

## Transition Board – Shetland Merger Project

<b>Committee</b>	Transition Board – Shetland Merger Project
<b>Subject</b>	Consultation on changes to UHI RAM
<b>Action requested</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For information only <input type="checkbox"/> For discussion <input type="checkbox"/> For recommendation <input type="checkbox"/> For approval
<b>Brief summary of the paper</b>	<p>Paper (TB2020-33 RAM consultation) seeks the views of academic partners on proposed changes to the way that UHI allocates teaching funding to academic partners for further and higher education. The proposal indicates introduction of new arrangements for academic year 2021/22 and clearly any changes in the RAM will affect Shetland UHI, so the consultation document was considered by the Finance and General Purposes Sub-committee. The response to the consultation resulting from the discussion at that committee is included below for the information of the Board.</p>
<b>Resource implications</b> [if yes, please provide detail]	No <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>
<b>Risk implications</b> [if yes, please provide detail]	No
<b>Date paper prepared</b>	08-Dec-20
<b>Date of committee meeting</b>	16-Dec-20
<b>Author</b>	Jane Lewis
<b>Equality and diversity</b>	No
<b>Status</b>	Non-confidential
<b>Freedom of Information</b> Can this paper be included in 'open' business?*	Yes
<b>Status following the meeting</b>	

## Response from Shetland UHI on RAM review

This has been reviewed and commented on by the Finance and General Purpose Sub-committee of the Shetland UHI Transition Board as any changes introduced as a result of this review will impact on the new college following its planned vesting in July 2021.

We welcome the proposal to review the University's Resource Allocation Model. We recognise that the current model is one that has developed over time during the development of the university and that it is overdue for revision. We believe therefore this is an extremely important piece of work and we note the need, alongside this, for reform of the partnership through the change programme of the University and in particular curriculum review within that programme.

We acknowledge the principles set out for the new model and agree they are appropriate.

The following general points were raised in response to the document:

- The need for a transparent and effective curriculum review process that ensures academic partners are not competing with similar programmes, that all academic partners have fair opportunities in delivery of programmes, that programmes are delivered efficiently and that programmes are fit for purpose, relevant and meet the needs of our region.
- We acknowledge the intention to link FE funding and delivery and the potential to reallocate FE credit that will flow from that. As a new college with ambitious plans we are keen to see transparent processes developed to achieve this.
- We support the review of Executive Office and wish to see simplification of structure of EO and welcome the thrust of this proposal to improve the transparency of activity and clarity regarding the support we can access.
- We have concerns over 'centralisation' and would wish to see activity spread across the partnership for providing central support as indicated in the paper.
- We would like to see more detail regarding the 'head room' fund proposed here and how this will be allocated/bid for to support curriculum development.
- We would like more clarity on what constitutes 'external income', at points in the paper it seems this is restricted to income associated with 'students' and other points it seems to refer to wider consultancy and possibly research income

Response to specific questions:

- **Do you agree with our proposal to introduce an institutional element to our funding model?**

Yes we welcome an institutional element to the RAM

- **Do you have views on which of the models of institutional element better meets the needs of the partnership?**

We were not sure about elements of the modelling and find it hard to comment on these without more detail. Would it be possible for finance practitioners to have a workshop to understand this better and allow us to comment more fully?

- **Do you agree with the proposal to spread the cost of the central university service more equitably and transparently across further and higher education funding?**

We agree with the principle of this proposal and wish to see this tertiary approach taken to all aspects of our activity. We think this will be an institutional strength to highlight as we contribute and respond to the

SFC review. We welcome clarity on what the retained funding will be paying for and given this will be a significant budget the opportunity to ensure this is value for money for the partnership.

- **Do you agree with the principle of a proportion of external income being contributed to the partnership centrally and if so, do you agree with the proposal that it initially be set at 10% of teaching income?**

We agree to the principle of contributing a portion of external teaching income. However, we would like clarity regarding other external income and if it will be expected to contribute in this way and how this would be managed. We would like to see clarity on the income 10% will generate and how it would be used effectively.

- **Do you agree with the proposal for an annual funding agreement between the university and each partner to provide clarity of expectation on both sides?**

We welcome the proposal for a funding agreement and the clarity it will bring to the partnership. We wondered how tailored this agreement will be for individual partners. We would like further clarity on a process of dispute resolution, should that arise between a partner and the university in respect of the annual funding agreement.