CM 4093 WELCOME

The Convener welcomed Professor I Hunter, Dean-Elect of the Faculty of Science, Mr K Ward, Deputy President of the Students Association, and Ms V Hunter, Head of Asset Management, to the meeting.

CM 4094 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2008 were approved subject to the following amendment:

CM 4091.1 Convener’s Actions: Late Fees
i. Egyptian Students
   Delete: ‘the fee for the Graduate Diploma (English) for postgraduate study’
   Insert: ‘the fee for the non-graduating English Teacher Training course’

CM 4095 DR A S HUNTER

The Convener proposed that Dr A S Hunter, previous Convener of Court, be nominated for a Fellowship of the University in light of the significant contribution he had made to the governance of the University and to the wider University community in general. He had been an effective and hard-working Convener with a light touch. Court unanimously

RESOLVED that a Fellowship of the University be conferred upon Dr A S Hunter.
PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

Court noted a report from the Principal which included the following information:

- Court was pleased to note that the Strathclyde Business School had risen significantly in the ranks of the Financial Times MBA list for 2008, and had been ranked 30 in the world. It had also been top of the league table for value for money. Court congratulated the Dean and his staff for achieving such success.
- Court was also pleased to note that Deputy Principal Professor McDonald had been appointed to membership of the Scottish Science Advisory Committee; and Dr Mashelkar, President of the Institute of Chemical Engineers, had recently opened the refurbished teaching and research laboratories in the Department of Chemical Engineering.
- An exhibition of physics for the marketplace had recently been held at the SECC in Glasgow which had featured contributions from all of the SUPA Universities, including Strathclyde.
- Court joined the Principal in congratulating the students on their recent success at the Scottish Universities Indoor Athletics; and also Mr G Singh, the current President of the Students Association, who had recently been elected President of the National Union of Students Scotland.

UNIVERSITY STRATEGY (CM 4081)

Court noted an update on progress with the implementation of the Strategic Plan and a paper setting out the strategic planning process for the future. In particular Pro Vice-Principal Professor Miller drew Court’s attention to the following matters:

- The Strategic Plan had been launched in May 2007 and all areas of the University had been asked to provide strategy statements by the end of June 2007 to show how they would be taking account of and responding to this new strategy. All areas have recently been asked to provide an update on their original strategy statements to show what had been achieved so far, how alignment with the strategy was being achieved and what their priorities for the future were.
- Reports on further excellence reviews had been circulated and these clearly demonstrated the changes that were being made in response to the excellence agenda. The next round of excellence reviews would shortly commence.
- The Working Group on the Appointment of Senior Academic Managers had recently reported and its recommendations had been endorsed by UMC and Senate and were now before Court for consideration and approval (see CM 4098 below).
- The University’s Resource Allocation Model (RAM) had been revised in order to ensure that it was more transparent and aligned with the strategy and would help ensure that the resource, both human and financial, was focussed in supporting the excellence agenda. It was recognised that there was a need to create headroom to allow staff the opportunity to be innovative and make changes. The new RAM would provide better identification of income and make it easier to track expenditure. In discussion of this matter it was suggested that the nature of the new RAM should be disseminated more widely to staff as it was considered that staff would be more accepting of it if they understood the underlying principles.
- The Holistic Review Group had held its first meeting last month and had agreed its terms of reference and the initial areas to be reviewed. It was the intention that there would be a report to the Residential meeting of Court in November on the progress, and some of the early outcomes, of these reviews.
A successful residential meeting of the Senior Officers and the Deans had been held recently. This had been an extremely useful session.

It was the intention to hold a briefing session on Thursday 8 May 2008 to which all members of the University community would be invited to hear an update on progress with the implementation of the Strategic Plan. An internal communications strategy was being developed to ensure that the University community was well informed of the projects and activities associated with the strategy. In discussion it was acknowledged that good communication was essential in order to get ‘buy-in’ from staff and to obtain useful feedback from across the University.

CM 4098  APPOINTMENT OF SENIOR ACADEMIC MANAGERS (SM 11287)

Court received the report from the Working Group on the Appointment of Senior Academic Managers. This Working Group had been established to review how senior appointments were made and to ensure that, whatever process the University used, it would identify the best candidates for the posts. Information and advice had been sought from a variety of sources and this had shown that Strathclyde was out of step in the sector in that it still retained elected posts in the form of the Vice-Principal and Pro Vice-Principal. There were also some concerns about the lack of transparency in relation to the appointments of Deputy Principals and the need to take a more consistent approach to the appointment of Deans. Currently there were no job descriptions for the senior officer posts (Vice-Principal, Pro Vice-Principal and Deputy Principal) and there was no scope to test the market externally for these senior posts. It was recognised that the post of Vice-Principal was a statutory post and, therefore, had certain specific responsibilities. The views of Senate would be important to determine the future method of appointments to this post. Professors Love and Paterson, both members of the Working Group, had consulted with Senate members on this particular matter and the feedback obtained had shaped the final report. It was noted that the recommendations of the Working Group had already been discussed and endorsed by both the University Management Committee and Senate.

In discussion it was noted that criteria for the Senior Officer posts would need to be developed. An induction process for all these posts would need to be developed in order to provide support to the individuals appointed. Also, given the changes being proposed, amendments to the University Statutes and Ordinances would be required. It was recognised that changes to Statutes had to be approved by the Privy Council and it would take time before these changes could come into effect. It was the intention that the proposed changes to the Statutes would be brought to Court for consideration at the next meeting.

On the recommendation of Senate, Court

RESOLVED that

i. there would be one, dominant, open process for the appointment of Deputy Principals and Deans through which internal and external candidates can apply. This process would centre around an Appointments Committee and would operate on the basis of clearly articulated criteria being established for any Deputy Principal and Dean vacancies.

ii. the appointing committee for Deputy Principals would normally be comprised of 6 members, including, the Principal, the University Secretary, the Convener of Court and three representatives elected by Senate, with a stipulation that there should be no more than one representative from any Faculty. For Deans, similar principles would apply, with a committee of 6, although the Senate representatives would be replaced by a Dean from another Faculty and Faculty representatives.

Court confirmed a preference for a single appointments committee which would take responsibility for managing the appointment process through to completion.
iii. the normal term of office for Senior Officers and Deans would be five years.

iv. Vice Principals would be appointed through an appointing committee similar to that for all other Senior Officer appointments although, in recognition of the special nature of the role of Vice-Principal, the appointing committee would be augmented to include five Senate representatives.

v. the position of Pro-Vice Principal be abolished with effect from 2008/09. In the meantime, whilst the amendment was going through due process, the post would not be filled once the current Pro Vice-Principal completed his term of office.

vi. the normal probationary period for these senior posts would be two years, with a robust performance assessment taking place towards the end of the second year. A possible outcome from this process would be the termination of the appointment where performance was considered to fall short of expectations.

vii. in relation to the process for the appointment and induction of Deans a common approach across all Faculties would be developed.

CM 4099 APPOINTMENT OF DEAN OF THE STRATHCLYDE BUSINESS SCHOOL

Court noted that Professor Harvey would be leaving the University shortly and in order to ensure continuity it had been decided to seek a new Dean using the existing procedures. On the recommendation of the Search Committee and under the terms of Statute XVI and Ordinance 7, Court

RESOLVED that Professor S Hart be appointed Dean of the Strathclyde Business School for the period 1 April 2008 to 31 July 2012, subject to endorsement by Senate.

CM 4100 SPORTS AND HEALTH FACILITY (CM 4073, 3872; ESCM 197)

.1 At its meeting in June 2006 Court had approved the development of a new Sports and Health Facility (CM 3872) to be located on land at Cathedral Street. This was viewed as a strategically significant project with the key objectives of improving the student experience, providing opportunities to improve the health and well being of staff and students, improving research opportunities and improving the marketing ability of the University. Estates Management had worked with the Project Steering Group to progress this development.

.2 Last year the Funding Council (SFC) had approached the University with a proposal that the University could combine with the four FE Colleges that would be merging and relocating on Cathedral Street to develop one large combined sports and health facility. It was considered that not only would this provide greater opportunities for improving FE/HE links it would also be more cost efficient. Staff and students across the University embraced the concept of a joint facility positively and since last spring have expended considerable energies to explore the efficacy of the project. The University made it clear at the outset that its timetable was such that the new facility had to be in place by 2011 at the latest, as this was needed to tie in with the relocation of staff from the Faculty of Education. Since then various discussions have taken place with representatives of the FE Colleges and the Funding Council in order to progress this. Quayle Munro, independent consultants, were appointed to review the perspectives of both the Funding Council and the University to determine an acceptable way forward with this project. The University has also sought legal advice and specialist advice on tax and VAT matters.
At its meeting on 19 February 2008 the Estates Strategy Committee received the report from Quayle Munro, together with advice from the University’s legal advisors. The Convener of the University’s Audit Committee had been invited to attend this meeting so that he could verify the processes that were followed and to provide a further independent view on this matter. The report from Quayle Munro and the University’s legal advisers indicated that progressing with the combined facility represented a high risk for the University unless certain matters of concern could be resolved with the Funding Council. Subsequent to this meeting a meeting between University Senior Officers and the Chief Executive of the Funding Council had been held to discuss this development in some detail. It was noted that the Funding Council had asked for more time to deal with the issues raised and it was agreed that they could be given until the end of March to try and find an acceptable solution.

In considering this project in more detail Court noted the following information:

- The cost estimates and building programme for the stand alone and the combined facility had been revised in light of the information obtained. This showed that there was very little difference in capital cost between the combined facility (£52.15M) and the provision of two stand alone facilities - £30.35M for the University stand alone facility and £25.72M for the Colleges.
- Work was in hand to provide similar comparisons for operational costs.
- The lifecycle and operational costs for this facility also had to be taken into account. Any agreement entered into with the Colleges would need to make explicit what contributions the Colleges would be expected to make to a combined facility. However, if the University owned and operated the facility there may be VAT consequences for the Colleges and this was a matter on which advice was currently being sought. The University already subsidised the operational costs of the existing sports facility and would continue to do so with any new facility, but it was questioned whether the Colleges would be able to afford to contribute the level of funding required to support such a facility.
- In discussions regarding the pattern of usage the information obtained from the FE Colleges demonstrated that there would be very little time left for recreational usage of this facility. This was contrary to one of the University’s key strategic objectives for this facility. Indeed the business plan prepared by the original University working group for the stand alone facility (chaired by the Secretary to the University) had been based on there being a significant amount of time available for recreational use and it was on this basis that Court had approved the original concept. The Colleges had, therefore, been asked to revise their timetable.
- The FE Colleges had not yet merged and it was not entirely clear who the University would be entering into an agreement with regarding the construction and operation of a combined facility. Given that the University’s preferred route, as supported by the Quayle Munro report, was for the University to take ownership of this facility the University would, therefore, take increased risk for its development and operation. This had a number of legal, operational and funding issues that would need to be addressed satisfactorily before the University could enter into any agreement. Currently the risk to the University was too high for it to agree to proceed with a combined facility.
- The University had made it clear at the outset that its target completion date was 2011. This project had already been delayed by a number of months to allow the discussions with the Funding Council and the FE Colleges to take place to explore the feasibility of a combined option. The Colleges were working to a different timescale as their merger was scheduled to be complete by 2015. The University had to complete by 2011 in order to tie in with the relocation of the Faculty of Education to the John Anderson Campus in 2011 and could not delay any further. A decision on the way forward had to be taken soon or the University would not be able to complete this development in the timescale.
Court – 11th March 2008

- The brief for the building had been extended to meet the FE Colleges stated requirements which meant that it was now too large for the site originally identified. The new facility would either spill onto land currently owned by the Central College of Commerce, or could be extended onto space currently occupied by Estates Management. Either way there was a need to find decant space or to relocate departments elsewhere to allow this development to proceed. This introduced further risk to the programme, as well as additional cost.

Court had three options before it: it could proceed with the combined facility if the Funding Council could provide sufficient assurances to the issues raised (Option 1); it could start with its own facility on the understanding that this could be extended at a suitable point in the future when the Colleges were in a better position to quantify and support their needs (Option 2); or the University could proceed with its own stand alone facility (Option 3). Court was clearly of the view that, at this point, the risks to the University to proceed with the combined facility were too high to justify this decision. It was known that there was a political steer for closer links between FE and HE and any opportunities to further such links were being encouraged. Court was also aware that public perception might question why potentially two separate sports and health facilities would be constructed adjacent to one another. However, the view was expressed that the Colleges needed to revisit their future predictions of their pattern of usage and the space required to support this as this could change in the future. It was also queried if they were ready to commit to such a project and to the future operational costs at this stage, given that the timetable for the completion of their new campus was still some way in the future (2015).

Concern was expressed about the potential ramifications of not proceeding with the combined facility and it was considered that other links with FE Colleges should be encouraged to counter balance this option should it be accepted. It was also considered that Option 2, where the construction could start now and the building could be extended at a later date to accommodate the Colleges, should not be ruled out. This might not produce the best building, and would increase the cost of the project, but it might help ease any political sensitivities. Court was clear, however, that whatever option it selected had to be aligned with the University’s excellence agenda.

In light of the above discussion Court

RESOLVED that a Special Meeting be held on Tuesday 15 April 2008 at 2.00.p.m to discuss this matter, by which time further discussions with the Funding Council will have taken place and further information will be available to Court in order that a decision can be taken as to how the University should proceed in this matter.

CM 4101  JORDANHILL BUILDING (CM 4076, 3783; ESCM 193)

At its meeting in January 2006 Court had resolved that, in principle, the Faculty of Education should be relocated to new, purpose built accommodation on the John Anderson Campus (CM 3783). Since then Estates Management had been working with the Faculty of Education and the Steering Group to progress this development. Two sites had emerged as possible locations for this new building. Quayle Munro, external consultants, had assisted Estates Management to evaluate the information gathered on both sites, and particularly in relation to the finalisation of the site selection criteria. The Estates Strategy Committee had been responsible for overseeing the progress of this development and for providing regular updates to Court. At its recent meeting on 19 February, the Committee had met to discuss the report from Estates Management and Quayle Munro in order to identify the preferred site and to make a recommendation to Court. Court noted the report from this committee.
.2 The Vice-Principal, Professor Love, provided Court with a summary of the strategic reasons behind this development. Court was clear that the move to a single campus would provide more opportunities for the integration of staff and students, as well as student services and IT services; it would improve the student experience; and would provide financial benefit by reducing the University’s overall footprint and operational costs.

.3 The Director of Estates Management provided Court with an overview of the project and activities since January 2006. A significant amount of work had been undertaken by staff in the Faculty, in Estates Management and on the Steering Group to ensure that the best solution for the University could be achieved. Two sites had emerged as possible locations for this building – the City Science site and the Graham Hills car park. The City Science site was owned by Scottish Enterprise (Glasgow) and if the University selected this site then they would have to work with Cala, the company appointed by Scottish Enterprise to develop this site. This would incur a developers fee of £4.6M. Whilst some of the risk would transfer to the developer, the University would carry the risk until 80% of the building had been tendered. Whereas the Graham Hills site was owned by the University and so a more traditional procurement route would be followed under the University’s control and using the University’s frameworks for such developments. The site selection criteria had shown that in qualitative terms the City Science site was marginally ahead; but in quantitative terms the Graham Hills site offered better value and would meet the aspirations of the Faculty. In considering all the information available to it the Estates Strategy Committee had concluded that the Graham Hills car park was the preferred site.

.4 The Director of Finance informed Court that this development would be funded, in part, from the proceeds of the disposal of the Jordanhill campus. It would also achieve savings in running costs, by providing new purpose built accommodation rather than meeting significant maintenance costs associated with the current buildings on the Jordanhill Campus, and would reduce the University’s estates footprint. However, regardless of which site was chosen there was still a need to reduce the size and cost of the new building. The Four Year Forecasts would be revised prior to presentation to Court in June but, essentially, there was sufficient funding available to meet the cost of this project once the overall costs had been trimmed.

.5 The Dean of Education confirmed that the staff in the Faculty had indicated a preference for the Graham Hills site and the better opportunities it offered for integration with the rest of the University.

.6 In discussion Court was clear that there was a compelling case, both financially and in terms of the integration opportunities it offered, for selecting the Graham Hills site. Court was also reassured that discussions with Scottish Enterprise (Glasgow) (SEG) had shown that there would be other opportunities for the University to work with SEG in relation to this site and other projects. In light of the information presented and the ensuing discussion, and on the recommendation of the Estates Strategy Committee, Court

RESOLVED that

i. the University should move to a single campus and the Faculty of Education be relocated from the Jordanhill Campus;

ii. the Graham Hills car park site be selected as the site for the development of the new Jordanhill building;

iii. Estates Management proceed to tender for the appointment of the Design Team from the framework;

iv. Estates Management be authorised to appoint the Design Team in order to proceed to Gateway 1, at an estimated cost of £1.5M;
v. discussions with the Faculty should continue with a view to reducing the overall costs.

On behalf of Court the Convener thanked everybody who had been involved in this project, and particularly the staff in Estates Management and the Faculty of Education, for all their hard work and efforts to get the project to this stage.

CM 4102 ESTATES DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: FINANCIAL UPDATE
(CM 4089.6; ESCM 202)

At the last meeting some concern had been expressed about the costs of some of the estates projects. Court now had before it a paper which provided financial information in a summary form and also a more detailed breakdown by zone of the budgeted and forecast estates expenditure. It was considered that it would be helpful if another line showing the expenditure approved by Court was added to this paper. Court agreed that this information was useful and it should continue to receive it on a regular basis.

CM 4103 FACULTY OF SCIENCE REPORT (CM 3958)

Professor Furman, Dean of the Faculty of Science, presented the Faculty’s annual report. He provided Court with a summary of the challenges that had been identified in previous reports and how the Faculty was addressing these, as well as information on how the Faculty was responding to the Strategic Plan and the excellence agenda. In particular Court was pleased to note that the Faculty was continuing to increase its research income and overseas student numbers. The Faculty wished to improve the quality of its home and EU undergraduate intake and had raised the entry requirements for certain subjects, namely Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Physics and Biomedical Sciences. It was acknowledged that there was a balance to be achieved as the Faculty would still continue to maintain entry from GOALS schools.

The Dean was pleased to report that the implementation of the outcomes from the review of Computer and Information Sciences was nearing completion and that this had allowed a number of major improvements to be achieved already with others to follow. The decision had been made to merge the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics and Modelling Science (STAMS). Whilst STAMS was a good department it was considered vulnerable because it was small. A merger Implementation Group has been established under the Convenership of Deputy Principal McDonald. This merger would take effect from 1 August 2009 subject to approval of Court on the recommendation of Senate. Court was interested to note that the Faculty had radically changed its structure in the past three years, moving from 10 academic departments to 5.

The Faculty was also assisting in the process of seeking external funding to help meet the costs involved in constructing the SIPBS building. A total of £8M in external funding was needed, with £2.75M secured so far. Bids had been submitted to other sources to meet the balance and the Faculty would also be contributing from its own resources. The Faculty would continue to be involved in the various pooling initiatives which, whilst being beneficial to the University, were also challenging.
In discussion it was noted that the Faculty was gradually improving its student retention rate but acknowledged that there was more to be done in this area to achieve a significant improvement. Overall it was considered that it would have been more helpful if the Faculty had provided clearer information on defining and measuring its targets. This would make it easier for Court to revisit the Faculty in the future and determine if the Faculty was achieving its targets. The Dean emphasised that targets were being set at departmental level in close consultation with the Dean and his Advisory Group.

On behalf of Court the Convener thanked the Dean for his presentation.

**CM 4104 CHANGE OF DEGREE TITLES: AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE 3 (SM 11288.3, 11270)**

Court noted that, within the Faculty of Science, a review of some of the degree offerings had been undertaken. This had led to proposals emerging to change the titles of some of the named degrees offered by the Faculty. These proposals had been supported by Senate. On the recommendation of Senate, Court

**RESOLVED** that Ordinance 3 be amended to include the degrees of

i. MChem, with effect from session 2008/09; and
ii. MPhys, with effect from session 2009/10.

**CM 4105 PRIZES AND SCHOLARSHIPS (SM 11288.9)**

On the recommendation of Senate, Court

**RESOLVED** that

i. an increase to £30 in the annual value of the J L S Allan Memorial Prize awarded in the department of Pure and Applied Chemistry be approved;

ii. with effect from 2008, the eHandS Health and Safety Software Prize of £500 be awarded annually on the recommendation of a committee convened by the Director of Lifelong Learning to the student on the MSc in Safety and Risk Management producing the best MSc research project in safety and risk management;

iii. with effect from 2008, the Tavistock Trust for Aphasia Prize of £300 be awarded annually to the student on the BSc in Speech and Language Pathology who produces the best piece of work (essay, dissertation, clinical related activities) that relates to aphasia.

**CM 4106 SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR JOURNALISM STUDIES**

Court noted that discussions with Glasgow Caledonian University had led to the conclusion that the Scottish Centre for Journalism Studies, which was a joint academic venture, should be closed as it was considered that this no longer provided an ongoing sustainable or strategically viable operation for the future. This recommendation was being made to both institutions by the Joint Executive Committee of the Centre. It was noted that the Strathclyde staff from this Centre would be transferring to the Department of English Studies where consideration was being given to establishing a new Diploma in Journalism Studies. Further information on this proposal would be forthcoming in the future. Court referred to Senate the recommendation of University Management Committee that the Scottish Centre for Journalism Studies be closed, and the agreement with Glasgow Caledonian University with respect to this joint operation be cancelled, with effect from the end of the current academic year.
STUDENTS ASSOCIATION: 2006/07 YEAR END REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Court received the Students Association’s Financial Statements and Report for the year ended 31 July 2007. It was noted that 2006/07 had been a difficult year for the Association and had resulted in a deficit of £109k, part of which had been due to staff restructuring costs incurred. The Association had also reviewed the funding of its various services and the income from its commercial activities in order to improve its financial performance. Mr Ward, Deputy President, was pleased to report that the Association was performing much better this year and should be in a position to return a small profit at the end of the financial year. Court

RESOLVED that the Financial Statements for the Students’ Association for the year ended 31 July 2007 be approved as presented.

REVISED CODE OF PRACTICE ON INVESTIGATIONS ON HUMAN BEINGS

On the recommendation of the University Management Committee and subject to the approval of Senate, Court

RESOLVED that the revised Code of Practice on Investigations on Human Beings be approved.

ESTATES STRATEGY COMMITTEE

Court noted the report from the meeting of the Estates Strategy Committee held on 19 February 2008.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CHARTER AND STATUTES: APPOINTMENT OF DEANS (CM 4084, 4029, 3983; SM11193)

At its last meeting Court had considered the comments received from the Privy Council relating to the proposed changes to the Charter and to Statutes I and XV. Following consultation with Senate and subject to any further changes the Privy Council may request, Court reaffirmed its earlier decision and

RESOLVED that

i. the wording of Article 12 be revised to read as follows:

Delete: Article 12 (1)

Insert: Article 12 (1)

Court, on the recommendation of Senate, shall have the power to constitute Faculties and may add to, substitute for, or discontinue any Faculty or Faculties.

ii. this be forwarded to the Privy Council for approval.

DATES OF MEETINGS IN 2008/09

Court noted the proposed dates of its meetings in session 2008/09.
CM 4112 GENERAL CONVOCATION

Court

RESOLVED that

i. under the terms of Statute XII.4 (h), Mr P Little, Principal of Central College of Commerce, be invited to join the membership of General Convocation for the period 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2011;

ii. Mrs Towndrow’s membership of Convocation be transferred from those co-opted by Convocation to the Heads of Schools category with immediate effect;

iii. under the terms of Statute XII.1 (5) (b), Emeritus Professor T Bone be re-appointed to membership of General Convocation for the period to 31 December 2010, and Professor T Wilson, Principal of Glasgow Metropolitan College, be re-appointed to membership of General Convocation for the period to 30 April 2011.

CM 4113 CONVENER’S ACTIONS

The following action taken under delegated authority by the Convener of Court was homologated by Court:

Head of Department of Bioengineering: Professor B Conway appointed for the period 1 August 2008 to 31 July 2011.

CM 4114 HANDBOOK FOR MEMBERS OF COURT

Court received, for information, the revised Handbook for Members of Court.

CM 4115 NEXT MEETING

A Special Meeting of Court will be held on Tuesday 15th April 2008 at 2.00pm. The next scheduled meeting will be held on Friday 9 May 2008 at 10.00 a.m. followed by lunch and then the meeting of General Convocation at 2.00 p.m.