UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

COUNCIL

10 October 2005

Present: Mrs M O Grant (in the Chair), the Vice-Chancellor, Professor J B Goddard (Deputy Vice-Chancellor), Dr J C Appleby, Mr L M Aviss, Mr D Bulmer (Education Officer), Mr J C FitzPatrick, Mr M I’Anson, Sir Miles Irving, Mr P M Johnson, Mr S Lightley, Professor P J W Olive, Ms K Priestley, The Hon James Ramsbotham, Mr A Robson (Communications Officer), Professor P Sen, Miss S Underwood, Sir John Willis and Mr A M Wilton.

In attendance: Professor O R Hinton, Professor O F W James, Professor C B Riordan, Professor E Ritchie, Professor A C Stevenson and Professor M P Young (Pro-Vice-Chancellors), Dr J V Hogan (Registrar), Mr H B Farnhill (Bursar), Mrs V S Johnston (Director of Human Resources) and Mr R J C Burrow (Assistant Director of Human Resources).

Mrs J Bullimore attended for items 7(c) & 9 and Miss K Ramskill (Safety Officer) attended for item 10.

The Vice-Chancellor was not present for item 13.

M I N U T E S

PART A : STRATEGIC ISSUE

1. WELCOME

The Chairman of Council welcomed Professor Riordan to his first meeting as Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the Faculty of HASS, Professor Hinton as Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the Faculty of SAgE, Professor Young in his new role as Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategic Development, Mr Ally Robson, the Union Society Communications Officer and Mr David Bulmer, the Union Society Education Officer.

2. PAY MODERNISATION

(Minute 74, 23.5.2005)

Received an oral presentation from Mrs V S Johnston, Director of Human Resources.

After noting that:

1. Professor Stevenson had taken over responsibility as Chairman of Staff Committee and outlined the pay modernisation process to date.

2. The pay systems and structures in higher education had not changed for a long period of time and this had resulted in a complex and confusing system. There were currently eight different pay structures, fifty different grades and four different job evaluation systems in place in the University.
3. The key principle behind the pay modernisation process was to establish a basis of equal pay for work of equal value.

4. The Higher Education Funding Council for England had required institutions to undertake a pay modernisation process and had provided some earmarked funding to support this initiative.

5. One of the intentions behind the pay modernisation scheme was to make the system more simple and transparent, to facilitate career progression and to help ensure the University’s competitiveness.

6. The University’s proposals had been drawn up within a number of national structures, notably the national framework agreement and the subsequent memorandum of understanding with the Association of University Teachers.

7. The University’s proposals had to be affordable, help to retain and motivate staff, support competitive recruitment and be consistent with existing academic career structures.

8. The University’s proposals took the single spine which had been negotiated nationally and had established nine different levels with common grade boundaries. Each level had a core through which staff could progress on the basis of annual increments and then a discretionary range.

9. The University had used the Hay job evaluation system and had worked with a consortium of other universities to develop this system for the needs of higher education.

10. The job evaluation system was based on four different job families, but this was largely to help the transition from our current confusing structures to the new single pay spine.

11. The University’s proposals seemed similar to some others which had emerged from Russell Group universities.

12. The University proposed to harmonize conditions at two different levels with conditions being the same for all staff on grades A-E and the same for all staff on grades F and above. There were still issues being negotiated with the Trade Unions concerning the terms and conditions of employment. In particular, under the proposals staff on A-E would work 37 hours a week. This represented a reduction of one hour a week for full time ancillary staff and an increase of one hour a week for full-time clerical staff. The University had proposed to delay the introduction of the increased hour for clerical staff for one year to allow staff to make appropriate adjustments, and had increased the holiday entitlement for most of the staff on grades A-E.

13. The estimated cost for the 2005-06 financial year, with an implementation date of 1 December, was £2.55m. For the 2006-07 financial year, the estimated cost was a further £3.7m. Thereafter, there were further increases but they were at a smaller rate. It was essential to emphasise that this settlement was not part of the annual pay award negotiations which were being conducted nationally and had just reached a settlement at around 3% for the current academic year.

14. Steps had been taken to communicate with trade unions and all staff.
15. There was still some uncertainty about the University’s ability to implement from 1 December, its desired commencement date. There was an absolute deadline proposed by the HEFCE of 1 August 2006.

16. Virtually all of the job matching and job evaluation was now complete, with only one or two areas where there had been some reorganisation still outstanding.

17. It was commented that a number of other universities had already reached agreement and had introduced a new pay structure. Some of these universities, notably Cambridge, Imperial, Manchester and Essex appeared to offer a more generous level of pay for certain categories of staff, particularly academic staff, than had been proposed by the University.

18. The University believed that its proposals would allow it to be competitive and it had looked carefully at the other schemes which had been confirmed and it appeared that the University’s proposals were similar to those adopted by Leeds and Sheffield. The pay structure would be kept under review to ensure that the University did remain competitive for the recruitment and retention of staff at all levels.

19. All staff had been informed of the outcome of the job evaluation process and in the majority of cases there would be no detriment to terms and pay. For the small number who had been identified as ‘red circled’, a range of possible solutions would be considered and implemented as appropriate.

20. Dr Appleby declared an interest as a member of the AUT negotiation team. He commented that the University was nearing the end of a long negotiation process which had been mostly constructive, although there were still issues which were outstanding.

21. The University had approximately £2.4m available from the Rewarding and Developing Staff fund earmarked by the HEFCE which would meet most of the cost of the implementation for the current financial year from 1 December but the costs beyond this financial year would fall directly on the University’s recurrent budget.

22. The lay officers of Council had been kept informed of the general nature of the negotiations.

23. It might be necessary for the University to obtain legal advice on the process to be adopted by Council in the event that it prove impossible to reach a negotiated settlement with the trade unions.

*Resolved that:*

(i) *Mrs Johnston be thanked for her informative presentation.*

(ii) *The Chairman of Council be authorised to act on behalf of Council to approve the final basis of the pay modernisation proposals on the basis that such proposals were identical to, or very close to, the ones that had been presented to Council. Should the proposals vary significantly as a result of the negotiation process, it would be necessary for the proposals to be re-submitted to Council for consideration.*
PART B : GENERAL BUSINESS

SECTION I
(Minutes & matters arising; Chairman’s and Vice-Chancellor’s business)

3. MINUTES

*The Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 18 July 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed.*

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(a) 12 December 2005 meeting
(Minute 82(d), 18.7.2005)

Noted that it was intended to proceed with the meeting of Council on 12 December 2005 as a normal meeting, with the away day to be held on 6 February 2006. Further details would be sent to members of Council once they had been finalised.

(b) Ethics Committee

Noted that it was intended that the issue of the University’s Ethics Committee would be submitted to a forthcoming meeting of Council. It was intended that the coverage of the University’s Ethics Committee would be broad and incorporate more than simple research or medical issues.

(c) Pre-meeting lunches
(Minute 82(e), 18.7.2005)

Reported that a briefing lunch for lay members of Council would be held prior to the meeting of Council on 22 May 2006. No academic member of Council had approached the Chair concerning the possibility of lunches for academic members of Council and therefore none had been arranged.

(d) Nominations Committee
(Minute 87, 18.7.2005)

Reported that the Chairman, acting on behalf of Council, had appointed the following to serve on Nominations Committee until 31 July of the year shown:

Mr P M Johnson (2008)
Miss K Priestley (2007)

(e) Progress of business

Received a business tracking form.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document B. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Noted that a number of important items were due to come to Council at its next meeting in December. In particular, the progress report on the Union Society had been delayed from the current meeting to the December meeting since the first meeting of the new Partnership
Group between the University and the Union Society would not now be held until late November.

[Note: In the event, this meeting would now be held in mid-December.]

(f) Working Group on Governance  
(Minute 88, 18.7.2005)

Considered a progress report from the Working Group on Governance.  
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document C. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Noted that:

1. The Working Group on Governance had held a further meeting on 28 September 2005 and had submitted a report to the senior management team on the committee structure for consideration.

2. At the next meeting of the Working Group, to be held in late October, consideration would be given to the issue of mechanisms for monitoring the overall effectiveness of Council and the effectiveness of individual members.

5. **CHAIRMAN’S BUSINESS**

(a) Audit Committee

Reported that the Chairman had taken action on behalf of Council to appoint Mr Glen Wilson, the former Chairman of Audit Committee, to a temporary appointment to Council and Audit Committee to ensure that the meeting of Audit Committee on 12 October 2005 would be quorate. The current requirement was for there to be three lay members of Council (one of whom must Chair the Committee) plus one additional lay member and currently only two lay members of Council had been appointed to the Committee. Audit Committee itself would give further consideration to this matter at its meeting on 12 October as its constitution was rather restrictive and it might be more beneficial to have two lay members of Council and two lay members who were not necessarily members of Council.

(b) Miss Sue Underwood

Reported that this was the last meeting for Miss Sue Underwood since she would shortly be leaving the country to take up a new role in the United Arab Emirates.

The Chairman expressed her appreciation of the work Miss Underwood had undertaken for the University and her personal sadness at her departure.

(c) The Treasury

The Chairman reported that the delegation from the Treasury had visited the University on 6 October at the request of the University, to discuss a range of issues and specifically the Science City initiative.
(d) Court

It was noted that a special programme of visits had been arranged for the new lay members of Court and the Chairman had asked for a similar programme to be made available to members of Council.

6. VICE-CHANCELLOR’S BUSINESS

(a) Deaths

Received a report on deaths recently announced by the University.

[Details filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that Council record its deep regret and sympathy for the relatives concerned.

(b) National Student Survey

Reported that:

(a) In August the University had received its results of the first National Student Survey, followed by publication of the national results in September. The Survey was based on a questionnaire of all final year students and was conducted in February 2005. The Survey provided a lot of valuable information on how the University’s students assessed aspects of their teaching and learning experience and would be very useful in improving performance internally. The University intended to run its own student survey during the current academic year, which would provide further valuable information.

(b) The University would be reacting to the lessons learned from the Survey. Whilst the University had done well in certain subjects, overall the results were a little disappointing in placing the University about half way in a number of league tables that had been compiled alongside a number of other Russell Group universities. In a small number of subject areas, the University’s performance had been poor and urgent action was required.

(c) Professor Ritchie, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching and Learning, had been asked to present an action plan to a forthcoming meeting of Executive Board and further consideration would be given by the University Teaching and Learning Committee to appropriate steps.

(d) One fact which emerged clearly from the national opinions expressed, was concern about the feedback on assessment.

(e) There were some methodological concerns about the Survey and the margin between success and failure was really very small. Overall, the students of this University had expressed satisfaction with their academic programmes.

(f) Some care would need to be taken over any proposed steps arising from the analysis of the National Student Survey and appropriate consultation with schools should take place.
(g) Increasingly parents were expressing issues about value for money with regard to undergraduate provision and this was a fact that the University needed to take into account.

(h) Clearly the area of student satisfaction was one which would need to be developed into a key performance indicator for the University.

(c) **Sunday Times League Table**

Reported that the University’s position in the most recent version of the Sunday Times league table published in October was disappointing. The University had fallen from 19th to 26th. The Sunday Times had introduced a number of subjective elements, including the review from a small number of headteachers for which no regional allowance had been made.

(d) **Science City**

Reported that:

(a) The submission of a prospectus to the Treasury by the three partners (the University, One NorthEast and the City Council) had been made in July. The Treasury had not yet responded formally and One NorthEast, the body which had taken responsibility for the actual submission, had asked that this document should not be released until after the Treasury had responded. Once the response from the Treasury had been received, it was expected that the submission would be made available to all members of Council.

(b) Work on the Science City project continued to make good progress. The partnership had not yet purchased the site but it was intended to complete the purchase by the end of the month. A formal project management structure had now been established within the University, which included a Council Advisory Group. The project management would include a detailed risk assessment. A further report would be submitted to Council in December.

Noted that:

1. It was intended that the three partners should purchase the site before the end of October.

2. The University’s work on the project was being greatly assisted by Mr Tony Pender, a former lay member of Council.

(e) **Planning permission**

Noted that:

1. The Vice-Chancellor had expressed concerns about some aspects of planning permission. The University was experiencing some difficulties with its proposals for the Barras Bridge building. As Council was aware, this building was intended to house the University’s Business School, Institute for Public Policy and Practice, provide an improved range of student services and house the Executive Office. Considerable work had been undertaken on the design and the University had made strenuous efforts to meet various points raised during the planning process. As a result of these changes, the
The proposed net internal area of the building had been reduced from 12,000m² to 7,500m². Nevertheless, it appeared that the changes undertaken to date might not be sufficient to secure the necessary planning approval. This would be a very damaging outcome, since the University had spent a large amount of money on the process to date and there was an important need to provide better accommodation for the users listed above.

2. The University had appealed against the decision of the Development Control Committee not to permit its proposed scheme of an addition of 280 bedrooms at the Castle Leazes site. Again, the University felt it had made important efforts to meet planning concerns. Its original proposal for 300 bedrooms had been supported by the officers in the Planning Department. The University had subsequently reduced the scheme to 280 when issues concerning light had been raised but the Development Control Committee had suggested that the site could only be developed for 130 additional bedrooms. The public enquiry on this would be held on 21 & 22 March 2006.

3. The University was currently responding to a proposal from the City for a conservation area on the northern part of the City which would incorporate the University campus and the campus of the University of Northumbria. Such a conservation scheme would make the changes required with the introduction of Science City and some of the University’s own master planning proposals much more difficult to achieve. For example, under the proposed conservation area it might not be possible to demolish the current Museum of Antiquities as part of the changes for the Great North Museum. It was also suggested that it might not be possible to demolish the Boiler House either.

4. There would be further discussions concerning the planning position in December, when some of the current issues might be clearer.

SECTION II
(Items of business)

7. REPORT FROM EXECUTIVE BOARD

Considered a Report from the meeting of Executive Board held on 13 September 2005.  
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document D. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

(a) Third Party Occupancy of University Space

After noting that:

1. The proposed arrangements concerning third party occupancy of University space were not intended to apply to the Union Society, except in so far as there was a need for clarity of the legal responsibility of health and safety issues and it was important to ensure that any arrangements with the Union Society were clearly understood by both the University and the Union Society.

2. Support was expressed for the view that the University could offer to increase its equity share in exchange for providing accommodation to spin-out companies.

3. The arrangements with regard to the NHS were complex and governed largely by the Pater formula. Most of these arrangements were well defined and there was close cooperation between the University and the Trust on such matters.
4. A major strategic issue for the University concerned the development of its ongoing relationship with the NHS Trusts and in particular if there was any attempt to change the basis of the Pater formula.

5. Support was expressed for the view that the University should not define too narrowly the companies in which it had an interest in a success. The definition could be broader than companies which the University had part of an equity share.

6. The proposed IP and Major Commercialisation Committee was part of a set of proposals which would be brought forward concerning the governance of our spin-out activity. The Working Group on Governance had already made some comments concerning the operation of Equity Committee and the need to make some changes in this area.

7. It was important to clarify the basis of third party occupation of University estate, not least for the future aspirations of Science City.

8. Mr Blezard had sent some detailed comments to the Estates Office concerning the policy which were helpful in clarifying a number of points on the heads of terms.

Resolved that the policy on third party occupation of University space be approved, subject to minor clarifications on the heads of terms as identified by Mr Blezard.

(b) Strategic cases for the recruitment of replacement Chairs in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Resolved that the proposals for replacement Chairs and Statutory Committees for the David Dale Chair of Economics and the Chair/Readership of Financial Economics be approved subject, where necessary, to the agreement of Senate.

(c) Equal Opportunities: proposed changes to the constitution of the Equal Opportunities Committee and relevant Sub-Committees

After noting that:

1. The Working Group on Governance had made a number of comments on the operation of the Committee structure in this area.

2. It was important for the University to ensure that its equal opportunities policies were appropriate and effective.

3. The trade unions would be part of the proposed Consultative Group, although the AUT had requested some further consultations on the operation of the sub-committee structure.

4. It would be necessary to keep this area of operation under review in the light of the changes to national legislation and the review of the University’s own effectiveness in this area.

Resolved that:

(i) The main Committee overseeing the University’s operations and policies on equal opportunities be re-titled the Diversity Committee with the terms of reference and constitution as set out in the document submitted to Council.
(ii) The sub-committee structure under the Diversity Committee be approved, with specifically the Impact Assessment Steering Group being established to ensure the University would comply with its statutory duties on race, disability and gender equality.

(d) Newcastle Magnetic Resonance Centre

Resolved that the new magnetic resonance facility at the Newcastle General Hospital be named the ‘Newcastle Magnetic Resonance Centre’.

(e) Refurbishment of teaching laboratories in the School of Dental Sciences

After noting that the University was seeking a permanent increase in its dental student numbers from September 2006 onwards and the HEFCE had indicated that a capital sum could be made available to enhance teaching facilities associated with the increased number of students.

Resolved that the proposed refurbishment of teaching laboratories in the School of Dental Sciences, with an estimated cost of £2.4m, be approved in principle, subject to the HEFCE providing the capital sum as part of the national plans to increase dental student numbers.

(f) HEFCE Code of Practice: Accountability and Audit: Value for Money

After noting that:

1. At the beginning of the 2004-05 academic year, Executive Board and Council had approved the University’s Value for Money Strategy.

2. The University’s approach to Value for Money was to embed such activity as part of the normal management activity.

3. The report detailed a number of operational areas where there had been some specific initiatives for value for money activities.

4. Audit Committee and the Internal Audit service had an important role to play in identifying and promoting value for money. As part of its review during 2004-05, the Internal Audit service had reviewed the use of temporary staff. For 2005-06, it was intended to tackle the much more significant area of value for money in teaching activities.

8. REPORTS FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE

Considered a Report from the meeting of Audit Committee held on 28 July 2005.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document E. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

(a) SRIF Capital Projects: Medspan

After noting that:

1. Audit Committee had expressed serious concerns about the projected cost over-runs on the Medspan project. It was recognised that this was a highly complicated project with
approximately thirty sub-projects, each taking place within an existing operational facility.

2. Audit Committee believed that there had been appropriate management controls in place but these had not been operated effectively.

3. The current projected overspend on the Medspan project was approximately £670,000 against the original project costs of £17.2m.

4. It was intended that a more consistent and transparent process for capital expenditure should be prepared as part of our capital planning process being taken forward by the Planning Office, Estates and Finance.

5. Concern was expressed over the recommendation to Council that a non-executive should chair the steering groups of certain major, high value projects. The alternative approach was to ensure that the senior manager responsible took appropriate responsibility for this to avoid overspends.

6. There might be benefit in reviewing the Gateway system used by the Treasury as part of its project management review mechanism.

7. For the next stage of the Medspan project, it was noted that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for the Faculty of Medical Sciences would chair the Project Steering Group.

Resolved that:

(i) Council note Audit Committee’s deep concern with regard to the Internal Audit report on the Medspan project, which had revealed a serious breakdown in the control and management of the project.

(ii) The University’s management needed to take steps to ensure that the numerous lessons identified as part of the Medspan project were embedded and effective in the management control systems.

(b) Purchasing Cards

Noted.

(c) Follow-up on previous Audits

Noted.

(d) Internal Audit Reports

(i) Research

Noted that progress was being made in transferring all of the contract research information to a single database operated by Knowledge House. Approximately 2,700 projects were to be transferred to the system.
(ii) **Institute of Human Genetics**

*Noted.*

Received a Report from the meeting of Audit Committee held on 13 September 2005.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document F. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

*Noted.*

9. **EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMITTEE**
   (Minute 52(b), 4.4.2005)

Reported that Council, at its meeting on 4 April 2005, had resolved that:

(i) A timetable for the conduct of impact assessments be brought to Council in October.

(ii) Work needed to be carried out to discover the causes for the racial equality issues affecting the recruitment and retention of students from ethnic minority backgrounds and progress on this should be reported to Council in October.

Considered a Report from the Equal Opportunities Committee.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document G. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

*Noted that:*

1. The University had a legal commitment to undertake impact assessments but such impact assessments were also extremely helpful in identifying potential problems which might inadvertently prevent the University from being as effective as it would like on equal opportunities matters.

2. To date, 178 policies had been identified as operating at University level that needed to be mapped across to the impact assessment template. It was hoped to complete this initial screening process by the end of December 2005 after which a further report was going to be made to Council.

3. A pilot impact assessment had been undertaken on staff recruitment which identified a number of areas where changes were going to be made.

4. There appeared to be a particular risk over the ways in which research staff were appointed and this would need to be addressed as part of an ongoing training programme for principal investigators.

5. Some concern was expressed about the reliability of the statistics presented in the report given the notorious difficulty of ensuring that people had disclosed information accurately.

6. It was important for the University to be proactive on equality issues and the report was welcomed for demonstrating the University’s commitment in this way.
10. REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY SAFETY OFFICE

Received a Report from the University Safety Office on accident statistics for 2004-05.  
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document H. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The report on accident statistics demonstrated that there had been a much better level of reporting with the accuracy of reports improved. Whilst it appeared that there had been an overall increase in 2004-05 in the number of accidents, this actually reflected the improved reporting mechanism which specifically now incorporated student sports injuries and staff in the Union Society.

2. For the avoidance of doubt, the statistics on staff of the Union Society were included for reporting purposes only and did not in any way imply that Council or the University was liable for such accidents. The Union Society operated its own building and was responsible for its own health and safety policies for its own employees and of any University employee or student or member of the public who used its building.

3. Staff members involved in manual work were more likely to have accidents.

4. The number of serious accidents was small given the total University size.

5. The liability for accidents rested with the University corporately and not with individual members of Council, unless Council, either individually or collectively, behaved in a reckless manner.

Resolved that:

(i) The Safety Officer be thanked for the report and the arrangements for improvements in reporting accidents.

(ii) It was important that the University continued to monitor this area closely and take any appropriate steps to continue to reduce the risks to staff, students and visitors.

SECTION III
(Items of minor importance or items for information only)

11. REPORTED BUSINESS

Received a report of action taken in accordance with agreed procedures, approved where necessary by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of Senate and/or the Chairman of Council on behalf of Council, and by other University bodies and Chairmen.  
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document J. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

12. MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL 2005-06

Reported that:

(a) Following Professor Riordan’s appointment as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Humanities and Social Sciences), Professor Riordan had resigned from his membership of Council.
(b) Professor M Goodfellow had been deemed elected by his colleagues on Senate to serve on Council with immediate effect until 31 July 2008 in place of Professor Riordan, as he had gained the next highest number of votes in the election.

(c) The Union Society had appointed the following to serve on Council for 2005-06:

Mr A Robson, Communications Officer
Mr D Bulmer, Education Officer

Received a list of the members of Council for 2005-06.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document K. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

PART C: RESERVED BUSINESS

13. THE VICE-CHANCELLORSHIP

Considered a paper from the Registrar.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document L. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The Chairman requested that the student members should not be required to withdraw even though this item had been placed under reserved business on the agenda. The issue of reserved business was currently being reviewed by the Working Group on Governance and since the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor was of importance to all parts of the University, she deemed it appropriate to invite the student members to remain for this item.

2. The confidential nature of the discussion was emphasised.

Resolved that:

(i) The procedure outlined in the paper to be used for the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor be approved, it being recognised that the timescale post-January 2006 was relatively tight.

(ii) Subject to comments by Senate, a joint Committee be established to make a recommendation as to the appointment of a Vice-Chancellor. The Joint Committee would comprise the Chairman of Council (Chairman), four members appointed by Senate and four members appointed by Council.

(iii) Following discussion of this item at Senate and the appointment of Senate members on the Joint Committee, Council members would be invited to submit to the Chairman, suggestions for Council-appointed members on the Joint Committee.

(iv) The Chairman be authorised, in consultation with the Registrar and the Director of Human Resources, to retain the services of search consultants.

(v) It was important to decide on the sort of characteristics and experience required for the new Vice-Chancellor.
(vi) It was important for the University to set out clearly its strategy which would be very influential in helping to choose a new Vice-Chancellor.

(vii) It was intended to take soundings both in this country and abroad as well as within the University.

(viii) The Chairman would speak on a confidential nature to her counterpart at the University of Durham concerning the timescales to be followed by the respective universities.

14. PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (SAGE) UNDER STATUTE 43

Reported that the Chairman of Council, on behalf of Council, had approved a recommendation that Professor O R Hinton be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Faculty of Science, Agriculture and Engineering) under Statute 43 from 1 October 2005 until 31 July 2010.