



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## UNIVERSITY COURT

17 June 2024, Room 2.55, Edinburgh Futures Institute

### Minutes

- Members Present:** Janet Legrand, Senior Lay Member  
Simon Fanshawe, Rector  
Rushad Abadan, Co-opted Member (items 1-10.2)  
Frank Armstrong, Co-opted Member  
Dora Herndon, Students' Association President  
Shereen Benjamin, Senatus Assessor  
Richard Blythe, Senatus Assessor  
Ruth Elliott, Students' Association Vice-President Community  
Alastair Dunlop, Chancellor's Assessor  
Tobias Kelly, Academic Staff Member (items 1-10.2)  
Peter Mathieson, Principal & Vice-Chancellor  
Sarah McAllister, Professional Services Staff Member  
Douglas Millican, Co-opted Member  
Jock Millican, General Council Assessor  
Kathryn Nash, Trade Union Academic Staff Member  
Mark Patrizio, Trade Union Professional Services Staff Member  
Alistair Smith, Co-opted Member (not present for item 3)  
Kavi Thakrar, Co-opted Member (items 1-10.2)  
Sarah Wolffe, General Council Assessor
- Member Apologies:** Robert Aldridge, City of Edinburgh Council Assessor  
Douglas Alexander, General Council Assessor  
Ruth Girardet, Co-opted Member  
Hugh Mitchell, Co-opted Member
- In Attendance:** Imran Khan, Governance Apprentice  
Leigh Chalmers, Vice-Principal & University Secretary  
Gale Macleod, Rector's Assessor
- Presenters & Observers:** Lewis Allan, Senior Governance Advisor to the Vice-Principal & University Secretary  
Lucy Evans, Deputy Secretary Students  
Kim Graham, Provost  
Lee Hamill, Director of Finance  
Colm Harmon, Vice-Principal Students  
Louise Kelso, General Counsel & Director of Legal Services  
Catherine Martin, Vice-Principal Corporate Services  
Theresa Merrick, Director of Communications & Marketing  
James Saville, Director of Human Resources  
Rona Smith, Deputy Secretary Governance & Strategic Planning  
Daniel Wedgwood, Head of Court Services  
Richard Davidson, Convener of Investment Committee (for item 3)  
Veena O'Halloran, External Facilitator for the Court Effectiveness Review (for item 7)

## OPENING ITEMS

### Opening and welcome

The Rector welcomed members and attendees and noted apologies, as listed above. He extended a particular welcome to Dora Herndon and Ruth Elliott, as the new student members of Court, and congratulated Sarah McAllister on her re-election as Professional Services elected staff member of Court and Kathryn Nash on her re-appointment as the academic trade union member of Court.

The Rector made opening remarks focused on the University's pursuit of truth, stressing, as part of this, the importance of dialogue and debate and the need to make efforts to access and take into account a wide range of views. He also noted recent University events at which he had been present and the positive impression they had made and commented that it was a privilege to be a part of the University community.

Having opened the meeting, the Rector invited the Senior Lay Member to chair the main items of business on the agenda.

#### **1 Minutes**

**Paper A1**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2024 were approved, subject to amendments to the wording of one paragraph under item 10.

#### **2 Matters Arising & Review of Action Log**

**Paper A2**

##### Action Log

The Action Log was noted.

In relation to the completed action (relating to wider on-going work) on Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression, the Rector mentioned relevant work carried out in the context of the English higher education sector by the Office for Students. The Principal noted that the Scottish Funding Council was aware of this and able to take it into account in any relevant work for the Scottish sector.

##### Matter Arising

It was noted that the previous Court meeting had included presentation of the annual Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Report, in the context of which there had been discussion of the University's duty under the Equality Act to 'foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it'. It was suggested that that discussion had not provided reassurance that the University was approaching this duty appropriately with respect to all protected characteristics. The Vice-Principal & University Secretary noted that there had been further discussions since the April meeting and that developments regarding the memberships and remits of relevant committees were imminent. It was agreed that these should be expedited as far as possible.

### **3.1 Principal's Report**

**Paper B1**

Court noted the report.

### **3.2 Report from the Short Life Working Group on Definition of Armaments for Investments [taken before item 2]**

**Paper B2**

The Senior Lay Member welcomed Richard Davidson, Convener of Investment Committee, to the meeting and thanked him and all the members of Investment Committee for their input on this topic so far. She also thanked all those who had been involved in the Short Life Working Group on Definition of Armaments for Investments or otherwise involved in the process that had led to the current discussion, recognising that substantial work had been conducted within a restricted timescale.

Court received a summary of this process and wider work, much of it on-going, to review the University's Responsible Investment Policy. It was noted that the University Executive had already discussed the working group's report, prior to input from Investment Committee having been available.

It was noted that the issues under discussion were complex and that decisions made at this point could have longer-term consequences. Members were reminded of the duties and responsibilities of Court members, including fiduciary responsibilities and responsibility for the University's reputation. Members were also reminded of the need for confidentiality in Court's proceedings, both as a matter of principle and to ensure the accuracy of public understanding of any outcomes.

Feedback from the working group was provided. The group had focused on matters of principle, in particular the definition of controversial weapons for the purposes of investment. While it was recognised that the issue had come to prominence in the context of the on-going conflict in Gaza, the working group had, intentionally, not considered individual investments, nor how different companies might be associated with any particular conflict. Nor had the group been able to consider the impacts of any particular decision in relation to investments. It had recognised that the input of Investment Committee and potentially others would be necessary in this respect. There had been a diversity of opinion within the group. The report was intended to include all voices from within the group and, reflecting this, it presented the perceived advantages, disadvantages and risks of any potential course of action.

It was noted that the University Executive's discussion had mirrored the working group's discussions in many ways, and also generated a diversity of opinion, suggesting that the report had successfully laid out the key issues and complexities for those who were not experts in the field.

Court received a summary of key considerations from the perspective of Investment Committee, which included the following:

- The majority of the University's investments were held in pooled funds, as would be expected for an investment portfolio of this size and type. For this part of the University's investment, the University chose the fund manager

and the manager selected individual investments. Fund managers were instructed to follow ESG (environmental, social and governance) principles, according to widely accepted definitions.

- Any further exclusions imposed by the University brought complexity both at the level of principled decision-making and implementation. For example, decisions included whether to include or exclude firms in supply or distribution chains for a given product or service, in addition to producers. Examples were provided from previous decisions to divest from tobacco and fossil fuels. Changes to the University's list of exclusions could require withdrawal from certain pooled funds and this could bring a significant financial penalty.
- Further complexity related to the diverse operations of many companies in which investments might be made. A test of 'materiality' was typically employed to determine whether a given company's activity in an excluded area was of sufficient scale to trigger divestment. In some cases, a company might be largely active in areas that would be highly aligned with the University's values and policies but also have some activity in excluded areas (for example, activity in both renewable energy and fossil fuels), requiring judgment over the net positive and negative implications.

Members engaged in extended discussion, in which a variety of views were expressed. Topics of discussion included the following:

- whether Court was in a position to make an informed decision at this stage or required more information, including on the impacts of different decisions and the practicalities involved;
- the potential reputational impacts of either taking an outlying position, relative to standard ESG definitions, of being perceived to abandon political neutrality or of being seen not to take action in this case;
- the considerable strength of feeling on potential relationships between the University's investments and the conflict in Gaza – which had been expressed recently through, for example, motions passed by Senate, protests that had occurred on campus in recent weeks and representations made through a number of other groups – but also the need to establish the range and balance of opinion in the University community and encourage dialogue, rather than assume that the most prominent voices were necessarily representative of the wider community;
- the advantages or disadvantages of making certain decisions quickly, including the potential to show responsiveness to concerns within the University community and the risks of making decisions under pressure;
- the implications of the complexities around potential divestment decisions, as set out by the Convener of Investment Committee, with members observing that previous experiences might provide reassurance of the University's ability to handle such complexity but also that repeated calls for divestment for different reasons could lead to an unmanageable investment policy;
- the potential future development of international ESG standards, such that Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) and AI-directed Lethal Targeting of Human Subjects might come to be designated more widely as controversial weapons, and whether this should encourage the University to wait to ensure alignment with accepted standards or to act early and help to drive the development of such standards;

- whether the University should look beyond specific weapons systems and seek to divest from all armaments, perhaps in the longer term, or should rather recognise the importance of defence capabilities and other justified uses of arms;
- whether Court should more fundamentally examine its overall objectives and principles with regard to investments, to better prepare Court to make fully informed, principled decisions in cases like the present debate; and
- whether the University might make investments in recovery funds for Gaza, irrespective of current decisions regarding potential divestments.

Recognising that disagreements remained regarding some of the substantive points discussed, Court agreed the following outcomes:

- Court members expressed gratitude for the substantial amount of information provided by various correspondents as well as to the Short-Life Working Group on Definition of Armaments for Investments, who had completed their work in a highly compressed timeframe.
- Court was committed to reviewing the University's approach to investment, emphasising the need for openness and transparency of the work of the Investment Committee, as reflected and discussed further in the context of the recent Court external effectiveness review.
- Court members had expressed openness to expanding the definition of controversial armaments including the ways in which AI targeting and other technological or digital developments might be incorporated.
- Court had noted challenges identified by the Short-Life Working Group, specifically that there is not currently a universally agreed definition of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems and that further work would need to be done to understand how expanding our definition could be implemented in our investment portfolio.
- Court therefore requested further information on the deliverability of such a change plus an analysis of the consequences.
- This work should be completed before the next Court meeting so that a fully informed discussion could then take place. By that time, the inputs into the wider consultation on the University's Responsible Investment Policy, which is open until 31 August 2024, would also be available. [Note: This timeframe was extended to allow analysis of the high volume of consultation responses.]
- Court agreed that while further work was ongoing, the previously agreed pause in certain new direct stock investments should be continued.
- Court reaffirmed the commitment previously expressed by the Executive to ensuring that any decisions are principled, meaningful, informed, and fit for any future situation that may arise.

In addition, the Convener thanked Richard Davidson both for his contribution to the meeting and his longstanding service to Investment Committee, noting that he would shortly be standing down from the committee and that the appointment of his successor was to be reported elsewhere in the agenda of this meeting.

## **4 Committee Business**

### **Senior Lay Member's Overview**

The Senior Lay Member reflected on the constructive nature of the previous discussion and the importance of clear communication of its outcomes was discussed.

#### **Exception Committee**

**Paper C1**

Court noted the report, which was closely related to the discussion under item 3.

It was clarified that the decision to make no further holdings in certain stocks had been made by the committee, responding to a recommendation made by the Principal.

#### **Policy & Resources Committee**

**Paper C2**

Two matters to be dealt with elsewhere in the agenda were highlighted: changes to the draft budget that had been requested by Policy & Resources Committee (PRC); and discussion that had occurred in the context of a number of Estates-related items, including requests for capital funding. The discussion at PRC had emphasised the importance of strategic review of Estates matters, to include consideration of disposal of assets.

#### **Nominations Committee**

**Paper C3**

On the recommendation of Nominations Committee, Court approved:

- the re-appointment of Hugh Mitchell as a member of Policy & Resources Committee for a further three-year term;
- the re-appointment of Hugh Mitchell, Sarah McAllister and Sarah Wolffe as members of Nominations Committee for further terms of three years;
- the re-appointment of Hugh Mitchell as Convener of Remuneration Committee for a further three-year term; and
- the re-appointment of Sarah McAllister as a member of Knowledge Strategy Committee for a further three-year term.

Also on the recommendation of Nominations Committee, Court agreed that at least three Court members be members of Knowledge Strategy Committee in the next academic year.

Court also agreed the recommendation of Nominations Committee that no change should be made regarding the unremunerated nature of the Rector position.

Court noted the following committee appointments that had been made, under delegated authority, by Nominations Committee:

- the extension of Alistair Smith’s membership of Estates Committee for one year (matching the remainder of his current term of office as a member of Court); and
- the appointment of Alastair Laing as Convener of Investment Committee.

It was noted that other decisions regarding the membership of Investment Committee were to be deferred until the new Convener had had the opportunity to provide input and that this was in line with a recommendation of the draft report of Court’s effectiveness review (see item 7 below).

### **Audit & Risk Committee**

**Paper C4**

Court received the report. Douglas Millican, Convener of Audit & Risk Committee, highlighted the following points:

- There had been an independent exercise to audit the University’s reputation management. While many stakeholders had reported that the University had a good overall reputation, specific knowledge of the University’s strengths and contributions was less commonly found. This pointed to areas for improvement and relevant work was underway.
- The Committee had endorsed the Internal Audit Plan for 2024-25 and the overall quality of the work of Internal Audit and had recommended the Plan for Court’s approval.
- The Committee had also expressed satisfaction with the work of the external auditor and recommended for Court’s approval the External Audit Annual Plan and Fee for 2023-24.

There was discussion and clarification of the inclusion of academic freedom within the University’s risk register.

Court approved the Internal Audit Plan 2024-25, the External Audit Annual Plan 2023-24 and the External Audit Fee for the 2023-24 audit.

### **Knowledge Strategy Committee**

**Paper C5**

Court noted the report. The role of Knowledge Strategy Committee in relation to other committees was discussed and it was noted that this was relevant to discussion of the effectiveness review (see item 7 below).

### **Senate**

**PaperC6**

Court received the report and noted that there was to be an additional meeting of Senate, as time had not allowed for all business to be covered in the previous meeting.

It was noted that the member-led paper on defence-related research had been well received. The Task & Finish Group on the recommendations of the Senate effectiveness review was considering ways to further enhance Senate meeting papers.

## KEY ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

### 5 Finance

#### Director of Finance's Report

Paper D1

Lee Hamill, Director of Finance summarised key points from his report. In broad terms, the financial position at Quarter 3 reflected that at Quarter 2. The University's reported surplus was expected to be substantial, due in large part to the consequences for the University of the recent shift in the USS pension from deficit to surplus, as a result of wider economic conditions. It was recognised that this created a communications challenge, with publicly-reported headline figures expected to be misaligned with the underlying financial position.

The size of the forecast shortfall against targeted EBITDA was discussed. It was noted that, given the nature of University activity, the scope for in-year adjustments to either income or expenditure was limited and that the planning and budgeting process (as covered in Paper D2), along with longer-term structural changes, offered much greater potential for re-balancing.

#### Planning and Budgeting: Planning round 2024-29, 2024-25 proposals Paper D2

Rona Smith, Deputy Secretary Governance & Strategic Planning, introduced the planning round and budget proposals, noting that a five-year view had been provided, with a focus on the coming academic year (2024-25) for the detailed budget. She gave an overview of the financial pressures and environment of relative uncertainty facing the higher education sector as a whole, with particular risks around student recruitment and tuition fee income, while noting that the University continued to experience high demand from prospective students.

It was noted that the framing of the budget had changed as a result of input from Policy & Resources Committee (PRC). It had been agreed through that committee that the budget would be set so as to achieve EBITDA as a percentage of income at a higher level than previous proposals. There were consequently elements of the budget that remained to be worked out in detail, with a requirement to embed additional savings, or, where possible, increased income. In adopting the current proposed budget, the University's senior management was committed to delivering these further savings and/or additional income through dialogue with budget-holders. In line with discussion at PRC, it was recognised that a variety of mechanisms to deliver savings would be required, with a focus on strategic, long-term effects where possible.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- The five-year forecast showed a need for increasing levels of savings to maintain EBITDA as a percentage of income.
- A range of data was used in calculating fee revenue targets, with careful consideration of the nature of different international markets, and a degree of certainty was provided by the fact that continuing students made up the majority of fee-paying students in a given year.



- The Director of Finance confirmed that scenario planning was to be undertaken and that Court would be updated regarding this, primarily through his regular financial updates for Court members.
- While recognising that there had not been sufficient time since the PRC meeting to develop detailed proposals, Court members were keen to understand how the necessary level of cost savings would be achieved.
- It would be important to employ clear communications on actions taken in relation to the budget, both to remove uncertainty for staff and to promote buy-in for the approach taken.
- An opportunity should be created to provide more information to Court around the time of next Court meeting, recognising that there was unlikely to be sufficient time within the meeting.

Court approved the budget, noting that further information was to be provided in due course and that the University would monitor financial performance closely during the budget period and react appropriately.

## **6 Annual People Report**

**Paper E**

James Saville, Director of HR, introduced the report, noting that this was the first annual report of its kind and that it covered the calendar year 2023, although the intention was to move to reporting in line with the academic year in future cycles. This first report was focused on activity within the central HR function but it was intended that future reports would encompass relevant work across the University.

The report had been produced as part of fulfilling a commitment to increase reporting on the staff experience at Court level. This was in addition to the continued provision of regular People Reports to the University Executive and Policy & Resources Committee.

It was noted that significant relevant work had been carried out in 2024, which was not covered in the report. The following points were highlighted:

- The first stage of implementation of the grade scale review had been completed in April 2024, bringing benefits to a large proportion of staff.
- There had been a narrowing of the gender pay gap, partly driven by the grade scale review.
- A new Predictable Working Policy and Menopause Policy were shortly to be introduced, subject to final discussions with trade unions.
- There had been work to harmonise holiday allowances, much of which produced improvements at the lowest pay grades.
- Support relating to immigration fees and visas had been further enhanced, an area in which Edinburgh was a sector leader.
- A positive change in tone had been noticed in staff engagement events, indicating improved staff morale. A staff survey was planned for early in 2025.
- Data made newly available through the People & Money system had facilitated new kinds of HR analysis.
- One area of improved insight was staff turnover. This was lower than that of most comparators in the sector and significantly lower than typical levels in many other sectors, a positive indication of staff satisfaction.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- Positive developments in the 2023 report and since were noted and the importance of clearly communicating these was emphasised. Clarity regarding the sector and institutional context would also be important in informing staff perceptions.
- Staff turnover had positive aspects, in refreshing an organisation's talent pool. This was recognised and there was consideration of how to optimise the contributions of both existing and new staff.
- While the report highlighted much positive activity, there might be scope for improved measurement of outcomes.
- Taking a broad view, there were a number of avenues for potential further enhancement of the staff experience. These included the benefits of a range of capital investments and engaging staff in improvements to sustainability.

Given limited time for discussion in this meeting, Court agreed that there should be further discussion of the staff experience in a future Court seminar or meeting.

## **7 Court External Effectiveness Review Report** [taken before item 6]

**Paper F**

Veena O'Halloran, External Facilitator for the Court External Effectiveness Review, introduced her report and thanked all participants, including members of Court, for their high levels of open engagement with the review process. She noted that the review was not a systematic audit of compliance in the area of corporate governance, although she expressed confidence in the University's arrangements in this respect. Instead, the review provided an overview of the current functioning of Court and its committees and reflected the input of participants to a considerable extent.

The quality of Court's membership was highlighted as a key strength. Many structural aspects were also commended, including the overall committee structure, mentoring and the use of Court seminars. Broad themes underpinning the report's recommendations for further enhancement included the creation of more time for strategic discussion, to include cross-cutting themes, consideration of how to enhance the student voice and the assessment of risk and appetite for risk.

It was agreed that Court should delegate initial consideration of the report's recommendations to Nominations Committee.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- Improvements to engagement with students might include joint presentations by University staff and the students' association on topics relating to the student experience. It was noted the National Student Survey was only one measure of student satisfaction and should not outweigh other perspectives on the student experience.
- It would be important for Nominations Committee to take into consideration Senate's parallel process and, in particular, to work with representatives of Senate on any changes relating to Knowledge Strategy Committee and any other areas of shared interest.

- Nominations Committee should prioritise the recommendations relating to the remit and membership of Investment Committee, given the committee's relevance to high-profile current issues (see item 3).
- The review was an opportunity to consider how Court papers and processes might be optimised to facilitate Court's governance role, with a focus on the types and quantities of information this required.

## 8 Student Experience

Paper G

Colm Harmon, Vice Principal Students, introduced the student experience update, highlighting the following points:

- The results of the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey had recently been published. Edinburgh's overall satisfaction score had risen by five percentage points. More detailed results included a significant increase in satisfaction with the provision of feedback, among other key areas of improvement.
- There had been further progress in relation to the implementation, enhancement and evaluation of the Student Support Model, which had attracted positive attention from peer institutions.
- Work had commenced on a portfolio review. This had been positively received in discussion with the Academic Strategy Group.
- Assessment and feedback continued to be a priority and there had been significant progress in improving reporting from all Schools and use of the resulting data to drive improvement.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- The new data on assessment and feedback were welcomed.
- There were significant costs associated with the Curriculum Transformation Project but a range of benefits was expected to flow from this, including streamlining of the University's offering, in addition to substantial enhancements to the student experience. The details of the business case for the project remained under discussion.

It was noted that a Court seminar on the student experience, with the involvement of the students' association, was planned to take place early in the 2024/25 academic year.

## 9 Students' Association and Sports Union Reports

### Students' Association Report

Paper H1

Court noted the report.

### Sports Union Report

Paper H2

Court noted the report.

## 10 Estates

Frank Armstrong, Convener of Estates Committee, provided an overview of Estates Committee's consideration of the matters for discussion in this section of the

meeting, noting that scrutiny by Estates Committee had been informed by other bodies, including Capital Projects Group where relevant.

A number of the proposals at hand requiring Court's approval were not included in the current Capital Plan. However, they had been identified as priorities and affordability had been considered carefully by Estates Committee. In some cases, the need for a degree of re-prioritisation reflected the continued impact of the disruption of estates activities during the Covid-19 pandemic. A new approach was to be taken to the planning exercise to create a robust and clear next plan. This would consider all dimensions of estates planning, including the possibility of disposal of assets.

In discussion, it was observed that the requests for approval of significant capital funding in these proposals ostensibly contrasted with the agreement elsewhere in the agenda that budgetary prudence was essential at this stage. It was noted that funds were available for all of the immediate proposed expenditure and that opportunity costs and future prioritisation were therefore the key considerations.

### **10.1 Residential Strategy 2023-2030 Update**

**Paper I**

Court approved the updated Residential Strategy. It was noted that changes made to the strategy since it had first been published in 2023 reflected numerous changes in the external context and were informed by an independent report on the accommodation market in Edinburgh.

### **10.2 Strategic Acquisition of Property**

**Paper J**

Damien Toner, Director of Estates, gave an overview of the proposal to acquire property that had become available through a potential private purchase. The site offered numerous strategic benefits through its location and relevant planning permissions. Subject to further planning permissions, the site would allow for significant expansion of the University's student accommodation and could potentially create efficiencies elsewhere in the University estate, as a result of consolidating activity.

Noting the importance of due diligence work, Court:

- supported the conclusion of ongoing acquisition negotiations with the agents of the owners of the property; and
- approved an initial funding package associated with the agreed acquisition price, VAT applicable on the purchase price and associated legal fees.

### **10.3 Churchill House Refurbishment**

**Paper K**

Catherine Martin, Vice-Principal Corporate Services, gave an overview of the proposal to undertake refurbishment of the University residences at Churchill House. This had been delayed as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and the works were now considered essential in order to return the accommodation to expected standards, for which standard levels of rent could be charged.

It was noted that the degree of structural complexity in this refurbishment had an impact on costs and that, in this context, Estates Committee had thoroughly scrutinised the cost-effectiveness of the proposals before recommending them to Court.

Court

- approved Capital Funding to progress the project to completion; and
- noted the requirement for Accommodation, Catering and Events (ACE) to secure a one-year nominations agreement to offset the loss of beds, which would be subject to a future Estates Committee approval.

#### **10.4 Sport & Active Wellbeing Facilities Development Recommendations      Paper L**

Court received an overview of the proposed projects to develop Sport & Active Wellbeing facilities. It was noted that Court's approval was sought because a reallocation of funding was requested, although the amount of funding was below the level normally requiring Court approval. A larger planned project was being reassessed as a result of changing costs and needs. It was proposed that some of the funding allocated to this should be reallocated to specific improvements to sport facilities that had been identified as urgent and/or of particular benefit.

Court approved the reallocation of part of the funding committed in the current Capital Plan for the delivery of the Peffermill Sports Complex to the seven specified small works projects.

#### **10.5 CRIC 4 – National Total-Body Positron Emission Tomography facility at Edinburgh Imaging      Paper M**

Court approved capital funding to progress the works to completion.

#### **10.6 Queens Medical Research Institute Collaboration Works      Paper N**

Court approved capital funding to progress the project to completion

#### **10.7 Midlothian Centre of Excellence and First Opinion Practice      Paper O**

Court approved capital funding to allow the project to progress to completion.

### **11 Digital**

#### **Digital Strategy      Paper P**

Court approved the strategy, noting the detailed scrutiny and recommendations for approval provided by Estates Committee, Knowledge Strategy Committee and other relevant bodies.

It was noted that Court could benefit from a future Court seminar on the physical and digital estate, to complement this strategy and provide further insight.

## **Digital Estates Capital Plan 2023-2029**

**Paper Q**

Court noted the update on Digital Estates capital expenditure projected for 2023/24 and forecast to 2028/29.

### **ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL**

#### **12 Annual Recognition of Alumni Clubs**

**Paper R**

Court renewed its formal recognition of the nine University of Edinburgh alumni clubs currently recognised and noted relevant activity over the past year.

#### **13 Development & Alumni: Donations and Legacies and Alumni Relations Activity**

**Paper S**

Court noted the report.

#### **14 Prevent Duty Annual Compliance**

**Paper T**

Court noted the update report.

#### **15 Education Act 1994 requirements in relation to the Students' Association**

**Paper U**

Court noted the Certificate of Assurance.

#### **16 Resolutions: Degree Programme Regulations**

**Paper V**

Court approved:

- Resolution No. 4/2024: Undergraduate Degree Programme Regulations
- Resolution No. 5/2024: Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

#### **17 Resolutions: Chairs**

**Paper W**

Court approved the presented Resolutions.

The number of Chairs created and implications for staff costs were discussed. Relevant procedures were outlined and it was noted that benchmarking with comparator institutions was conducted in this area.

#### **18 Any Other Business**

Court approved the rescheduling of a Court meeting.

#### **19 Date of Next Meeting**

Monday 7 October 2024, all day (seminar and meeting)