the project board made the decision to proceed with the go-live date in March 2012.

Unforeseen issues that arise in the final weeks up to the go-live date will be managed through a risk reduction strategy, with the aim of meeting the go-live date. However, should a major unforeseen issue arise that precludes going live in March 2012, the final decision will be made at the project board meeting on 1st February. Plans are in place to delay the go-live to October 2012 or March 2013.

External reviews

The project has been reviewed by Valuta in June 2011, who made 12 recommendations. These were presented to the project board, and have been acted upon. This included the appointment of Dr Peter Kemp, former Director of Information Services at Stirling University, to the project board as an external expert.

In December 2011 the project was reviewed by Internal Audit, and this review will result in further recommendations. This report will be presented to the project board when it is finalised. The draft recommendations have been helpful in sharpening some of the points made by Valuta and are being acted upon by the project team.

Financial summary

The following table indicates the actual spend, and projected spend during the lifetime of the project:

Item (all figures in £K)	Budget	Total spend	Variance	Contingency	TOTAL
FY:10/11	106	124	18	4	14
FY:11/12	818	776	-42	162	-204
FY:12/13	628	669	41	122	-81
FY:13/14	169	181	12	31	-19
Total	1721	1750	29	319	-290

The overspend in 2010/11 is a result of bringing forward tasks from 2011/12 into the procurement process. The underspend in 2011/12 is due to a lower level of school support than anticipated for the minimum change implementation going live in March 2012. It is expected that this resource will be required for the more complex extended implementation taking place in 2012/13. The final spend is projected to be £29k above the budgetary figure, but within the contingency funding set aside for the project.



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Shared Academic Timetabling Policy and Guidance

**Version 2.3.1
November 2011**

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Background	4
2.1	Document Construction and Approval.....	4
2.1.1	Contributors	4
2.1.2	Approval	5
2.1.3	Approval Timeline	5
2.2	Document Structure	5
3	Timetabling Policy	6
3.1	Aims	6
3.2	Governance and Operational Management	6
3.3	Principles of operation.....	7
3.4	Roles and Responsibilities	8
3.5	Teaching Times	10
3.6	Teaching Availability.....	11
3.7	Room Allocation.....	11
3.8	Planning Cycle for Timetabling.....	13
3.9	Innovative Learning Week.....	14
3.10	Course Conflicts	14
3.11	Room Conflict Resolution.....	14
3.12	Ad-hoc Bookings	15
3.13	Changing/Cancelling Bookings	15
3.14	Equality and Diversity	16
3.15	Monitoring and Review.....	16
4	Guidance on Timetable Implementation	17
4.1	Guiding Principles for Effective Timetable Construction	17
4.2	Teaching Availability.....	18
4.3	Room Allocation.....	18
4.4	Timetable Publication	19
5	Glossary of Terms.....	21
6	References	22

1 Executive Summary

The Shared Academic Timetabling Project has developed a timetabling policy as part of the transition to a common shared timetabling solution across the University. The policy has been developed with reference to comparable institutions in addition to current practice across schools and support units.

This document states the proposed timetabling policy that governs the allocation of timetabled learning and teaching activities, and ad-hoc bookings for space that is used for learning and teaching. It covers the aims of the timetabling policy, its governance within the University, and the principles of its operation. The roles and responsibilities of staff and students, with respect to the policy operation, are outlined, as well as the annual timetable of events. The procedures used to allocate spaces to learning and teaching events are stated, along with factors governing the allocation. Performance measures are also presented. In addition, the means of conflict resolution are stated within the policy. In addition to policy, this document also presents guidance on timetable production and maintenance.

The key changes to current practice are:

- Use of a common timetabling solution
- The inclusion of all learning and teaching activities, including those scheduled in School managed rooms
- The inclusion of all rooms, including laboratories, used for learning and teaching in a common room booking system, retaining current management structures
- The use of a common system for room request/booking for all activities, both recurring and ad-hoc, held in a room used for learning and teaching
- Production of draft timetable information for all learning and teaching activity, including those wholly taught in School managed rooms, is completed during the first quarter of the calendar year
- Visibility of full timetable and room information across The University
- Introduction of a resolution route for timetabling conflicts
- Enabling approved constraints in learning and teaching availability to be considered
- Changes to the Curriculum Framework to introduce a variable lunch hour and removal of the 20 minute afternoon break

2 Background

The Shared Academic Timetabling Project will be introducing a shared system to handle academic timetabling and learning and teaching space booking. The potential benefits of a shared system, some of which may be realised only after a number of years of operation, are identified and prioritised in the White Paper (Hulton, October 2010) and are repeated below:

Benefit 1: Student focused, coherent institutional timetabling which enhances student experience

Benefit 2: Improved management information and tools to support the effective use of University resources

Benefit 3: Improvements to the management of curricula and academic timetables

Benefit 4: More effective provision and use of learning and teaching space

Benefit 5: Greater flexibility in managing staff teaching time

Benefit 6: More effective use of administrative staff resources

Benefit 7: Supporting family-friendly policies

Benefit 8: Improved curriculum planning

Given the clear benefits of adopting a common approach to timetabling it is essential that the University decides upon and agrees a Timetabling Policy. Such policies are increasingly common at institutions that have effectively deployed timetabling solutions including other Russell Group institutions such as: University of Liverpool, Kings College London, University of Leeds and University of Warwick. The policies adopted by these institutions have been consulted in the production of this document.

2.1 Document Construction and Approval

2.1.1 Contributors

The Shared Academic Timetabling Project Board and Project Team

Wider University community:

- Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)*

- Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC)

- Space Management Group

- Learning and Teaching Space Advisory Group (LTSAG)

- Estates Committee

- Central room bookings team

- School staff with a role in producing/administering timetables

- School administrators

- Registry

- Estates & Buildings

- Accommodation Services (and other users of learning and teaching space e.g. IALS for Summer Schools)

- Disability Office

Information Services Learning and Teaching Spaces Technology Services
(LTSTS)
Support Groups and Directorates
*Approval group

2.1.2 Approval

The policy has been reviewed and released by the Project Board and CSPC. Following review and feedback from the University community, CSPC will be required to formally endorse the Timetabling Policy by the end of December 2011.

2.1.3 Approval Timeline

It is critical to the Shared Academic Timetabling project's success to have a policy that informs how the system is to be implemented across the University. The policy should ideally be approved no later than December 2011 ahead of the implementation of the new solution for 2012/13.

A detailed approval plan was agreed by the Shared Academic Timetabling Project Board at their meeting on the 23/8/11

2.2 Document Structure

The policy is defined in section 3, with associated guidance documentation presented in section 4. A glossary of terms used within the policy is presented in section 5.

3 Timetabling Policy

3.1 Aims

The document defines University policy, procedures and responsibilities in respect of:

- Production of the shared timetable
- Use of space for learning and teaching activities
- Use of learning and teaching space for other activities

The Timetabling Policy covers the scheduling of all learning and teaching activities, including tutorials, labs and other practical sessions, on University programmes of study delivered across the University estate.

The long-term aims of the Timetabling Policy are to:

- Generate student focused, coherent institutional timetables which enhance student experience
- Improve management information and tools to support the effective use of University resources
- Improve the management of curricula and academic timetables
- Enable more effective provision and use of learning and teaching space
- Create greater flexibility in managing staff teaching time
- Make more effective use of administrative staff resources
- Support family-friendly policies
- Improve curriculum planning

3.2 Governance and Operational Management

Timetabling Policy is overseen by the **Curriculum and Student Progression Committee (CSPC)**. CSPC have responsibility for maintaining the policy and addressing feedback on the policy from across the University.

Academic Registry within Student and Academic Services Group (SASG) has overall responsibility for the day to day management of the Shared Academic Timetabling system.

Timetabling Policy and its implementation is a key aspect of University operations and will be regularly reviewed, initially on an annual basis, by governance groups and committees across the University.

The majority of the learning and teaching spaces are part of the University's estate. Any matters relating to space allocation and utilisation of these spaces at a strategic level are determined by the Senior Vice Principal and Director of Estates and Buildings guided as appropriate by the Space Management Group and Estate Committee. The Senior Vice-Principal, in conjunction with the Director of Estates and Buildings, determine the escalation path for matters relating to room conflict resolution arising from the timetabling process that cannot be resolved at a local level, or by the Timetabling and Learning Spaces Coordinator.

3.3 Principles of operation

P1 - All learning and teaching activities (e.g. lectures, tutorials, labs, workshops, etc.), excluding centrally arranged examinations, are timetabled within the timetabling system, including activities taking place in centrally or School managed rooms, learning and teaching outside of “normal” teaching times, learning and teaching that forms part of the Degree Regulations and Programme of Study (DRPS) and non DRPS activity.

P2 – Room allocation prioritises the use of either School managed or Centrally managed rooms within the same Timetabling Zone as that requested.

P3 – Outwith designated mid-morning and lunch-time breaks, movement between Timetabling Zones (by students and staff) across consecutive teaching slots will be minimised, but may be necessary in exceptional circumstances.

P4 – If booked learning and teaching space is no longer needed, it is cancelled at the earliest opportunity. Charges may be levied for late cancellations or non-use of booked space.

P5 – Except in exceptional circumstances, staff and students should have at least one hour free of learning and teaching commitments between 12:00 and 14:00.

P6 – Student requests for study space (and other ad hoc requests for use of learning and teaching space) are prioritised for a selection of spaces, and supported but subject to restrictions and approval, for other learning and teaching space.

P7 - Exams are integral to the timetable process. Whilst these may continue to be timetabled separately examination events are included in student and staff personal timetables.

3.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The **Timetabling and Learning Space Manager** is the senior manager within Academic Registry responsible for the day to day operation of the Shared Timetabling system. The responsibilities of the Timetabling and Learning Space Manager and the supporting Timetabling Unit include:

- Managing the operation of the shared academic timetabling system
- Liaising with Information Services for software maintenance and upgrade
- Issuing detailed timetabling guidance to Schools
- Supporting schools in the operation of the timetabling system
- Publishing draft and final versions of the shared timetable
- Advising on resolution of conflicts over room bookings
- Ensuring that all learning and teaching room information and availability (for both Centrally and School managed space) is accurate and up to date
- Ensuring that maintenance requirements and use for non learning and teaching events are accurately reflected in room availability
- Reporting to CSPC, LTSAG, Space Management Group, Estates Committee and other interested parties on the effectiveness of Timetabling Policy and implementation
- Collecting, measuring and reporting accurate data on space utilisation offering/seeking guidance on more efficient use of learning and teaching space
- Reviewing the timetabling process and outcomes and initiating continuous improvement

School Timetabling Coordinators are the primary contacts for timetabling within their School responsible for liaising with the Timetabling Unit to book Centrally managed rooms, progress timetabling requirements and resolve timetable conflicts. The responsibilities of School Timetabling Coordinators include:

- Coordinating timetable design and production across undergraduate and postgraduate programmes within their School
- Ensuring that collection, collation and timely recording of information on courses is carried out, including: classes, room requirements and number of students and any constraints on staff availability
- Acting as gatekeeper for School managed rooms
- Carrying out timetabling tasks as required by the stated deadlines.
- Notifying the Timetabling Unit of any changes to the established timetable and room cancellations
- Reporting inaccuracies in learning and teaching room information (for both Centrally and School managed space) to the Timetabling Unit

Teaching staff within each School have responsibility for fulfilling published timetable commitments and keeping their School Timetabling Coordinators informed of cancellations or other changes. Teaching staff also report any problems with their timetable or learning and teaching rooms they use so that this information can be used to improve the overall operation of timetabling at the University. Teaching staff responsibilities include:

- Providing information for, and reviewing their timetable
- Fulfilling their published timetable commitments
- Advising their School Timetabling Coordinators of cancellations or other changes
- Reporting any problems with their timetable or the learning and teaching rooms they use

School Administrators are responsible for management of resources (e.g. staff, budget, space) within the School. Their responsibilities include:

- Ensuring that the School Timetabling Coordinators and support team carries out the timetabling tasks required by the stated deadlines.
- Ensuring that learning and teaching rooms and other School managed resources are accurately recorded in the shared timetabling system

Heads of School are responsible for academic leadership and overall management and strategy of the School including development of academic and resource plans, promotion of research activity. The responsibilities for Heads of School include:

- Negotiation and agreeing any limitations on staff teaching availability.
- Helping to resolve timetabling conflicts impacting on the School

Student responsibilities include:

- Providing details of accessibility requirements as soon as possible.
- Reviewing their published learning and taught timetable as soon as possible and alerting their Director of Studies of any problems.
- Adhering to School or centrally defined procedures for requesting a change to a timetable allocation
- Making appropriate use of any student study spaces bookable through the shared timetabling system

Accommodation Services (commercial and academic-related booking)

responsibilities include:

- Carrying out their normal duties with relation to events booking and ensuring that the Timetabling Unit is aware of any events booked and kept up to date on any cancellations
- Keeping external customers up to date on any changes/conflicts with their booking

3.5 Teaching Times

The standard teaching day is from 9am to 6pm, Monday to Friday. It is recognised that learning and teaching sometimes takes place outside of these hours. For timetabling purposes, 'morning' is defined as any time before 13:00, 'afternoon' is defined as any time between 13:00 and 18:00, and 'evening' is defined as any time after 18:00.

The DAY is divided into 50 minute slots. Within these slots, rooms should be booked for the actual times that they are required (e.g. some may teach for 1.5 hours in a 2 hour slot or for 3 hours in a half-day slot). The existing rule that rooms may not be booked across 11 am and 4 pm except for bookings of at least 3 hours will remain in force.

Single	Double	Half Day
0900-0950	0900-1050	0900-1300
1000-1050		
1110-1200	1110-1300	
1210-1300*		
1310-1400*		
1410-1500	1410-1600	1410-1800
1510-1600		
1610-1700	1610-1800	
1710-1800		
1830-1920	1830-2020	
1930-2020		

*variable lunch hour

Notes

1. Teaching times indicate when the class is scheduled to begin and NOT five minutes later. (e.g. lectures to start at 0900 **and not** 0905). All timetables are to be issued with a statement that "students should be in their seats 5 minutes before the advertised time".
2. There is a 20-minute mid-morning break to facilitate movement between Timetabling Zones.
3. Except in exceptional circumstances, staff and students have at least one hour free of learning and teaching commitments between 12:00 and 14:00.

The WEEK is divided into slots each at a given hour of the day and further subdivided into Monday/Thursday and Tuesday/Friday slots for classes requiring two whole-class sessions (WCS). If three WCS are required, the preferred extra day to maximise flexibility is Wednesday (for morning classes) or Friday/Thursday (for afternoon classes).

Single	Double	Triple (a.m.)	More
Mon	Mon/Thur Tue/Fri	Mon/Wed/Thur	Any
Tue		Tues/Wed/Fri	
Wed		Triple (p.m.)	
Thur		Mon/Thur/Fri	
Fri		Tues/Thur/Fri	

Notes

1. Only in exceptional circumstances will core lecture or class slots be scheduled on Wednesday afternoon when no alternative can be found. Scheduling such a class at this time must be approved by the relevant College Learning and Teaching Committee. This does not preclude schools from offering classes (e.g. laboratories) on a Wednesday afternoon, provided that alternative times are offered at other points in the week.
2. Classes that are outside of the normal teaching times or for greater duration (for example weekend working) should ensure that there is no more than 4 hours of consecutive learning and teaching without a break.

3.6 Teaching Availability

Teaching staff are available for teaching at any time during their contracted teaching day(s) except where restricted by individual agreement with Heads of School in accordance with existing HR guidelines.

Timetabling implementation will allow the incorporation of constraints to enable staff within specified groups to share teaching-free times, e.g. to enable scheduling of research seminars.

3.7 Room Allocation

The University learning and teaching estate is divided between Centrally managed and School managed space.

All learning and teaching space, including lecture theatres, seminar rooms, labs and any other spaces used for learning and teaching purposes is included in the Shared Academic Timetabling system.

All users of the system have read-only access to the schedules of other Schools' space.

Spare capacity in School managed rooms is made available to requests from other Schools. Such requests continue to be managed by the Schools themselves via School Timetabling Coordinators. Normally it is expected that where spare capacity

exists, requests from other schools will be accommodated. Where requests are granted, it is the responsibility of the requesting School to provide any AV and IT support required by its users.

The allocation of rooms is driven by the following factors:

Factor	Performance Measure	Priority
Seating Capacity	% Capacity Allocation	Essential
Essential Equipment	Requested vs Actual	Essential
Locality (Proximity to School)	Allocation/Utilisation of School managed rooms Allocation/Utilisation of Centrally managed rooms Utilisation of rooms within the schools' timetabling zone	Essential
Layout and Furniture	Requested vs Actual	Essential
Accessibility	All requirements can be accommodated	Essential
Licensing	Licensed activities accommodated in Licensed Rooms.	Essential
Continuity	Measure % of course classes running in same room where requested.	Essential
Location	Travel time required between classes	High
Preferred Equipment	Requests met with required equipment, or mobile alternative.	High
Use Type	Requested vs Actual	High
Preference	Requested vs Actual	Medium

Once the timetable has been set for the year, room bookings are confirmed but the Timetabling Unit retains the right to change room allocations in response to evolving resource constraints: such as changes to course enrolment figures, or loss of learning and teaching space in the event of an emergency.

3.8 Planning Cycle for Timetabling

The planning cycle reflects the need for planning to take place in line with information becoming available from academic planning and our corporate systems.

Month	What Happens
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the EUCLID Course Creation Approval and Maintenance CCAM rollover, which occurs in January, the previous year's courses' schedule, but not room allocations, will be rolled forward. Schools make amendments following the roll forwards. School Timetabling Coordinators construct a draft timetable of their own learning and teaching events, including the requirements for Centrally managed rooms. School managed learning and teaching space within Schools is booked immediately via School Timetabling Coordinators.
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centrally managed room requests are submitted to the Timetabling Unit. Requests are submitted for rooms from other Schools where their learning and teaching space meets the needs, and there is availability.
June/July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The shared timetable is published based on estimated numbers of students, and associated rooms have been allocated.
June/July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2nd year and above course selection available. Any required changes to room bookings and staff allocation are investigated and applied.
July/Aug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st year course selection available for programmes starting prior to the main September intake, and Postgraduate Enrolment Any required changes to room bookings and staff allocation are investigated and applied.
1 st September Onwards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk of 1st year courses and Post Graduate courses are selected during Freshers Week Any required changes to room bookings and staff allocation are investigated and applied. Changes to class size or course cancellations are monitored to allow space to be released, should it not be required. Rooms for student study become available for student bookings

Following the creation of the rolled forward timetable for the upcoming academic year, the oldest timetable on the system is archived.

3.9 Innovative Learning Week

Semester 2 is divided into three parts. Teaching blocks 3 and 4 comprise the 11 weeks of standard teaching, and the remaining weeks comprise the exam diet. The Innovative Learning Week, which takes place between Teaching blocks 3 and 4, is booked separately on the Shared Timetabling system according to the following principles:

Priority booking will be given to programmes that have opted out of the Innovative Learning Week, and whose opt-outs have been approved by Curriculum and Student Progression Committee.

After opt-out courses have been allocated, all other bookings are considered.

Booking applications for unique spaces, such as the JCMB Teaching Cluster, are adjudicated by College Deans or their representatives. Other bookings are considered on a first come, first served basis.

3.10 Course Conflicts

Conflicts in the timetable due to conflicts in courses are resolved between School Timetabling Coordinators and any academic staff involved in the organisation of courses. Any timetabling conflict that can not be resolved is escalated to the Heads of Schools in the first instance. If required, the Timetabling and Learning Spaces manager will suggest potential solutions based on curriculum planning scenarios. Ultimately if the conflict cannot be resolved between Schools and the Timetabling and Learning Space Manager, then the conflict is further escalated to the Senior Vice Principal.

3.11 Room Conflict Resolution

Where there is a conflict in availability of a Centrally managed room this is resolved between the Timetabling Unit and the parties concerned. Where there is conflict in availability of a room managed by another School the needs of the owning School generally take precedence. Irreconcilable conflicts are escalated for resolution to the Timetabling and Learning Space Manager and the relevant Heads of Schools.

Ultimately if the conflict cannot be resolved between Schools and the Timetabling and Learning Space Manager, then the conflict is further escalated to the Senior Vice Principal and Director of Estates and Buildings. Where appropriate, precedence set by the outcome from the conflict will feed into this policy to ensure there is clear guidance on conflict resolution and University policy.

3.12 Ad-hoc Bookings

Non learning and teaching events (such as College and School Committee meetings) and Ad-hoc booking requests for learning and teaching spaces can be submitted at any time, but are normally only agreed once the main learning and teaching timetable has been published.

During “vacation time” Edinburgh First including the Festivals Office has priority for bookings, on a pre-agreed selection of rooms, followed by other users of space in the summer e.g. learning and teaching outside the standard academic year, summer schools, ELTC bookings, etc.

3.13 Changing/Cancelling Bookings

Late changes to the published timetable are often detrimental to the student experience and should be largely avoided by the construction of a timetable based on timely and accurate data. Unavoidable changes are to be carried out in the Shared Timetabling System and only be made where the change cannot be accommodated by changing staff/student allocation such as: -

- New accessibility requirements become known
- Change in staffing for unavoidable reason (e.g. staff illness)
- Staff double booking
- Student double booking
- Approved change in staff availability
- Actual number of students exceeds room capacity
- Actual number of students is much smaller than expected, hence would fit in a smaller room freeing a larger room for a larger activity which cannot otherwise be accommodated
- Location becomes unavailable

Where a learning and teaching space is locally managed, bookings must be changed if:

- A room booking is no longer required
- An allocated room is no longer appropriate for the booked event’s requirements
- Learning and teaching cannot proceed in the allocated room as someone else is occupying it (i.e. double booked), there is a lack of required equipment or maintenance is needed.

The Timetabling Unit is to be informed at the earliest opportunity if:

- Courses are cancelled
- A centrally managed room booking is no longer required
- A centrally managed allocated room is no longer appropriate for the booked event’s requirements

- Learning and teaching cannot proceed in a centrally managed allocated room as someone else is occupying it (i.e. double booked), there is a lack of required equipment or maintenance is needed.

3.14 Equality and Diversity

The construction of learning and teaching timetables is carried out in line with the University's Diversity and Equality of Opportunity Policy.

3.15 Monitoring and Review

In support of the guiding principles, the following measures must be put in place:

Policy Aims	Measure
End-user satisfaction with the timetabling and its ease of use.	Survey for staff and students to gauge their satisfaction with the timetabling system and their experience of timetabling.
Support delivery of high quality learning and teaching	Monitoring "Requested" vs "Actual" on all building and zone allocations for core learning and teaching activities
Learning and teaching takes place in most appropriate accommodation	Same as above
Minimise travel across Timetabling Zones, e.g. between Holyrood and George Square	Study of classes across Timetabling Zones and actual student/staff travel involved in an academic year
Shared repository of timetables, room bookings and room availability	Management information from the system on booking data and Staff survey
Personalised timetables	Number of students subscribed to mobile device timetable delivery
Unified approach to timetabling and room booking	Room booking survey carried out and feedback measured
Optimise utilisation of University estate	Room utilisation survey Booking data analysis Management information to allow planning and what if scenarios. Measure against University-set utilisation benchmarks

These measures should be used to drive any improvement initiative to timetabling or changes required to this policy to better reflect the needs of the University.

4 Guidance on Timetable Implementation

In order to achieve all of the Benefits identified, the following guidance should be followed by School Timetabling Coordinators and the Timetabling Unit.

4.1 *Guiding Principles for Effective Timetable Construction*

- All learning and teaching activities are to be scheduled in the Shared Timetabling system
- Learning and teaching activities taking place off-site should also be included where:
 - students will benefit from having the activity as part of a personal timetable; and/or
 - recording the activity aids staff in scheduling other activities for clash-free timetabling.
- Any learning and teaching delivery that forms part of the Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study (DRPS) is scheduled before other non-DRPS requirements.
- Wherever appropriate, timetabling is to match learning and teaching to School managed rooms or suitable rooms within their Timetabling Zones.
- Whole Class Sessions (WCS) where a course event is delivered to all students at once is given first priority when allocating learning and teaching space. Additional activities such as tutorials and lab sessions (that are divided into multiple slots to sub-groups of students) are fitted in around WCS.
- As far as possible, the same learning and teaching space is used for recurring classes.
- In order to limit the impact of travel between zones, movement between zones takes place during the specific time-slot: 10.50-11.10; and during the lunch period.
- When class numbers are known, any booked resource that is no longer required is cancelled as soon as possible.
- Normally, timetabled events are carried forward from year to year provided this doesn't restrict efficiency or flexibility in the curriculum.
- Early production of timetable information is strongly encouraged to enable efficient scheduling of courses in different Schools.

- Space allocated to students for non-timetabled activity, such as studio space, should be recorded in the timetabling system.

4.2 Teaching Availability

Schools may decide to establish and incorporate constraints within the system to ensure that wherever possible individual learning and teaching commitments are suitably blocked and not overly dispersed.

The Shared Academic Timetabling system enables all agreed learning and teaching constraints to be recorded with the system by the School Timetabling Coordinators and used to inform timetabling decisions.

4.3 Room Allocation

Factor	Description	Priority
Seating Capacity	Learning and teaching rooms are allocated on a 'best fit' basis, with a target seating capacity	Essential
Essential Equipment	Room requests for specialist or essential learning and teaching equipment are allocated to classes requiring that equipment first. Specialist equipment includes lab equipment, IT Networking, specific software etc.	Essential
Locality (Proximity to School)	Rooms managed by the School delivering the learning and teaching are allocated as first preference; then Centrally managed rooms within their zone and then rooms managed by other Schools or outside the School's zone.	Essential
Layout and Furniture	The room layout should match that of the learning and teaching session or be configurable to the requirement of the session.	Essential
Accessibility	Where there is a known disability requirement only appropriate rooms are allocated Where such information is brought to light late on in the timetabling process changes to the timetable need to be accommodated and existing bookings re-homed	Essential
Licensing	Rooms with specific licensing are only allocated to appropriate event types (e.g. anatomy and research for VAT exempt rooms).	Essential
Continuity	Regular (full-semester or longer) bookings and short fat (e.g. 5 ½ days back to back learning and teaching) take precedence over single or sporadic bookings	Essential

Factor	Description	Priority
Location	Ideally all classes are scheduled in the same Timetabling Zone. Where travel cannot be avoided, the room is to be within a traversable distance of the other classes a student or member of staff is required to attend, given the time constraints for travel between locations	High
Preferred Equipment	Rooms allocated should have the preferred equipment required to allow staff to conduct their teaching. For example, Wireless Network Access, Audio Visual, White/black Boards, Desktop PCs, lecture capture and clicker response systems. Where fixed equipment is not available, Schools should liaise with LTSTS regarding possible portable alternatives.	High
Use Type	Priority is given to whole class sessions, then Non WCS Tutorials, Labs and other required activities.	High
Preference	Where a preference has been indicated for a specific room, this is booked unless overridden by one of the higher priority factors.	Medium

4.4 Timetable Publication

Timetables are available to those who need them, in a clear and accessible way. The University aims to provide complete, accurate and up-to-date timetables, published in advance of the start of the academic year and maintained throughout the academic year. These will be available through the appropriate University portals.

The Timetabling system will retain 3 years of timetabling information that can be accessed in the normal manner (i.e. the timetable in planning for the upcoming year, the current year's timetable and the previous year's published timetable).

At the end of each planning cycle the oldest year's timetable is archive away from the timetabling system but retained in a format that could be accessed for reporting purposes.

Those who need access to timetables include: -

- Teaching staff
- Students
- Administrative staff
- Building Managers
- Servitors (so they can open buildings and organise room and AV)
- Premises Managers and other E&B staff for maintenance programming
- Events and conferencing staff in Edinburgh First/Accommodation Services

- EUSA events staff
- Any other user that can request University rooms

5 Glossary of Terms

Term	Meaning
Whole class Session (WCS)	A class or learning and teaching event that requires all students to attend.
Class Exam	An examination that is organised within the school and possibly not during the central examination times (i.e. at semester end)
Main diet exam	An examination that is organised centrally and takes place at the end of semester.
Centrally Managed	Rooms or Learning and Teaching Space that is bookable via the Timetabling Unit (previously EBIS room booking team)
School Managed	Rooms or Learning and Teaching Space this is bookable via a School Timetabling Coordinator (or Gatekeeper)
Timetabling Zones	A geographical zone which divides the University Estate into collections of buildings. Zones are defined in such a way that any two buildings, where the travel time between them exceeds 10 minutes, are in different zones.

6 References

Several external references have been consulted in the production of this document, including:

University of Leeds

<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/timetable/policy.htm>

University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies

<http://www.soas.ac.uk/timetable/policies/policy/>

University of Warwick

<http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/services/centraltimetabling/policy>

Kings College, London

[http://www.kcl.ac.uk/college/policyzone/assets/files/teaching/College Timetable Policy.pdf](http://www.kcl.ac.uk/college/policyzone/assets/files/teaching/College_Timetable_Policy.pdf)

University of Liverpool

<http://www.liv.ac.uk/orbit/policy/>

Shared Academic Timetabling Project - Policy Analysis Summary

<https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/download/attachments/106922503/PolicyAnalysis.pdf?version=1>

Shared Academic Timetabling Project – Timetabling White Paper, Nick Hulton, October 2010

https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/download/attachments/106922512/Timetabling_Whitepaper.pdf?version=1

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

**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 6 February 2012 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 ratify the tuition fee for RUK-domiciled students on undergraduate nursing training for 2012/2013, to endorse the way forward in respect of the insurance issues, and to note the remaining 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 3 - 12

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

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2012

University Court, Meeting on 20 February 2012

Report of the Finance and General Purposes Committee

6 February 2012

(Report on Other Items)

1 US GAAP ACCOUNTS - UPDATE

Appendix 1

The Committee noted and welcomed that the Accounts prepared in accordance with US GAAP requirements had been completed and approved on time. The process had been challenging for all concerned and it was noted that there would be an on-going requirement to prepare US GAAP Accounts with the intention next time of preparing these Accounts in line with the UK GAAP Accounts timetable.

2 SUBSIDIARY COMPANY BOARD MEMBERSHIP CHANGE – SSTRIC LTD

The changes to the membership of the board of SSTRIC were approved by the Committee and the proposed new arrangements as set out in the paper were fully endorsed.

US GAAP

US GAAP Financial Statements

The US GAAP Financial Statements were reviewed and approved by sub-groups of Audit Committee and F&GPC / Court and submitted to the US Department of Education (USDE) on the 26th January 2012. The audit findings from the US loans administration audit for both ECA and the University, together with corrective action plans were also submitted.

The USDE is tightening up its governance rules and failure to submit by the 31 January 2012 may have resulted in a 10% (\$1.6m) penalty. The USDE are now reviewing the information received to ensure that the University meets its criteria of being “financially responsible.”

The preparation of the 2010/11 US GAAP accounts was a major exercise for both the University and KPMG as this is the first time that HE institutions in the UK were required to undertake the work. As the US GAAP rules surrounding HEI's is different to industry, meeting the USDE deadlines was not easy and KPMG worked very hard to ensure that deadlines were met.

This exercise will be required on an annual basis and it is hoped that future US GAAP accounts preparation can be done at the same time as the UK GAAP financial statements. However, this may not be practical for the 2011/12 financial statements as there are a number of merger accounting issues to be dealt with as part of the 2011/12 financial statements preparation.

F&GPC is asked to note the work undertaken.

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

Recommendations of the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland

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

The paper sets out proposals on taking forward the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland.

Action requested

Court is invited to note the publication of the Report and consider an appropriate process to develop a position statement.

Resource implications

None directly.

Risk Assessment

There are a number of risks which the University will be considering.

Equality and Diversity

None directly although the recommendations within the report do have equality and diversity implications.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Any other information

The University Secretary will present the paper.

Originator of the paper

Dr Katherine Novosel
February 2012

Recommendations of the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland

The panel to review higher education governance in Scotland published its report on 1 February 2012. The report sets out over 40 separate, wide ranging, recommendations grouped around 17 headings:

The role of the Privy Council
A new statue of the Scottish Parliament
Academic Freedom and Institutional Autonomy
The role of Governance
Advisory Forum
Relationship with Further Education
Appointment and Role of Principals
Remuneration of Principals and Senior Management
Role Composition and Appointment of Governing Bodies
Chairing of Governing Bodies
Membership of Governing Bodies
Training
Composition of the Academic Board and Appointment of Members
Whistleblowing
Evidence Base
Avoiding Bureaucratisation
Code of Good Governance

The full Report can be accessed at the following URL:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0038/00386841.pdf>

It should be noted that a dissenting opinion was published alongside the main report by a panel member unable to support all the recommendations.

The Cabinet Secretary has indicated that the recommendations contained within the Report will be taken forward in discussion and consultation although the exact details of this process are not yet known. In order to consider this University's position it would seem appropriate to adopt a similar approach to that taken in formulating the response to the initial call for evidence of the review panel and for Court to establish a representative Sub-Group to consider and prepare a position statement for further consideration and approval by Court.

The approved members for the previous Sub-Group were:

Dr Markland
Professor Monro
Professor Ansell
Professor Smyth
Mr McPherson

With the exception of Dr Markland, Court may consider it appropriate to appoint the same individuals to take forward this next stage and perhaps to strengthen the membership by the addition of further co-opted members of Court. It may also be the view of Court that the Principal and the University Secretary should be members of the Sub-Group given their depth of understanding and experience of governance matters. It should further be noted that Universities Scotland is looking to develop a sector position on the recommendations.

Actions: Court is invited to note the publication of the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland and to consider the process to formulate a University position on the recommendations contained within the Report.

**Development of the University's Strategic Plan 2012-2016
Update on Progress**

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

The paper provides Court with an update on progress with developing the University's new Strategic Plan covering the period 2012-2016.

Action requested

For discussion.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? One of the purposes of the University's Strategic Plan is to inform the allocation of resources.

Risk Assessment

Monitoring of progress against the University's Strategic Plan targets forms a key element of the University's approach to risk assessment.

Equality and Diversity

The current Strategic Plan's 'Promoting equality, diversity, sustainability and social diversity' strategic theme details equality and diversity implications. The new plan will take this forward. The proposed structure for the new plan is set out in Section 4.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper

Rona Smith, Senior Strategic Planner
Alexis Cornish, Director of Planning and Deputy Secretary



Court

20 February 2012

Development of the University's Strategic Plan 2012-2016 Update on Progress

1. Introduction

Our next Strategic Plan, which will cover the period 2012 – 2016, will be published in summer 2012. We are seeking broad input into the development process. This paper provides Court with an update on progress to date. The proposed structure presented in section 4 of the paper reflects discussions at FGPC on 6th February 2012.

2. Approach to developing Strategic Plan: early engagement phase

Court and Senatus' set the direction for the new Strategic Plan in September/October 2011.

We have subsequently been gathering input from PSG, the University's main committees, our staff and students and the Trade Unions. Staff focus groups covering the 12 different aspects of the University's strategy were conducted during November and December. These were well-subscribed with several requiring parallel sessions to be held. A broad cross-section of University staff participated, conveying, with enthusiasm, their views and ideas to help shape the University's direction and priorities over the next few years.

The early engagement phase has given us a number of steers on things to keep, and things to change, from the current Strategic Plan.

3. Proposals for new Strategic Plan

A summary of the key points from Court and Senatus discussions is as follows:

Strategic goals:

- No change to 3 Strategic goals

Enablers:

- New enabler to be introduced: Financial sustainability
- Quality Services enabler to be removed – if people and infrastructure are right, this should be a given
- People and Infrastructure to remain but to be refreshed. 'Quality' symmetry for enablers now outdated

Strategic themes

- Strategic themes are still relevant but need to be more exciting and ambitious
- Some unpicking and regrouping would help ensure these are better balanced and refreshed for the period to 2016

General

- No change to overall size of plan
- Refresh terminology and make more ambitious, e.g. Advancing Internationalisation → Delivering Global Impact

In addition to these high level conclusions on the structure of the new plan, a wide range of proposals for the aim, objectives, strategies and targets for each goal, enabler and strategic theme have been made. To give Court members an impression of the kinds of thoughts and ideas put forward, the following examples are for the Learning and teaching/Student experience sections:

- Excellence in learning and teaching language must be more ambitious
- e-learning should be fully integrated with traditional learning and should not be referenced separately within the plan
- the University must close the student experience gap to that of the modern workplace - should be leading way in digital assessment and feedback
- Plan should capture wider experience issues such as those covered by Edinburgh Award (volunteering), free thinking encouraged by group approach to learning, and the feeling of having joined a 'community of scholars'
- Graduate attributes should be set out in the plan: need to ensure we are producing graduates who are 'work ready'
- Changing student population/demographic, particularly through internationalisation – as a University we need to better understand and support different cultures/learning styles: students, staff, curriculum
- No support for 'students as consumers' terminology/thinking

4. New Strategic Plan: proposed structure

Based on the guidance from Court and Senatus, plus additional input gathered so far through our consultation process, it is proposed the Strategic Plan 2012-16 should reflect the following:

- Introduction of a new enabler: FGPC proposed that this should be called 'Finance' rather than 'Financial sustainability'
- Removal of the separate 'Quality services' enabler – content to be incorporated within 'People' and 'Infrastructure' enablers
- Division of previous 'Promoting equality, diversity, sustainability and social responsibility' strategic theme into two separate themes covering:
 - Widening participation
 - Promoting sustainability and social responsibility
- Removal of the separate 'Stimulating alumni relations and philanthropic giving' strategic theme – content to be incorporated within:
 - Engaging with our wider community
 - Finance
 - Enhancing our student experience

The proposed structured, as agreed by FGPC, is therefore as follows:

Vision			
Performance measures (targets and KPIs)			
Excellence in learning and teaching	Excellence in research	Excellence in commercialisation and knowledge exchange	Strategic goals
People			Enablers
Finance			
Infrastructure			
Enhancing our student experience	Engaging with our wider community	Building strategic partnerships and collaborations	Strategic themes
Delivering global impact	Promoting sustainability and social responsibility	Widening participation	

We are now drafting individual sections of the plan. A first full version will be circulated to PSG, CMG, FGPC and Court for comment during April/May 2012. In the meantime, once individual sections have been drafted, these will be made available for comment on Governance and Strategic Planning's Strategic Plan wiki¹.

This early and open approach to drafting the plan is intended to ensure as many stakeholders as possible have an opportunity to influence the development of the plan, and gain ownership of it as part of that process.

¹ <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/govstratplan/2012-2016+Strategic+Plan>

Members of Court wishing to be notified of updates to the Strategic Plan wiki are invited to contact Katherine Novosel (Katherine.Novosel@ed.ac.uk)

5. Performance measurement

Particular thought is being given to the targets and KPIs we select to measure progress on achieving our objectives. As part of this, we are aiming to develop a framework around each measure such that we have clarity from the outset on baselines, definitions, data sources, and margins for determining performance categories (improving/on track, maintaining or worsening/not on track) in the annual report on progress.

6. Next steps

The timeline for developing the Strategic Plan 2012-2016 is as follows:

- Phase 1 Early engagement: September 2011 – early January 2012 (now complete)
- Phase 2 Consolidation - review and comment on drafts: January - April 2012 (under way)
- Phase 3 Finalise and sign-off: May - July 2012

We intend to seek Court approval of the final version on 2 July 2012.

For further information, or to submit any further views and ideas for the University's next Strategic Plan, please contact Rona Smith (rona.smith@ed.ac.uk; 0131 650 2097).

*Rona Smith, Senior Strategic Planner
Alexis Cornish, Director of Planning and Deputy Secretary
Governance and Strategic Planning
7 February 2012*

Report from Estates Committee [EC] Meeting held on 30 November 2011Brief 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 30 November 2011.

The issues in this report relate to the Strategic Plan enabler '*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.

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/index.cfm>

Action requested

Court is invited to note that CMG and FGPC noted and endorsed the EC report at their respective meetings on 25 January and 6 February 2012.

Court is invited to note and endorse the recommendations contained in the paper.

In addition Court is invited to approve the level of expenditure re utilities as noted in Appendix 3 attached.

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

Project Management – mitigated by on going monitoring of Design Team, Contractor, Risk Register and meetings of Project Boards 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.

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.

Any other information

The Senior Vice-Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy will present the paper.

Originator of the paper

Paul Cruickshank - Estates Programme Administrator
Angela Lewthwaite - Secretary to EC
9 February 2012

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

University of Edinburgh Regents

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

Sufficient information to put the paper in context, providing a summary of the issues covered and how they relate to the University's strategic plans and priorities.

Action requested

Note the proposal and approve the concept and appointment of those nominated.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes

There are costs associated with stewardship but these will not exceed those currently in progress.

Risk assessment

Does the paper include a risk assessment? No

This will be beneficial to all concerned as long as due diligence is applied when selecting Regents.

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

Professor Mary Bownes, Vice Principal External Engagement

University of Edinburgh Regents

What are they?

People who significantly support the University either financially or with their expertise or by sharing their networks.

Why do we need them?

At present we have a Campaign Board. The board comprises a variety of people who were willing to share their time and expertise to help the University realise its campaign objectives. Individual board members have been extremely helpful. This campaign is almost complete and we will move to a new themed fundraising approach and significantly increase the targets for philanthropic and charity support as well as dramatically improving alumni engagement. The new fundraising approach will be managed by Development & Alumni through existing University processes.

We will continue to need key people to help us to network, make key contacts for us and share their expertise and knowledge.

So why not a new board?

There are many people who feel they cannot devote time for frequent visits to board meetings but can be extremely helpful. We have no way to recognise them and the huge contribution they make, nor a formal way of asking them to be part of the University.

As we move to the new themes things will be more fluid and flexible in terms of our key projects for fundraising at any point in time, so we will need the input of different people at different times and for a variety of reasons. This should be much more valuable than a fixed board. We will also be able to work with a larger pool of key people and there will be a clear understanding of the role of each Regent.

How will we select them?

Nominations will be made by staff and the list of Regents will be ratified annually by Court.

How long will a Regent serve?

This will depend on individual circumstances but I would suggest 3 years in the first instance and renewable for a further period if they continue to be supportive.

What is their Role?

A document will be produced outlining a Regent's general role but each will have a brief specific remit. They will support the University as agreed.

How many do we need?

I would suggest building to at least 50, with appointments made annually so we do not potentially lose everyone at once.

How will we look after them?

Each Regent will have a named University of Edinburgh staff member who is their key contact. This will be the key stewardship partnership.

We will send them updates on campaign progress and general development and alumni highlights 3 times a year.

We will invite them annually to the University to an event at which there will be an update from the Principal or Vice-Principal on the progress of the University in general and fundraising specifically. This event will also showcase one of the new projects we are fundraising for and include a key enthusiastic research talk demonstrating our leadership and innovative ideas in that discipline. It will be followed by a reception or dinner as appropriate.

What do we want today?

Court is asked to approve the new approach.

We have the final Campaign Board Meeting in March. Many of them are keen to continue to support us. We propose to invite them all to be Regents if they wish. We also propose that we invite the Board of the USA Development Trust.

Professor Mary Bownes, January 2012

University of Edinburgh Campaign Board

List of Current Board Members

Mr John Allan CBE

Mr John Clare CBE

Dr Michael Cross

Dr Neil Cross

Mr George A David OBE

Mr Roger Dye

Dr Roualeyn Fenton-May

Mr Ian A Godden

Dr Allan Little

Mr Gregor R Logan

Mrs Bridget Macaskill

Mr David A McCorquodale

Dr Sheena McDonald

Mr Alan McFarlane

Mr Malcolm I Offord

The Rt Hon Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP

Mr Ian Russell CBE (Chair)

Dr Jack Watters

Mr John Allan CBE

Chairman, DSG International

Director, National Grid plc

Mr John Clare CBE

Chairman, Regional & Capital plc

Non-executive Director, Dyson plc and Dreams plc

Retired Group Chief Executive, DSG International

Dr Michael Cross

Executive Chair, Navigate Group

Dr Neil Cross

Independent Director and Business Advisor

Chairman of BMT and of Albion Technology & General VCT plc

Trustee, Mary Kinross Charitable Trust

Former Executive Director, 3i

Mr George A David OBE

Chairman, Coca-Cola Hellenic Bottling Company SA

Director Petros Petropoulos AVEE, Titan Cement Co SA and AXA Insurance SA

Mr Roger Dye

Retired Chief Executive Office, The Davis Service Group

Dr Roualeyn Fenton-May

Chairman and CEO, CarrierWebb LLC

Former Director, Operations Development, The Coca-Cola Company

President of the University of Edinburgh USA Development Trust

Mr Ian A Godden

Chairman, ADS

Chairman, Farnborough Industries

Dr Allan Little

BBC Journalist and writer

Mr Gregor R Logan

Former Joint Deputy Chief Investment Officer, New Star Asset Management Ltd

Mrs Bridget Macaskill

President and CEO, First Eagle Investment Management, New York

Mr David A McCorquodale

Senior Partner and European Head of Retail, KPMG Scotland

Dr Sheena McDonald

Writer and Broadcaster

Mr Alan McFarlane

Chairman, Dundas Global Investors Limited.

Former Managing Director, Walter Scott and Partners Ltd

Mr Malcolm I Offord

Partner, Charterhouse Development Capital

The Rt Hon Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP

Conservative MP for Kensington

Chair of the University of Edinburgh Development Trust

Mr Ian Russell CBE (Chair)

Former Chief Executive, Scottish Power plc

Chairman of Remploy Ltd

Dr Jack Watters

Vice President, External Medical Affairs International, Pfizer Inc.

University of Edinburgh USA Development Trust

List of Current Trust Members

Dr Armeane M Choksi

Mr Simon Fennell

Dr Roualeyn Fenton-May (President)

Dr Edwin Feulner (Vice-President)

Mr Kenichi Shoji (Treasurer)

Mr William Webb

Dr Armeane M Choksi

National President, The Republican Indian Committee

Adjunct Professor, Business and Public Policy at the University of Philadelphia

Former President and CEO, Rubicon Capital Investments

Mr Simon Fennell

Investment Banker, William Blair International

Former Managing Director, Goldman Sachs

Dr Roualeyn Fenton-May

Chairman and CEO, CarrierWebb LLC

Former Director, Operations Development, The Coca-Cola Company

Dr Edwin Feulner

President, Heritage Foundation

Mr Kenichi Shoji

Principal, Stissing Lake Advisors

Senior Advisor, Global Risk Management Advisors, Inc.

Mr William Webb

Director, Public Sector at Enterprise Solutions Group (ESG)

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

Enhancing Student Support ProjectBrief description of the paper and statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

The paper outlines the Enhancing Student Support Project. The framework of proposals in the project is designed to bring about more consistent quality of provision, while also helping students to monitor their progress and performance more systematically and relate these to their longer-term aspirations. There are six principal strands within the project:

- articulating roles, responsibilities, and remits within a new Personal Tutor scheme: for Personal Tutor, Personal Tutee, Senior Tutor and Dean of Students
- rolling-out peer support 'families'/buddy systems across the University
- strengthening central student services
- compiling IT tools and other resource materials for advisees and advisors
- planning communication, briefing and training strategies
- and revision of the present *Standards and Guiding Principles for Academic and Pastoral Support*.

Action requested

For information. The paper was discussed by Senatus at its meeting on 8 February 2012 and Senate members agreed to engage with the project and consultation process and to encourage colleagues to do likewise. Members of Court are also invited to engage with the project.

Resource Implications

Does the paper have resource implications? Yes. These are being taken forward via the Principal's Strategy Group, Central Management Group and the planning process.

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? The Student Support Implementation Group will carry out a risk analysis of the work as part of the project.

Equality and Diversity

Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? An equality impact assessment will be carried out as part of the project.

Freedom of Information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes.

Originators of the paper

Professor Dai Hounsell, Vice Principal, Academic Enhancement
 Professor Ian Pirie, Assistant Principal, Learning Developments and SSIG Convener
 Ms Sara Welham, ESSP Project Manager, Academic Services
 13 February 2012

Enhancing Student Support Project

- 1 At its meeting in October 2011, Senate noted that support for students, and for staff supporting students, was being reviewed. The University was exploring the scope to introduce a personal tutor system, which would be central to advising students, possibly in small groups. The aim was to improve the academic and pastoral support system for students and the support for staff who undertake this role, by 2012/13.
- 2 At its meetings on 28 November and 5 December, PSG approved proposals to significantly strengthen and update the arrangements for providing academic and pastoral support to students at Edinburgh. The proposals were also endorsed at the University's Learning and Teaching Committee at its meeting on 14 December 2011. The framework of proposals is designed to bring about more consistent quality of provision, while also helping students to monitor their progress and performance more systematically and relate these to their longer-term aspirations.
- 3 There are six principal strands within the Enhancing Student Support Project:
 - articulating roles, responsibilities, and remits within a new Personal Tutor scheme: for Personal Tutor, Personal Tutee, Senior Tutor and Dean of Students
 - rolling-out peer support 'families'/buddy systems across the University
 - strengthening central student services
 - compiling IT tools and other resource materials for advisees and advisors
 - planning communication, briefing and training strategies
 - and revision of the present *Standards and Guiding Principles for Academic and Pastoral Support*.Although initial discussion has focused on the Personal Tutor scheme, all strands of the project are important and require support and resources. We will make use of existing good practice in Edinburgh and across the sector to develop the strands. Staff and students are encouraged to contribute to the project to ensure its effective development.
- 4 The project is being overseen by the Student Support Implementation Group (SSIG). Initial emails about the work have been sent to all staff and students. A wiki has been created, which will be used for communication and information. Annex A contains a copy of the revised PSG and LTC paper, which is available on the wiki. Annex B contains the remit and membership of SSIG.
<https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/PESS/Home>

Next Steps

- 5 SSIG and Colleges are producing draft roles and responsibilities for Personal Tutor, Personal Tutee, Senior Tutor, Dean of Students and Student Support Officer. These will then be discussed with key stakeholder groups.
- 6 Work on each of the strands is being taken forward by relevant groups and drawing on the views of stakeholders. SSIG will ensure that there are opportunities for students and staff to contribute to the project in general and in relation to the specific strands. Stakeholder engagement will be held at an early stage and will also be an ongoing factor of the project. **Members of Senatus are invited to engage with the project and consultation process and to encourage colleagues to do likewise.**
- 7 We are taking a phased approach to implementation as part of the risk management approach to the project. Initial aspects of the project will be

implemented in 2012/13 but some aspects will be phased in over a three-year period, to ensure that we can effectively develop the full range of tools, approaches and resources needed. This will enable the new scheme to develop iteratively and be adapted in response to evaluation and experience gained in the early years of operation.

Professor Dai Hounsell, Vice Principal, Academic Enhancement
Professor Ian Pirie, Assistant Principal, Learning Developments and SSIG Convener
Ms Sara Welham, ESSP Project Manager, Academic Services
13 February 2012

The University of Edinburgh

GUIDANCE AND SUPPORT TO STUDENTS

A Framework of Proposals for an Enhanced Approach

Executive Summary

This document sets out proposals for a significant strengthening and updating of the arrangements for providing academic and pastoral support to students at Edinburgh. The overriding aim is to ensure that, over the next decade and beyond, students have access to a framework of guidance and support that builds on the best of current practices, meets contemporary needs, and is of a quality and consistency appropriate to a university of high global standing.

The framework is designed to bring about more consistent quality of provision, while also helping students to monitor their progress and performance more systematically and relate these to their longer-term aspirations. It seeks to blend a clear set of University-wide requirements, well-understood by all students and staff, with scope for Colleges and Schools to tailor provision to reflect differences in programme structures, subject needs and professional accreditation requirements.

There are six principal strands:

- articulating roles, responsibilities, and remits within a new Personal Tutor scheme: for Personal Tutor, Personal Tutee, Senior Tutor and Dean of Students
- rolling-out peer support 'families'/buddy systems across the University
- strengthening central student services
- compiling IT tools and other resource materials for advisees and advisors
- planning communication, briefing and training strategies
- and revision of the present *Standards and Guiding Principles for Academic and Pastoral Support*.

The implementation of this Project on Enhancing Student Support will be taken forward by a Student Support Implementation Group. There will be initiatives for each strand. It will build on and develop existing good practice, drawing on the experiences of students and staff and current resources, tools and systems. This is a major priority for the University with additional investment of £4 million over the next three years, and the phased introduction of improvements. We will evaluate and monitor pilot elements and ensure that ongoing monitoring, evaluation and enhancement planning is embedded within quality assurance systems.

GUIDANCE AND SUPPORT TO STUDENTS

A Framework of Proposals for an Enhanced Approach

Overview

- a. *This document sets out proposals for a significant strengthening and updating of the arrangements for providing academic and pastoral support to students at Edinburgh. The overriding aim is to ensure that, over the next decade and beyond, students have access to a framework of guidance and support that builds on the best of current practices, meets contemporary needs, and is of a quality and consistency appropriate to a university of high global standing.*
- b. *The approach outlined is an integrated one that will draw on the combined expertise of the Schools and Colleges, the Student and Academic Services Group, EUSA and the wider student body, the Institute for Academic Development, and Information Services. It entails enhanced functions for those in advisory roles, a concomitant 're-badging', and increased funding for ongoing student support as well as one-off investment in initiatives to help put the six principal strands of the new approach securely in place.*

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1. The present framework of student guidance and support centres around the Schools-based Directors of Studies (DoS) system, complemented by a range of central services. Following an earlier review, and in response to concerns about the effectiveness of the DoS system in particular, a set of *Standards and Guiding Principles for Academic and Pastoral Support* was approved by Senatus in June 2010 for implementation in academic year 2010/11. This proposal builds on these standards and guiding principles.
2. While aspects of the DoS component of the framework are working very well, there are continuing indications that overall, the system is not operating with the degree of consistency that the University expects. Shortcomings in the system featured in the recent student elections and continue to be highlighted by EUSA officers as an area of significant concern. At the same time, the NSS results for 2011 again show considerable variation in student satisfaction with 'Academic Support'. While the scores of almost one-quarter of Schools are above the upper quartile for the Russell Group and the Scottish HEIs, the majority of Schools have scores below the Russell Group and Scottish HEI averages. Concerns about the DoS system have also surfaced last semester in the course of the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review meetings with students.
3. A recurring focus in recent discussions – not only about these concerns but also those relating to feedback to students on their learning – has been the unintended consequences of the coming of mass higher education. In the wake of much larger classes, more diverse student intakes, unitised curricula and greater pressures on resources, students can experience their academic studies as more fragmented, and fostering a sense of belonging to a community of learning has become harder to achieve.

4. At the same time, much greater attention is being given (at Edinburgh, across the UK higher education sector, and globally) to ensuring that students develop an appropriate range of overarching attributes and qualities that will enable them to thrive in the increasingly competitive graduate workplace. Yet while considerable progress is being made by reviewing curricula and making graduate attributes more explicit in course descriptions, there remains the challenge of assisting students to reflect on how the various courses that make up their programme of study will equip them with the knowledge and skills to pursue their chosen career trajectories.
5. This paper sets out proposals for a revised and enhanced framework of student support designed to bring about more consistent quality of provision, while also bringing to the fore the goal of helping students to monitor their progress and performance more systematically and relate these to their longer-term aspirations. Equally importantly, the approach envisaged introduces an element of structured group work alongside one-to-one interactions, as well as developing links to online resources and records. It seeks to blend a clear set of University-wide requirements, well-understood by all students and staff, with scope for Colleges and Schools to tailor provision to reflect differences in programme structures, subject needs and professional accreditation requirements.
6. These various changes also necessitate a change in the title of the core role of Director of Studies. Following consultations, and with the firm endorsement of EUSA, the new title is that of 'Personal Tutor'.

KEY COMPONENTS OF THE NEW APPROACH

7. There are six principal strands to the approach outlined: articulating roles, responsibilities, and remits within the Personal Tutor scheme; rolling-out peer support 'families'/buddy systems across the University; strengthening central student services; compiling IT tools and other resource materials for advisees and advisors; planning communication, briefing and training strategies; and revision of the present *Standards and Guiding Principles for Academic and Pastoral Support*. Each is now considered in turn.

a. ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND REMITS

8. Within the new approach, the key roles will be those of Personal Tutor, Personal Tutee, Senior Tutor, and Dean of Students. Each of these roles is clarified below (§9-21) with reference to undergraduate students generally. However, Colleges and Schools will consider how best to adapt these requirements to taught postgraduate students in due course, and to undergraduate students where they are for example undertaking work placements or study abroad.

Personal Tutors

9. The front-line role in academic guidance and support will be that of the Personal Tutor. Personal Tutors will have a crucial part to play in helping

students to make the most of their time at Edinburgh and to fulfill their potential within and beyond their chosen programme of study. They will also continue to have a pastoral role in advising students and, where relevant, in advising student on course selection. The core remit of Personal Tutors will be the following:

- a. to assist students in reviewing their academic progress and performance across the various courses that make up their chosen programme of study
 - b. to provide opportunities for students to reflect on how their learning within and outwith the formal curriculum can help them in pursuing their longer-term future development
 - c. to help foster in all students a sense of belonging to a community of learners.
10. As with the present DoS system, the role of Personal Tutor will be discharged by mainstream academic staff. But since the changed remit is likely to make additional calls on the time and effort of the members of staff concerned unless other measures are put in place, it is proposed that:
- the role of Personal Tutors should be concentrated on academic guidance and support, where their expertise can be deployed to maximum effectiveness.
 - Personal Tutors will share pastoral responsibilities and duties of care for their tutees with other staff in Schools, referring students to central services as and when appropriate.^{1,2}
 - additional funding is made available to Schools to relieve Personal Tutors of the administrative and clerical burdens associated with their role.
 - structured group discussions will be introduced to complement one-to-one interactions with tutees and provide a cost-effective means of advancing a. and b. in particular of the remit in 9. above. These could involve opportunities for invited specialist input, e.g. on study skills, employability, graduate attributes.³
 - Students as tutees will be expected to undertake preparatory and follow-up work to optimise interactive time with Personal Tutors in group and one-to-one meetings and will be guided and supported to develop this active partnership approach in their learning.
11. As a guiding principle, there will be at least one group meeting and one

¹ There have in fact already been moves towards such a division of responsibility, with some pastoral support in CHSS undertaken by Student Support Officers, and in CSE by Teaching Organisations.

² The distinction between academic and pastoral support is of course a relative rather than an absolute one, since difficulties of either kind can be interrelated in various ways, and those advising a student from either standpoint need to remain alert to crossover factors, and be ready to refer to their respective counterpart where appropriate.

³ Some Schools (e.g. Economics, Social and Political Sciences) have already been experimenting with group sessions with directees.

individual meeting between Personal Tutors and Tutees per semester⁴.

12. The University will provide resource materials, opportunities to network and share good practice, and training and development for Personal Tutors. All Personal Tutors will be required to undertake ongoing and refresher training and development associated with their new role.

Personal Tutees

13. Every undergraduate student will be assigned a Personal Tutor (wherever possible drawn from their intended main subject area), normally for a minimum of two years⁵. Between pre-Honours and Honours, there will be the option of remaining with the same Personal Tutor (where this is feasible) or being assigned a new one in the main subject area.
14. Given the important role which meetings between Personal Tutees and their Personal Tutor will play in each students' progression through their chosen programme of study and beyond, participation in such meetings will not be optional, but a formal University requirement, and attendance will be recorded (e.g. on EUCLID – see Strand e. below).
15. Personal Tutees will be expected to:
 - participate actively in scheduled meetings with their Personal Tutor, undertaking the prescribed preparatory and follow-up activities
 - keep a record of these activities and the reflections on their progress, performance and longer-term aspirations associated with these activities⁶
 - inform their Personal Tutor promptly of any material change in their circumstances.

Senior Tutors

16. It is crucial to the effectiveness of the new approach that oversight of personal tutoring arrangements within each School are formally assigned to an appropriately experienced member of academic staff, with the designation Senior Tutor, and reporting directly to the Head of School with respect to those responsibilities. This post may be held in association with another, but must be distinct and clear to the students.
17. The suggested remit of each Senior Tutor is as follows:
 - to ensure that new Personal Tutors are well-briefed about the role and have

⁴ The project will be implemented in a phased way: not all aspects will be in place for the start of academic year 2012/13. Details of minimum standards and engagements will be agreed but the group meeting could be typically one or one-and-a-half hours in duration, the individual meeting 15-20 minutes. In CMVM, meetings may be more frequent than is specified above in para 11.

⁵ We will draw on the commendable practice in Schools such as Chemistry, exploring opportunities, where practicable, for Personal Tutors to lead first-year tutorials with each new cohort of their Personal Tutees.

⁶ Since the primary purpose of Personal Tutorials (whether group or individual) is developmental, assisting students to gain the maximum from their studies at Edinburgh, the function of record-keeping by tutees is to underpin that purpose.

completed the required training programme

- to help all Personal Tutors in the School to keep up-to-date with developments in provision
- to deal promptly and effectively with concerns raised by Tutors and Tutees
- to advise Personal Tutors regarding unusual or complex cases
- to liaise between the Personal Tutors and the Dean of Students
- to liaise between the School and central services
- to ensure that the effectiveness of personal tutoring within the School is regularly and systematically monitored by giving all tutees the opportunity at least once per year to comment on both personal tutoring arrangements and the wider framework of student support.

Deans of Students

18. It is no less important that responsibilities for oversight at the College level are not only clearly assigned, but in a form which is transparent to students and readily accessible.
19. It is therefore proposed that each College will appoint an appropriately experienced member of academic staff to the position of Dean of Students with oversight of student support across the College. The post may be held alongside another (e.g. Dean of Learning and Teaching) but it is crucial that the title is kept distinct rather than merged to indicate clearly to students where College-wide responsibility lies.
20. In addition to their strategic role, Deans of Students will also be expected:
 - to ensure that effective mechanisms are in place in Schools for obtaining feedback on the operation of the Personal Tutor system, for example, regular interchange with student representatives and with Senior Tutors
 - to serve as a liaison with central student services
 - to ensure that systems are in place so that evidence of the effectiveness of personal tutoring (see **17.** above, last bullet) feeds into College quality assurance procedures (e.g. annual course monitoring and programme review).

Workloads and Career Progression

21. It will be essential to ensure that Schools' workload models are modified as appropriate to incorporate the roles of Personal and Senior Tutor, and that similar modifications are made at College and University levels, in consultation with union representatives, to procedures relating to career progression.

b. ROLLING-OUT TO ALL SCHOOLS OF PEER SUPPORT SYSTEMS

22. It is becoming increasingly evident (at Edinburgh as in other universities⁷) that peer support 'families' and 'buddy' systems can play an invaluable complementary role in frameworks for student support, in synergy with School-based personal tutoring and central support services. They can take the form of arrangements for incoming students to be able to call on the advice of student 'buddies' in later years, as well as the creation of Facebook-style online networks.
23. In a paper prepared for the 8 June 2011 Senatus, EUSA Vice-President Amy Woodgate outlined the various examples of such initiatives that were already in place in some Schools and working well, and EUSA are keen to see them more widely rolled out across all Schools of the University.
24. It is proposed that EUSA is invited to bid for project funding to pursue this aim, with the broader goal of establishing peer support systems as an integral part of student guidance and support at Edinburgh. Colleges and Schools might also wish to consider how the 'buddy' approach could be incorporated into personal tutoring, with a Personal Tutor's tutees in second and later years being invited to mentor his or her new tutees. Such buddy roles could also perhaps be linked to the Edinburgh Award being developed by the Employability Strategy Group (as in some current pilots), and/or to the Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR).

c. STRENGTHENING CENTRAL STUDENT SERVICES

25. As is the case with the present framework of student guidance and support across the University, the revised approach outlined in these proposals rests on a partnership between School-based provision and central student services.
26. These services have fulfilled that role outstandingly well, but they have come under increasing pressure in recent years as Edinburgh's student body has not only grown very considerably, but has also become much more diverse. The proposed changes in the framework of student support, together with further shifts in the student demographic, will add to those pressures, and it is of the utmost importance to ensure that these services are adequately resourced for current and emerging needs.
27. It is therefore proposed that a short-life review is undertaken, under the auspices of the Student and Academic Services Group, of the mechanisms for determining the appropriate level and nature of resource for these services, taking into account comparisons with a sample of other universities (Russell Group and others) in terms both of the range and nature of services provided and of their respective student profiles. There is a need to look particularly at the implications for language support of the considerable and

⁷ For example, St. Andrews and Cambridge Universities

continuing rise in international student numbers, and of the availability of expert call-out support in cases of critical need.

28. The review should also take account of the exemplary role played by EUSA's Advice Place, a facility which also finds itself increasingly stretched as the calls upon its services continuing to intensify. The proposed shift in School-level pastoral support may add to these pressures, and any revision to mechanisms for funding central student services should take account of the adequacy of the funding of the Advice Place through the EUSA block grant.
29. There is also scope to develop more efficient means of ensuring that both students and staff have ready and up-to-date access to information about the various sources of student guidance and support across the University. A small pilot project was recently undertaken to develop a set of FAQs for precisely this purpose, and a mechanism could usefully be created to embed this initiative, through liaison between SASG, Deans of Students and Senior Tutors.

d. I.T. TOOLS AND RESOURCES FOR ADVISEES AND ADVISORS

30. A fourth and no less crucial strand in the revised framework of student support proposed is the development of IT tools and of resources to underpin personal tutoring, and initial consultations are in train with the Head of IS and colleagues.
31. Such tools and resources could take the following forms:
 - a facility on EUCLID to log interactions between personal tutors and tutees where these have a significant bearing on student progression (e.g. a change in course choice)⁸
 - enabling Personal Tutors to get rapid, up-to-date information on students' marks or grades
 - systems for early identification of students having difficulties, e.g. poor attendance, late or non-submission of work, low marks across several courses
 - the use of PebblePad or a similar software tool to enable tutees to document and reflect on their progress and performance across different courses and over time, and to feed into the sharing of their reflections with their peers in personal tutorials
 - the development of tools, templates or rubrics to assist teaching staff to provide online structured feedback to students on set work⁹. A resource of this kind could enable students to monitor their feedback systematically, with evident benefits not only in the effective use made of

⁸ As noted earlier, the intention is not to put in place a substantial and complex system of formal record-keeping. On the contrary, records should be no more than the minimum necessary to document decisions made and material changes in student circumstances.

⁹ For optimal effectiveness, particularly in relation to first and second-year students, this might entail not only consultations between IS staff and course organisers, but also consultations across first-year courses in cognate subject areas to explore the potential for commonalities of approach.

feedback generally, but also to underpin reviews of progress in personal tutorials.

32. Further discussions, consultation and benchmarking will be necessary to explore these possibilities further and to establish what investment of staff time and expertise will be entailed to develop reasonably 'future-proofed', comprehensive and inter-related digital tools, with associated resources.

e. COMMUNICATION, BRIEFING AND TRAINING

33. Given the far-reaching nature of the proposed changes, a carefully targeted communication strategy will be necessary to inform all students and staff about the new approach and its implications. It seems probable that the strategy will need to make use of multiple communication channels, it will be developed in close consultation with EUSA to maximise its impact.
34. Additionally, there will need to be more substantial and more specifically focused training and development initiatives, involving the Institute for Academic Development in consultation with Deans of Students, Senior Tutors, EUSA and central student services.
35. Training and development initiatives should include:
 - design and trialling of a range of illustrative activities and sample resource materials for group personal tutorials
 - College-and EUSA-led briefing workshops for class reps
 - induction and ongoing professional development for Personal and Senior Tutors.

f. REVISION OF "STANDARDS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES"

36. The sixth and final strand falls to the Learning and Teaching Committee, which will need to take forward revision of the current *Standards and Guiding Principles for Academic and Pastoral Support*, for endorsement by Senatus.

IMPLEMENTATION

37. The implementation of this Project on Enhancing Student Support will be taken forward by a Student Support Implementation Group. There will be initiatives for each strand. It will build on and develop existing good practice, drawing on the experiences of students and staff and current resources, tools and systems. This is a major priority for the University with additional investment of £4 million over the next three years, and the phased introduction of improvements. We will evaluate and monitor pilot elements and ensure that ongoing monitoring, evaluation and enhancement planning is embedded within quality assurance systems. Information about the project will be available online: <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/PESS/Home>

Document History

The Principal's Strategy Group approved the original version of this paper at its meetings on 28 November and 5 December 2011. The proposals were also endorsed at the University's Learning and Teaching Committee at its meeting on 14 December 2011.

The Student Support Implementation Group (SSIG) for the project on enhancing student support held its first meeting on 16 January 2012 and agreed that a revised version of the paper, along with an executive summary, needed to be prepared for students and staff. This is that paper. Following consultation on the details, the scheme will develop within the general framework of these proposals.

SSIG, 19.1.12

**Project on Enhancing Student Support
Student Support Implementation Group
Remit and Membership**

Remit

The work of the Student Support Implementation Group is aimed at supporting the University's Strategic Plan's Strategic Goal of "excellence in learning and teaching" and Strategic Theme of "Enhancing our student experience".

The Student Support Implementation Group (SSIG) will coordinate the implementation work in support of the framework of proposals for an enhanced approach to guidance and support for students, which was agreed by the Principal's Strategy Group on 28 November and 5 December 2011. Given the far-reaching nature of the proposals, the SSIG will develop a communication strategy to inform students and staff about the changes.

The work will encompass a number of work areas. SSIG will develop principles for the work of Personal Tutors; their remits; and minimum requirements for contact etc. SSIG will oversee the coordination of other implementation groups:

1. the work in each College to support College activities. Colleges will lead on their own areas and will keep SSIG informed on relevant matters, e.g. progress on appointments and development of student support processes.
2. the work to strengthen student support services, which will be taken forward by a review group supported within the Student and Academic Services Group.
3. the work on developing IT tools and resources, in particular the student record, to support personal tutoring.
4. the Institute for Academic Development's work on establishing and delivering a briefing and training programme for Personal Tutors.

SSIG will also receive information about the progress of work by EUSA on the rolling out to all Schools of peer support systems.

Membership

Assistant Principal Professor Ian Pirie, Convener

Vice Principal Professor Dai Hounsell

Assistant Principal Dr Sue Rigby

Dr Morag Donaldson, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CHSS

Professor Allan Cumming, Director of Undergraduate Learning and Teaching, CMVM

Professor Simon Bates, Dean of Learning and Teaching, SCE

Dr Sharon Cowan, A Senior Director of Studies, CHSS

Dr Fanney Kristmundsdottir, A Senior Director of Studies, CMVM

Dr Paul Jackson, A Senior Director of Studies from SCE

Ms Rio Watt, Director, Academic Registry, SASG representative

Ms Shelagh Green, Director, Careers Service, SASG representative

Vice Principal Professor Jeff Haywood, Information Services representative

Dr Jon Turner, Director, IAD

Ms Lindsey Miller, HR representative

Mr Mike Williamson, EUSA Vice-President (Academic Affairs)

Ms Sarah Purves, Academic Manager, EUSA

Ms Sarah McAllister, GeoSciences, an administrator from a Teaching Organisation

Ms Sara Welham, Academic Services, for project management coordination and support

Vice Principal Dai Hounsell, following consultation with Colleges and Support Groups
16.1.12

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

ECA Endowments and Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund

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

The purpose of this paper is to provide Court with an update in respect of the Andrew Grant Scholarship Fund including the methodology and indicative figures for splitting the ECA endowments between the Andrew Grant Bequest, the College Prize Fund and other ECA endowments and to confirm new administrative arrangements in respect of meetings of the Trustee of the Andrew Grant Bequest.

Action requested

Court is asked to approve the actions outlined in the paper.

Resource implications

None

Risk Assessment

No

Equality and Diversity

There are no equality and diversity implications.

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Originators of the paper

Jennifer Roskilly
Financial Accountant
Elizabeth Welch
Assistant Director of Finance
February 2012

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

REF 2014 - Code of Practice

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

The attached Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF 2014) – Code of Practice on Equality and Diversity (hereafter referred to as the Code of Practice), has been developed in accordance with the Higher Education Funding Council's (Hefce) 'Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions' and provides guidance on equality and diversity considerations when dealing with the selection of staff for the REF submission.

Action Requested

Court is asked to approve this version of the Code of Practice (v9) which was endorsed by CMG at its meeting on 25 January 2012 and to delegate authority to Professor Nigel Brown, Senior Vice-Principal and Sheila Gupta, Director of Human Resources to make any alterations or amendments in accordance with Hefce's guidance up to the submission date of 27 April 2012 and any further amendments after the Review by REF in April 2012. Court will be asked to approve the final version at its meeting in July 2012.

Resource Implications

There are resource implications involved in providing training and development for staff and in terms of staff time in implementing the Code of Practice.

Risk Assessment

The Code of Practice provides guidance and advice on how to manage the selection of staff for submission in the REF in accordance with REF Guidelines, employment law and good practice. To this extent, it offers a sound and robust means for the University to manage any potential risks effectively.

Equality and Diversity

The Code represents good practice in equality and diversity and ensures that the University is acting in accordance with its legal obligations in relation to equalities legislation.

Freedom of Information

Can this paper be included in open business? No

Originator of the paper

Sheila Gupta
Director of Human Resources

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

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 Senate on 8 February 2012 and of the business dealt with by the electronic Senate of 17-25 January 2012.

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

www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/committees/senate/agendas-papers

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

Dr Stephanie Colvan
Senate Secretariat
15 February 2012

Summary Report from the Senatus Meeting on 8 February 2012

A Presentation and Discussion – ‘Widening Participation’

The meeting began with presentations and discussion around a particular theme. The strategic theme for the winter meeting was ‘*Widening Participation*’.

There were presentations by Professor Bownes, the Vice Principal External Engagement, on the myths surrounding Widening Participation; Ms Kathleen Hood, Head of Widening Participation on existing projects and programmes; Mr Robert Lawrie, Head of Scholarships and Student Funding Services outlined the University’s bursary schemes; Ms Gillian Russell, Depute Principal, Stevenson College, outlined a college’s perspective on Widening Participation; and Mr Matt McPherson, EUSA President on widening participation within a fees framework. There followed a positive and valuable discussion of the presentations and the University’s commitment to the Widening Participation agenda. Details are given in the Senate minutes, which are sent to Court members, and are online:

www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/committees/senate/agendas-papers

B Formal Business

1. Summary Report of Senate Business Conducted Electronically

The Senatus conducted electronic business between 17 – 25 January 2012. This included consideration of the following items:

Membership of the Senate

The new Professorial members were noted.

Conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus

The Senatus agreed to confer the title on the relevant professors.

Notice of Election of Senatus Assessors on the University Court

The Senatus was invited to consider and make nominations for the two vacancies.

Special Minutes

The Senatus adopted the Special Minutes that had been prepared for the Professors.

Communications from the University Court

The Senatus noted the content of the Court report from its meetings on 7 November and 12 December 2011.

Report of the Central Management Group

The Senatus noted the content of the report from the Central Management Group from its meetings on 11 October and 14 November 2011.

Report of the Central Academic Promotions Committee

The Senatus noted the award of Personal Chairs.

Resolutions – Chairs

The Senatus offered no observations in relation to the three Personal Chair Resolutions presented by Court (Draft Resolutions 1/2012, 2/2012 and 3/2012).

Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee

The Senatus approved the recommendations as presented for the award of honorary degrees.

2. Resolutions

The Senate offered no observations on the draft Resolutions:

Draft Resolution No. 7/2012: Foundation of a Chair of Economics

Draft Resolution No. 4/2012: Foundation of a Personal Chair of e-Science

Draft Resolution No. 5/2012: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Database Systems

Draft Resolution No. 6/2012: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Computation Theory

3. Report of CMG from its meeting on 25 January 2012

Senate noted the content of the report.

4. Project on Enhancing Student Support

Senate noted the report which was for information.

5. Proposed Amendment to Laigh Year Regulations

Senate agreed to postpone discussion of this item until the outcome of the EUSA referendum was known. If students voted in support of the change then Senate would consider its position via e-Senate.

6. National Student Survey (NSS) 2012

Senate received an oral update and were informed that the survey is now open for students to complete.

C CLOSED BUSINESS

1. Conferment of Degrees

The Senate approved the recommendations as presented.

2. Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee

The Senate approved the recommendation as presented.

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

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. 1/2012: Foundation of a Personal Chair of International Health and Molecular Medicine

Resolution No. 2/2012: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Politics and International Relations

Resolution No. 3/2012: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Biopolitics

Dr Katherine Novosel

February 2012

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Resolution of the University Court No. 1/2012

Foundation of a Personal Chair of International Health and Molecular Medicine

At Edinburgh, the Twentieth day of February, Two thousand and twelve.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Personal Chair of International Health and Molecular 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 the Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Personal Chair of International Health and Molecular Medicine 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 International Health and Molecular Medicine 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 November Two thousand and eleven.

For and on behalf of the University Court

K A WALDRON

University Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Resolution of the University Court No. 2/2012

Foundation of a Personal Chair of Politics and International Relations

At Edinburgh, the Twentieth day of February, Two thousand and twelve.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Personal Chair of Politics and International Relations:

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 Politics and International Relations 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 Politics and International Relations 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 November Two thousand and eleven.

For and on behalf of the University Court

K A WALDRON

University Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Resolution of the University Court No. 3/2012

Foundation of a Personal Chair of Biopolitics

At Edinburgh, the Twentieth day of February, Two thousand and twelve.

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

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 Biopolitics 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 Biopolitics 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 twelve.

For and on behalf of the University Court

K A WALDRON

University Secretary

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

Naming of the new King's Buildings Library

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

This paper describes the background to the request to Court to agree the naming of the King's Buildings library.

In accordance with the University policy, agreement to put the proposal to Court has been obtained from the Convener of the Estates Committee, the Director of Estates and Buildings, the Vice-Principal External Engagement and the Principal. Professor Sir Kenneth Murray has been consulted on whether the proposal is acceptable.

Action requested

Court is requested to approve the name "The Noreen and Kenneth Murray Library" for the new library presently being constructed at King's Buildings.

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

Professor Nigel Brown
Senior Vice-Principal

Naming of the new King's Buildings Library

The library presently under construction at King's Buildings will be completed in September 2012. This is a multi-functional building combining the former Darwin, JCMB and Robertson libraries and containing a café and spaces for individual and group study. Together with the remodelling of the KB Centre, it will provide a new hub for both students and staff at KB.

To indicate the new uses of the library and the exciting nature of the new building, it is appropriate to give the building a new name. "The Noreen and Kenneth Murray Library" is proposed.

Professor Sir Kenneth Murray FRS FRSE and Professor Noreen Murray CBE FRS FRSE are distinguished and well-respected scientists who worked in the School of Biological Sciences and its preceding departments for most of their careers. They separately and jointly laid the foundations for the new scientific developments in molecular genetics that allow genetic modification of organisms. Following Noreen's untimely death in 2011, a large meeting of European microbiologists was asked whether they had used certain techniques and microorganisms in their researches. Over 95% had used methods or strains arising directly from Noreen's laboratory.

Ken Murray was one of the first biologists to understand the possibilities that methods of molecular biology offered the pharmaceutical industry. He developed the subunit vaccine against hepatitis B. This was done in conjunction with the formation, together with scientists from the US and Europe, of one of the first biotechnology companies, Biogen. This vaccine has been widely adopted and has played a significant role in reducing the world-wide incidence of viral hepatitis.

Income from the licence on this invention has brought considerable benefit to the University and allowed Ken and Noreen Murray to found The Darwin Trust of Edinburgh. The philanthropic donations of the Darwin Trust have been directed towards the education and development of young scientists and to providing infrastructure to allow new developments in biological science. It has supported capital projects in this University, including the Darwin Library, the Michael Swann Building, and the new King's Buildings Library as well as supporting nearly 300 PhD students from 54 countries, the majority of whom have worked in the School of Biological Sciences in Edinburgh.

Both Sir Kenneth Murray and Professor Noreen Murray have received high academic honours, being elected to the Scottish and the UK National Academies, and have received honorary degrees from a number of universities, including the University of Edinburgh. Given their interests in the education and development of scientists, it is entirely appropriate that the new library on the King's Buildings campus is named after them.

Court is invited to approve the naming of the library at King's Buildings as "The Noreen and Kenneth Murray Library".

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

Constitution of the Edinburgh Consortium for Rural Research

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

This paper updates Court on the proposed current membership of the Edinburgh Consortium for Rural Research recommended by the Board.

Other changes are minor and include the renaming of The Bush Telegraph magazine as the ERCC Newsletter.

Action requested

As the authorising body for ECRR governance, Court is requested to approve the revised membership and to approve the constitution.

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

Professor Nigel Brown
Senior Vice-Principal

Dr Alastair A MacDonald
Secretary of ECRR

CONSTITUTION

1. Aims and Objectives

- To act as a co-ordinating body for the University of Edinburgh, other Higher Education Institutes, and research institutions, with a common interest in research and allied scientific matters related to the rural environment whether of national or international dimension
- To promote enterprise, stimulate conjoint research activities and applications among ECRR members, in a strategy consistent with emerging policies for science in Scotland, including connectivity with policy-makers, funders and users of science. This would take account of their wider networks, and national and international partners.
- To foster public engagement on scientific issues and their social relevance.
- To promote the development of science education at all levels.

2. Board Composition

The Board will be chaired by a senior member of the University of Edinburgh, appointed by the Court of the University. The Chairman will hold office for a fixed term of five years and will be re-appointable for a maximum of two terms.

The membership of the Board will comprise senior representatives of the member Institutions. These Institutions are

The University of Edinburgh

- College of Science & Engineering
- College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine
- College of Humanities & Social Science

SAC (Scottish Agricultural College)

- Research & Development
- Education & Training

Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh (RBGE)

British Geological Survey (BGS)

The Roslin Institute, The University of Edinburgh

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Edinburgh

Forest Research, Northern Research Station

Moredun Research Institute

Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA)

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)

Heriot Watt University
Edinburgh Napier University, School of Life, Sport & Social Sciences
University of Stirling Institute of Aquaculture
University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI)
The James Hutton Institute
BioSS - Biomathematics & Statistics Scotland
University Marine Biological Station Millport
National Museums Scotland
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
SNIFFER (Scotland & Northern Ireland Forum for Environmental Research)
Society, Religion and Technology Project (SRT Project)
The Royal Zoological Society of Scotland (RZSS)

The Scientific Director and Secretary/Treasurer of ECRR will attend Board meetings ex officio. The status of 'invited observer' will be extended to the Editor of the ECRR Newsletter, Coordinators of facilitating Research Centres established by the Board and to individual senior staff of member organisations whose particular expertise may assist Board deliberations.

3. Conduct of Business by the Board

The Board will be widely based and will fulfill the aims and objectives at a strategic level. For this purpose it will meet not less than twice a year at such times as shall be determined, and it will conduct its affairs, at the tactical level, through the aegis of an Executive Committee whose composition will be:

1. A Chairman to be elected by and from the Board.
2. A minimum of three representatives of the University of Edinburgh approved by the Board.
3. A minimum of three representatives of other member institutes approved by the Board.
4. The Scientific Director and the Secretary/Treasurer of ECRR.
5. Other member(s) co-opted on the recommendation of the Chairman.

Members elected to the Executive Committee shall be appointed for a maximum of 3 years, but appointments may be renewed for one or more further periods.

The Executive Committee shall meet as frequently as is required, but not less than quarterly, and will carry out such functions as may from time to time be authorised by the Board.

The Board will encourage the establishment of 'facilitating bodies' otherwise known as Research Centres and the Co-ordinators of each Centre will be invited to attend Board Meetings.

The Board, in fulfilling its aims and objectives, shall have the authority to raise funds from member institutions in order to conduct its affairs to best effect, subject to such fund raising being limited to maximum amounts per institution as may from time to time be determined.

In addition, the Board will have the authority to appoint a Scientific Director, and such other staff, such as Editor of the ECRR Newsletter, as may from time to time be agreed, from the funds collected in the aforesaid manner, always providing that the Board has no authority to make any financial commitment in excess of those as may be mutually agreed by the Board from time to time. Any staff appointed in this way shall have their contracts renewed on an annual basis.

4. Changes to the Constitution

This constitution may be changed, subject to the approval of the University Court, at any meeting of the Board for which due notice has been given and at which 75 per cent of Board Members signify their agreement at the meeting in question or, if absent, signify their written agreement in advance to the Chairman.

5. Quorum

The quorum for meetings of the Board shall be ten members.

6. Casting Vote

In the event of a tie, the Chairman shall exercise a casting vote.

7. Secretary/Treasurer

The Board shall appoint an Honorary Secretary/Treasurer for such periods as may be determined. The Secretary/Treasurer will be in attendance at Board and Executive Committee meetings.

8. Notice of Board Meetings

A minimum of fourteen days noticed shall be given for all meetings of the Board.

November 2011

[List of member organisations updated November 2011]

The University of Edinburgh

The University Court

20 February 2012

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 2011 - 10 February 2012, prepared for the meeting of Court on 20 February 2012.

Action requested

For information

Resource implications

None

Risk Assessment

n/a

Originator of the paper

Mr Alex Hyde-Parker
Deputy Director of Development / Acting Secretary, University of Edinburgh Development Trust

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business?

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