



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE
Raeburn Room, Old College
20 November 2018, 10 am

AGENDA

- | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|
| 1 | Minute | A1 |
| | To <u>approve</u> the Minute of the previous meeting held on 22 October. | |
| 2 | Matters Arising & Action Log | A2 |
| | To <u>raise</u> any matters arising. | |
| 2.1 | Core Systems Update | Verbal |
| 3 | Principal's Communications | Verbal |
| | To <u>receive</u> an update from the Principal. | |

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | | |
|------------|---|---------------|
| 4 | <u>Student Experience</u> | |
| | To <u>discuss</u> the following papers from the Senior Vice-Principal and Deputy Secretary Student Experience | |
| 4.1 | Student Experience Project Plan | B1 |
| 4.2 | Teaching and Academic Careers Project. | B2 |
| 4.3 | Areas for Further Development from Annual and Periodic Quality Reviews | B3 |
| 5 | Family Friendly employment policies | C |
| | To <u>consider</u> and <u>approve</u> the paper from the Director of Human Resources. | |
| 6 | Staff Survey | Verbal |
| | To <u>receive</u> an update from the Director of Human Resources. | |
| 7 | Partnership with the Government of Gujarat: Gujarat Biotechnology University | D |
| | To <u>discuss</u> a paper by Director of Professional Services, School of Biological Sciences | |
| 8 | Digital Transformation | Verbal |
| | To <u>receive</u> a presentation from the Chief Information Officer. | |
| 9 | Finance Director's Report | E |
| | To <u>consider</u> the report from the Director of Finance and to approve the new Anti-Money Laundering Policy. | |

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL

- | | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| 10 | Strategic Plan Performance Measurement Framework | F |
| | To <u>note</u> . | |

- | | | |
|----|--|--------|
| 11 | Update on University Social Investments- Progress, Timelines and Next Steps
To <u>note</u> . | G |
| 12 | Plan S
To <u>approve</u> . | H |
| 13 | Modern Slavery Statement
To <u>approve</u> . | I |
| 14 | Annual Procurement Report
To <u>approve</u> . | J |
| 15 | UoE Utilities Supply Company Limited – Revised Governance Arrangements
To <u>note</u> . | K |
| 16 | People Report
To <u>note</u> . | L |
| 17 | Disclosure of Intimate Relationships Policy
To <u>note</u> . | M |
| 18 | University Executive Communications
To <u>note</u> the key messages to be communicated. | Verbal |
| 19 | Any Other Business
To <u>consider</u> any other matters by UE members. | Verbal |
| 20 | Date of Next Meeting
Tuesday, 15 January 2019 at 10 am in the Raeburn Room, Old College. | |



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

22 October 2018

[Draft] Minute

- Present:** Peter Mathieson (Convener)
David Argyle, Eleri Connick, Leigh Chalmers, Chris Cox, Gavin Douglas,
Hugh Edmiston, David Gray, Gary Jebb, Gavin McLachlan,
Wendy Loretto, Theresa Merrick, Dorothy Miell, Tracey Slaven, Sarah Smith
and Moira Whyte.
- In attendance:** Barry Neilson (for items 4 and 5), Lee Hamill, Fiona Boyd and
Kirstie Graham.
- Apologies:** Charlie Jeffery, Richard Kenway, Phil McNaull, Andrew Morris, Jane Norman,
Dave Robertson, James Saville, Jonathan Seckl and James Smith.

1 Minute Paper A1

The Minute of the meeting held on 25 September 2018 was approved.

2 Matters Arising Paper A2

The Action Log was noted. Members requested an update on the final approval of the Policy on Intimate Relationships and the decision on the Reimbursement of Immigration Fees and it was noted that formal communications on the outcome of both of these items were in preparation and would be circulated in due course.

3 Principal's Communications

The Principal reported on the following: the planned senior team away days on 1 and 2 November; the staff survey was now closed with next steps to be considered by the Leadership Forum on 21 November; the ongoing discussions on the University Superannuation Scheme, reporting the University would respond to the Universities UK consultation to support the recommendations of the Joint Expert Panel including the proposal for a second phase of work; progress on a number of deep strategic partnerships with comparable universities in continental Europe, discussions on joint work with Glasgow University and consideration of partnerships beyond Europe; a recent successful trip to Hong Kong and mainland China with opportunities emerging from the 'Greater Bay Area Initiative'; the Chancellor's visit to the University today to open the Bayes Centre and Lister Building.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4 Review of Delivery of Advice and Support to Students

Paper B

The Executive considered a proposal to review the delivery of advice and support for students including the Personal Tutor (PT) system and Student Support Teams (SSTs). As the Service Excellence Programme (SEP) will review the SSTs, who provide the administrative support for PTs, the proposal was for a holistic review of the PT and SST systems using change management methodology and capability within the SEP, with the leadership and governance of SST through the Student Administration and Support Programme and the PTs through the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, with a 'Design Group' established to bridge the two groups.

During discussion it was noted that this was a considerable addition to SEP and would require adequate resource, it was important that this approach strengthened rather than diluted the work of the SEP, student representation should be included on the proposed 'Design Group', PTs were effective in many schools so the review should learn from best practice while aligning with core University values, effective communication must be considered carefully and built into the programme.

Taking into account the issues discussed, the Executive was supportive of the direction of travel, recognising there was more work to be done in developing a fully worked up and costed programme and that the proposed change in scope and resources would go the SEP Board for further consideration and approval.

5 Service Excellence & Core Systems Procurement Updates

**Paper C1
Paper C2**

The Executive considered an update on the SEP, noting that the SEP Board met on 18 October and approved the Blueprint and Business case for the Finance Transformation Programme which would now move to implementation. The project sponsor, the Director of Finance (designate) recorded his thanks to all in reaching this stage. The work on the Student Administration and Support Programme was noted, including the planned launch of the single timetabling service.

The Executive was also updated on the Core Systems Procurement Programme within the SEP. Following a substantial amount of work, the Invitation to Submit Final Tenders will be issued to the 2 remaining qualified bidders. As these were both 'Tier 1' vendors and given the complexity of the requirements, there is expected to be an increase in the anticipated cost. The Executive noted progress and the ongoing work on costing.

6 Finance Director's Report

Paper D

The Executive considered the report, noting the 'quarter zero' meetings provided an early indication that the overall position was on track, while noting this did not include any incremental net benefit from the City Deal. The strategic target surplus range of 3% - 5% of turnover was raised, recognising the challenge of achieving this in the short term due to a number of strategic initiatives. In this context, there was discussion of role of the 10 year forecast, and it was noted that the latest update of this would go to the December meeting of Court, and this could also helpfully be circulated to budget holders when available.

7 UK/EU Undergraduate Student Recruitment Trends & Targets 2019/20

Paper E

The Executive was asked to note the increasingly competitive environment, with demographic changes and Brexit uncertainties expected to impact on recruitment cycles across the three year planning horizon. There was discussion on the future balance of the student intake, the variation of impact across the Schools in terms of headroom to increase international intake to balance any potential loss of EU students, and a shared understanding that, although recruitment remained buoyant, there was no space for complacency in ensuring the University continued to admit the best students.

The Executive approved the planning assumptions and targets outlined in the paper for SEU non-controlled UG intake and the expectation of SIMD20 (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 20% least advantaged postcodes) entrants. The Executive also approved the initiation of preparation for engagement in Clearing during the 2019/20 undergraduate UCAS cycle, noting that all programmes will be available in SIMD20 Clearing, with the expectation that almost all programmes would also engage in A-level Clearing.

8 Venture Funding Update

Paper I

The Executive considered a summary of venture funding, noting that over the last 2 years a model has been developed for external professional venture funds working with the University on a non-exclusive complementary basis, each bringing their own particular expertise to support the exploitation of the University's research portfolio. The Commercialisation Sub-Group of Policy and Resources Committee had met on 17 October and considered the interaction between Investment Committee, Policy & Resources Committee and the University Executive, noting that for novel and/or potentially contentious investments, initial review by University Executive is expected before a strategic decision by Policy & Resources Committee, for implementation by Investment Committee.

There was discussion on the future of Old College Capital (OCC), which is the University's own fund that has been in existence for 8 years. It has received 2 rounds of investment, has funded 19 companies and there are indications that there could be a number of exits over the next 12-14 months. The future of OCC was currently being considered, whether to collapse, continue in its current form or evolve into a more substantial fund, which would require additional resources. An evidence case was being developed for the most appropriate approach and this will return to the University Executive for a decision.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTING:

- 9 Fee Strategy Group** **Paper F**
- The Executive approved: the proposed student accommodation rents for 2019/20, noting the indicative rent increase for 2020/21 and 2021/22; the fee rates for the Outdoor Education Programmes; and noted the routine fees approved by Chair's Action. The Executive also approved the Turkish Scholarship Agreement, while requesting that FSG consider developing a formal ethical assessment process for scholarship agreements.
- 10 Proposals for Chair Establishment and Changes** **Paper G1
Paper G2**
- The Executive approved the establishment a Chair of Inorganic Chemistry and the re-naming the currently vacant established Chair of Mathematics (Third – Ord 22/2007) as the Chair of Operational Research in the College of Science and Engineering and the establishment of a Chair of General Practice and a Chair of Primary Care and Multimorbidity in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine.
- 11 Health and Safety Quarterly Report: Quarter 4: 1 June 2018 – 31 August 2018** **Paper H**
- The Health and Safety report for the period 1 June 2018 to 31 August 2018 was noted.
- 12 Date of next meeting**
- The University Executive will next meet on Tuesday, 20 November 2018 at 10.00am in the Raeburn Room, Old College.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Teaching and Academic Careers Project

Description of paper

1. In May 2018 the University Executive agreed to establish a Teaching and Academic Careers task group to review processes and incentives for the recognition, reward and support for teaching in academic careers alongside other parts of the academic role. The group has developed a set of Principles and consulted widely and deeply on them, for example with Unions, Colleges and Schools, the Students' Association. It has taken account of the feedback from this consultation process, and presents a final version of the Principles (attached as Appendix A) for approval by the University Executive.

Action requested/recommendation

2. The Executive is invited to approve the Principles.

Background and context

3. The remit of the task group is to review processes and incentives for the recognition, reward and support for teaching (including Personal Tutoring) in academic careers alongside other parts of the academic role. This is to include inter alia:

- Foundational assessment of excellence and/or potential in teaching in initial recruitment processes;
- Continuing and developmental recognition of teaching in annual review;
- Measures that open up – and regulate – flexibility to shift emphasis of roles to and from those predominantly focused on teaching across the career course;
- Support/expectations for professional development in teaching;
- Professional recognition in promotion and reward processes, including those employed in roles predominantly focused on teaching, including Teaching Fellow roles, extending from Grade 7 through to Grade 10;
- The role of Heads of Schools in ensuring their academic staff deliver high performance in teaching.

4. The task group membership, which includes representation from all Colleges and from the University and College Union and Students' Association, is available at: www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/projects/teaching-and-academic-careers

5. During semester 1 of 2018/19 the task group consulted extensively on draft Principles to guide its work. Consultation involved a wide range of activities, including:

- A discussion at Senate Learning and Teaching Committee on 18 September 2018, and a detailed strategic discussion at the Senate meeting on 3 October 2018;
- Open sessions led by senior members of the task group at six College committees and 11 School committees;
- Two focus groups to ascertain the views of staff on teaching-only contracts specialising in teaching;

- Student feedback via a School rep forum;
- A lunchtime session to gather the views of the Joint Unions;
- Written submissions (seven written submissions at School-level, two group submissions, 10 individual submissions and a UCU committee written response.)

Discussion

Feedback from consultation

6. There was strong support for the objective of the project, of giving teaching parity with research. During the consultation activities, the task group explored two different models for recognising, rewarding and supporting teaching in academic careers – a separate teaching track, and a more flexible mainstream academic pathway (where staff could move from teaching, to teaching and research, or research only, more flexibly at different points in their career). While there was broad support for the principle that all academic staff (including those focussing on teaching) should have access to career progression opportunities, there was a lack of support for the idea of creating a new separate teaching career track. Instead, there was more support for the idea of a more flexible mainstream academic path. While some respondents had concerns about some implications of a more flexible model (for example, whether it could make it more challenging for Schools to meet business needs regarding teaching, or weaken the link between teaching and research), the task group was satisfied that these concerns could be addressed.

7. The other main consultation findings were as follows:

- Relatively few comments were received about professional development for teaching, with most of those comments focusing on the need to ensure that staff have sufficient time to take up opportunities for professional development, and no evidence of support for the idea of requiring staff involved in teaching to hold teaching qualifications;
- Various concerns regarding current career pathways and development opportunities for staff on teaching-only contracts at grades UE07 and UE08, but also the suggestion that the University should be cautious about making changes to the contractual status and/or access to career pathways for those staff currently employed on teaching-only contracts.
- Broad recognition that it is challenging to recognise, reward and evidence excellence in teaching, with respondents making a range of suggestions for possible approaches and raising concerns regarding some forms of evidence currently utilised by the University;
- In addition to addressing the issues highlighted by the Principles, staff pointed to the need to address issues associated with academic staff workload allocation, and growth in the student population, in order to enhance the student experience.

8. The task group paper providing detailed analysis of the consultation responses is available on the Committee members' wiki.

Recommended Principles

9. The task group has given careful consideration to the consultation findings (the detail of which is available) and has agreed a revised set of Principles (see Appendix A).

10. In addition to making some suggestions for the wording of the Principles (which the group took into account), the UCU submission highlighted some specific issues regarding current arrangements for grading and promotion for Teaching Fellow posts, which the group has asked Human Resources to clarify with the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences.

11. The group discussed the implications for the University's Research Excellence Framework (REF) submission of the introduction of a more flexible academic career pathway, and was satisfied that any implications for REF 2021 were likely to be marginal and that any implications for subsequent REFs (or equivalent) could be managed.

Resource implications

12. Phase two of the project will have resource implications for Human Resources, the Institute for Academic Development and Academic Services – for example, project management, benchmarking, policy analysis and drafting, and consultation activities.

13. The introduction of a more flexible academic career pathway may lead to an increase in promotion applications. This may require greater resource in Human Resources academic promotions teams. There may also be greater resource needed to support staff through the process and to deal with appeals against decisions and with unhappy colleagues, which will require increased input from senior line management. The introduction of a more flexible academic career pathway may also lead to changes in some academic staff recruitment and employment practices, which could have resource implications. The implementation of the Principles may also have other resource implications, for example for the level of resources the University allocates to academic development activities.

14. Where possible, during stage two of the project the group will seek to quantify the resource implications of implementing the Principles, and, if relevant, it will make bids to the 2019-20 Planning Round for relevant support groups. However, in practice, it will not be possible to quantify some of these resource implications at an institutional level, since some will depend on how the management of individual Schools decide to operate within the context of revised policies.

Risk Management

15. This project aims to contribute to the University's broader work to mitigate risks associated with the student experience. During stage two of its work, when translating the Principles into practice, the task group will pay careful consideration to identifying and mitigating any risks associated with specific changes to policy or procedure.

Equality & Diversity

16. The task group will oversee Equality Impact Assessments regarding any substantive changes to policy as a result of the implementation of the Principles. The adoption and implementation of the Principles may assist the University to support career opportunities for female staff, who are currently disproportionately represented among teaching-only staff.

Next steps & Communications

17. If the Executive approves the Principles, the task group will begin phase two of its work, which will involve coordinating a review of how the Principles should be translated into policy/procedures and academic development practice. In doing so, it will take account of the range of detailed suggestions that stakeholders made during the consultation on the Principles. Following that period of technical review (December 2018 to March 2019), the group will oversee a process of consultation with stakeholders regarding any proposed changes, prior to submitting a final report to the University Executive seeking approval/endorsement for any proposed changes by the end of 2018-19.

18. The group has already undertaken some benchmarking of comparator institutions' practices, and anticipates that it will undertake further benchmarking to inform phase two of its work.

19. The group has identified the importance of careful communications to stakeholders regarding the next stages of the project, for example to:

- Reassure staff that emphasising the importance of excellence in teaching does not mean that the University is placing unrealistic demands on academic staff to be excellent in everything they do;
- Emphasise that the University's work on recognition, reward and support for teaching is only one part of broader systematic work to enhance the student experience; and
- Manage expectations e.g. from staff who may have unrealistic expectations that changes to policy will enhance their chances of promotion, or who may perceive that a more flexible career pathway would allow them to determine their balance of work (in practice this would be determined by management in discussion with the member of staff).

20. The group will seek advice from Communications and Marketing regarding how to approach these communications issues.

Consultation

21. See paras 5 to 8 for an overview of the task group's consultation activities regarding the Principles.

Further information

22. Author

Professor Charlie Jeffery
Tom Ward (Director of Academic Services)
Ailsa Taylor (Academic Policy Officer,
Academic Services)

Presenter

Professor Charlie Jeffery

Freedom of Information

23. Open paper.

University of Edinburgh Teaching and Academic Careers group

Principles

The group aims to enable the University to make a significant step forward in the way excellence in teaching is valued within academic career paths at the University. The following draft Principles will guide the group's recommendations:

What kind of University do we want to be?

- A community that embraces the concept of scholarship, in which we value excellence in teaching and research equally and resource them appropriately;
- A community that uses our staffing policies and processes to value and reward teaching;
- A community that expects and supports our academic leaders to inspire and assist their colleagues to achieve excellence in teaching and/or research;

Flexible career pathways open to all academic staff

- We should ensure career pathways into the University and up to Professorial level (UE10) are clear and open to all academic staff from grade UE07, regardless of the balance of academic responsibilities (including those specialising in teaching);
- We should ensure that we have clear descriptions of what excellence in teaching means at each level, and enable staff to evidence their excellence in relation to these criteria through a range of qualitative and quantitative measures;
- Our academic career pathways should be flexible enough to enable academic staff to place greater emphasis on particular aspects of their academic roles at different points in their careers;

Supporting academic development through these pathways

- All annual reviews should provide an opportunity for academic staff to reflect on their achievements, career aspirations and development needs in teaching, as well as in other aspects of their academic role;
- We should provide clear guidance on the experience and qualifications that academic staff require at each stage of their career in order to operate at the level expected in teaching;

- A core aspect of the academic role involves engaging in formal and informal teaching training and development activities, and we should put sufficient capacity in place to support these activities, and ensure that academic staff have space within their workload to engage with them;

What do we want the University to be like in five years' time?

- All academic staff will understand what we mean by excellence in teaching, and the expectations of this for their own performance, development and career progression;
- We will be able to articulate the different career pathways available to all academic staff, and individual staff will benefit from the diverse range of pathways;
- A significantly higher proportion of academic staff will have demonstrated their commitment to teaching excellence through acquiring teaching qualifications or externally accredited recognition (e.g. HEA Fellowship);
- Students will recognise our commitment to excellence in teaching.

13 November 2018



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Areas for Further Development from Annual and Periodic Quality Reviews

Description of paper

1. This paper outlines the areas for further development identified through annual monitoring, review and reporting processes (25 reports from Schools, Deaneries and Colleges) and 11 teaching/postgraduate programme (periodic) reviews and 14 student service annual reports for AY 2017/18.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is invited to discuss the areas for further development identified and consider how they might feed into future activities to enhance the student experience.

Background and context

3. Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) considered the outcomes of annual and periodic review at its meeting in September 2018 and identified the strategic areas below <https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/sqac-agendapapers-20180920-web.pdf> (papers C and E).

4. The Personal Tutor system and student support were identified as an area for further development from both annual and periodic reviews. There was no strong sense from Schools of how to address the issue and recognition of the need to think more fundamentally about student support. SCAQ noted the planned holistic review of the Personal Tutor system which will link to a wider review of student support and thus did not propose any further action.

5. Building academic communities was identified as an area for further development from teaching/postgraduate programme reviews. This was identified as an area of good practice from annual monitoring, reporting and review. This will be included as a key theme of the University-level sharing good practice event and examples will be collated for Teaching Matters. Additionally, supporting and developing academic staff, including postgraduate tutors and demonstrators was identified as an area for further development from periodic reviews. Senate Quality Assurance Committee noted the work underway on teaching and academic careers and the planned evaluation on the Policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators and did not propose any further action.

Discussion

Pressure on Staff Time (annual review)

6. The Sub Group of SQAC that reviews School annual quality reports noted that as student numbers increase, staff are identifying challenges with, for example, effectively delivering the Personal Tutor system, providing quality feedback to students on assessments within the required timescales, and providing effective supervision for dissertations. The Sub Group identified a particular tension between the provision of quality feedback to students on their assessments and feedback

turnaround requirements. A number of comments specifically related to the increase in student numbers on postgraduate taught programmes.

Learning and Teaching Accommodation (annual review)

7. The Group noted that Schools are continuing to identify challenges with accessing suitable learning and teaching accommodation. Comments primarily related the lack of availability of large lecture theatres and classrooms to accommodate growing student cohorts. The Sub Group recognised that ongoing estates issues are having an impact on student satisfaction as, where improvements have been delivered, there has been a positive impact on student satisfaction. For example, the delivery of social space within the School of Chemistry and the Appleton Tower development for the School of Informatics. The Sub Group recommended that plans for student numbers should be considered in line with estates developments.

Space – provision of study and social space for students (periodic review)

8. Recommendations were made in relation to a lack of dedicated space for postgraduate research students at King's Buildings, pressure on all types of accommodation, and students establishing and maintaining a sense of identity with their school.

Resourcing and planning (periodic review)

9. Recommendations related to the resourcing of programmes and courses should student numbers expand, investing in teaching to allow for forward planning, and rewarding and recognising teaching. This is linked to the above points on pressure on staff time and estate issues and requires a holistic approach to safeguard teaching excellence and the quality of the student experience.

KPIs (student service reports)

10. Few reports included KPIs or impact measures related to the student experience. The sub-committee that reviews student service reports concluded a need to consider how to set service standards for student experience and measure the impact of the service on the student experience. The Student Counselling Service was highlighted as a good example that uses service response times and outcome measures as KPIs. The committee discussed the challenges of developing a set of KPIs that would work across all services and suggested the potential to consider themed KPIs that might work for clusters of services either defined by the nature of the service (e.g. well-being, academic support, student administration) or by student journey/lifecycle themes (e.g. induction), and a more outcomes-focused approach.

Working in partnership to support the student experience (student service reports)

11. The reports indicated potential opportunities for more cross-service working in supporting aspects of the student experience, to provide a more joined-up approach from the student experience perspective. The International Student Advisory Service's Refugee Advisory Group was highlighted as a model of cross-service working.

Affordability and finance (student service reports)

12. The Advice Place report noted that financial difficulties are the second factor affecting students' studies after academic issues. Given the increasing diversity of our student population, we may wish to consider how to address affordability in terms of the services that students use (in particular accommodation and campus catering) as well as consider how the University supports students experiencing financial difficulty.

Resource implications

13. There are no actions proposed in the paper and thus no specific resource implications identified at this stage.

Risk Management

14. The provision of a high quality student experience is covered by the University's Risk Register and actions are ongoing and continue to be managed via Risk Management Committee. Additionally, failure in effectiveness of the quality assurance framework, including aligning review activity with external expectations and taking action on findings, constitutes an institutional risk.

Equality & Diversity

15. Equality impact assessments are carried out on University quality assurance policies and processes.

Next steps/implications

16. This will be dependent on discussion at University Executive. A progress report on actions is considered by SQAC at an appropriate point later in the academic year.

Consultation

17. Good practice and areas for further development from annual and periodic review were included in the annual report to the Scottish Funding Council which was considered by SQAC, Senate and University Court in September and October 2018.

Further information

18. Assistant Principal Professor Tina Harrison, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance and Nichola Kett, Academic Services can supply further information.

19. Author

Professor Tina Harrison
13 November 2018

Presenter

Senior Vice-Principal Professor Charlie Jeffery

Freedom of Information

20. This paper is open.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Family Friendly employment policies – comparator benchmarking and recommendations

Description of paper

1. This Paper summarises the findings of a desk-based review of Russell Group university ‘family friendly’ policies (i.e. maternity, parental etc) and recommends where enhancements can be made to the University’s policies to ensure they remain competitive and position the University as an employer of choice.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is asked to review the benchmark data, decide its comparator stance (median, upper quartile or upper decile) and agree the corresponding enhancements to its maternity and other ‘family friendly’ policies.

Paragraphs 3–36 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

37. As above, the main risk associated with enhancing our policies is financial, i.e. of unpredictable cost. However, failure to do so, and so renege on commitments within our Athena SWAN action plan, could be internally and externally damaging to our reputation as a family friendly employer. It would also damage our ability to claim we are ‘an employer of choice’ as we would continue to lag behind other RG universities, which could impact staff recruitment, retention and engagement.

Equality & Diversity

38. These proposals seek to ensure that staff feel equally supported across their family ‘life-cycle’, from caring for new-born children to elderly parents, irrespective of the gender of the carer. Equality impact assessments supporting each policy will be reviewed as each policy is updated and rewritten.

Paragraphs 39-40 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

41. The contents of this Paper have been discussed and agreed with the Vice Principal - People and Culture and the Director of HR. The trade unions will be consulted on the refresh of the policies through their representative participation in working groups. The refresh of all family friendly and leave policies will be agreed with the unions jointly and ratified by CJCNC in March 2019.

Further information

42. Authors

Suzanne Mackenzie
Senior HR Partner – Employee Relations
and Employment Policy

Presenter

James Saville
Director of Human Resources

Linda Criggie, Deputy Director of HR
(Employee Relations, Employment Policy,
Equality & Diversity
5 November 2018

Freedom of Information

43. This paper is closed until all referred to policies have been consulted on and agreed with the trade unions and formally ratified through CJCNC early in the first quarter of 2019, for implementation from April 2019.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

**UoE Partnership with the Government of Gujarat:
Gujarat Biotechnology University**

Description of paper

1. A Strategic Partnership is proposed between the University of Edinburgh and the Government of the State of Gujarat, India. The Government of Gujarat (GoG) intends to create a new, small, specialist HEI to deliver industry-focused training and research that will help to stimulate economic growth in Biotechnology. GoG wants the new institute to operate with the innovation culture of a UK research-intensive HEI, and thus seeks to engage UoE to deliver the academic programme and overall leadership to establish the new institution. UoE's partnering role will be fully-funded by GoG, with the aim of building capacity to create an institute of excellence that can eventually stand alone, or evolve into a more equal collaborating partnership with UoE. The proposed partnership sits very well with UoE's emerging strategy and ambitions in biotechnology teaching, research and industry engagement.

Action requested / Recommendation

2. As this partnership is unlike existing international ventures, the University Executive is asked to consider and approve in principle key features of the proposed collaboration:

- UoE would enter into partnership with a regional government focused on capacity-building to create excellence, rather than partnering with an established HEI;
- UoE would operate the new institute for ten years, for an agreed fee paid by GoG.

3. The University Executive is invited to comment on the proposal to enter into a dual degree award with GBU (noting the discussion in paragraphs 16 and 17 in particular).

Paragraphs 4-19 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

20. External specialist advice is currently being procured to mitigate risks associated with legislative matters, legal and operating context in India, and tax issues. Due diligence and financial planning currently underway will mitigate financial risk; the proposed model reduces financial risk since UoE is not making major up-front investment. Reputational risk associated with the quality of delivery of education in GBU will be managed by clear governance and quality assurance processes put in place using UoE's models. A Risk Register is included in the Outline Business Case.

Equality & Diversity

21. As with any international collaboration, UoE must assure suitable standards of equality and inclusion in all processes, policies and operations relating to GBU. Indian equality legislation is similar to the UK, but (as in the UK) custom and practice may not match legislative standards. UoE's current expectations and standards for

the student body and staff in GBU will be the default principle. In developing the initiative, internal and external guidance will continue to be sought on the cultural context within which GBU will operate and how to manage any equality challenges.

Paragraphs 22-23 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

24. The proposals and curriculum have been discussed with academic colleagues from relevant Schools/Deaneries in CSE, CMVM and CAHSS, and with academic managers and senior professional services staff in CSE. Representatives of Edinburgh Global, Legal Services, Academic Services, Finance, HR and Edinburgh Innovations have been engaged in internal discussions and in meetings with the delegation from GoG. International Ventures Group is providing advice and Edinburgh Global is currently undertaking due diligence.

25. The British Council has advised that GoG has the capacity to deliver the infrastructure, financial package and economic stimulation envisaged by this proposal. The British Deputy High Commission Ahmedabad is strongly supportive and the British High Commissioner is aware, as are the Indian High Commissioner to the UK and the Consul General for India in Scotland.

Further information

26. <u>Author</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
Anne Payne	Dr Anne Payne on behalf of
Director of Professional Services	Professor David Gray

Freedom of Information

27. Closed: commercial interests - exemption until exchange of contracts.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Finance Director's Report

Description of paper

1. The paper reports the draft University Group Annual Report and Accounts for the 2017/18 financial year. This follows on from the draft (unaudited) financial results and headlines presented to University Executive in September. The paper also includes a special focus update on the University's External Borrowing arrangements, and also presents the University's first Anti-Money laundering policy for approval.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive is asked to note and comment on the Finance Director's report and members can use this report to brief their teams on Finance matters.

Paragraphs 3-16 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

17. The University manages its financial risk by not breaching the Group risk appetite as described in its financial metrics¹. A key metric is that our unrestricted surplus should be at least 2% of total income (the current Finance Strategy provides a target surplus range of 3% - 5% to remain sustainable). The draft 2017/18 Financial Reports demonstrate that we do not expect this indicator to be breached. Quarter Zero forecast for 2018/19 projects a 1.9% operational surplus (excluding City Deal, see paragraph 8) however we expect that this will rise as we progress through the year. This will be monitored very closely and we will continue to report this key financial forecast to committees.

Equality & Diversity

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

Next steps & communication

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

Consultation

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

Further information

21. Author

Lee Hamill

Deputy Director of Finance

Lorna McLoughlin

Presenter

Phil McNaull

Finance Director

¹ For reference the University's Risk Appetite statement can be found at the following link:
www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/GaSP/Governance/AuditandRisk/RiskAppetiteStatement2018.pdf

Head of FIRST (Financial Information,
Reporting & Strategy Team)
Julia Miflin
Senior Financial Controls Accountant
8 November 2018

Freedom of Information

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



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Strategic Plan 2016 Performance Measurement Framework

Description of paper

1. A performance measurement framework has been developed to assess the University's performance against the Strategic Plan 2016. This is an overview of the performance measures progress for 2017-18.

Action requested

2. University Executive is requested to discuss and provide comments on progress against the measures for 2017-18 which can inform the presentation to Court in December 2018.

Paragraphs 3-9 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

10. Performance measurement is essential in allowing the university to monitor its exposure to various risks. Measures reported to Court focus on those that are highest impact and therefore a risk for the University.

Equality & Diversity

11. The strategic performance framework dashboards and other online or printed material comply with accessibility requirements.

12. The measures relating to 'Diversity of Staff Population' and 'Diversity of Student Population' are partially intended to monitor the impact that delivering the strategic plan has on different groups.

Next steps

13. We will provide more updates to University Executive on the measures in 2019. Views from University Executive members on how and when they would like to receive these updates would be welcome. In-year updates will be made available to the UE (and wider staff audiences, as appropriate), via the online Strategic Performance Measures dashboards SharePoint site. The dashboard pages will be supplemented during 2018/19 with complementary pages which provide commentary and insight on progress, guidance on interpreting the indicators and data definitions. <https://uoe.sharepoint.com/sites/strategicperformancemeasures>

14. The refresh of the strategic plan will provide an opportunity to refresh the performance measures, particularly those for the 'Executive' level, to ensure that we are measuring what is critical for our success.

Resource implications

15. The collation and reporting of measures is managed by Governance and Strategic Planning with input from colleagues from across the University. Reporting on measures and refining the framework represent ongoing workload for these staff members.

Consultation

16. Colleagues from across the University contribute the underpinning data for the performance measures.

Further information17. Author

Pauline Jones/Lynda Hutchison
Governance and Strategic Planning
5 November 2018

Presenter

Tracey Slaven
Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning

Freedom of Information

18. This paper is closed as the final version of the performance measures will be published after review by Court in December.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Social Investments Update - Progress and Next Steps

Description of paper

1. This paper summarises the University's journey on social investments to date and outlines required next steps to deliver agreed and effective governance.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Executive is asked to note the paper and recommend the proposed revision to the Delegated Authority Scheme and Treasury Mandate.

Paragraphs 3-19 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Equality and Diversity

20. Social investments would be expected to benefit society and the environment, with consequent benefits for disadvantaged groups, those affected by climate change (disproportionately women and those in poorer communities) and disadvantaged groups such as homeless people or ethnic minorities.

Next steps/implications

21. As set out in paragraph 18 above.

Consultation

22. The paper is being submitted in parallel to Policy and Resources Committee and follows-up earlier papers to PRC and Court as described above.

Further information

23. Author

Dave Gorman

Director of Social Responsibility and Sustainability

31 October 2018

Freedom of Information

24. This paper is closed.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Plan S

Description of paper

1. This paper describes the likely impact of a new initiative to accelerate the transition to full and immediate Open Access (OA) to research publications which was announced by Science Europe, under the name of 'Plan S'¹. Launched on 4 September by the Open Access Envoy of the European Commission, it was further developed by the President of Science Europe. Endorsed by a group of thirteen European National research funders (including UKRI, ERC and EU Commission) and two charitable foundations (the Wellcome Trust and the Bill Gates foundation) – a full list in appendix 1. Plan S puts forward a number of fundamental principles for developing Open Access to publications more fully. The ERC Scientific Council has decided to support the initiative.

Action requested

2. University Executive is invited to discuss the implications of the Plan S initiative, understand the risks and to approve the draft outline consultation and compliance plan, set out in section 17 below.

Paragraphs 3-17 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

18. The main risks associated with Plan S are:

- i. Failure to engage with Plan S and ensure awareness amongst researchers could result in poor funder compliance rates – resulting in loss of research funding.
- ii. Additional cost to the University. When this Plan is implemented across Europe the major EU-based publishers will shift to OA and APCs only for all their journals. But publishers may increase their APC costs as they defend their profit. In addition, The University may have to bear the costs of Open monograph and other open access publishing costs.
- iii. Failure to comply with the requirements of Plan S could result in sanctions for researchers and reputational damage to the University.
- iv. Potential issues with some world rankings, if our research articles are not published in traditional High Impact journals.
- v. Academic unhappiness with some aspects of Plan S, including the academic freedom to publish in the journal of their choice and potential changes/clarity on the copyright ownership of published research articles.

Equality & Diversity

19. There are no impacts on equality and diversity associated with this report.

Paragraph 20 has been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

¹ Plan S https://www.scienceurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Plan_S.pdf

Consultation

21. This paper has been reviewed by Vice Principal Jonathan Seckl, Library & University Collections Senior Management Team and the University of Edinburgh LERU theme leads. Content in this paper will also feature in reports to Research Policy Group, College Research Committees, University Library Committee, Knowledge Strategy Committee, Academic Strategy Group and College Library Committees.

Further information

22. Authors

Dominic Tate
Head of Library Research Support

Theo Andrew
Scholarly Communications Manager
Library and University Collections

Gavin McLachlan
Chief Information Officer and Librarian to the University
Information Services
8 November 2018

Presenter

Gavin McLachlan
Chief Information Officer and
Librarian to the University

Freedom of Information

23. This paper is closed, as it contains commercially sensitive information which could affect library negotiations with publishers.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Modern Slavery Statement 2017/18

Description of paper

1. This paper provides a draft of this year's Modern Slavery Statement, which is the University's third statement since the Modern Slavery Act came into force.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is asked to approve the statement, which will then go to Audit and Risk Committee and Court.

Paragraphs 3-7 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

8. The attached statement outlines the potential risks for the University of Edinburgh and the writers' understanding of the current mitigation taking place. It is deemed unlikely that we are at risk of modern slavery in our direct operations but there are risks in our supply chains and in relationships with contractors and potentially with our international activities.

Equality & Diversity

9. Due consideration has been given to equality and diversity as part of this review. An Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

Next steps & Communications

10. After Executive Committee, the statement will go to Audit and Risk Committee, and Court. It will be signed off by Court before the end of 2018 and will then be published on the University website (linked from the bottom of each web page).

Consultation

11. The statement has been reviewed by members of the Modern Slavery Working Group as mentioned above, and by the Social Responsibility and Sustainability Committee.

Further information

12. Author

Liz Cooper
Research and Policy Manager
Department for Social Responsibility
and Sustainability

Freedom of Information

13. This is a closed paper until the final statement is approved by Court.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

First Statutory Annual Procurement Report

Description of paper

1. The Procurement Reform (Scotland) Act requires the University to provide a prescribed University Annual Procurement Report (APR). Attached is the final draft for approval.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive is asked to consider and approve the proposed draft Annual Procurement Report.

Paragraphs 3-6 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

7. Procurement Risk Management Executives recommended minimum compliant reporting and this model within the statutory guidance has been used for the Annual Procurement Report. Forward plans in particular are only included with appropriate caveats applied.

Equality & Diversity

8. An Equality Impact Assessment is not required. Procurement plans include equalities duties and supply chain code of conduct covering fair workplace issues. Living Wage accreditation implies that on-site services should meet this standard.

Next steps/implications

9. The Annual Procurement Report will be published online and notified to the Scottish Government by the end of November.

Consultation

10. The University's Procurement Risk Management Executives have reviewed the procurement strategy.

Further information

11. The Joint Directors of Procurement are responsible for the production of the procurement strategy and this annual report. Further information is available from the authors.

Authors

Karen Bowman and George Sked
Joint Directors of Procurement
5 November 2018

Presenter

Phil McNaull
Director of Finance

Freedom of Information

12. This paper will made public following approval by the University Executive.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Revised Governance Arrangements - UoE Utilities Supply Company Limited

Description of paper

1. The purpose of this paper is to set out the revised overarching governance arrangements for the University of Edinburgh Utilities Supply Company Limited which includes the divisionalisation of the company to include Utility Supply and relevant Estates Development projects.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive is requested to consider the following:
- The proposal to change the name of the company to 'UoE Estates Services Company Limited.';
 - The revised Articles of Association;
 - The revised Memorandum of Agreement between the company and the University; and
 - The proposed membership of the Board of the company.
3. The University Executive is further asked to note that the revised governance arrangements will be presented to Estates Committee for comment before approval is sought at the Policy and Resources Committee on 28 January 2019.

Paragraphs 4-10 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource implications

11. There are no resource implications as a result of the recommendations contained within this report.

Risk Management

12. There are no specific risks identified.

Equality & Diversity

13. No specific Equality and Diversity issues are identified.

Next steps/implications

14. Following consideration by the University Executive, the next step will be to seek formal governance approval of the same via the Estates Committee and Policy and Resources Committee.

Consultation

15. The short-life working group has been involved in the proposals for the revised governance arrangements. The Directors of the Board have had the opportunity to review the proposals and provide comments. The Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning and the Head of Tax have been provided with details of the proposals.

Further information

16. Author

Kyle Clark-Hay
Head of Estates Business Services
8 November 2018

Presenter

Phil McNaul
Director of Finance

Freedom of Information

17. This paper is closed as disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the University and UoE Utilities Supply Company Limited.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

**People Report
(Incorporating work of People Committee and Human Resources)**

Description of paper

1. This paper provides an update on work instigated by People Committee and on other People related matters being taken forward by Human Resources and other University departments.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Executive is requested to note the content of this paper and comment or raise questions.

Paragraphs 3-27 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource implications

28. Resources will be met from within existing budgets unless outlined in the paper.

Risk Management

29. The University has a low risk appetite for both compliance risks and people risks.

Equality & Diversity

30. Equality issues will be considered on a case by case basis for each individual project/piece of work.

Next steps/implications

31. Regular reports will be presented to the University Executive.

Further information

32. Author and Presenter

James Saville

Director of Human Resources

6 November 2018

Freedom of Information

33. This paper is closed.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

20 November 2018

Disclosure of Intimate Relationships Policy

Description of paper

1. This paper presents an updated version of the new policy requiring staff members to disclose if they are, or have been, in an intimate relationship with a current student or other staff member with whom they have a line management/connection.

Action requested

2. University Executive is asked to note the tracked changes in the Appendix.

Paragraphs 3-5 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

6. The attached policy will help the University to minimise risk to staff and students and to its reputation.

Equality & Diversity

7. This policy emphasises the University's commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion and zero tolerance of harassment. An equality impact assessment will be carried out to support final consultation with the trade unions.

Next steps & Communication

8. The attached policy will be submitted to CJCNC following the University Executive meeting.

Consultation

9. The attached policy has been informed by discussions at People Committee, the work of the Short Life Working Group and informal discussions between the Vice Principal, People and Culture and the Heads of College.

Further information

10. <u>Author</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
Linda Criggie	Jane Norman
Deputy Director of HR (Employee Relations)	Vice Principal, People and Culture

Freedom of Information

11. This paper is closed until the policy has been formally agreed by CJCNC.