

# Extraordinary Board of Management

## Agenda

**Meeting reference:** Board 2022-23/EM02  
**Date:** Thursday 06 October 2022 at 5:30pm  
**Location:** Boardroom (Braham Room 019)  
**Purpose:** Extraordinary meeting re time-bound business unable to be discussed at a Scheduled Board Meeting

\* Denotes items for discussion/approval.

Members should contact the Secretary in advance of the meeting if they wish to request an item be starred.

	Agenda Items	Author	Led by	Paper
1	Welcome and Apologies		Interim Chair	
2	Declaration of a Conflict of Interest in any Agenda Item		Interim Chair	
3	Minutes of Extraordinary Board meeting held on 05 September 2022	Clerk	Interim Chair	Paper 1
*4	General Board Discussion supported by the following items:  Paper 2a – Summary of Scrutiny, Decisions & Actions from Strategic Development Committee, 21 September 2022  Paper 2b – Revised SWOT Analysis  Paper 2c – Revised & Prioritised Areas of Negotiation	Clerk  SMT  SMT	Interim Chair	Paper 2a  Paper 2b  Paper 2c
5	Date and time of next Scheduled meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Thursday 20 October 2022</li></ul>	Clerk		

# Extraordinary Meeting of Board of Management

## Minutes

**Meeting reference:** Board 2022-23/EM01

**Date and time:** Monday 05 September 2022 at 5.00pm

**Location:** Boardroom (Braham Room 019)

**Members present:** Brian Crichton, Chair, Board of Management  
Graham Watson, Chair, AST Board  
Jim Crooks, Chair, Audit Committee  
Andrew Comrie, Chair, Strategic Development Committee  
Katrina Hodgson, Chair, Finance & Resources Committee  
Heather Cormack, Board Member  
Sheena Devlin, Board Member  
Jenny Hamilton, Board Member  
Fiona Martin, Board Member  
Derek Waugh, Board Member  
Margaret Cook, Principal & Chief Executive  
John Dare, Staff Board Member  
Patrick O'Donnell, Staff Board Member  
Todor Pavlov-Kennedy, Student Board Member  
Liam Fowley, Student Board Member

**In attendance:** Alastair MacColl, Chair of UHI Court (Item 3 only)  
Lorenz Cairns, Depute Principal  
Catherine Etri, Vice Principal  
Veronica Lynch, Vice Principal  
Iain Wishart, Vice Principal  
Ian McCartney, Clerk to the Board of Management

**Apologies:** Michael Buchanan, Board Member  
Debbie McIlwraith Cameron, Board Member

**Chair:** **Graham Watson (on behalf of Brian Crichton)**

**Minute Taker:** Ian McCartney

**Quorum:** 10

## **MINUTES**

Item		Action
1.	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies</b></p> <p>Chair welcomed new Board Members, Derek Waugh and Liam Fowley to their first meeting, and congratulated Debbie McIlwraith Cameron on the recent birth of her child.</p> <p>Chair welcomed Alastair MacColl, Chair of UHI Court, who would be addressing the meeting under Item 3.</p> <p>Chair noted that he would be formally stepping down on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2022 and as such would be taking a step back from much of the discussion at this meeting. Chair of this meeting was passed to Chair of AST, who will formally take over as Interim Chair from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2022.</p> <p>Chair AST thanked Brian Crichton for all he has contributed in the support of students and staff at Perth College over the last 5 years.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Declaration of Interest in any Agenda Item</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Presentation from Alastair MacColl, Chair of Court, UHI</b></p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI noted his involvement with UHI as Chair of Court for over a year, and that it had taken that time to get to know such a complex organisation.</p> <p>Despite the changing environment over the last 10 years, particularly with regards to the market and economic cycles, the partnership hasn't kept up which has led to this "reset" moment re the function, operation and behaviours within the partnership. This would be addressed partly through ways of working.</p> <p>The Paper provided to prior to this meeting (Paper 1) was arrived at with the involvement of key decision-makers within the partnership, including the Chair and Principal of Perth College, to identify where things can be improved. Essentially, the Paper is a framework (or manifesto) for such commitments and aspirations, however the radical element is to actually make this happen; the previous vagueness of responsibilities has to change.</p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI noted that Perth College is a valued part of the partnership, and wants Perth College to be a committed member of this partnership. Delivery of the Paper will improve the organisation for the benefit of students, staff and the community.</p>	

On conclusion of this presentation, Chair AST noted that he had collated some questions from Board Members which would be put to Chair of Court, UHI, following which the floor would be opened to further questions.

Chair AST: It's hard to disagree with the background note, however there's no sense of how the partnership should be structured. Concern has been raised over going down the route of the 7 change initiatives with no idea of the end point of the structure of the partnership.

Chair of Court, UHI: If UHI was being designed from scratch, it wouldn't be structured as it is currently. There is no specific gameplan regarding future structure, however it will clearly need simplified. Would personally like to see fewer partners, and expects to see more alliances, resource sharing, and possibly mergers and less partners represented at Court.

Chair AST: What is the view of Court regarding Perth College remaining a partner?

Chair of Court, UHI: It's fundamental; a summary of inter-dependencies between UHI and Perth College runs to over 3 pages. The financial impact of not working together is almost existential for both parties; not working together forms a huge risk versus the dividend of working together in terms of student numbers and financial and economic impact. Would ask that Perth College fully commits to not just supporting but actively delivering on the 7 initiatives.

Chair AST: Structure and viability has not been tackled in the past – what guarantee will there be to allow Perth College to be confident at the end of the proposed 2-year period?

Chair of Court, UHI: Can't speak explicitly for Court, but would expect Court to want to go faster and be more ambitious than that laid out in the Paper. It's a relatively new Court, with four new members, and there is a conviction at Court that the plan will be worked through and implemented using all partners to allow UHI to prosper. UHI has so much opportunity yet to be exploited.

Chair AST: Do the Senior Leadership Team within EO share the vision to make change with no barriers?

Chair of Court, UHI: Barriers need to be considered as part of any major change programme, and while there is confidence that the programme developed by the partnership will be made to happen, this will only happen if all partners are fully committed.

Chair AST: One way of getting buy in from Perth College would include the College Principal being project lead on one of the 7 initiatives.

Chair of Court, UHI: Having spoken to the Principal, it looks like a deal may already have been done in this regard.

	<p>Chair AST: Commitment from Perth College would require a willingness on the part of UHI to open its books. It's hard to really know how money flows in and out of UHI, particularly in regard to Executive Office (EO). The Paper does not show what sustainability means in monetary terms, and transparency is needed regarding benefits received from what College pays for.</p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI: Could not agree more, extracting data from across the partnership has been very difficult, not just around financials, eg Return on Investment, and this includes EO. It's not easy, and will require a forensic effort from all partners.</p> <p>Chair AST: Time is not on our side within the current climate, though. Perth College needs reassurance that it can feed into the Tayside economic recovery rather than Highlands &amp; Islands.</p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI: There is a recognition that collaboration is crucial. It is expected that the partnership will work with a number of economic partners in their geographic areas, however there is a sense that Perth College has looked elsewhere in the past and this project needs full commitment from Perth. The plan will release significant dividend, albeit with the recognition that nothing is forever and ever.</p> <p>Chair AST: Perth College have a strong request to see that the plan represents a genuine partnership rather than a takeover.</p> <p>At this point, the floor was opened to other Board Members to ask questions.</p> <p>Chair Audit: The 7 priority areas provide a map, but processes and structures won't solve all of the issues at hand. It is perceived that there is a culture of "first among equals" with regard to EO. Perth would be looking for an absolute commitment to establish a culture of parity across the partnership.</p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI: Can identify with this statement, and there is a need to change the culture. However, this goes both ways in that there is both "Them &amp; Us" and "Us &amp; Them" on display – this needs to be stopped and replaced with "We, Us &amp; Our".</p> <p>Staff Board Member: Given the various attempts at restricting over the years, there is a definite feeling of "here we go again" amongst staff across the partnership.</p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI: Have heard this, and understand the scepticism, however this time there is absolute conviction and UHI can't afford to fail – fiduciary responsibilities are taken very seriously. UHI has time, resources, capital and cash to make these proposals work.</p> <p>A recent Audit Scotland report was quite explicit about making changes, but these have not been done and now need addressed.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Board Member: As a newish member of the Board, it's a struggle to understand what UHI looks like. The Paper a move toward a tertiary model but doesn't define which one, eg University of London, and this would determine what the initiatives work towards. UHI appears to be in a good position for a new model, but it can't be seen where this is.</p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI: Confident the model will emerge, but it's unlikely to be UoL due to the lack of multiple colleges with degree-awarding powers. Scotland is the only nation in Europe without a successful model of tertiary education, and the work being conducted over the next 12 months will seek to establish this.</p> <p>Staff Board Member: Is it identifiable where the "Us v Them" scenario is at its most obvious, as that's not the experience in terms of collaboration within teaching and research.</p> <p>Chair of Court, UHI: Agreed that at ground level collaboration is working well, however this doesn't appear to be replicated so much at higher levels within the organisation.</p> <p>Chair AST thanked Chair of Court, UHI for his candour and coming to speak with the Board. Chair of Court, UHI offered to attend future Board meetings as an Observer as part of a Court initiative, if that was deemed to be useful.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>General Board Discussion</b></p> <p>Chair AST opened meeting up to comments and questions from those present, and commenced by asking Principal for initial thoughts.</p> <p>Principal: noted that SMT had met this morning to work on an options paper for Strategic Development Committee (SDC) that challenged the perceived assumption that leaving the partnership would represent a panacea for the College, and had been open with Chair of Court, UHI in a one-to-one meeting earlier today.</p> <p>Depute Principal: There is no doubt that Chair of Court, UHI would like Perth College to be part of UHI, but there is concern over lack of detail within the plan therefore it is difficult to sign up without a level of substance and analysis.</p> <p>Chair Audit: We don't have detail for other options either – could a 2-year commitment as proposed work for Perth College? Main consideration has to be student voice in this, and would be interested to ascertain whether the current set-up meets students' needs.</p> <p>Student Board Member: Every time a question has been posed to Perth College students around this issue, there has been a positive response around the sense of connection. Whilst there is some unhappiness, there is a clear consensus that students want to be part of UHI, albeit there may be different opinions this year.</p>	

	<p>Student Board Member: Key consideration for students is the student experience.</p> <p>Chair Audit: Cannot underestimate role HISA plays in student satisfaction, and what Student Members have advised is that there is a key risk around change.</p> <p>Principal: The main disconnect tends to be at a higher level which should not be visible to students or staff, therefore some care must be taken in making generalisations in this area.</p> <p>Chair SDC: The direction of travel is unclear, so should the Board be considering red lines? These could easily be set out given previous discussions. Agreed that there needs to be a coherent tertiary model set up for UHI.</p> <p>Student Board Member: Students now constantly assess whether they've made the right choice to continue they're studies. Whatever we do we have to provide stability for students.</p> <p>Board Chair: Not wholly convinced that student satisfaction survey results are entirely useful due to how questions are framed and no way of asking students questions around how they would feel about delivery with another partner.</p> <p>Student Board Member: Part of the problem is that most students cannot identify what UHI is, but if changes were made student could make a more considered response.</p> <p>Vice Principal: Ask anyone across the country what UHI is and there will be confusion, including within UHI itself. Chair of Court, UHI mentioned an enormous divide within UHI – this has been the case for 20 years, which has been caused by confusion over UHI's identity. There is a clear divide between FE and HE, so UHI is no different from any other organisation.</p> <p>Depute Principal: EO barely recognises FE which casts adrift the dream of tertiary – this needs changed dramatically. A number of staff are concerned about the most recent curriculum review, therefore the issues between UHI and Perth College are not just at the top levels, it's at ground level too.</p> <p>Chair Audit: We can look at data re migration from FE to HE and can be compared across the sector. The real advantage comes from progression from HNC to HND and degree – it took SRUC 8 years to acquire own degree-awarding powers. Articulation stats tend to be between institutions – UHI offers more well-defined pathways than other FE organisations, and Perth College could lose this advantage under a different set-up.</p> <p>Board Member: The model that appears to be favoured is centrally controlled therefore runs the risk of uniqueness of local offer within the offer of a wider route. The review needs to be about what kind of UHI we</p>	
--	---	--

want it to be.

Chair SDC: Goes back to red line discussion – progression should be a right.

Board Member: Can't make an informal decision without knowledge of other models, and we don't have a sense of how these might work.

Principal: UHI would like Perth College to park things for 2 years despite Perth College never saying anything about leaving the partnership.

Chair AST: It's a reasonable position for them to adopt, albeit not unconditionally.

Principal: We need quantifiable purposes and expectations if we are to sign up for 2 years.

Board Member: There is clear intent, but not much detail in terms of goals – there is the possibility of the project plan being a distraction for a couple of years.

Chair F&R: Chair of Court, UHI mentioned time, capital, resources and cash being available, however there looks to be about 10 years' of work in this project so remain unconvinced they've had a reality check yet. There may be in inspirational Chair working this through, but where are the team sitting now the chief has gone?

Principal: Intention is for this gap to be filled from across the partnership.

Depute Principal: Biggest problem is recruitment – UHI is 10-15% under target on HE recruitment, which is significant. Is the curriculum not attractive enough? Everything fails without students, and the presentation earlier did not mention student experience.

Board Member: Need to consider what other options look like for student experience too.

Principal: Any "divorce" process would require consideration of validation of HE courses, which may provide opportunity to shop around, however there is a cost to doing this, which would be different to the costs via UHI. Looking at a Tayside collaboration (not merger), courses don't transpose in full. Ultimately, we may achieve a better student experience in the longer term, but this may take many years at significant cost.

Chair AST: There are many things out with our control by going down alternative routes, which brings things back to red lines being a sensible course of action within these timescales as other options would take time to establish.

Chair Audit: There is the potential for some short-term wins from within the Paper. Choosing an alternative option at this time would be difficult having things in place beforehand, and looks impossible within 2 years.



	<p>Board Chair: Be under no illusion that UHI project will take more than 2 years. Red lines should be as audacious as possible as UHI is bust without Perth College. This is about knowing the College's worth, not just its core purpose.</p> <p>Principal: Benchmarking is done widely across the HE sector. If "divorce" was the favoured outcome, this would need to be facilitated by Scottish Government, and UHI would seek to retain custody of HE numbers. We need to test "stay and improve" against other models.</p> <p>Vice Principal: What are we willing to give up as well as seeking to gain? These need to be identified to achieve the "big" wins.</p> <p>Chair SDC: Is unification dead in the water?</p> <p>Principal: Discussion has moved away from "One UHI", and now recognised as not viable, but there is desire for an appearance of this without the parent/subsidiary model.</p> <p>Chair SDC: The offer of Chair of Court, UHI observing at Perth College Board meetings should be taken up, otherwise there is a risk that all information is coming from EO rather from partners.</p> <p>Chair AST: This makes sense if we buy into the commitment of 2 years.</p> <p>It was <b>AGREED</b> that SMT present information to Strategic Development Committee regarding options available and potential red lines. An additional Board meeting will be convened in around four weeks with the intention of reaching a decision on next steps.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 7:05pm.</p> <p>Following conclusion of meeting, Board Chair summarised that his intention as Chair had been to leave the College in a better place than when starting, and hoped that the talent around the table was evidence that this had been achieved. Board again thanked Board Chair for his time and commitment.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Date &amp; Time of Next Scheduled Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thursday 20 October 2022 @ 5:00pm</li> <li>• Additional Extraordinary Board Meeting tbc</li> </ul>	

Information recorded in College minutes are subject to release under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOI(S)A). Certain exemptions apply: financial information relating to procurement items still under tender, legal advice from College lawyers, items related to national security.

Notes taken to help record minutes are also subject to Freedom of Information requests, and should be destroyed as soon as minutes are approved.

**Status of Minutes – Open ☒**

An **open** item is one over which there would be no issues for the College in releasing the information to the public in response to a freedom of information request.

A **closed** item is one that contains information that could be withheld from release to the public because an exemption under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 applies.

The College may also be asked for information contained in minutes about living individuals, under the terms of the Data Protection Act 2018. It is important that fact, rather than opinion, is recorded.

Do the minutes contain items which may be contentious under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998?      **Yes** ☐      **No** ☒

## Perth College UHI

Paper No. 2

<b>Committee</b>	Extraordinary Board of Management
<b>Subject</b>	General Board Discussion
<b>Date of Committee meeting</b>	06/10/2022
<b>Author</b>	SMT/Clerk
<b>Date paper prepared</b>	29/09/2022
<b>Executive summary of the paper</b>	<p>Please outline the follow elements of this paper:</p> <p>This paper provides the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A summary of the areas of scrutiny, discussion, decisions and actions from the Strategic Development Committee meeting held on 21 September 2022;</li> <li>b) A revised SWOT analysis based on above; and</li> <li>c) A revised set of Areas for Negotiation based on above.</li> </ul> <p>Paper 2a is intended to provide Board with comfort that appropriate levels of scrutiny over the proposals had taken place at Strategic Development Committee</p> <p>It is further intended that Board <b>endorse</b> the proposal from SMT regarding the adoption of Scenario 1 as outlined in the SWOT Analysis (Paper 2b) and the Areas of Negotiation (Paper 2c)</p>
<b>Consultation</b> Please note which related parties, stakeholders and/or Committees have been consulted	Issue previously discussed at Extraordinary Board (05 September 2022) and Strategic Development Committee (21 September 2022)
<b>Action requested</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> For information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For discussion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For endorsement <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly recommended for approval <input type="checkbox"/> Recommended with guidance (please provide further information, below)

## Perth College UHI

<p><b>Resource implications</b></p> <p>Does this activity/proposal require the use of College resources to implement?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details.</p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p><b>Risk implications</b></p> <p>Does this activity/proposal come with any associated risk to the College, or mitigate against existing risk?</p> <p>(If yes, please provide details)</p>	<p><b>Yes/ No</b></p> <p>Risks are referred to within SWOT Analysis</p>
<p><b>Link with strategy</b></p> <p>Please highlight how the paper links to the Strategic Plan, or assist with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance</li> <li>• National Student Survey</li> <li>• partnership services</li> <li>• risk management</li> <li>• other activity [e.g. new opportunity] – please provide further information</li> </ul>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b><u>Equality and diversity</u></b></p> <p>Does this activity/proposal require an Equality Impact Assessment?</p> <p>If yes, please give details:</p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p><b><u>Data Protection</u></b></p> <p>Does this activity/proposal require a Data Protection Impact Assessment?</p> <p>If yes, please give details:</p>	<p>Yes/ No</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>
<p><b>Island communities</b></p> <p>Does this activity/ proposal have an effect on an island community which is significantly different from its effect on other communities (including other island communities)?</p>	<p>Yes/ No</p> <p>If yes, please give details:</p> <p>Click or tap here to enter text.</p>

## Perth College UHI

<b>Status</b> (e.g. confidential/non confidential)	Non Confidential
<b>Freedom of information</b> Can this paper be included in "open" business?*	<b>Yes/ No</b>

\* If a paper should **not** be included within 'open' business, please highlight below the reason.

Its disclosure would substantially prejudice a programme of research	<input type="checkbox"/>	Its disclosure would substantially prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs	<input type="checkbox"/>
Its disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of any person or organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Its disclosure would constitute a breach of confidence actionable in court	<input type="checkbox"/>
Its disclosure would constitute a breach of the Data Protection Act	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other [please give further details] Click or tap here to enter text.	<input type="checkbox"/>

For how long must the paper be withheld? Click or tap here to enter text.

Further guidance on application of the exclusions from Freedom of Information legislation is available via:

<http://www.itspublicknowledge.info/ScottishPublicAuthorities/ScottishPublicAuthorities.asp>  
and

[http://www.itspublicknowledge.info/web/FILES/Public\\_Interest\\_Test.pdf](http://www.itspublicknowledge.info/web/FILES/Public_Interest_Test.pdf)

## Summary for Board of Management: Strategic Development Committee, 21 September 2022 – Actions & Scrutiny

### Background:

At the Extraordinary Board of Management Meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2022, it was agreed that SMT present information to Strategic Development Committee regarding options available and potential areas for negotiation, with an additional Board meeting being convened subsequently with the intention of reaching a decision on next steps.

This document summarises the key discussions and actions to enable the Board of Management to focus on decision-making without the need to repeat detailed scrutiny undertaken at Strategic Development Committee.

Item	SMT Summary	Scrutiny/Agreement & SMT Action
6.1 – Paper 2 Options Paper	Principal noted that SMT had considered three options/scenarios for structural change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• remain in UHI and continue to work on improving the partnership</li><li>• leave UHI and be a stand alone college retaining our HE numbers</li><li>• leave UHI and create a Tayside FE/HE formalised collaboration</li></ul>	Had PC received anything from EO that influenced these positions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- No, at no point had PC indicated leaving UHI, only that options would be considered</li></ul>
6.1 – Paper 3 UHI Revitalisation Paper	Focus on 7 groups identified to work on 2-year process for substantive change. Principal scheduled to chair one of these groups (Shared Services) with support from Vice Principal (Operations).  Key question identified was “Why is this different?” – UHI had identified that there was a “burning platform” for change due to pressing financial impetus.	What structures would change programme have, eg leading or sponsoring? And where are resources coming from? <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Leadership of groups not fully identified yet, although a closed Court meeting on 22/09/2022 would look at leadership following departure of UHI Principal</li><li>- Structure of groups not yet determined</li></ul> <b>Principal to report to EBM meeting on 06/10/2022 re likely structures of change programme – expectation is that work will commence January 2023 per proposals, although PC would like some momentum to be retained</b>  Concern re “what is UHI?” and whether this can evolve out of change programme. Also concern that 7 different groups might take 7 different positions if this not defined.

		<p>Regular reporting to/reviews with Colleges required to ensure clarity over direction of travel should be included within the mode of delivery.</p> <p>Concern over 2024 being a realistic timescale given recent changes in UHI leadership.</p> <p>Need to know project management model to be utilised, eg PRINCE2.</p> <p><b>Principal to confirm which project management model to be used.</b></p> <p>Consideration re areas of work identified by PC but not in 7 workstreams identified by UHI?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May be new subsets within workstreams – this is a discussion point for senior group responsible for delivery</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed that there needs to be some form of input from Boards of APs – Principal to negotiate form this may take.</b></p>
6.1 – Paper 4 Financial Comment	<p>Briefing provided on key financial implications not discussed in detail at Extraordinary Board.</p> <p>7 scenarios have not been modelled, therefore no definition of what completion, or part thereof, means financially</p>	<p>What are sector benchmarks re overhead v teaching costs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approx. 50/50, although “teaching expenditure” needs defined.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outline deliverables should be defined</b></p> <p>How much of PC teaching and academic spend (ie 63%) is HE vs FE, and what is PC contribution to shared teaching on networked courses, ie what would PC need to spend to retain current levels in event of a split from UHI?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed split on a cost basis would be extremely difficult to track as there is no clarity in terms of what PC draw down from EO – no SLAs, top slice is not defined by what APs want. This is not currently a linear relationship</li> </ul> <p>Why is PC paying for something not being used? Was opt-in/out discussed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not been discussed since formation of EO, and impact of EO costs on APs has never been assessed. Goes back to fundamentals of “What is UHI?”.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed that review of EO needs to go back to “first principles”</b></p>

6.1 – Paper 5 SWOT Analysis	Some of Opportunities/Strengths for Scenario 1 (Remain in UHI) may be improved by PC depending on the model adopted around Revitalisation	<p>Able to evidence SWOT, or is list opinion?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subjective opinion with qualitative rather than quantitative evidence – deeper levels of detail not able to be provided within such a short turnaround</li> </ul> <p>Are retaining Degree-awarding powers within UHI likely to be a deal-breaker for PC's HE provision?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other colleges provide degrees offered by other HE organisations, eg Open University, Greenwich University</li> <li>- Funded places ceiling may have impact on Scottish Universities offering degrees with Scottish Colleges</li> </ul> <p>Weighting for the different strengths/weaknesses may help support a decision about the preferred Option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should political intervention be strongly weighted? Political positions may have evolved in recent months</li> </ul> <p>Anything in the current Audit Scotland report that should be factored into the SWOT analysis?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>SMT to cross-reference</b></li> </ul> <p>Student voice and staff upheaval should also appear within Scenario 1.</p> <p>PC has an opportunity to be a dynamic leader in this process to benefit all.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1 agreed as position moving forward, however the SWOT analysis for this requires attention prior to submission to full Board.</b></p>
6.1 – Paper 6 Areas For Negotiation	SMT sought feedback from Committee in terms of being strongly for/against	<p>Parts around revenue generation require greater impetus</p> <p>Negotiation points around Curriculum Strategy – what are implications of these? Is there a danger of signing up to a strategy that might not suit PC?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UHI recently conducted a Curriculum Review, however this was a rationalisation process with no strategic framework, and didn't allow for local niche provision</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Any future review would need more input from APs, particularly around networking on programmes</li></ul> <p>Some timescales on demands look very tight (includes reference to Oct 2022) – what is bandwidth of negotiation/compromise?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <b>SMT will review Paper ahead of Board meeting given changes in recent past, including prioritisation of list of negotiation areas</b></li></ul>
--	--	--

## **Paper 2b**

### **Options Paper – SWOT Analysis of Scenarios**

**(Updated following Strategic  
Development Committee, 21  
September 2022)**

## **Scenario 1: Remain in UHI and continue to work on improving the partnership**

### **Strengths:**

- Degree awarding powers providing agility in the development of emerging curricula
- Opens door which we wouldn't have eg International
- Perception of university and community in Perth
- Tertiarieness
- Tap into EO cash – borrow
- Ability to be more responsive to community/employers
- Much wider curriculum offer from the entire partnership
- Marketing – impetus, local and national
- Aligned to national collaborations (AAS)
- Comms easier within region
- Choice of delivery/study methods
- Internal collaboration/sharing of best practice with research and knowledge exchange
- Potential clear articulation routes
- Utilising the increased numbers given to universities

### **Weaknesses:**

- Complex organisation – lack of cohesion
- Trust and transparency (lack of)
- Repeating mistakes – lack of learning
- Not ranked in key university tables
- Apathy for FE – not truly tertiary
- Marketing interventions limited/non existent
- Lack of vision
- Public perception
- Equity model:                Student access versus experience  
   Financial viability
- Lack of investment in technology and online pedagogy
- No real accountability to partners
- One partner, one vote
- Lack of autonomy eg International
- Commercial/International top slice

### **Opportunities:**

- Fundraising approach – galvanised campaign/collective strengths
- Shared services
- Restructure EO and duplicated services
- Restructure the partnership:        What/how we do things  
    Role of partners/EO  
    Facilitating EO
- Better targeted activity – delivery
- Geographical location for International
- Centres for Excellence need to be developed/marketed
- Emerging technologies in regions – own the curriculum

### **Threats:**

- Lack of dynamic leadership
- Lack of shared/realistic vision and urgency, lack of time

- Other institutions have greater reputation/credibility
- Lack of collective belief in current UHI
- Current recruitment
- Curriculum
- Lack of focussed marketing
- On-line and shared delivery
- Lack of part time delivery
- Sustainability of UHI and AP's
- Political intervention

## **Scenario 2: Leave UHI and be a stand-alone College**

(Assumption – retain HE numbers (2a and 2b))

### **Strengths:**

- Autonomy/self determination
- Ability to be more responsive to community/employers
- Autonomy over curriculum
- Simplified funding from sfc
- Direct relationship with sfc and other bodies
- Reduction in duplication
- Own ROA

### **Weaknesses:**

- Capability/capacity to delivery change
- Loss of specialist staff
- Reputation risk/loss of university status for Perth city
- Potential redundancy if HE was not continued/national dispute
- Question of IP – what do we own?
- Community involvement in decision
- Never stood alone/always in UHI
- International recruitment?
- Identity as a College

### **Opportunities:**

- New partnerships with other institutions
- 3 year degrees
- Franchising degrees
- Reset as a College and then develop HE – shrink and consolidate
- Provide a better student experience
- Better student choices
- Redesign what we are to our community
- Flexibility
- Control our reputation

### **Threats:**

- Losing HE numbers
- Level of activity/work to develop partnerships
- UKVI changes for International for College level provision
- Length of time to transition
- Negotiate the “divorce terms”
- Existing student impact
- Political will
- Realigned staff structure (TUPE)?
- Destabilise EO and Perth
- Destabilise International contacts
- Unknown costs
- Fear of change
- Staff impact/strikes
- Stakeholder impact
- Competitive advantage geographically would be lost

### **Scenario 3: Leave UHI and create a Tayside FE/HE formalised collaboration**

#### **Strengths:**

- Underpin degrees (Abertay/Dundee)
- Marketing – impetus local and national
- Aligned to Tay Cities collaborations
- Comms easier within region
- Travel to study would be shorter
- Collaboration with an established university
- Potential clear articulation route
- Appealing partner to other partners
- Increase in numbers given to universities

#### **Weaknesses:**

- Transitional and on-going costs
- Harmonise T&C's
- Degree on integration
- Degree awarding specialisms for previous UHI courses
- Continuing/different complexity
- Conditions of integration eg kit
- Culture mismatch
- "Messy divorce" – not attractive to partners
- Curriculum rationalisation

#### **Opportunities:**

- New markets
- Association with a university with good reputation
- Re-launch ourselves
- Serve wider region in employment skills
- Best of both worlds if we structure well, retain autonomy

#### **Threats:**

- Cost of partnership
- Loss of market share for Perth
- Curriculum could be limited by expertise of partner
- Larger programmes more viable and niche provision could be lost
- Longevity of partnership
- Lack of flexibility in provision
- UHI animosity
- Structure of partnership

# **Paper 2c**

## **Areas for Negotiation**

**(Updated following Strategic  
Development Committee, 21  
September 2022)**

## **Perth College UHI Strategic Development Committee**

### **Context Points for Discussion and Endorsement in Relation to Negotiation Approach**

- In our discussions with Executive Office, we could consider referring to 'cultural change' from EO rather than 'red lines'. As EO demonstrate this change we should move towards them (making co-creations) until we become "all in" at some point. A big part of this cultural change will be partners having much more say in the running of the partnership and EO becoming what the partners need them to be. As this happens partners would require to then accept the new EO position and fully support them in this new role.
- Modelling of the seven strategic outcomes (to be complete by end October 2022). There must be some level of comfort that the seven strategic outcomes will take UHI to where the leadership needs it to be. It would be a missed opportunity to complete the seven strategic objectives and subsequently find we are short of where we need to be. As an example, neither the opportunity to save between £0 and £35 million through adopting a culture of continual improvement, nor generating profitable additional income sources appear in the seven strategic outcomes. Seeking agreement from EO that a focus on including some additional strategic objectives such as continuous improvement and market development along with other areas which arise during the strategic development process would be valuable. Modelling of these objectives would help us understand what additional objectives may be valuable additions,
- Clear vision of what success looks like in 2 years (to be completed by end October 2022)

Similar to departments contributing to strategic success, the teams carrying out the seven (or more) strategic outcomes should be focused on aligning their solution with the common vision.

- Agreement on EO's lead role (to be completed by the end of November 2022) Determine the role of EO, what it will be (that all the partners must support) and what it will not be (that EO has to follow). For example, perhaps EO would create a single strategy used in UHI while academic partners set the curriculum. EO's role should be in the provision of the awarding body status. The new EO vision would be set with a team made up of a representative from all partners. After the vision is set, EO could spend 12 months creating their new structure. This feels different to the seven objectives document which seems to lean towards EO deciding what it is going to be. EO also has to have some accountability to partners moving forward
- Academic Partner leads: The seven strategic outcomes (or more depending on recommendation above) should be sponsored rather than led by attendees of the Nairn meetings. The team leads should be (where possible) SMT members from around the partnership. The sponsor role would be to hold leads accountable, remove "roadblocks", ensure resources are available and ensure the project keeps moving forward.



## **Minimum Negotiation Points**

- 1** EO will conceptualise and implement a restructuring plan, focussed on rationalisation and efficiency. This must enable the UHI Partnership to be agile and responsive to industry and global partners and enhance our reputation, increase recruitment and capitalise upon profitable commercial revenue streams – by end August 2023
- 2** A shared vision of what success will look like in 2 years' time – by end October 2022
- 3** Consideration of a value placed on a reduction on the top slice of for example 25% in year one and a minimum of 50% in year 2 of the planning process
- 4** Create a new curriculum strategy, led by the academic partners, and completed within year 1
- 5** Workstream should develop an “opt in” shared delivery model - this should be developed from existing SUCCESSFUL shared delivery model and this model should be costed with structured management – within 18 months. This will help colleges with low numbers still offer an attractive curriculum portfolio – NB this is an opt in service and NOT a one size fits all delivery model
- 6** Shared services feasibility study – by end March 2023

## **Potential Areas of Compromise**

- UHI/ Perth College Branding which resonates with all target audiences
- EO top slice on commercial profits (5%)