

## **REVIEW OF COURT EFFECTIVENESS**

### **FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **1 Summary and Judgement**

This Report is the outcome of an externally facilitated Effectiveness Review conducted by a University Court appointed Review Working Group.

The review was conducted over the period February to October 2015 by a team of 5 Court appointed reviewers (listed in paragraph 4 below). The methodology and approach adopted by the Review Working Group was facilitated by an external adviser and supported by the University Secretary and former Governance Adviser.

Having reviewed all the evidence available to it, the overarching judgement of the Review Working Group is that the University Court has **Effective** arrangements in place to ensure that it meets its key obligations as set out in the University Court Statement of Primary Responsibilities. Examples of best practice in governance are in place, and a small number of areas for potential development and enhancement has been identified and form the basis of recommendations set out in Section 5 of this report.

#### **2 Format of Report and Recommendations**

This report consists of two parts. The first part is an overview of the overarching conclusions and recommendations of the Review Working Group. These conclusions and recommendations draw heavily on the second part of the report, which is the independent assessment and report produced for the Working Group by the External Adviser, John Lauwerys. That report is appended to this document. Given the unanimity with which the Review Working Group accepted almost all the conclusions and recommendations set out in that report, the Lauwerys report has been reproduced in full as part of the review outcome.

#### **3 Background and Review Approach**

As part of a process of enhancing the effectiveness of its governance, and in fulfilment of the requirements

and report of its committees, and ensure that any parallel reviews undertaken of the  
senior academic board and its committees. Effectiveness shall be assessed with against  
Statement of Primary Responsibilities and compliance with this Code. The governing body  
where necessary, review its structure or processes and all require the senior academic  
of its institution to review its structure and processes accordingly.<sup>11</sup>

The University Court has already commissioned the University's Internal Auditors, KPMG, to  
undertake an audit of compliance with the Scotland Code shortly after the Code came into  
effect and Universities were required to implement u uU à U u pl

#### **4 Review Outcome and Recommendations**

Having reviewed all the evidence available to it, the overarching judgement of the Review Working Group is that the University Court has **Effective**

**5.3** *The number of Key Performance Indicators presented on a quarterly basis to Court should be reduced to ten or a dozen high level KPIs. The performance targets should be agreed by Court annually and not amended during the following year. [Paragraph 3.3]*

The University Court has discussed proposals to reduce the number of KPIs presented to it on a number of occasions, with members expressing varying views on the matter. It is suggested the University Court accepts the principle cept

**5.8** *The Court should amend the terms of office for Court members and its Officers when the Governing Instrument is next amended to reflect the greater flexibility of the Scottish Code. [Paragraph 4.4]*

The

