Present: Mrs M O Grant (in the Chair), Professor J B Goddard (Deputy Vice-Chancellor), Professor M J Atkins and Professor T F Page (Pro-Vice-Chancellors), Dr J C Appleby, Mr L M Aviss, Mr N Blezard, Professor M Goodfellow, Sir Miles Irving, Mr P M Johnson, Mr D Kalumba (student member), Mr S Lightley, Mr R H Maudslay, Mr D W Midgley, Professor P Sen, Miss S Underwood, Mr D K Wilson, Mr G C Wilson and Mr A M Wilton.

In attendance: Dr J V Hogan (Registrar), Professor P H Baylis and Professor A C Stevenson (Provosts), Mrs V S Johnston (Director of Human Resources), Mrs D A Michie (Senior Assistant Registrar),

Mrs C Harvey (Director, External Relations Division) attended for item 46, Mr R J C Burrow (Assistant Director of Human Resources) attended for item 53 and Mr S Wilmot (Assistant Director of Finance) attended for items 57 & 58.

Mr P M Johnson was not present for item 55(B).

Note: Copies of documents are filed in the Minute Book and are normally available on request from barbara.akinhead@ncl.ac.uk or telephone 222 6087.

MINUTES

PART A : STRATEGIC ISSUES

46. THE EXTERNAL RELATIONS DIVISION : OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Received: a presentation on the work of the External Relations Division from Mrs Cathryn Harvey, Director, External Relations Division. [A copy of the slides used by Mrs Harvey in her presentation is filed in the Minute Book and is also published on the web at http://www.ncl.ac.uk/internal/council/minutes/erd_presentation.ppt.]

After noting that:

1. The External Relations Division comprised approximately 100 staff across five separate offices, although the staff were not evenly distributed. Its main focus was on the recruitment of students, student development, the enhancement of their learning and their post-graduation success, with the five offices working together to achieve this;

2. The work of the Division was labour intensive, given its focus. For example, staff in the Student Recruitment Office were currently meeting the challenges of generating and then handling increasing numbers of enquiries, attending a greater number of higher education
fairs and focusing on positioning the University for 2006, the first year in which variable fees might be charged. The Office had greatly reduced the response rate to requests for prospectuses, with the turnaround time now down from three weeks to 36 hours;

3. The number of applications from local students had increased markedly, not only through the Partners programme but from the region in general and, in particular, from the non-Partners pupils in schools and colleges in the Partners scheme. However, this was a region with a low participation rate in higher education and so it was a major challenge to raise aspirations. Additionally, the University needed to make more rapid progress towards meeting a range of benchmarks in relation to widening participation;

4. The University had a strategy for each of the G6 further education colleges in the Tyne and Wear region which varied according to how the curriculum offered by a college mapped onto that offered by the University. There had been an increase in applications from further education colleges over recent years. For instance over three quarters of the students at South Tyneside College who applied to university included Newcastle in their choices;

5. A more integrated visual identity had been introduced this year for all recruitment publications which was proving very successful;

6. There had been a large increase in international students over the last few years and there were now approximately 2,500 on campus, compared with 1,100 in 1998. However, the University needed to improve the conversion rate from applications to registrations and to consider the attractiveness of its programmes to international students and ways of enhancing their experience while at the University. The University was considering in detail how it should take forward its international work and Council would be updated in due course;

7. The Director of Information Systems and Services had identified the support of teaching and services for students as a priority and would be investigating ways of developing the technology to permit customer relationship management and assist with the e-learning strategy. The need for a student portal had been identified in the past but its development had been delayed until certain of the key components, such as Campus Management, were in place;

8. The work of the Centre for Academic Development in supporting the University’s teaching and learning strategy was going well. In particular, providing opportunities for work-related learning had proved popular with, for example, 700 students involved in student tutoring this year and 1,100 registered for voluntary work, which not only benefited the students but also the community. In addition, interest in the support available for enterprise programmes had also increased, with 65 business plans involving 234 students being submitted to this year’s Business Planning Competition. It was intended that the University’s success in enhancing the employability of its students and making a positive contribution to the region in this regard would be a key marketing message;

9. While the Centre for Academic Development took the lead role in implementing the University’s employability strategy, there were many other areas of the University
involved in this, including the Union Society and the Careers Service, and it was important that the work of the various components was co-ordinated;

10. Universities were judged not just on the quantity of graduates in employment six months after graduation but, increasingly, on the quality of this employment. The Careers Service was therefore working closely with academic schools and students to assist with achieving these outcomes. However, there was evidence that significant numbers of students were leaving their job search until after graduation and this often led them to be under-employed. Graduates taking a gap year were not counted in the graduate destination league tables, but nevertheless numbers expressing the intention of taking a post-graduation break meant that they were unlikely to be actively searching for a graduate-level post during their penultimate or final year of study;

11. The Careers Service was looking at ways in which links could be made with the home labour markets of international students and an innovative project focusing on this was now underway;

12. The Careers Service was open to all current students (and to Newcastle graduates for a limited period of time) but was not currently available to graduates from other universities returning to the region as funding previously provided to enable this had ceased;

13. Many of the efforts of the staff in the Division took time to come to fruition, for example the widening participation strategy, and it was important that they were well planned and given time to achieve results;

14. While it was important that the University competed effectively in the increasingly competitive marketplace, and closer collaboration between the schools and central services could help to achieve this, it was essential that reputation and brand was maintained and further enhanced. Newcastle should stress its high quality of provision by, for example, emphasising that teaching was informed by research and the imminent launch of the teaching excellence area of the website could help to support this message.

Resolved that Mrs Harvey be thanked for her useful presentation.

PART B : GENERAL BUSINESS

47. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on 16 February 2004 were approved as a correct record and signed, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 37(k), delete minute and substitute:

‘Reported that the recurrent costs of the Clinical Research Facility would be a joint responsibility between the NHS and the Faculty of Medical Sciences.’
48. **MATTERS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES**

(a) **Progress of business**

Received a business tracking form.

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

After noting that it was important to monitor items on the business tracking form more closely.

**Resolved that more consideration should be given to planning and setting dates by which items should come back to Council.**

(b) **Cultural Quarter**

(Minute 35(c), 16.2.2004)

Received an oral report from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Goddard.

After noting that:

1. The University had received a grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund to assist with the preparation of the revised bid, which could be taken as an indication that the Fund would look favourably on it;

2. The revised bid would be scaled down to a cost £25m and it was likely that it would propose having the majority of the parts of the museum for visitors in the Hancock Museum with offsite storage. This did leave, however, the issue of the development of the Claremont Building;

3. The City Council had provided a great deal of support.

**Resolved that Council should be kept informed on progress of the revised bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund.**

(c) **Close House**

(Minute 39, 16.2.2004)

Received an oral report from the Chairman.

After noting that:

1. Positive discussions were continuing over the second offer which had been received and the Vice-Chancellor was proceeding in accordance with the decisions made at the last meeting, but there was nothing as yet to report to Council;

2. Information which was confidential and commercially-sensitive could not be reported until the third party involved had given permission.

**Resolved that a full report would be made to Council once it was possible to do so.**
(d) Fire in the Old Library Building  
(Minute 37(j), 16.2.2004)

Received a briefing note from Dr J V Hogan, Registrar.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document B. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The damage caused by smoke had been considerable and the costs of cleaning up afterwards were approaching £2m;

2. The University was working on the areas which did not go well in order to make sure that, if this happened again, its response would be improved. However, it seemed likely that the fire had been caused by a weakness in the 24 hour access policy for some buildings and resolving this issue of security was particularly difficult as the University was faced with the conflicting needs of having good safety and security and of being an accessible institution;

3. Executive Board had received a disaster strategy plan approximately one year ago, which had been used during the incident, but it had not been rolled out to schools and other units as there were concerns about the amount of work for schools which implementing the plan would involve. The senior management were therefore taking advice on what steps could be taken centrally and what would have to be devolved.

Resolved that:

(i) A report on how the disaster strategy plan was to be implemented and the issues relating to security addressed, together with a timetable, should be brought to a future meeting of Council;

(ii) Offers of assistance from lay members of Council with the development of the disaster strategy plan would be gratefully received.

49. CHAIRMAN’S BUSINESS

(a) Death of Sir Peter Ustinov

Reported that Sir Peter Ustinov, the Chancellor of the University of Durham, had died on Sunday 28 March 2004.

Resolved that the Chairman of Council should write a letter of condolence to the Chairman of the Council of the University of Durham.
(b) Council working dinners & day of Council meetings

After noting that:

1. The Chairman had written to lay members to discover their preferences for the timing of when lay members could have the opportunity to be briefed on University issues by the Vice-Chancellor and had received replies from them all;

2. Options 1 and 4 were the preferred ones, with option 1 – lunch before certain meetings of Council followed by a meeting on a Monday afternoon at 2.30pm – gaining the majority of the votes;

3. It had been suggested that one or two members of the academic staff might also attend the lunches as they might have a different perspective to that of the senior managers.

Resolved that:

(i) In the coming academic year, meetings of Council should be held at 2.30pm on Mondays, with a briefing lunch held prior to certain of the meetings;

(ii) The Chairman should discuss the attendance of one or two academic staff at the lunches with the Vice-Chancellor.

(c) Frequency of Council meetings

After noting that:

1. Under the present arrangements, there was frequently quite a long gap between meetings of Council in the summer months and meetings at other times were sometimes close together, which was not helpful for the conduct of business;

2. A change to six meetings a year, which were held bimonthly, might help to address this problem;

3. Consideration needed to be given to the need for academic members of Council to be able to conduct their research and attend conferences.

Resolved that:

(i) Council should meet six times in 2004-05, with meetings to be held in, or around, late September, November, January, March, May and July;

(ii) If any members of Council did not agree with this proposal they should write to the Chairman.
(d) Leadership Foundation

Reported that the Chairman had attended the launch of the Board of the Leadership Foundation by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The event had been very interesting and the tenor of the occasion had been much warmer than had been the case when the Lambert Review was first set in place. The University should take full advantage of this Foundation.

(e) Higher Education Policy Lecture

Reported that the Chairman had attended the Higher Education Policy Lecture which had been given by Robert Reich. The Lecture contained interesting comparative information on universities in Britain and in the USA, and expressed concerns about the direction higher education had taken in the USA. The Chairman would prepare a paper for Council on this topic.

50. 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) Funding

Reported that HEFCE had recently published a comparator analysis of its recent grant allocations for 2004-05. This University had been allocated an above average block grant increase of 7% on the 2003-04 allocation, which was the fourth largest increase in England. The average increase in the sector was 4.3%. This increase was due partly to the successful bid for additional student numbers and an improved performance in the last RAE. The overall increase, if adjusted by volume, was 3.6%, which was good in the North East when compared with a decrease in real terms for the Universities of Durham and Sunderland. However, although this was good publicity for the University, the allocation should be kept in context. The funding for rewarding and developing staff now formed part of the teaching grant and so that grant had not increased as greatly as it would appear from the figures. In addition, there would be significant cost implications if job evaluation and the move to a single pay spine were introduced.

(c) Lambert Review

Reported that in its preliminary response to the Lambert review of university-business links, the government had confirmed that universities would be given a permanent ‘third stream’ of funding to foster collaboration with business. The government planned to develop the existing Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) as a permanent third stream ‘to further build the capacity in the university sector of knowledge transfer’. The HEIF was worth £187m over 2004-06.
However, which body was going to be given responsibility for the allocation of the new money was still being discussed.

(d) The Northern Way

Reported that One North East was leading a consortium on the Northern Way, an initiative to provide additional support for infrastructure, and that the northern universities had been successful in securing an input into this initiative. The Northern Way was a response to criticisms made of the money provided for the Thames Gateway but as yet there was no funding associated with it. However, as the University of Greenwich had received funding through the Thames Gateway, there was a precedent for universities benefiting from such initiatives and, if funding became available, there was a possibility that the University might be granted funds for campus renewal.

(e) HEFCE Project Capital Allocation Round 3 (3PCA)

Reported that HEFCE had awarded the University a total of £6,881,903 through its Project Capital Allocations Round 3 scheme (3PCA) which required the University to contribute a further 10%, or £593,631. Through this successful bid, almost £7.5 million could be spent on upgrading teaching and student facilities. Projects included: the creation of social learning spaces; the refurbishment of the ballroom and foyer to create a large events area; computer networking of students’ residences, which would assist with student recruitment; new postgraduate training facilities; and the upgrading of science and engineering laboratories. However, these projects would take place within busy areas of the campus and there could be some disruption.

(f) Pro-Vice-Chancellors

(Minute 37(f), 16.2.2004)

Reported that Senate had agreed that the role of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Relations) be established from 1 August 2004. Staff had been invited to nominate candidates by 16 April 2004. The role description for the post was on the web at: http://www.ncl.ac.uk/internal/hr/pvceXternalrelations.doc

51. Deputy Vice-Chancellor under Statute 12

Reported that:

(a) Professor J B Goddard’s term of office as Pro-Vice-Chancellor under Statute 12 would end on 31 July 2004.

(b) The following procedure had been approved by Council and was incorporated in Senate Standing Order XII:

1. At least six months before the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, appointed in accordance with Statute 12, retires, the following Committee shall be constituted to recommend to Council the action to be taken in accordance with Statute 12:
Council 29 March 2004

The Chairman of Council
The Vice-Chairman of Council
The Vice-Chancellor
Three members appointed by Council
Four members appointed by Senate

The retiring Deputy Vice-Chancellor shall not be eligible to be a member of this Committee.

2. The Committee shall consult widely amongst Senators and Councillors and shall invite them to propose names for its consideration together with any observations they may have.

3. The Committee shall report to Council through Senate what recommendations it wishes to make. Any comments by Senate on the report shall, at the same time, be submitted to Council.

4. Senate, at its meeting on 16 March 2004, agreed to suspend Senate Standing Orders to provide for an adjusted timetable for the appointment to the post of Deputy Vice-Chancellor and appointed the following members of Senate, who were also the members of Senate elected by and from their own number on the Committee on the appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors under Statute 13, to be the ‘Senate appointed’ members on the Committee on the appointment of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor:

- Dr J C Appleby
- Professor M Goodfellow
- Dr G R Hammond
- Professor M A Hughes

Considered the appointment of the three members to serve as Council representatives on the Committee for the appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor under Statute 12.

After noting that:

1. Mr Hilton had volunteered to serve on this Committee;
2. Two nominations for University staff to serve on the Committee had been received;
3. It would be helpful if one of the members could be female.

Resolved that:

The following be appointed as Council’s representatives on the Committee for the appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor under Statute 12:

- Professor S Bond
- Professor G Docherty
- Mr C Hilton
52. REPORT FROM SENATE

Considered a report from the meeting of Senate held on 16 March 2004.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document C. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

A. AUT Industrial Action

Noted that:

1. The strike action had now been suspended and there would be a full ballot of members, with the AUT recommending acceptance of UCEA’s offer;

2. The industrial action short of a strike, which had been taken by some members of the AUT, had caused disruption to students and had had significant impact in certain isolated areas. There was still work to do to relieve the impact of this on the students affected and it was important that this was resolved as quickly as possible, as this was a particularly worrying time for students. However, one of the conditions of the agreement with UCEA was that staff should not be put under pressure to catch up on work and discussions would be held with Human Resources on this issue;

3. The suspension of industrial action would allow the University to move forward with pay modernisation and the implementation of job evaluation.

B. Restructuring of the Academic Services: Information Systems and Services

Noted.

53. REPORT FROM STAFF COMMITTEE

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

A. University Policy on the Use of Fixed Term Contracts

After noting that:

1. The proposed Policy was intended to address the particular situation in higher education, in which there were more staff than was typical on short term contracts, and the University was working on this issue in a number of ways to improve matters;

2. While there were statutory requirements to take this forward, it was important to appreciate the principles of fairness and equity which underpinned the Policy, and the University’s proposal was intended not only to be procedural but also to build on and improve good practice;

3. The Policy on the Use of Fixed Term Contracts was the result of extensive negotiation and consultation and was based on national guidelines. It aimed to
achieve a reduction in the use of fixed term contracts and was in the process of being implemented;

4. The academic year referred to in paragraph 13 ought to read 2004-05.

*Resolved that, subject to the correction of the dates in paragraph 13, the Policy on the Use of Fixed Term Contracts be approved with immediate effect.*

B. Redundancy Procedure for Academic and Research Staff and setting up of a Standing Redundancy Committee

After noting that:

1. The draft Redundancy Procedure for Academic and Research Staff was a key part of the implementation of the Policy on the Use of Fixed Term Contracts. As staff were moved from fixed term contracts to open ended ones, it was important that there was a procedure for dealing with such situations as funding for research ceasing or projects coming to an end. However, everything possible would be done to minimise the use of the Procedure and it would be essential that there was clarity and transparency around it to reassure all concerned;

2. An analysis suggested that there would be approximately 15 redundancy dismissals from open ended contracts per annum but it was hoped, that with good management, this figure might be lower;

3. The AUT had been consulted but had asked that the Redundancy Procedure be ring-fenced and only used for certain purposes and for staff funded by ‘soft’ money, they had not agreed to a streamlined procedure for all redundancies;

4. It was important that research funds were managed so that research staff were not disadvantaged and staff were given satisfactory contracts of employment. This benefited both the staff and the University’s research performance. Some parts of the University already had excellent practice in place and this needed to be more widespread;

5. There could be some bureaucratic costs attached to the Procedure but the precise details of the statutory procedure required would not be available until July 2004;

6. The University ought to obtain specific advice on the construction of paragraph 10;

7. A more detailed procedure would come back to a subsequent meeting of Council for further consideration and approval.

*Resolved that:*

(i) *The University should obtain advice on the construction of paragraph 10;*

(ii) *Council note the proposal on a Redundancy Procedure for Academic and Research Staff and agree, in principle, to the setting up of a Standing Redundancy Committee.*
54. **REPORT FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Considered a report from the meeting held on 12 February 2004.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document F. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

**A. Expenses**

Noted that:

1. At the meeting of Audit Committee on 16 October 2003, concerns had been expressed concerning weaknesses in the procedures and regulations for expenses and had considered revised procedures at its meeting on 12 February 2004;

2. There was to be further consultation with the faculties and support services and the revised procedures would then be considered by Executive Board;

3. The revised procedures should then be considered at the next meeting of Audit Committee;

4. It was important that the new procedures and regulations were introduced from the start of the next financial year and that the timetable did not slip.

**B. Internal Audit Plan 2003-04**

(a) **VAT**

Noted that the University’s VAT arrangements were complex as certain of its purchases and sales were exempt, some were standard rated, some were zero rated and some were lower rated, which meant that the University could be regarded as ‘partially exempt’. However, the proposals made by the University as the basis of the partial exemption arrangements had not been agreed with or formally approved by HM Customs and Excise. The University therefore had an exposure to risk in this area, which Council should be aware of, although provision for the potential liability had been made in the accounts.

(b) **Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology (INSAT) follow-up**

Noted.

(c) **Cash, bank, loans and investments**

Noted.

(d) **Insurance**

After noting that:
1. The internal audit had concluded that there were various controls in place to identify insurable risks and to ensure that they were adequately covered by various policies;

2. The University assumed quite a lot of risks itself rather than having expensive insurance cover, which was acceptable as long as the University knew that it was accepting the risk. However, this was currently not the situation as Council was not informed of what was covered by insurance policies and what the University covered itself, which was a significant risk for the University.

Resolved that the recommendation that an insurance report be made annually, through Finance Committee and Executive Board, to Council, be approved. The report would set out the areas insured, the cost and those areas uninsured where the University had accepted the risk.

C. Internal Audit Performance Indicators

Noted that Audit Committee had reviewed the progress of the Internal Audit team against the audit plan for 2003-04 and recognised that audits were taking longer than had been anticipated. One reason for this was that the audits were wider in scope and more detailed than those done by external auditors in the past. Another reason was that a larger amount of work than expected had arisen on grant applications, which could not be placed externally owing to the tight time constraints. The audit plan had therefore been revised.

D. Annual Audit Return to HEFCE

Noted.

E. Revised HEFCE Code of Practice

Noted that:

1. The revised HEFCE Code of Practice was still at the consultation stage and was planned to come into effect on 1 August 2004;

2. The revised Code included a new emphasis on the importance of corporate governance in institutional accountability and audit;

3. The revised Code recommended that the membership of Audit Committee should be independent of the University and so, if the final version contained this recommendation, the existing membership of the University’s Audit Committee would have to change and revisions to the membership and terms of reference would need to be brought to Council for approval.
55. **REPORT FROM COUNCIL NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

Considered a report from the meeting held on 15 March 2004.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document G. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

A. **Constitution and Terms of Reference**

*Resolved that the revised constitution and terms of reference of the Committee be approved.* [Appendix to Document G.]

B. **Honorary Treasurer**

*Resolved that:*

1. *Mr D Wilson be thanked for the excellent service he had given the University for so many years;*

2. *Mr P M Johnson be given a proleptic appointment as Honorary Treasurer with immediate effect until 31 July 2007.*

C. **Lay members of Council appointed by Council**

Noted that the Committee had resolved not to advertise externally for lay members this year in the light of the review of the structure of the senior management team and the fact that the systems which would be required to administer this process could not be put in place in the time available.

*Resolved that Council support the decision of the Committee not to advertise externally for lay members this year.*

56. **REPORT FROM JOINT ETHICS COMMITTEE**

Considered a report from the Joint Ethics Committee dated March 2004.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document H. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The proposal to disestablish the Joint Ethics Committee arose from a directive from the EU which introduced new standard operating procedures for NHS Research Ethics Committees;

2. There were other areas of work which needed ethical approval, including non-NHS staff research, students’ research projects and certain work conducted internally on student volunteers, and it was essential that there was a body which could carry out this work;

3. The issue of the ethical approval of student projects was being looked at on a national basis but the current proposals appeared to be unworkable;

4. Under the circumstances it would not be sensible to disestablish this Committee until the way in which the other areas requiring ethical approval were considered was determined.
Resolved that:

(i) The Joint Ethics Committee should not be disestablished at this time;

(ii) The Provost of the Faculty of Medical Sciences should present a paper to a later meeting of Council recommending how the non-NHS areas which needed ethical approval should be considered in future.

57. HEFCE GRANT 2004-05

Received a summary of the HEFCE grant letter prepared by the Bursar.

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

Noted that the details had been outlined under Minute 50(b).

58. QUARTERLY REPORT ON THE ACCOUNTS TO 31 JANUARY 2004
(Minute 28, 15.12.2004)

Received the accounts for the 2nd quarter to 31 January 2004.

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

Noted that:

1. The Financial Monitoring and Budget Scrutiny Group had met on 17 March 2004 and considered the detail of the accounts. The Group had then submitted a report to Executive Board which highlighted two issues for concern;

2. The first issue was that income from consultancy was not as strong as had been hoped and, while this could be being caused by staff concentrating on their research rather than consultancy as the RAE approached (as might be indicated by the rise in research income), it was still a matter for concern;

3. The second issue was that expenditure on pay was expanding at a faster rate than income and, if this was allowed to continue, would lead the University into difficulties. This issue was of particular concern in view of the likely effect of the headroom posts, which could move the University from spending 56% of its income on salaries to 60-63% once the appointments were in post;

4. Another area of concern was the forecast for expenditure of the faculty reserves, which had substantial commitments against them;

5. Overall, however, the six-month position was good.

59. MINUTES OF STRATEGY BOARD

Received the Minutes of the meeting of Strategy Board held on 3 February 2004.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document L. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]
60. **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 M. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

**PART C : RESERVED BUSINESS**

61. **PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (TEACHING AND LEARNING) UNDER STATUTE 13**

Resolved that the recommendation from the Committee on the Appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors under Statute 13, endorsed by Senate, that Dr E Ritchie be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) under Statute 13 with immediate effect until 31 July 2007, be approved.

[Noted: That Dr Ritchie would be ex officio a member of Council for this period.]

62. **SENIOR MANAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY**

Received a briefing note by the Chairman of Council on plans to review the senior management at the University.

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

After noting that:

1. Senate had considered a paper from the Vice-Chancellor on the future of the senior management team and there had also been some discussion at Council Nominating Committee on this subject;

2. It was too early to bring this matter to Council as there were other issues to consider, such as the overall size of Council and the structure and functions of both Executive Board and Strategy Board. The Committee on the Appointment of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor would be asked to review these issues;

3. Another issue which would need consideration was how research would be represented externally in the future, as it appeared that there would be no pro-vice-chancellor responsible for research, and this had been raised at Senate.

*Resolved that this matter be brought to a future meeting of Council.*