

Minutes (Open) Approved University Court**Minutes of decisions taken by correspondence on 17 December 2025****52. Process for the Appointment of a Chair of Court****CT/1225/056**

- (i). Following discussion at the meeting of Court on 26 November 2025 (minute 49) and the decision not to extend the term of appointment of the current Chair of Court, David Brew, when it ends on 15 May 2026, the Governance and Nominations Committee at its meeting on 4 December 2025 (minute 19) agreed that Court should be invited to consider by correspondence the process for the appointment of a Chair of Court, with the option for an extraordinary meeting if required.
- (ii). Court was asked to:
- (a) approve the revised regulations for the appointment of a Chair of Court.
 - (b) agree to establish an Appointment Committee and to approve its Terms of Reference.
 - (c) delegate to the Appointment Committee the responsibility of devising the criteria with respect to the position and ensuring the efficiency and fairness of the process for filling the position.
 - (d) note the proposed membership of the Appointment Committee and to delegate authority to the Vice-Chair of Court and Secretary to Court to confirm its final composition.
- (iii). Some queries were raised by various members of Court, which were addressed by the Vice-Principal and University Secretary, Caroline Summers, with questions and responses provided in full to all members of Court via email. These included clarification that all students, including Abertay Online and those at partner institutions, registered as Abertay students on the qualifying date would be eligible to vote in the election, and that the recommendation to the Appointments Committee, similar to the approach in 2023, will be to use an independent third-party to undertake the election. Minor editorial amendments were agreed including the adoption of gender-neutral language throughout.
- (iv). Responses were received from 20 of the current 22 members of Court. The current Chair of Court, David Brew, declared a conflict of interest and therefore did not participate in the decision. Of those that did respond, all confirmed that they were content to approve the process as noted above.

Outcome: Court approved the Regulations for the Appointment of a Chair of Court.

Outcome: Court agreed to establish an Appointments Committee and approved its Terms of Reference.

Outcome: Court agreed to delegate to the Appointment Committee the responsibility of devising the criteria with respect to the position and ensuring the efficiency and fairness of the process for filling the position.

Outcome: Court noted the proposed membership of the Appointment Committee and agreed to delegate authority to the Vice-Chair of Court and Secretary to Court to confirm its final composition.

53. Intellectual Property Policy

CT/1125/057

- (i). Following discussion at the November meeting of Court (minute 25), Court had agreed to consider by correspondence the approval of the Intellectual Property (IP) Policy, assuming that the Finance and Corporate Performance Committee (FCPC) was content to recommend it for approval following its review of the policy on 9 December 2025. In addition to the policy, Court was also provided with the draft minute extracts from the meeting of FCPC (agreed with the Committee Chair, Antony Marks), noting that the Committee were content to recommend the policy to Court for approval, and from the meeting of the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee held on 3 December 2025 (agreed with the Committee Chair, Professor James Bown). Court was reminded that a new IP Policy was required by 1 January 2026 to ensure Research Excellence Framework (REF) Open Access compliance.
- (ii). Court was advised that the policy sought to establish a clear framework for the ownership, protection, and commercialisation of intellectual property created by staff, students, and affiliates. The policy, which is aligned with UK legislation and sector best practice, ensures compliance with contractual obligations and promotes innovation and knowledge transfer for societal benefit.
- (iii). Several queries were raised by various members of Court, which were addressed by the Dean of Research and the Graduate School, Professor Nia White, and the Director of People and Culture, Eilidh Fraser, as appropriate, with questions and responses provided in full to members of Court via email. These included clarification that the revenue share rates were in line with several other UK universities, that the University retains attribution and enforcement rights and that the IP remains with the University when an employee leaves the University. It was highlighted that in addition to the policy there will be the launch of the Wellspring Evolve IP system and a robust training and communication programme, which will look to address queries regarding copyright, IP, moral rights, Creative Commons and Open Educational Resources. Court was advised that the university-wide policy states that it “applies to ownership of IP created by its members (full time employees, part time employees, honorary roles), together with any related intellectual property rights comprised in or relating to such intellectual property” and that it “does not apply to IP generated in a personal capacity unconnected with employment

with the University”. Other minor editorial amendments were agreed for clarity and inclusivity and including the adoption of gender-neutral language throughout.

- (iv). While most Court members were content with the responses provided, an objection was raised by two members (Kerith George-Briant and Thomas Sloan) that the policy and the processes that emerge from it did not sufficiently consider how this issue affects professional services staff and students. They were however content for the policy to be published by 1 January and for these concerns to be addressed with a view to Court agreeing to any necessary revisions in February.
- (v). Responses were received from 20 out of 22 members of Court. Of those that did respond, 17 members of Court confirmed that they were content to approve the policy, with 2 members noting an objection as highlighted above.

Outcome: Court approved the Intellectual Property Policy pending further consideration of the objections which had been raised.

Secretary’s Note: Following further explanations given by Professor N. White and others about the context for the IP Policy and the way in which it would be operationalised, K. George-Briant and T. Sloan confirmed, at a meeting on 27 January 2026, that they were now content with the IP Policy as approved by Court in December and did not require any changes to be made.

Chair: David Brew
18 December 2025