



University of the Highlands and Islands

Governance Effectiveness Review

Final Report
December 2022

—

Aaron Porter
Keith Bartlett
Carol Burns

Advance HE was commissioned by the University of the Highlands and Islands to review the effectiveness of its governance and to prepare this report. It is intended solely for use by the governing Court of the University of Highlands and Islands and is not to be relied upon by any third party, notwithstanding that it may be made available in the public domain, or disclosed to other third parties.

Although every effort has been made to ensure this report is as comprehensive as possible, its accuracy is limited to the instructions, information and documentation received from the University of the Highlands and Islands and we make no representations, warranties or guarantees, whether express or implied, that the content in the report is accurate outside of this scope.

Contents

1.	Introduction	5
2.	Executive Summary	7
3.	Main Findings	8
3.1	Structure	8
3.2	Strategy and performance	9
3.3	Secretariat and Court support	11
3.4	Academic oversight	14
3.5	Equality, diversity and inclusion	14
	Annex 1 – Action plan - Recommendations & Suggestions	17
	Annex 2 – Survey results	20

1. Introduction

The University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI) is a regional tertiary university partnership encompassing twelve college and research institutions covering the Highlands and Islands, Moray, Perthshire and Argyll. UHI, the charitable company is also referred to as the 'Executive Office' is also the Regional Strategic Body for those academic partners assigned to it by the Scottish Government under legislation and therefore acts as the funding body with associated responsibilities. In line with expectations from the Scottish Funding Council and the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance, this is a routine cyclical review being conducted 5 years after the last review having taken place in 2017.

The unique and distinctive nature of UHI's partnership of independent colleges and research institutions, encompassing learning from access level to PhD, brings a number of governance challenges. Not the least of these is the fact that each academic partner has its own principal or director, management structure, and academic and corporate governance arrangements, whilst also belonging to the UHI structure.

There is a particularly special affinity which UHI has to its geography. In many areas, UHI is the only provider of higher level skills and therefore it has a crucial role to play in upskilling and re-skilling in the region and for the nation.

UHI's *Daring to be Different* strategic plan launched in 2021 and runs to 2025, focussing on increasing both UHI's reputation for innovative teaching and a connected curriculum to deliver excellence in student success, and overall standard of research, while streamlining the business model.

The scope of the review was to evaluate the current governance arrangements of Court and its committees and to offer recommendations and suggestions for further improvement, considering the Statement of Primary Responsibilities, the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and the HE Governance Act 2016. As part of the review, online observations of Court, committees (including Finance and General Purposes and Audit), interviews with Court members, a benchmarking e-survey and a review of relevant governance documentation were undertaken. The interviews with Court members and relevant members of the UHI management took the form of informal discussions covering a range of thematic elements of governance relevant to UHI on a non-attributable basis.

The benchmarking e-survey was issued to all members of Court and 2 senior managers who routinely attend Court, covering over 40 questions related to governance themes and also 7 questions to capture the wider demographics of respondents. The survey has been completed by just over 50 higher education providers in the United Kingdom ranging from large multi-faculty research intensives to small, specialist institutions. The

survey questions allowed respondents to leave a score on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) through to 5 (strongly agree) as well as the opportunity to choose 'don't know' or leave the answer blank. The benchmark is therefore generated by calculating the mean score from institutions who have completed the survey. The survey also included some open text comments which were incorporated to the review analysis and helped to inform themes which were picked up in the interviews.

The review takes place at an important moment for UHI and for the tertiary sector in Scotland more generally. For UHI specifically, during the review process the Principal agreed to bring forward his scheduled departure. UHI is now in a period of interim leadership, which is being managed alongside a challenging funding environment and ongoing discussions to optimise the relationship between the partners of UHI and the Executive Office. More widely, there are financial challenges across tertiary provision in Scotland with a real terms diminishing unit of resource and rising costs across but not limited to energy, salaries and pensions and the legacy of the covid-19 pandemic still bearing practical challenges and legacy issues to resolve.

2. Executive Summary

Overall we found some effective governance at UHI, with room for improvement which has begun to be charted. Whilst the wider structure of UHI was beyond the scope of the review, the Chair was comfortable for us to make wider observations which have been incorporated. In our view, there is a need for the UHI partnership to make further strides toward becoming a more genuinely unified structure. We believe it is essential if UHI is to make progress with its governance and indeed to realise the original vision for UHI and its wider organisational benefits more generally.

Governance specifically at UHI has been on a journey, and this accelerated following the appointment of Alastair MacColl as Chair. There has been acknowledgement that the Court ought to play a clearer role in shaping strategy, monitoring performance and also to try and ensure there is a greater coherence to both the governance and structure of UHI. The progress on each of these fronts has been widely welcomed, and there is an acknowledgement there is further to go.

As part of our methodology we undertook a range of one to one interviews, small focus groups, Court and committee observations (virtually), deployed the use of a benchmarking e-survey and a comprehensive review of governance materials and documentation. We should point out that 4 scheduled one to one interviews did not take place due to late cancellation or no-shows; 2 others were affected by technical issues. In our experience it is unusual for this number of interviews to be disrupted in this way and in our mind raises potential questions about administrative or individual governor capability. We also encountered during our review the observation of a meeting of the Finance and General Purposes committee which was brought to a premature close due to a breakdown in relationship between the (now departed) Principal and the committee. In different ways, both of these observations speak to a governance system requiring improvement in process terms and in culture.

Across our report, we make 1 observation, 11 recommendations and 2 further suggestions for improvement. The key recommendations in this report relate to ensuring a **more rigorous approach to performance management** tracked by performance measures (recommendations 2 and 4) and revamping and **improving the process for governor training induction and review** (recommendations 6, 7 and 8), as well as 2 observation about the structure of UHI (observations 1).

We would encourage Court to consider the report with all recommendations and suggestions in their totality, to discuss their merits and decide which to implement and over what timescale as part of the action plan (annex one). Given the nature of some of these recommendations, their urgency and importance, it would be prudent to appoint a

task and finish group to oversee the implementation of the action plan which reports regularly to Court.

3. Main Findings

3.1 Structure

Fundamental to the long term success of UHI will be to move to a truly unified structure of governance. Although we appreciated matters concerning the structure of UHI are strictly beyond the terms of reference for the review of governance, there is an inextricable link between organisational structure and governance effectiveness. To that end, we present our finding in this section on structure (3.1) as an observation, rather than as recommendations or suggestions. At present, UHI is not able to progress as much as expected or meaningfully realise any economies of scale. Instead it continues to navigate the complexities of having 12 component parts and 1 over-arching entity, which brings with it the cost of duplication and complexity. This is reflected in governance terms with each academic partner having its own structure, whilst also participating in a central model. UHI is also the Regional Strategy Body (RSB) under Scottish Government legislation and therefore the existence of parts of UHI are enshrined in law.

The tensions which flow from individual entities also being part of a central model has made decision making less agile than in truly unified structures. In a challenging and increasingly competitive environment, it is essential that UHI is able effectively to navigate complexity and do so with appropriate speed. To unify would require legislative change and would require exploration with the Scottish Government, the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), UHI and its academic partners. With the support of the individual academic partners and the central UHI entity, and a clear economic case for moving toward a single model, the case is strong. Once authorised, this would, and should, lead to the cessation of the academic partners as individual legal entities and to one single entity, although we would propose some light touch governance remaining for each partner.

In the period before legislation is passed to enable the move to a single entity, preparations should also be made for what a future governance model could look like. Our focus was primarily to review the existing governance arrangements and identify opportunities for development, rather than create a new structure from scratch. However at the core of a new unitary governance model, some of the features could include:

- a UHI Court which as the supreme governance body includes strategic, financial and academic oversight and responsibility for all UHI sites

- a single UHI strategy (with performance indicators) which applies to all sites of the institution
- each UHI partner could have an advisory board which would focus on local implementation of the UHI strategy and report to the UHI Court
- structured opportunities for representatives of the UHI partners to meet and contribute to the development and delivery of university-wide strategies, e.g., teaching, learning and research; and an annual UHI conference at which staff from across the university can input to policy development and provide feedback on institutional progress and performance.

There are precedents for individual entities successfully coming together into single unified tertiary institutions both in Scotland and elsewhere in the United Kingdom. In Scotland there is SRUC [Scotland's Rural College], which was created in October 2012 from the merger of Barony, Elmwood and Oatridge Colleges with the Scottish Agricultural College (SAC) as the host institution.

In England, the examples of the University of the Arts London (UAL) and the University for the Creative Arts (UCA) both serve as excellent case studies for how separate legally distinct entities with previously separate governing bodies were able to combine as a single entity, under one strategy and one governance structure.

Observation

1. UHI should work with the Scottish Government and SFC to bring about the necessary legislative change to enable UHI to move to a single truly unified structure.

Suggestion

- A. Detailed examination of SRUC, the University of the Arts and the University for the Creative Arts, each of which brought together a number of previously independent entities under a single entity, strategy and governance structure, should be considered.

3.2 Strategy and performance

Over the last 18 months, there has clearly been a more focussed emphasis on the performance and strategic direction of UHI. A challenging financial landscape has undoubtedly focussed attention, and there has been a concerted effort to ensure clearer communication and engagement between the colleges within UHI to better articulate the direction of travel. Whilst ensuring the Court plays a more obvious role in setting the

institutional strategy, there is also a need to ensure that the Court fulfils a prominent role in monitoring performance.

Although in interview Court members consistently stated there was now a better approach to ensuring clearer sight of the strategy, it was felt that because UHI started from so far back, there was not as yet a fully effective approach. This is echoed by the survey results, which demonstrate relatively low scores for the extent to which members feel there is currently an appropriate approach to managing and overseeing strategy. It is clear that there needs to be a continued and vigorous emphasis placed on ensuring that strategic objectives are agreed, and that they apply not only to UHI, but also to each of the partners within UHI, with appropriate measures and milestones to measure performance over time.

Nu.	Question	% Agree	Difference to benchmark*
10.	The Court understands the institution's key stakeholders and what is material to each stakeholder group in the context of its strategy	81	-9
33.	The Court ensures that planned outcomes agreed as part of the strategic plan are being regularly monitored, assessed and reported	69	-20
22.	The Court has agreed performance measures incorporating leading and lagging indicators against which it receives assurance of institutional performance against the strategic plan	56	-23
26.	The Court is well equipped to support the organisation's long term strategic plans	50	-38

**the benchmark for the e-survey is generated from the mean of 50 UK institutions who have also completed the survey. Further details of the survey methodology included in the introduction to the report and annex two with the full survey results.*

Encapsulated by the roadmap to 2024, with 7 workstreams, this has begun to provide a focal point for a commonly agreed set of priorities for the organisation, which to a large degree has superseded the Daring to be Different strategy (which runs to 2025). During

the review itself, the Principal brought forward his departure and UHI is now in a period of interim leadership which should allow for a new focus on financial stabilisation and delivery of the roadmap to 2024, with a more coherent approach to UHI across all sites.

In the period after 2024, and assuming good progress has been made on the 7 workstreams, consideration should be given to a new set of strategic priorities to define the new period ahead, ideally with UHI as a single legal entity (building on recommendation 1). It is vital that a new strategy is developed alongside a suite of key performance indicators which operate UHI-wide and are monitored by Court and the Executive Office.

Another area in which Court have not felt well sighted is in relation to the performance review of the head of the institution. The e-survey score for this aspect was 19%, -46% lower than the sector benchmark.

There may well be a link between the interim leadership which sees UHI through the execution of the 2024 roadmap and permanent leadership which would begin after the roadmap and the development and delivery of the new strategy beyond that point.

Recommendations

R1. The interim executive leadership and the Court of UHI to remain focussed on the objectives of the roadmap to 2024 in order to bring about financial stability and increased coherence across UHI.

R2. Ahead of 2024, development of a new UHI strategy and suite of performance indicators (PIs) should begin, for implementation by UHI as a single entity. The PIs should apply UHI-wide and be closely monitored by the Court.

R3. To consider the inter-relationships between interim leadership during the period of the 2024 roadmap and permanent leadership for a new strategy to commence after 2024.

R4. Revise the approach to monitoring the performance review for the head of institution, ensuring that objectives are aligned with the strategic objectives of the university and then clearly fed back to Court.

3.3 Secretariat and Court support

Supporting governance in an institution which to some degree replicates processes in place across each partner is demanding. It is also inefficient, given that UHI's aggregated student numbers make it a small tertiary provider. We did find that there was a detailed

and comprehensive approach to regulatory oversight and UHI has to balance being the RSB which is unique to a higher education institution in the UK. Partly because servicing the current governance structure is demanding, UHI has been slower to adapt and modernise its approach to support than many other providers. Moving to a single unified entity will be simpler to service and this will create more space for making existing processes more efficient and agile.

Both over the short term and the longer term (post 2024), steps should be taken to improve the papers including making more explicit in papers and cover sheets the link to strategy and where possible continuing to make papers more concise with clearer executive summaries. For some papers, identifying the input from Court (an overview of the key arguments, together with what is required i.e. a decision or noting) can be made clearer to the reader.

Court members and our review of documentation indicated there was a comprehensive approach taken to regulatory compliance and oversight. There was a thorough approach to ensuring that mapping against Scottish Funding Council (SFC) regulatory conditions are met and overseen by Court, as well as the principles of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance.

More generally, consideration should be given to how technology can aid and improve the support to Court. The use of Teams/Webex to facilitate online meetings has of course made a difference to meetings and active consideration is being given to the balance between remote and in person meetings for both Court and committees. But there is an opportunity to consider how technology can be incorporated within governance more generally. This might include, inter alia, the use of a Board pack allowing users to annotate papers and share comments with others, recordings for presentations which can be circulated in advance of meetings (to save time in the meetings themselves) etc.

One area which scored poorly in the Court e-survey and was also raised frequently in the one to one interviews was the quality of induction. There was a strong view that induction needed to be overhauled to better capture the circumstances of UHI, to be more tailored to the needs of individuals and also to move toward a number of bite-sized sessions structured over the first 12-18 months of tenure, rather than largely delivered in one long session at present.

Nu.	Question	% Agree	Difference to benchmark
15.1	The induction of Court members is: Effectively managed	56	-23

15.2	The induction of Court members is: Relevant	56	-23
15.3	The induction of Court members is: Periodically evaluated	31	-12
15.4	The induction of Court members is: Tailored to individual need	31	-26

More generally, Court members felt there were additional opportunities to include training and development sessions both for Court as a whole and for individual members. There should be an expectation, even for experienced Court members that they engage in development activity on an annual basis. UHI should proactively look to disseminate training opportunities offered by organisations including Advance HE, audit firms and others who support Court members and governors on an ongoing basis.

As well as improving induction and the development opportunities for Court as a whole, a prominent theme in interviews was the need to introduce a more formalised process for reviewing the individual performance of Court members. Whilst, given the voluntary nature of the role, it does not need to be a fully fledged appraisal meeting, it is good practice to expect each Court member to meet with the Chair on an annual basis to reflect on their own effectiveness and that of the Court as a whole. This is supported by the survey which showed that only 63% Court members agreed that “Court is effective in reviewing its own performance” (which is -15% below the sector benchmark).

Recommendations

R5. Make further improvements to the Board pack to better draw out key findings and recommendations, and the link to strategy and performance.

R6. Overhaul Court induction to better reflect the current circumstance of UHI and move toward a number of bite sized sessions, tailored to the individual, structured over a 12-18 month period.

R7. Development opportunities for Court members should be more proactively circulated, with an expectation that all Court members engage in at least 1 development opportunity each year.

R8. Formalise the approach for individual members to meet annually with the Chair to review their performance.

Suggestion

B. Consider how technology can be further utilised to improve governance processes including the use of interactive online Board packs and recordings for Court presentations to be disseminated ahead of meetings etc.

3.4 Academic oversight

Over the last 18 months, there has been a concerted effort to ensure that oversight of academic quality and the student experience has become a more prominent feature of Court meetings. Most members described this as a “work in progress” and whilst this was now at an acceptable level, it required ongoing attention to ensure that there remains an appropriate degree of focus on these issues.

In order to strengthen the degree of focus on academic matters and the student experience, we propose a menu of options which should be discussed by Court and then decided which should be implemented. New initiatives might include:

- Presentations from staff and students prior to Court meetings (from different departments or thematic areas)
- Webinar presentations from departments or UHI services (e.g. civic, employability etc.)
- Coffee/lunch with student representatives after meetings
- Reverse student mentors for Court members (to meet with a student once a term for thematic discussions about elements of UHI life)
- Constructing a data dashboard with key academic metrics across UHI to be routinely reviewed by Court and/or a designated sub-committee

Recommendation

R9. To further strengthen academic oversight, consider the menu of initiatives proposed in the body of the report to augment opportunities for engagement with academic quality and the student experience.

3.5 Equality, diversity and inclusion

One area which was raised prominently in interview and scored poorly in the e-survey was the approach to equality, diversity and inclusion. Although there was a clear

commitment to this agenda, it was the lack of progress which concerned a number of Court members.

The relevant survey scores have been extracted below demonstrating that only 63% of respondents felt there was an adequate approach to ensuring assurance on EDI issues for staff and students, and less than 40% felt there was an appropriate approach to testing EDI objectives, demonstrating up-to-date knowledge and that sufficient information is supplied to test UHI's approach and initiatives.

More generally, there was a view that UHI could do more to improve the diversity of Court itself. Although good progress has been made on gender, other characteristics including ethnicity (only 2 of the 16 respondents declared a non-white ethnicity), age (14 of 16 respondents stated they were older than 50 years of age) and disability (only 1 of 16 respondents declared a disability or impairment) were all felt to be areas of importance to look to diversify in future. Given the challenge UHI faces to improving Court diversity, it may wish to consider other schemes including engaging with the [Governor Apprenticeship Programme](#), to support board diversity across the sector and learning for the Board¹.

Nu.	Question	% Agree	Difference to benchmark
37.	Effective mechanisms are in place for ensuring there is assurance of equality diversity and inclusion matters for staff and students, across the Court	63	-23
38.	The Court tests the institution's development and delivery of its equality, diversity and inclusion objectives	38	-46
40.	All Court members demonstrate up-to-date knowledge and confidence in discussions of equality, diversity and inclusion matters	38	-41
39.	The Court receives sufficient information to test the equality, diversity and inclusion implications of policy, approaches and initiatives that it decides upon.	31	-50

¹ See also <https://www.abdn.ac.uk/about/strategy-and-governance/governor-apprenticeship-programme-2061.php> and <https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/about/organisation/governance/council>

Recommendations

R10. Overhaul the approach to providing assurance, information and training on matters relating to equality, diversity and inclusion to the Court.

R11. Look to make improvements to age, ethnicity and disability to help diversify Court membership as a matter of priority at the next and future rounds of Court recruitment. This should include taking a targeted approach to generate applications from certain backgrounds.

Annex One – Action Plan

(Observations, Recommendations and Suggestions)

Label	Observation/ Recommendations/ Suggestions	Court decision (accept/reject)	Owner (to be appointed by Court)	Progress (including deadline where appropriate)
	OBSERVATION			
Ob1.	UHI should work with the Scottish Government and SFC to bring about the necessary legislative change to enable UHI to move to a single truly unified structure.			
	RECOMMENDATIONS			
R1.	The interim executive leadership and the Court of UHI to remain focussed on the objectives of the roadmap to 2024 in order to bring about financial stability and increased coherence across UHI.			
R2.	Ahead of 2024, development of a new UHI strategy and suite of performance indicators (PIs) should begin, for implementation by UHI as a single entity. The PIs should apply UHI-wide and be closely monitored by the Court.			
R3.	To consider the inter-relationships between interim leadership during the period of the 2024 roadmap and permanent leadership for a new strategy to commence after 2024.			

R4.	Revise the approach to monitoring the performance review for the head of institution, ensuring that objectives are aligned with the strategic objectives of the university and then clearly fed back to Court.			
R5.	Make further improvements to the Board pack to better draw out key findings and recommendations, and the link to strategy and performance.			
R6.	Overhaul Court induction to better reflect the current circumstance of UHI and move toward a number of bite sized sessions, tailored to the individual, structured over a 12-18 month period.			
R7.	Development opportunities for Court members should be more proactively circulated, with an expectation that all Court members engage in at least 1 development opportunity each year.			
R8.	Formalise the approach for individual members to meet annually with the Chair to review their performance.			
R9.	To further strengthen academic oversight, consider the menu of initiatives proposed in the body of the report to augment opportunities for engagement with academic quality and the student experience.			
R10.	Overhaul the approach to providing assurance, information and training on matters relating to equality, diversity			

	and inclusion to the Court.			
R11.	Look to make improvements to age, ethnicity and disability to help diversify Court membership as a matter of priority at the next and future rounds of Court recruitment. This should include taking a targeted approach to generate applications from certain backgrounds.			
	SUGGESTIONS			
A.	Detailed examination of SRUC, the University of the Arts and the University for the Creative Arts, each of which brought together a number of previously independent entities under a single entity, strategy and governance structure, should be considered.			
B.	Consider how technology can be further utilised to improve governance processes including the use of interactive online Board packs and recordings for Court presentations to be disseminated ahead of meetings etc.			

Annex Two – Survey Results

There were 16 responses to the Court survey, which was made up as follows; 7 external members, 2 executive members, 2 staff members, 3 senior managers (non-members) and 2 lay members of committee. The survey was circulated to 22 individuals so represents a 73% response rate. It should be pointed out that there were no student responses, in part a reflection of the time of year when student members were new to Court.

In 2020, some changes were made to the core survey meaning that not all questions have a benchmark comparator.

Respondents were invited to offer a score on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) through to 5 (strongly agree) as well as 'don't know' or not to answer.

The benchmark is derived from the mean score, generated by 50 UK higher education institutions who have also completed the survey. The 50 providers are broadly representative of UK higher education institutions ranging from large research intensive universities to small, specialist providers.

For % **Strongly Agree or Agree** – the questions with a score of 85% or above are coloured green, those between 60% - 70% are in amber and those below 60% are in red.

For the **difference to benchmark** – the questions above the sector benchmark are in green, those between -1% and -9% are in amber and those which are -10% or more are in red.

Nu.	Question	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Difference to benchmark
23.	The Court receives the clear and prompt information it needs to be fully informed about its legal and regulatory responsibilities	100	+8
32.	The Chair actively establishes, promotes and sustains a governance culture that supports effective stewardship of the organisation	100	+10
2.	There is a genuine and shared understanding about, and commitment to ensure effective governance by both the Court and the executive	94	+1

6.	Mechanisms are in place to enable the Court to be assured as to the organisation's financial resilience and overall sustainability	94	-4
4.	There are effective arrangements in place for involving staff and students in the Court	88	-2
7.	Mechanisms are in place to allow the Court to be assured that the organisation has effective processes in place to enable the management of risk	88	-3
11.2	Board papers: Are made available in a timely fashion	88	
27.	The Court is well informed about likely changes in the external environment and any major implications for governance that may result	88	-6
28.	The Court actively ensures it receives assurance on the standards of the organisation's student experience	88	
29.	Court meetings and business are conducted and chaired in a way which encourages the active involvement of all members in discussions and decision-making	88	-4
10.	The Court understands the institution's key stakeholders and what is material to each stakeholder group in the context of its strategy	81	-9
11.1	Board papers: Are of consistently high quality	81	
11.3	Board papers: Address organisational strategic priorities	81	
11.4	Board papers: Are succinctly presented with clear recommendations where necessary	81	
16.4	Court membership: Has an appropriate range of skills and experience	81	-9

18.	The Court demonstrates an understanding of and commitment to the organisation's vision, ethos and culture	81	-13
19.	The Court displays the values, personal qualities, and commitment necessary for the effective stewardship of the organisation	81	-15
30.	Working relationships between Court members and the organisation's executive are transparent and effective	81	-9
35.1	The Court has a positive overall impact on the institution's: Performance	81	-10
35.2	The Court has a positive overall impact on the institution's: Resilience	81	-11
5.	Mechanisms are in place for the Court to be confident in the processes for maintaining the quality and standards of teaching and learning and the standard of awards	75	-10
13.	Recruitment practices to fill board vacancies are effective, transparent, and enable a diverse pool of candidates to be appointed	75	-5
16.2	Court membership: Reflects the organisation's key stakeholders	75	-2
17.	Discussions at and decisions made by the Court are informed and challenged by different perspectives and ideas	75	-14
20.	The Court actively supports core organisational values, and principles, e.g. autonomy, diversity and academic freedom	75	

25.	The Court balances its time effectively in reviewing the organisation's performance (looking back) alongside considering its strategic direction (looking forwards)	75	
31.2	The role of the Court in providing constructive challenge is: Undertaken effectively	75	-13
34.	The Court ensures that defined quality levels for the student experience are being achieved	75	-7
35.3	The Court has a positive overall impact on the institution's: Reputation	75	-13
12.	Mechanisms are in place to confirm that the responsibilities of members as trustees and, where applicable, their duties as company directors, are being effectively discharged	69	
16.3	Court membership: Provides a range of approaches to problem solving	69	-14
31.1	The role of the Court in providing constructive challenge is: Understood and accepted by both members and the executive	69	-21
33.	The Court ensures that planned outcomes agreed as part of the strategic plan are being regularly monitored, assessed and reported	69	-20
3.	The Court is effective in regularly reviewing its own performance	63	-15
9.	The respective responsibilities and relative accountabilities of the Court and Academic Council are appropriate, clearly defined and mutually understood	63	-24
16.1	Court membership: Reflects the diversity of the organisation (in terms of gender, age and ethnicity)	63	-1

36.	The Court ensures that external and internal stakeholders have a high degree of confidence in the organisation	63	-17
37.	Effective mechanisms are in place for ensuring there is assurance of equality diversity and inclusion matters for staff and students, across the Court	63	-23
15.1	The induction of Court members is: Effectively managed	56	-23
15.2	The induction of Court members is: Relevant	56	-23
22.	The Court has agreed performance measures incorporating leading and lagging indicators against which it receives assurance of institutional performance against the strategic plan	56	-23
8.	The scheme of delegation is clear and well understood and applied consistently and correctly	50	-33
14.	Effective reviews of Court members' individual contributions are conducted periodically	50	-7
26.	The Court is well equipped to support the organisation's long term strategic plans	50	-38
24.	The Court communicates transparently and effectively with its stakeholders	44	-37
38.	The Court tests the institution's development and delivery of its equality, diversity and inclusion objectives	38	-46
40.	All Court members demonstrate up-to-date knowledge and confidence in discussions of equality, diversity and inclusion matters	38	-41

15.3	The induction of Court members is: Periodically evaluated	31	-12
15.4	The induction of Court members is: Tailored to individual need	31	-26
39.	The Court receives sufficient information to test the equality, diversity and inclusion implications of policy, approaches and initiatives that it decides upon	31	-50
21.	The Court ensures that effective performance reviews of the head of institution are undertaken	19	-46

Contact us

Advance HE enables excellence in higher education, helping it shape its future. Within the UK and globally, Advance HE supports institutions in the areas of excellence in education, transformative leadership, equity and inclusion and effective governance. This is delivered through membership benefits (including accreditation of teaching, equality charters, research, knowledge and resources), programmes and events, Fellowships, awards, consultancy and enhancement services and student surveys.

Advance HE is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales no. 04931031. Registered as a charity in England and Wales no. 1101607 Registered as a charity in Scotland no. SC043946. The Advance HE logo should not be used without our permission.

© 2022 Advance HE. All rights reserved.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of Advance HE. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any storage and retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. Such permission will normally be granted for non-commercial, educational purposes provided that due acknowledgement is given.

To request copies of this report in large print or in a different format, please contact the Marketing and Communications Team at Advance HE:

+44 (0) 3300 416201 or publications@advance-he.ac.uk