

# Minutes Unrestricted

---

**Meeting title:** Council

---

**Date:** Thursday 7 July 2011

**Time:** 4.00pm

---

**Location:** The Council room, George Thomas Building

---

**Present:** Dame Valerie Strachan (*Chair*), Mr M Burrow, Professor I Cameron, Professor J Falkingham, Mr P Greenish, Mr R Henderson, Professor R Holdaway, Mr M Killingley, Mr S Ling\*, Professor B Makhoul, Professor D Nutbeam, Mr T O'Brien, Dr D Price, Dr M Read, Ms R Rivaz, Mrs H Smith, Professor P Smith, Mr M Snell and Professor A Wheeler

---

**In attendance:** The Chief Operating Officer, the University Secretary, the Director of Communications and Marketing, Professor D Humphris, Professor P Nelson, and Dr K Piggott

---

**Observers** Mr J Boyer (future Class 2 member from 1 August 2011) , and Mrs T Harrison, Registrar-designate

---

\* not present for restricted business

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, particularly Mr Ling, the new President of the Students' Union attending his first meeting as a member. She also welcomed Mr Boyer, attending as an observer in advance of joining Council as a lay member in 1 August 2011, and the Registrar-designate, Mrs Harrison, also attending as an observer. She was delighted, on behalf of Council, to congratulate Dr Read on the award of the CBE in the Queen's Birthday Honours List, for services to the Public Sector and to Business.

She asked anyone aware of any conflict of interests to declare them. It was noted that in respect of the pensions update (agendum 7) all University staff present had an interest as members of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS). Mr O'Brien declared an interest as he was in receipt of a pension from USS. The Chief Operating Officer (COO) and the Treasurer declared an interest as Trustees of the University's pensions scheme PASNAS.

Members then received a presentation from Mr Simon Peatfield, (Director of Communications and Marketing) and Mr Richard Kennett (Director of UK Student Recruitment, Outreach and Admissions), entitled Undergraduate 2012 Marketing & Recruitment.

## 101 Obituary

There were no obituaries on this occasion.

## 102 Minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2011

**Resolved** That the Minutes (unrestricted) of the above meeting be approved and signed, and that the non-confidential minutes may now be published on the SUSSED group site.

## 103 Matters arising (not covered elsewhere on the agenda)

There were no matters arising which were not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

## 104 Publication of unrestricted papers

The Chair advised that a separate version of the KPIs paper (agendum 10) had been prepared for publication on the open access site. The risk register (agendum 11) should be held as confidential to Council and senior members of the University. The HEFCE Assessment of Risk (agendum 26) should be regarded as confidential to Council, although not so marked on the agenda, and the Access Agreement (agendum 28) should not be published on the open site until approved by OFFA.

**Resolved** That with the exceptions set out above the papers circulated for the meeting on 7 July should now be published on the open access SUSSED site.

**Received** A paper from the Vice-Chancellor headed 'Higher Education White Paper' dated 4 July 2011, with the executive summary of the White Paper attached as an annex. (A revised version of annex 1, review of AAB students by discipline, was tabled).

In presenting the paper the Vice-Chancellor explained that at this stage he wished to share some thoughts with Council on the possible impacts of the White Paper, and to seek members' input to inform the University's response to the first stage of the consultation. As thinking developed it was likely there would be some significant decisions to be taken, which would require Council's involvement. He commented that the White Paper sought to create a market for students in higher education – a market for excellence by providing additional places for students with AAB grades at A level, and a market for price by allowing expansion in student numbers at institutions whose average fee after waivers was £7,500 or less. Southampton would be focussing attention on the former, as it was extremely unlikely that the University would ever charge below the £7500 average fee for its programmes.

He had three immediate areas of concern, which he had already raised at an informal discussion with the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Minister for Universities and Science:

- An apparent contradiction between the Government's ambitions for widening participation and the focus on AAB students in the White Paper, given that 'widening participation' students were often admitted on the basis of potential rather than actual grades. It was likely the forthcoming report from Simon Hughes MP, the Advocate for Access to Education, would encourage universities in future to give greater weight to contextual information when making admissions decisions, and this was also at odds with the focus on AAB students.
- There was a risk that the proposals could lead to a loss of places in STEM subjects at higher cost research intensive universities. It was essential that the University took action to protect its intake of high calibre students in science subjects
- Although the Government had expressed a wish to reduce the requirements for data collection the White Paper outlined a significant number of additional requirements to be placed on institutions. Production of this information would be costly and time-consuming. Where information was to be required about individual programmes this also had the potential to be misleading if it was based on feedback from very small numbers of students.

In response to a query about the future role for private providers, and how the University might prepare itself to succeed in this new market, the Vice-Chancellor commented that in his view that conditions were not obviously in place to support a dramatic growth in the private market in the short-term. He suggested that a greater challenge would emerge if American universities, for example, took advantage of the provisions opening up the market and set up campuses in this country. He also suggested that, as the market for private provision becomes clearer, the University might also consider setting up a distinct 'private arm' to compete in this market.

Members shared the Vice-Chancellor's concerns regarding STEM subjects and widening participation outlined above, and agreed that these were issues which should be pressed in any discussions with Ministers. With regard to the former perhaps the University might lobby for the reduction in number controls to cover high calibre students in widening participation target groups as well as AAB students? It was also pointed out that there were some academic areas, such as music and art, where excellence was not assessed simply on the basis of A level performance – this too should be taken into account.

With regard to links between the Education White Paper and the Research and Innovation White Paper due shortly, the Vice-Chancellor commented that in his view it was preferable for the two to remain separate, given that the education paper had a very narrow focus on undergraduate teaching. He was concerned to avoid any discussions at the national level which could lead to 'trade-offs' between the two areas. What would be important, however, would be to ensure that, internally, the University made the appropriate links for its own strategy and planning purposes.

It was not yet known whether the additional funding for the increased number of student places created by the White Paper would be capped. HEFCE had initiated a consultation on proposals for implementing changes to funding methods for teaching and student numbers for 2012–13, with a second stage to follow, to cover the period from 2013–14 onwards.

The Vice-Chancellor invited members to submit any further reflections to him outside the meeting, to inform the University's response, and also invited any interested members to join a 'critical friends'

group to work through the final response. The initial consultation on the White Paper would end on 2 September. Mr Ling suggested there should be a 'joined up response' from the University and SUSU, and the Vice-Chancellor warmly welcomed this suggestion (although each party might also wish to submit a separate response).

- Resolved**
- (i) That members should pass any further reflections to the Vice-Chancellor by e-mail, to help inform the University's response to the White Paper; and that any member who would like to be part of a 'critical friends group' to participate in framing the response should let the Vice-Chancellor know.
  - (ii) That there should, if possible, be a 'joined up response' between the University and SUSU (although each party might also wish to submit a separate response).
  - (iii) That the report on the White Paper be noted.

106 **University budget 2011/12** (agendum 6)

**Received** A paper from the COO and the Acting Director of Finance headed 'University Budget and Financial Projections 2011/12' dated 28 June 2011.

In presenting the paper the COO drew attention to the substantial reductions in HEFCE grant funding in 2010–11 and the further cuts which would take effect in 2011–12. Despite this the University had performed well financially over the past year, particularly in terms of tuition fee income (both for home/EU and international students) and in reducing staff costs. It was essential to avoid complacency – the University had performed well because it had taken and implemented a series of tough decisions and significantly increased productivity, but this must continue into the future.

He explained that the proposed University level budget proposals would produce an accounting deficit of £604,000. However if the effects of excess equipment depreciation charges associated with the replacement equipment in the Clean Rooms, and the new provision for budgetary units to carry forward and spend accumulated surpluses, were both set aside, this would give an underlying surplus on normal operations of £9.3 million. The proposed budget would meet the University's financial strategy targets, with the exception of cash generation from ordinary activities (which would be at 4% of turnover, against a target of 5%) and the level of investment funds (2.6% (£11million) against a target of 3%). He highlighted the risks as set out in the circulated paper: in particular, the impact of national pay awards should there be any pressure for 'catch up' pay awards in future years. The Treasurer commented that the proposed budget was thorough, comprehensive and prudent; however there was no room for complacency, particularly given the current uncertainties.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- It was questioned whether depreciation might rise in future, as the University was likely to need to invest in additional equipment. The COO indicated that the current level of depreciation was high because of the charges associated with the replacement equipment in the Clean Rooms (2012 was year three of the 'hump' in such charges). While depreciation would indeed rise as the University invested in new facilities, it would nonetheless be expected to fall from current levels.
- It was questioned whether individual elements of the budget were necessarily as conservative as the whole – for example, the predictions regarding growth in international student' fee income. The COO explained that Faculties had each been questioned in the strategic planning meetings, and on the basis of current information the predicted income figures were seen as reasonable and achievable. It was however the case that international student recruitment was susceptible to changes in the global situation, and any such change could have a significant effect on the achievement of these targets.
- Although the HEFCE grant had been confirmed for the coming financial year it was still possible that there would be in-year adjustments, arising from the consequences of the overlap of the government financial year 2012/13 and the last 4 months of University financial year 2011/12.
- The University's level of external debt as a percentage of turnover was marginally above the average for the sector; however the situation varied considerably from institution to institution.
- It was recognised that other operating costs were increasing, and the COO said it was the intention to review this in the coming year (up until this point the priority had been to focus on reducing staff costs).

- With regard to the need for additional capital investment for the Faculty of Business and Law, it was noted that £10 million had been set aside in the capital plan. This might not be sufficient given the Faculty's ambitions and potential but, if warranted by a sustainable business plan, consideration would be given to developments beyond this level of funding.
- In response to a query from the Treasurer regarding the ongoing concerns over research income generated by Biological Sciences, it was explained that the strategy was to address this through the creation of the Institute for Life Sciences, thus bringing Biological Sciences into closer relationship with other related academic areas, to stimulate growth through interdisciplinary working.

**Resolved** That the overall University budget showing a small deficit of £604,000 for 2011/12, the individual spending plans of Faculties and professional services, and the spend of £11.5million on centrally supported initiatives, as set out in the circulated paper agenda 6, be approved.

#### 107 **Annual review of pension schemes and risk to University** (agenda 7)

**Received** A paper from the COO headed 'Annual Review of Pension Schemes and Risk to University' dated 12 June 2011.

The COO presented the paper and reminded members that the results of the latest full valuation of USS would be published late in 2011. Given the low pay settlements since the last valuation, the implementation of USS reforms, the move from Retail Prices Index to Consumer Prices Index for indexation of pensions, and the continued recovery of asset prices since late 2008, it was likely the valuation would not show a large deficit on the fund, although it was anticipated that USS would increase the life expectancy assumptions. He outlined the background to the reforms of the USS benefits structure, the consultation process with members and the changes made to the proposals as a result. The Universities and Colleges Union (UCU) was now balloting for strike action or action short of a strike as a result of the reforms and the way in which these were ratified; the outcome was due in September.

Mr Burrow, as Chair of the Audit Committee, commented that he had been concerned that the cost of pensions was regarded as the lowest of the risks shown on the University's risk register, and he had questioned whether the risk level should be raised. As an example of the impact of risk he explained that each 1% increase in the USS contribution rate would cost the University about £1.25million per annum.

In response to a query about the likely risk of industrial action and whether there was anything the University might usefully do to prepare for this, it was explained that contingency arrangements had been previously developed and could be put in place as necessary, but that overall for this University, the risks were thought to be relatively low. USS remained a relatively generous scheme. There was a brief discussion about the implications of new tax laws on pensions for high earners, and whether some might leave the scheme as a result. The COO indicated that it was likely that newly appointed Vice-Chancellors would see a very considerable tax charge if mitigation action was not taken. USS was currently considering means to smooth the effects.

**Resolved** To note the report, and that the COO would bring to Council in due course a paper on the outcomes and impact of the USS valuation.

#### 108 **Health and Safety**

##### 108.1 **Vice-Chancellor's annual health and safety report** (agenda 8.1)

**Received** The Vice-Chancellor's annual health and safety report 2010, dated 12 June 2011 with the Acting Head of Health and Safety's annual report as an appendix.

The Vice-Chancellor explained that, while the report covered the period 1 January – 31 December 2010 he had also wished to highlight where actions had been taken or were in hand in 2011 to address issues raised. He intended that next year the report would be submitted to Council in March.

Mr Henderson drew attention to the commitment in the Acting Head's report to investigate further the key area of accidents for students (handling, lifting and carrying) and suggested that this should be included in the list of priorities for 2011. It was agreed that this would be appropriate. He also sought further information about the trend of increasing reported injuries involving students over the past 6 years. The Vice-Chancellor took this question on notice – he would ensure a report was given to Mr

Henderson outside the meeting. Mr Henderson also commented, based on his experience of cases at other organisations, that periods of major structural change could trigger health and safety incidents – it would be important for the University to be self-critical, particularly in respect of the possible effects of the loss of staff in key roles. Was the University requiring all those in leadership positions to undertake appropriate health and safety training? The Vice-Chancellor referred to the Report from the Health and Safety Assurance Committee providing assurance that the training of senior staff was in hand Dr Price commented that changing the culture in respect of risk assessment and introducing a standardised system was likely to be very difficult, but he agreed that this should be a high priority, as it was easy for people to become complacent.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the Vice-Chancellor's annual health and safety report 2010 be endorsed.
  - (ii) That the commitment to investigate further in 2011 the key area of accidents for students (handling, lifting and carrying) would be added to the list of priorities.
  - (iii) That information should be provided to Mr Henderson outside the meeting with regard to the trend of increasing reported injuries involving students over the past 6 years, and health and safety training for those in leadership positions.

#### **108.2 Report from the Health & Safety Audit and Assurance Committee (agendum 8.2)**

- Received** A report from the Health and Safety Audit and Assurance Committee on the outcomes of the annual reporting process 2010, dated 25 May 2011.

Ms Rivaz, Chair of the committee, presented the report and commented that members had recognised that the annual reporting process had taken place in the context of significant structural change. It was very clear that the Deans were fully aware of their leadership role for health and safety; however in some cases progress had been slower than might have been hoped. The management of change had clearly been easier where there had been continuity – for example, where a single School had become a Faculty, and the former Head of School had become the Dean. Particular concerns had been identified about inconsistency of reporting, data presentation and analysis, all of which made assessing internal compliance challenging. Some specific recommendations had been made to improve this for the future. The committee had been particularly pleased to see the progress which had been made with regard to the provision of a comprehensive training programme at all levels, using different forms of delivery.

The committee had recognised that Mr Harmsworth's death was a great loss for the institution. The Acting Head had done an excellent job in providing continuity and interim leadership. However, health and safety required recognised leadership to move forward and (while this was clearly an executive decision), it was the view of the committee that the post should be filled on a permanent basis as a matter of urgency. The University Secretary was pleased to report that this had now been advertised.

- Resolved** That Council endorses the Health and Safety Audit and Assurance Committee's assessment of the University's health and safety performance 2010, as set out in the circulated report.

#### **108.3 Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Improvement Notice (additional item)**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the University had received an Improvement Notice from the HSE in respect of an incident in which a technician had sustained a broken leg as a result of an accident while unloading a delivery from a lorry using a pedestrian stacker (forklift). An investigation had found that the equipment was not suitable for the task, it was operated incorrectly and there was no risk assessment covering the task. Actions were already in hand to address the requirements set in the Improvement Notice by the HSE's deadline of 30 September. In addition the University was undertaking a review of the risk assessments for the use of forklifts across all faculties and professional services.

- Resolved** That the information provided by the Vice-Chancellor regarding the HSE Improvement Notice served on the University be noted.

#### **109 Principles to guide international partnerships and engagement (agendum 9)**

- Received** A paper from the Vice-Chancellor headed 'Principles to Guide International Partnerships and Engagement' dated June 2011.

The Vice-Chancellor reminded members that, in the context of discussing developments in Libya, Council had agreed in March 2011 that he and the Chair would develop protocols for determining the circumstances in which Council should become involved in discussions about the appropriateness of

entering into memoranda of understanding with particular international universities and organisations. The circulated paper identified underlying principles to guide such institutional developments, including the trigger points where a planned agreement would be referred to Council.

At Senate in June there had been a helpful discussion about the nature of international partnerships and related ethical issues. As a result of this he now suggested including an additional key principle, to make clear that all staff appointments and student admissions would be made on merit, with no restrictions based on race or religion, but that national laws would need to be observed and cultural sensitivities understood and respected. Members agreed that this would be appropriate. A number of minor grammatical changes were also proposed and agreed.

It was questioned whether the reference to 'cordial diplomatic relations' was too vague and might not give adequate guidance. However the Vice-Chancellor emphasised that this was the terminology used by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) – the intention was that the University would be relying on their definition as a trigger for particular proposals to be referred to UEG (and potentially Council) for consideration. In response to a suggestion that the University might need to think more long-term than the FCO given the duration of some of its agreements, the Vice-Chancellor said that it would be impossible to eliminate all risks given the changing nature of international relations. (The relationship with Libya was a good example of how the acceptability of partnerships could change quickly).

- Resolved**
- (i) That a fourth key guiding principle be added to the paper, as follows:  
'All staff appointments and student admissions made by the University of Southampton as a part of our international partnerships will be made on merit, with no restrictions based on race or religion. Where staff and students are engaged in work or study through our international partnerships, the University will use reasonable endeavours to provide an environment which is safe and secure, and to provide students with a "student experience" that is compatible with our reasonable expectations. Wherever our staff or students are in the world, the national laws do need to be observed and cultural sensitivities understood and respected.'
  - (ii) That under Risk Mitigation in paragraphs 5 and 6 the word 'should' should be replaced with 'will'.
  - (iii) That, subject to the above amendments, the principles to guide international partnerships and engagement and the arrangements under which an agreement would be referred to Council for consideration and, if appropriate, for approval, be endorsed.

#### 110 **Key Performance Indicators** (agendum 10)

**Received** The Key Performance Indicators, with a covering note from the Head of Corporate Planning.

The COO presented the report, and paid tribute to the work of Mr Staniczenko, the Head of Planning, for his work in preparing the document in its new simplified format. Several members commented favourably on the format and content of the report. Mr Greenish said that as a new member he had found it particularly helpful in presenting a 'snapshot' of the University and the areas with which Council should be concerned.

With regard to research income, it was questioned why this was regarded as 'red' rather than amber, given the statement that the University was currently third out of nine in its comparator group for income per academic member of staff. Professor Nelson commented that the comparator group was not the full Russell Group and that in the relatively recent past the University had been top of the group by this measure. Although research income had been progressing in the right direction, it appeared that the focus on the production of papers in preparation for the Research Excellence Framework assessment (REF), the effects of the transition process, and the impact of the new funding environment, including demand management, could all be having an impact on the number of grant applications being made.

Several members raised issues relating to employability and the National Student Survey (NSS), warning against complacency. Professor Humphris agreed that it was essential the University continued to improve – maintaining current levels of performance was not an option, or the University would be overtaken in the rankings. The Vice-Chancellor said that it was important to set the NSS data in context, and it would be helpful for Council to receive more targeted information showing how Southampton was performing relative to its specific comparator group. Professor Humphris undertook to put together a report for the next meeting. In response to a query as to whether there were any actions Council members could take to assist the University to move forward in the area of employability Professor

Humphris commented that she would welcome lay members' involvement in the Employability Working Group. Professor Holdaway said he would be interested to be involved.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Council should receive at its next meeting a more detailed briefing on the NSS and Employability, including information as to where the University sits in relation to its direct comparators.
  - (ii) That Professor Humphris would contact Professor Holdaway with further information about the Employability Working Group.
  - (iii) That the KPIs document be noted.

**111 University risk register** (agendum 11)

**Received** The University risk register, with a covering note from the COO dated 28 June 2011.

The COO commented that the only change since Council reviewed the risk register in March was the movement upwards of the risk relating to the provision of student residential accommodation. This related to concerns about the planning process, which were currently being acted upon. There would however be substantial changes in the Autumn, when risks would need to be included relating to student recruitment. When the risk register had been considered in March Mr Henderson had asked whether risks relating to failure to protect intellectual property (IP) should be included. The COO had obtained a detailed briefing from Research and Innovation Services (R&IS), on the basis of which he was assured that this was not a significant risk. He undertook to share the briefing note with Mr Henderson.

Dr Price suggested that the requirements of the Bribery Act should be included as a risk until it was clear that all necessary policies and processes had been reviewed and were in place. The COO confirmed that all necessary work on this was already in hand, and additional guidance had been circulated to staff; he agreed, however, that inclusion in the risk register would be appropriate.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the COO would send to Mr Henderson the briefing prepared by R&IS explaining why issues relating to IP protection were not regarded as a key risk for the University.
  - (ii) That the Bribery Act should be included as a risk, until it was clear that all necessary policies and processes had been reviewed and were in place.

**112 Amendments to Ordinances** (agendum 17)

**Received** A paper from the University Secretary, 'Revisions to Ordinances' dated 27 June 2011.

The changes proposed corrected some minor omissions, amended titles to take into account that the posts of Registrar and of COO now existed as separate roles, and amended the titles of academic units in line with the academic structures within each Faculty approved by Council in March 2011. The changes had been endorsed by Senate on 15 June, (agendum 29). The University Secretary reported that there would be a further change to one of the academic unit names in the Faculty of Medicine. Amending the Ordinances to include this change would require a further consultation with Senate (to take place electronically), before Council approval was sought. He asked that Council authorise Dame Valerie to take Chair's action on this matter in due course

- Resolved**
- (i) That the amendments to the Ordinances (Section 1.10, Section 1.11, Sections 2.1 to 2.4, 2.6 to 2.9, Section 2.12.4, Section 2.12.6, Section 2.12.7 and Part 4), as listed in the circulated paper and set out in detail in the Appendix, be approved to come into effect on 1 August 2011.
  - (ii) That, following consultation with the Senate, the Chair be authorised to take Chair's action to approve an amendment to Ordinance 2.6 in relation to a change of name for one of the academic units in the Faculty of Medicine.

**113 The Vice-Chancellor's report** (agendum 18)

**Received** The Vice-Chancellor's report, dated 7 July 2011.

The Vice-Chancellor's written report was received under the following headings:

- OFFA Submission
- The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)
- 2012 Student Application Numbers
- International Collaboration Opportunities

- Times Good University Guide 2012
- Development and Alumni
- New Research Awards
- Press coverage since the last meeting of Council
- Queens Birthday Honours Lists

- UEG Decisions for Council attention

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the decision regarding the *Southampton Marine and Maritime Institute*. The formal establishment of the Centre and its inclusion in the Ordinances as a cross-University Research Institute would require Senate endorsement and Council approval. The Vice-Chancellor proposed to consult with Senate electronically, and then to take Chair's action on behalf of Senate to bring a recommendation to Council. He asked that Council authorise Dame Valerie to take Chair's action on these matters in due course.

- Resolved**
- (i) That, following consultation with the Senate, the Chair be authorised to act on behalf of Council in respect of recommendations relating to the establishment of the Southampton Marine and Maritime Institute and its inclusion in the Ordinances as a cross-University Research Institute.
  - (ii) That the Vice-Chancellor's report be noted.

**114 Report from the President of the Students' Union** (agendum 19)

**Received** The report from Mr FitzJohn, Students' Union President 2010 – 2011.

Mr Ling presented the report prepared by his successor, and drew attention to the following items:

- In respect of tuition fees and funding, the Students' Unions' future priorities were to minimise the impact of funding cuts on students, and to encourage the University to invest in the student experience. SUSU and the University should work closely wherever possible to lobby the government to resist further cuts.
- He outlined the new representation and governance structures within the Students' Union.
- SUSU now had a Mission statement and a statement of vision and values, together with a five-year plan. Council members welcomed these developments.

With regard to relationship with local resident groups the Chair welcomed the positive approaches the Students' Union was taking to build a closer understanding with the local community.

**Resolved** To note the report.

**115 Amendments to Financial Regulations** (agendum 20)

**Received** A report from the Audit committee (27 June 2011) concerning proposed revisions to the Financial Regulations.

It was noted that the revisions to the Financial Regulations were required to take account of changes in the University's organisational structure and reporting lines within Professional Services; and to reflect recent legislative changes and European and UK Research Councils' grant conditions.

**Resolved** That the revisions to the Financial Regulations be approved.

**26 Annual HEFCE risk assessment**

**Received** A paper from the COO headed 'Annual HEFCE Risk Assessment' dated 20 June 2011.

It was noted that the formal letter setting out HEFCE's assessment of institutional risk had not yet been received. HEFCE had however released their analysis of the financial forecasts submitted, and the circulated report showed Southampton's forecasts against the various HEFCE indicators of financial health, and compared the University's forecasts with the sector as a whole.

**Noted** The report.

**117 Financial monitoring 2010/11: management accounts May 2011** (agendum 27)

**Received** The May 2011 management accounts, with a covering paper from the Acting Director of Finance, dated 15 June 2011.



**Noted** The May 2011 financial statements.

**118 Final version of the University of Southampton's Access Agreement** (agendum 28)

**Received** The University of Southampton 2012/13 Access Agreement as submitted to the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) for approval. (*Confidential until approved by OFFA*).

The Access Agreement was submitted to OFFA in April 2011. As indicated in the Vice-Chancellor's report (agendum 20), OFFA had subsequently asked the University to slightly raise the access targets, and the version circulated for information to Council included the amendments made in response to this request.

**Noted** The final version of the University of Southampton's Access Agreement as submitted to OFFA for approval.

**119 Report from the meeting of Senate, 15 June 2011 (unrestricted)** (agendum 29)

**Received** The unrestricted report from the above meeting of Senate, under the following headings:

- Membership of Council under Class 3 (Update on Senate appointments to Council)
- Revisions to Ordinances to reflect new academic structures (see also agendum 17)
- University Programme Committee: report from meeting held on 25 May 2011.

**Noted** The unrestricted report from the meeting of Senate on 15 June.

**120 Review of the Laws of the Students' Union** (agendum 30)

**Received** A paper from the University Secretary headed 'Review of the Laws of the Students' Union.

It was noted that review of the Laws of the Students' Union, required at intervals of not more than 5 years (Ordinance Part 4 (6)) would be postponed until the November meeting of Council. This was to fit with the timetable under which the Students' Union was seeking registration with the Charity Commission as a separate charity, which would require amendments to the Laws of the Union.

**Noted** The updated report on the Review of the Laws of the Students Union.

**121 Report to Council on the review of the Code of Practice regarding the requirements of the Education Act 1994** (agendum 31)

**Received** The annual monitoring report from the Director of Student Services on the Students' Union's compliance with the Code of Practice drawn up by the University in response to the requirements of the Education Act 1994, dated 3 June 2011.

**Noted** The report from the Director of Student Services.

**122 Sealing of Documents** (agendum 32)

**Received** A paper listing the documents sealed, dated 29 June 2011.

**Noted** The list of sealed documents.

**123 Valedictions**

The Chair reported with regret that this was the last meeting for both Mr Snell and Dr Lawrence, who had reached the end of their current period of office, and had also each served for three three-year terms, the maximum period normally permitted as a lay member. Both had made very valuable contributions as members of Council during this period. In addition Mr Snell had had significant involvement in the University's education agenda as a member of the Education Policy Committee and had served on the Estate Policy Committee, while Dr Lawrence had been a member of the Finance Policy Committee and had worked in support of the University outside of Council meetings. On behalf of Council the Chair thanked them both (Dr Lawrence in her absence) for their contributions and expressed the hope that they would continue to offer support and assistance informally as friends of the University.

The Chair also thanked the University Secretary, Dr Strike, for the support he had given to Council while serving as Acting Clerk to the Council in the absence of a Registrar.