UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE
COUNCIL
18 July 2005

Present: Mrs M O Grant (in the Chair), the Vice-Chancellor, Professor J B Goddard (Deputy Vice-Chancellor), Professor E Ritchie (Pro-Vice-Chancellor), Mr N Blezard, Mrs B Dennis, Sir Leslie Elton, Mr J C Fitzpatrick, Professor M Goodfellow, Mr C J Hilton, Mr M I’Anson, Sir Miles Irving, Mr P M Johnson, Mr S J Lightley, Professor P J W Olive, Ms K Priestley, The Hon James Ramsbotham, Professor P Sen, Miss S Underwood, Sir John Willis and Mr G C Wilson.

In attendance: Professor O F W James, 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 Mrs D A Michie (Senior Assistant Registrar).

Mrs Grant was not present for item 79. Sir John Willis was in the Chair for this item.

Professor M J Whitaker and Professor N G Wright attended for item 78. Mr L Heslop (Head of Estates Planning) attended for item 81(a) and Ms R M Walker (Assistant Registrar) attended for item 84(c).

MINUTES
PART A : STRATEGIC ISSUE

78. NEWCASTLE SCIENCE CITY
(Minute 65, 23.5.2005)

Received an oral introduction from the Vice-Chancellor, followed by presentations from Professor J B Goddard, Professor M P Young and Professor N G Wright, updating Council on recent developments relating to the Science City project, together with a written Report from the Vice-Chancellor.

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

After noting that:

1. The Vice-Chancellor and Miss Underwood both declared an interest as they were members of the Board of the Regional Development Agency (RDA). Mr I’Anson also declared potential conflicts of interest;

2. Council had been briefed previously on the Science City project but the situation had changed since the last update. The University had recently been presented with an opportunity to purchase, in collaboration with Newcastle City Council (NCC) and the RDA, part of the former Scottish and Newcastle Brewery site which could be developed as the hub for Science City. The chance to purchase such a large city centre site provided an
unusual opportunity, not available to those other cities designated as science cities, to develop a large central area of Newcastle as a Science City and to have a major input into the regeneration of this part of the city. Members had been consulted in writing on their views on whether or not to commit to making a joint purchase as the proposal to the Treasury had to be submitted before this meeting of Council;

3. The other two partners in Science City (NCC and the RDA) had discussed the opportunity to purchase the city centre site with their members and each had given strong support to the proposal;

4. The original model had been focussed on developing Science City on campus but the space constraints there would have made it challenging to achieve what was desired. The new opportunity would provide space for a more effective model to be created which would allow a novel way of working with business and industry to be developed and for more immediate, long term, interactions to take place. It would also allow the University to compete with science developments at other universities by creating critical mass in certain subjects;

5. This opportunity could also be viewed as a threat since major investment, including substantial government support, would be required if the project was to be successful;

6. The University of Durham had been consulted on whether it would wish to be involved in the development of the Science Central site. There were potential advantages in this but the senior management at that University had not yet had the opportunity to consult with academic colleagues so further discussions would take place at a later date;

7. Senate had discussed the proposal at an extraordinary meeting and given support to the purchase, although some members had expressed concern over the possible consequences for the non-science parts of the University. However, if the intended bid for additional student numbers was successful, this could benefit such areas as the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences;

8. The proposal for the development of Science City had been submitted to the Treasury on 14 July and copies would be distributed to members of Council when they were available;

9. The development of Newcastle as a Science City was set against a background of government concern about the lack of investment in science and the need to bring science and urban/regional regeneration initiatives together. This had been achieved successfully in other countries, for example in New England and Finland, where the close proximity of business and the research base contained within universities had led to improved interaction and helped to achieve regeneration;

10. In the 1960s, the University had worked closely with the region but had subsequently lost sight of the importance of the science and engineering base to the region. However, in more recent years, and particularly since restructuring, it had begun to redress the balance and was now committed to playing a leading role in the economic, social and cultural development of the North East of England;

11. The Science City concept of mixed uses of the physical estate by both the University and other bodies was consistent with the general move by the University towards opening out
the campus. Cultural Quarter would be a similar development. Science Central would provide the opportunity for the University to be integrated with other bodies in an open and inclusive way and provide space for translational activities. It would allow a major development of mixed uses to take place in a co-ordinated manner;

12. The proposed site for Science Central was close to important areas of medical research, such as the Centre for Life and the General Hospital. Also, as education would be an integral part of Science City, the proximity of the site to the Discovery Museum would be useful;

13. The development of a prospectus for taking forward the creation of Science City had been undertaken by a combination of a leadership group, a task group and various workstreams all with representation from the University, the City, the Regional Development Authority and other sectors such as the NHS. It outlined the main programmes which were planned and the related timescale;

14. The government was keen for business, academic activities and the development of the region to be linked for their mutual benefit. Therefore the main theme of the proposals for Science City was to draw enterprise into where the core of expertise lay by providing space and facilities to allow the critical interactions to take place. This would however need to be done to a high standard if it was going to attract investment and people both to work in science and to learn science;

15. A series of objective criteria had been developed for initiatives which would be included in Science City. These had led to the creation of an initial list of multi-disciplinary initiatives: energy and the environment; molecular engineering; stem cell biology and regenerative medicine; and ageing and health – all of which were major research strengths in the University. However, some of these were cross-cutting, and so care should be taken to ensure that a holistic way forward was adopted;

16. The existing physical structure of the University had evolved over a period of time and did not reflect the current need to allow interaction to take place. There was little or no translational space on campus and this deterred such new developments as allowing business to come onto the campus and reduced the effectiveness of research. If the physical structure was changed so that connectivity (both internal and external) was improved, research links and the efficiency of teaching would be enhanced;

17. The Faculty of Medical Sciences felt that this proposal could provide it with opportunities to develop their areas of greatest strength. For example, while the University was currently very strong in stem cell research, other parts of the world were investing in this area and would provide challenges to Newcastle in the future. Science City would provide the opportunity to allow the University to ensure it had critical mass in this area and continue to compete internationally. Likewise, the Faculty would benefit from the opportunities provided by this proposal to allow more effective interaction between medicine, science and technology to take place and for synergies which did not currently exist to develop;

18. The development of Science Central would lead to some relocation of staff to it from the main campus. This would be likely to include a substantial part of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Agriculture but figures were not yet available. This relocation would free
up space on campus which would allow a more logical, optimal use of space to be implemented. A plan would be brought to Council concerning this in December;

19. It would be important to co-ordinate with Northumbria and Durham Universities to ensure that developments by this University were complementary to any they were planning and that there was no duplication. Discussions had already taken place to try and ensure this. For example, the heads of the Newcastle and Northumbria business schools had met to look at complementarity and the Vice-Chancellor had joined the Board of Netpark so that he could ensure that, if it was appropriate for a Newcastle development to be taken forward there, this would happen. It would also be important to ensure that the NHS was involved in Science City;

20. When Council members were consulted in writing, the issue then raised was the urgent commitment of University funds. Since then an alternative route had been considered whereby NCC would purchase the land using a loan and the University would be granted an option to purchase a one-third interest at a later date. This alternative would mean that the University did not have to spend a large sum until a later date and would simply be committed to contributing one third of the costs of servicing the borrowing by NCC. It therefore appeared that this route would be more attractive to the University. However, certain points might need further clarification:

- whether conditions, which could be adverse to the interest of the University, would be imposed by the City should the alternative route be followed
- what the exact financial commitments in the short term would be, eg would fees be charged and what would be the rate of interest
- whether the cost of purchase would be affected if the alternative route was followed and the purchase postponed

These concerns needed careful investigation. However, in view of the timescale involved, it would not be possible to bring this back to a meeting of Council and so Council should consider if it was willing to delegate authority to the Chairman to take action on this matter;

21. NCC had commissioned Lamb and Edge to undertake a valuation of the site. The University had not commissioned an independent valuation but it would seem that the figure was justified. However, the valuation was based on the site’s value on the open market and, if permission was given only to develop it for Science City, the value could be reduced;

22. The project was already complex and would require careful management during its development. It would be necessary to appoint a project director in the near future to ensure that the partners worked together and a form of governance for the project was established, for example the way in which decisions would be made;

23. The proposal which had been submitted to the Treasury outlined the vision of what the partners would like to achieve and to highlight that the University would be requesting additional student numbers to assist with enabling the project to go ahead. HEFCE had also been informed of the proposal and it was anticipated that it would include it in their submission to the next spending review for strategic development. The proposal would be
discussed further with the Treasury and HEFCE when they visited the University in October;

24. Care should be taken to avoid raising expectations too highly as it would be almost certain that there would not be sufficient space for all the developments that were desired to take place at Science Central. The University should therefore define the minimum that would be developed there and build on that;

25. As the Vice-Chancellor had mentioned at Senate, it was essential that the University did not suffer from planning blight while Science City was being developed. The unlikelihood of environment and sustainability being relocated to Science Central was an example of how a recent development could affect the project and so care should be taken, for instance, when future bids were made to SRIF. Reconsideration should therefore be given to the implementation of the estate masterplan.

Resolved that:

(i) Council support the proposal to develop the Science City/Science Central project;

(ii) Council confirm the availability of funds for the development of Science City/Science Central up to the sum of £10.5 million;

(iii) Authority be delegated to the senior management, the Chairman of Council, the Honorary Treasurer, Mr Blezard and Ms Priestley to approve the financial commitment to enter into the initial partnership to develop Science City/Science Central once the issues and concerns noted above had been addressed if this matter required urgent attention during the summer period;

(iv) Consideration be given to scheduling the meeting of Council in December as either an extended meeting or an Away Day in order to allow a full discussion of the implications of the development of Science City/Science Central to take place.

(v) The Vice Chancellor be asked to ensure that the potential risks associated with this venture were kept under regular review and they together with regular updates about the project be reported to Council.

(vi) Council recognised that Science City/Science Central represents an immense opportunity and challenge and will impact upon the University in diverse ways which will require not only major thinking but substantial change management if the vision expressed in the document is to be achieved.

PART B : GENERAL BUSINESS

79. CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL

Considered an oral report from the Vice-Chairman of Council on behalf of Nominations Committee.
Noted that all members of Council had been consulted about the proposal to re-appoint Mrs Grant and there had been unanimous support for the suggestion.

**Resolved that Council approve the recommendation of Nominations Committee that Mrs M O Grant be re-appointed Chairman of Council from 1 August 2005 until 31 July 2008.**

80. **MINUTES**

**Resolved that the Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 23 May 2005 be approved as a correct record and signed.**

81. **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

(a) **Reports from Executive Board - University car parking**

(Minute 71(a), 23.5.2005)

Reported that Council, at its last meeting, had resolved that proposals for a multi-storey car park be progressed to the next stage and that these be brought to a future meeting before a planning application was submitted.

Considered a Report from a sub-group of Executive Board on progress to date and recommendations for further action.

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

After noting that:

1. Following the report on the proposals for a multi-storey car park which had been made to Council at its May meeting, a plot option study appraisal exercise was carried out. Six potential sites were assessed: the Porter Cowen/Old Forge site; Herschel plots 1, 2 and 3; Claremont Tower/Merz Court; and the Stephenson Building. In addition, consideration was given to developing a car park on the Claremont public car park;

2. Traffic access, accessibility, the relationship to the estate masterplan, general planning issues and the number of spaces each could provide were taken into consideration. The need to link the development of a car park to the removal of spaces for parking caused by the Barrass Bridge building was also borne in mind;

3. The results of the appraisal exercise were discussed with the Development Control Officers of Newcastle City Council’s Planning and Highways Department and their views were taken into consideration when preparing the report to Council;

4. Of the sites on campus, only the Herschel plots met the majority of the criteria and could be developed within the required timescale, however these were prime sites for core academic use. A car park on these plots would be built on plots 1 and 2 and part of plot 3 and would provide 508 parking spaces. It would cost an estimated £8.49 million to build;

5. The ideal solution for the University would be to build on the Claremont public car park as this would not remove space which could be developed for academic use. The
City Council held a leasehold interest on the site with the freehold held by the Freemen of the City. If this development was permitted, it would allow a car park with 575 spaces to be built which would be made available for public use in the evenings and at weekends. The Vice-Chancellor had written to the City Council to enquire if this development would be possible;

6. The fees anticipated to develop the concept of a multi storey car park to a stage where it could be submitted for a detailed planning application were estimated to be £160,000 (inclusive of VAT). It was hoped that this could be done by October/November this year;

7. The removal of car parks was essential if the estate masterplan drawn up by Terry Farrell was to be implemented and a series of quadrangles developed. However, space for parking was necessary as many staff had no alternative means of travelling to work.

Resolved that the Herschel plot option be taken forward to the next stage of the study as the preferred option for further development, at a cost of £160,000, should the Claremont public car park option fail to be approved by Newcastle City Council.

(b) **Progress of business**

Received a business tracking form.

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

**82. CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS**

(a) **Retiring members**

Reported that it was the last meeting of Council for Professor M Goodfellow, Mr G C Wilson, Mr T Gorman and Ms R Currie. The Chairman thanked all those members for their valuable contribution to the work of Council. Particular thanks were offered to Mr G.C. Wilson who, as Chairman of Audit had given particular service for many years. His contribution was greatly appreciated. It was pleasing to note that he would retain an association with the University as a member of the Development Trust.

(b) **Newcastle and Gateshead Councils**

Reported that the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Chairman of Council had had two dinners with Newcastle and Gateshead City Councils which had proved to be both helpful and productive. A report on this would be made to a later meeting of Council.

(c) **Joint Court/Council/Senate lunch**

Reported that it had been decided that there was no longer any need to hold the joint lunch, traditionally held prior to the last meeting of Council before Christmas, in view of the various other lunches and dinners which would be taking place in future, particularly the Honorary Fellowships Dinner in October, to which all members of Court, Council and Senate would be invited.
(d) December 2005 meeting (see also minute 94)

Reported that item 17 of the agenda had stated that the meeting of Council would be held at 2.30 pm and not in the morning as previously notified. However, following further consideration, it might be helpful if this meeting could either be an extended one or be used as an Away Day in order to provide the opportunity for Council members to be more fully involved in strategic issues. This would be particularly useful as a great many planning issues would need to be resolved by February. Members were therefore asked to keep both the morning and afternoon of 12 December available for this purpose.

(e) Pre-meeting lunches

Reported that currently briefing lunches for lay members of Council were held before certain meetings in order to provide background information and the opportunity for questions to be asked. If the academic members of Council considered that it would be helpful for similar lunches be held for them, could they please let the Chairman know as she would be happy for that to be arranged.

(f) Procedure for filling vacancies in the lay membership of Council

Reported that, following her letter asking for views on how vacancies in the lay membership of Council should be filled, the Chairman had received helpful responses. There was general agreement that the Code of Practice should be complied with and there was support for producing a role description and publicising the vacancies on the University website and on other sites which would reach the voluntary and community sectors. However, care would need to be given when drafting the role descriptions to ensure that they were not too prescriptive and would attract those with seniority of experience.

(g) Council Room

Reported that this would be the last meeting of Council to be held in the Council Room. In future, the Room would be used to support the work of the Centre of Excellence in Teaching and Learning awarded to Music.

83. VICE-CHANCELLOR’S BUSINESS

(a) Queen’s Birthday Honours : June 2005

Reported that Dr Frances Spalding, School of Arts and Cultures, had been awarded a CBE in the Queen’s Birthday Honours 2005.

(b) Grant From BUPA Foundation

Reported that the University had been awarded £200,000 from the BUPA Foundation to explore ways of helping dementia patients participate more fully in discussions with their doctor.

(c) Devonshire Building and Paul O’Gorman Building
Reported that the Devonshire and Paul O’Gorman Buildings had both won architectural excellence awards at the Northern Architecture Hadrian Awards ceremony, organised jointly by the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Civic Trust and the Arts Council.

(d) Graduate Retention

Reported that the University had, for a number of years, given a high priority to providing the technology and skills that were required to regenerate the North East economy. The revival had been very apparent in cultural terms and it now seemed that the North East was able to provide suitable jobs for many of the University’s graduates. HESA’s Destination of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE) statistics showed that 52% of Newcastle graduates in employment were based in the North East. Of these graduates, 70% were in graduate level jobs, an even higher proportion than those of the University’s graduates employed elsewhere in the UK. About 43% of students who chose to live and work in the region originated from outside of the North East. This represented a net inflow of 340 graduates. This was the first time that HESA had compiled such data. The University Careers Service had recorded graduate retention statistics over a number of years which, while not directly comparable to the HESA data, suggested that the proportion of the University’s graduates staying in the North East had risen steadily from 39% in 1999 to 49% in 2003.

84. REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE BOARD

Considered Reports from the meetings of Executive Board held on 7 June and 12 July 2005. [Circulated with the Agenda as Documents E & F. Copies filed in the Minute Book.]

(a) Budget Setting Process for 2005-06

After noting that:

1. The budget built on improvements to the process introduced in the past and had also had better data to use in the process of preparation;

2. The growth of income was slower than in recent years so the University would take longer to reach its targets. It was projected to grow by 3% in 2005-06 whereas that for 2004-05 was forecast at 7.1%;

3. In order to address the under-investment in people and physical assets in the past, the University continued to budget for break-even, which was in contrast to an emerging trend at other universities to budget for a surplus. Round 3 of SRIF and round 4 of PCA were about to begin. These initiatives, together with their immediate predecessors, would amount to a combined investment in the academic estate and equipment of over £110 million by the government and University. This level of investment, together with a sharply increased level of borrowings with their associated costs, was a feature of the way universities now operated and an example of the more volatile environment in which business was now carried out. This was the reason that other universities budgeted for a surplus and this University should consider following this method of operation for 2006-07 onwards;
4. The strategy of having headroom funding of 3% of total income and a contingency of 1% of total income had worked well. The headroom funding had allowed funds to be released for major new initiatives;

5. The budget assumed the increase in employer’s contributions, previously notified to Council, to the RBP pension scheme. This would increase costs by approximately £600,000. However, this University was well placed in comparison with many comparator universities with regard to its pension position;

6. The allocation of £1.5 million to support preparation for the RAE was in addition to the investment of £6 million in new posts which had been sourced from headroom funds in 2003-04 and 2004-05;

7. It had been decided that, in order to comply with the financial strategy agreed by Finance Committee, efficiency gains totalling £2,609,000 would be required. This sum was distributed to the principal budget holders on the basis of their core pay costs;

8. The University allocated those funds which it received for general purposes, as distinct from those which were earmarked, to the four main budget holders through an agreed resource allocation method. This method would be replaced by a cost driver model in 2006-07 in order to provide greater transparency to the allocation process. This should assist lay members and would reflect the strategic priorities more clearly;

9. The deficits predicted for the Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences and Science, Engineering and Agriculture were not expected to cause them problems;

10. The main threats to the budget were:

   - Failure to achieve the increase in income contained in the budget (the main risk to this would be postgraduate and international student recruitment)
   - Cost increases arising from the Fair Measures scheme
   - Cost increases from the annual pay settlement operative from 1 August 2005, which had not yet been finalised;

11. A great deal of effort was being made to address the problem of international student recruitment. Help was to be provided with the induction and training of staff and, by December 2005, the Enquiries to Registration project should be in place. Currently, indications were that postgraduate international student recruitment would be much the same as 2004-05 even though applications had risen in each of the faculties. Undergraduate applications were lower. The University would need to diversify and plans were underway for this;

12. The surplus at the end of 2004-05 was expected to be higher than included in the papers as costs were below budget and some non-recurrent items had generated income;

13. The budget did not include any provision for either the Science City project or Northern Way but, if necessary, this could be met from the unallocated balance of headroom funds;
14. The balance sheet remained strong and the budget had been prepared with customary care, consultation and careful deliberation.

*Resolved that Council accept the budget for 2005-06.*

(b) **Tuition Fees Instalment Scheme**

*Resolved that the following recommendations be approved:*  
(i) The 2% discount arrangement for full fee payment at registration be continued;  
(ii) The scheme whereby tuition fees may be paid in two instalments for these categories of student be maintained;  
(iii) The second instalment date be set for 31 January. This would map to existing control dates in the SAP calendar;  
(iv) Since the revised arrangements represented no detriment to existing students, it would be promulgated for 2005-06, although any impact at this stage of the admissions cycle may be lessened;  
(v) Appropriate modifications to the University’s debt control arrangements and systems be reviewed to reflect the revised timing. This would involve development work from ISS to automate the processes involved in issuing by e-mail reminders and ‘dunning’ notices about the second due instalment and, prompt action to disable smartcards for those defaulting on the second payment, who have not made arrangements with the Finance Office;  
(vi) The impact of this change be formally reviewed in March 2006 in relation to bad debt collection and cash flow;  
(v) The whole payment calendar be reviewed in 2006 for the 2007-08 cycle.

(c) **Corporate Planning Statement and Annual Monitoring Statements**

After noting that:  
1. It was a requirement by HEFCE that the University submitted the Corporate Planning Statement and Annual Monitoring Statements. The Corporate Planning Statement could be as brief as four pages but experience had shown that it could prove useful to include greater detail;  
2. The Corporate Planning Statement was generally retrospective but did contain some indications of plans for the coming year;  
3. The University had maintained the highest growth rate of its peer group of universities, having had the lowest for the previous four;
4. The key strategic objective to double the number of international students to 4,800 by 2010-11 would be reviewed in the light of current concerns over the international recruitment market;

5. The ninth objective, concerning the annual rate of growth, should be amended to read ‘To aim to increase our annual rate of growth to 12.5% per annum, based upon a growth in core activities, to generate increased income of 8% per annum, supplemented by other activities which will raise it, in those years, to 12.5%;

6. It would be helpful if in future versions there could be clear links between the strategic issues and the Statement.

Resolved that the Corporate Planning Statement and Annual Monitoring Statements be approved for submission to HEFCE.

(d) University Ethics Committee

After noting that ethical matters were broader than simply research or medical issues and it would be helpful if further consideration could be given to the emerging, major issues in this area.

Resolved that this topic be brought to a future meeting of Council for further consideration.

(e) Great North Museum Update

Noted.

(f) Safety Reports

Noted.

85. REPORT FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE

Considered an oral report from the Chairman of Audit Committee.

After noting that:

1. At the meeting of Council in December 2004 it had been agreed that the University should go out to tender for external auditors for 2005-06 onwards;

2. Since then the official journal procedures had been followed and five firms had responded. Two of these were considered unsuitable as they did not possess relevant experience and the remaining three were invited to meet the selection panel. A set of criteria was agreed and each firm was scored against them. The outcome was a unanimous decision that a recommendation should be made to Council to retain PriceWaterHouseCoopers (PWC), but with certain conditions;

3. Following a meeting with the University, PWC would be asked to submit a written response to the University’s concerns over:
• The insufficient time devoted to the University’s external audit by the audit manager in the past
• How the partner in charge of the audit could be involved in other support, such as advice, for the University
• The slow response to queries experienced in the past

Resolved that PriceWaterHouseCoopers be retained as the University’s external auditors for five years, from 2005-06, subject to the University receiving reassurance on the above concerns and subject also to annual review.

86. REPORT FROM NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Considered a Report from the meeting of Nominations Committee held on 24 May 2005. [Circulated with the Agenda as Document G. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Received an oral report from the Chairman who stated that the Honourable James Ramsbotham had agreed to serve on Safety Committee but would no longer be able to serve on Audit Committee, therefore there would be a vacancy for a lay member of Council on that Committee.

Resolved that:

(i) The following be re-appointed as lay members of Council from 1 August 2005 until 31 July of the year shown:

- Mr N Blezard (2008)
- Mr C J Hilton (2006)
- Sir Miles Irving (2008)
- Mr S Lightley (2008)

(ii) The following be appointed/re-appointed as Chairmen of the Committees shown from 1 August 2005 until 31 July 2008:

- Mr C Fitzpatrick - Audit Committee
- *Mr R H Maudslay - Equity Committee
- *Professor W Clegg - Safety Committee
- *Professor N L Simmons - Radiation Protection Safety Sub-Committee

(iii) Council note the remaining item in the Report, including the remaining vacancy in the lay membership of Council.

87. MEMBERSHIP OF NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Received an oral report from the Chairman that she was still considering how best to fill the vacancy on Nominations Committee from 1 August 2005.

88. PROGRESS REPORT FROM THE WORKING GROUP ON GOVERNANCE

(Minute 18(a), 13.12.2004 & 37(b), 7.2.2005)
Considered a Progress Report from the Working Group on Governance.

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

After noting that:

1. The Working Group had checked the University’s current compliance with the Code of Practice contained in the Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK published in November 2004 and found that it was currently compliant with the majority of the Code and the associated general principles of governance. However there were some areas in which the University was not compliant and some of these would require review to assess the best way to achieve full compliance;

2. While the Code of Practice was voluntary and intended to reflect good practice in the higher education sector, if an institution’s practices were not consistent with particular provisions an explanation had to be published in the corporate governance statement of the annual audited financial statements. In contrast, compliance with the Code seemed likely to bring some benefits;

3. The Code of Practice required the University to adopt a Statement of Primary Responsibilities. The draft Statement for this University had been based on the Model Statement of Primary Responsibilities, the University Statutes and the Financial Memorandum between HEFCE and institutions;

4. The Group should continue its work but it might be useful to review the membership. It would be helpful if a member of the senior management team could join it to contribute to discussions concerning the executive and liaise with specific people as appropriate. Senate should also be given the opportunity to reconsider the membership of the Group, particularly as Dr Appleby and Mr Wilton would no longer be members of Senate in 2005-06;

5. With regard to the recommendations contained in the Progress Report:
   - C1(a) – the Vice-Chancellor and the senior management team were working on the development of key performance indicators and these would be brought to Council at a later date
   - C2 – the Vice-Chancellor would draft a summary of the responsibilities that Council delegated to management and, in particular, those delegated specifically to him, for approval by Council
   - C4 – the executive should establish an induction programme for new staff or student members of Council and Senate and develop an ongoing programme of opportunities for further development of all members of Council together with specific, tailored training for individuals taking on new roles
   - C6 – the Group should review the standing orders of Council and submit them to a future meeting of Council for consideration
   - D1(a) – the respective roles of Executive Board, Strategy Board, Senate and Council and how they interlinked should be reviewed by the Chairman of Council, the Vice-Chairman of Council, the Honorary Treasurer and the senior management team and a report made to the Working Group for its consideration
D1(b) – An Away Day might serve as the mechanism to ensure that members of Senate and Council could be engaged in the early stages of the development of strategy

D1(d) – in consultation with the senior management, the Group should review the structure of the sub-committees of Council

D2 – the Group should review the effectiveness of the provision of information to Council, including the definition and operation of reserved business

D3 – the Group should be asked to give advice on the issues relating to the effectiveness of the members of Council

D4 – Senate should be asked to review its own effectiveness and that of its sub-committees and consideration could be given to asking former members of Senate to take part in the review as they might be able to provide constructive criticism based on their experience

It would be helpful if an indication of the timescales connected to the actions and proposals listed above could be presented to Council.

Resolved that:

(i) Council approve the recommendation that the University should comply with the CUC Governance Code of Practice;

(ii) Council approve the recommendation that the draft Statement of Primary Responsibilities be approved and adopted;

(iii) Council approve that the actions and proposals listed under 5 above should be implemented and reports on progress, including an indication of the related timescales, be brought to future meetings of Council.

89. REPORT FROM THE FAIR TRADE WORKING GROUP

Considered a Report from the Fair Trade Working Group.

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

Resolved that:

(i) The University should commit to achieving Fair Trade status as outlined in the report;

(ii) As part of this process, the group named in the report be established as a Fair Trade Steering Group (as a sub-group of Executive Board) to progress the application and to seek to ensure that the five minimum goals were achieved and built upon for the future.

90. RISK MANAGEMENT : DISASTER PLANNING

(Minute 56, 4.4.2005)

Considered a report from Dr J V Hogan, Registrar, on progress with the roll-out of emergency planning to schools.

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

Resolved that the report be noted.
91. UNIVERSITY REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

Considered a recommendation that the constitution of University Remuneration Committee be amended to increase the number of lay appointed members to two, in line with a recommendation in the CUC Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies.

Resolved that the above recommendation be approved.

92. PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT) UNDER STATUTE 13

Reported that the Chairman of Council, acting on behalf of Council, had approved a recommendation that a fourth Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development) post be created under Statute 13, with particular responsibility for science and technology. [See also Minute 98 below.]

93. UNIVERSITY STATUTES

(Minute 7, 11.10.2004)

Reported that the Privy Council had approved the amendments to the University Statutes.

94. DATES OF MEETINGS 2005-06

(Minute 59, 4.4.2005)

Reported that, subject to further consideration on the format of the meeting to be held on 12 December 2005, the full list of meetings in 2005-06 would be as follows:

- 10 October 2005, 2.30 pm (followed by Honorary Fellowships dinner)
- 12 December 2005 (timing under consideration)
- 6 February 2006, 2.30 pm
- 3 April 2006, 2.30 pm
- 22 May 2006, 2.30 pm
- 17 July 2006, 3.30 pm followed by dinner

95. 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 L. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

96. MINUTES OF STRATEGY BOARD

Received the Minutes of the meeting of Strategy Board held on 3 May 2005.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document M. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]
PART C : RESERVED BUSINESS

97. REPORT FROM THE STATUTORY COMMITTEE ON PROMOTIONS TO PERSONAL PROFESSORSHIPS AND READERSHIPS

Reported that the Chairman of Council, on behalf of Council, had approved the recommendations in the Report from the Statutory Committee on Promotions to Personal Professorships and Readerships.

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

98. PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT) UNDER STATUTE 13

Reported that the Chairman of Council, on behalf of Council, had approved a recommendation that Professor M P Young be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development) for a period of three years. [Dates to be confirmed at a later date.]

99. PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES) UNDER STATUTE 43

Reported that the Chairman of Council, on behalf of Council, had approved a recommendation that Professor C B Riordan be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Humanities and Social Sciences) under Statute 43 from 1 August 2005 to 31 July 2010.

100. CONSOLIDATED REPORT FROM FACULTY PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES

Reported that the Chairman of Council, on behalf of Council, had approved recommendations in the consolidated Report from Faculty Promotions Committees.

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