

Minutes Unrestricted

Meeting title: Council

Date: Thursday 20 May 2010

Time: 4.00pm

Location: The Council Room, George Thomas Building

Present: Dame Valerie Strachan (*Chair*), Professor IC Cameron, Professor R Holdaway, Mr AJ Jukes, Mr MS Killingley, Ms V Lawrence, Professor B Makhoul, Mr A Morgan, Professor D Nutbeam, Mr T O'Brien, Mr S O'Reilly*, Professor W Powrie, Dr MP Read, Mrs HE Smith, Professor AA Wheeler

In attendance: The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer, the Director of Communications, the Director of Finance, Professor AD Fitt, Professor PA Nelson, the University Secretary and Dr KA Piggott

By Invitation The Director of Human Resources (for agendum, 5.3), the Director of iSolutions and the Director of Estates and Facilities (for agendum 5.4 and 12) Professor JW McBride (for agendum 7)

* not present for restricted business

The Chair welcomed Mrs Hilary Smith, attending her first meeting as the new representative of the non-teaching staff.

Members were invited to declare any conflicts of interest. It was noted that all members of academic staff present were affected by the proposals under agendum 9 in relation to the change of scope of the Professorial and Senior Salaries Committee. No other conflicts of interest were identified.

The Chair advised members that as Mr Jukes had been unable to attend the last three meetings of Council, Council was required to authorise continuation of his membership, in accordance with Statute 17(6).

Resolved That the membership of Council of Mr Andrew Jukes be continued.

97 Obituary

The Chair reported with regret the deaths of the following members of the University and invited members to stand as a mark of respect:

Dr Trudy Roach, Reader in the School of Medicine, in April 2010.

98 Minutes (unrestricted) of the meeting held on 25 March 2010

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

99 Matters arising (not covered elsewhere on the agenda)

99.1 Code of Practice to Ensure Freedom of Speech

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer indicated that the Head of Legal Services and Mr Henderson had been in contact. A revised Code of Practice would be brought to the July meeting for approval.

99.2 Programme to Implement Organisational Structures: best estimate' of overall costs of change programme (Minute 71.2)

Received A paper headed 'Transition Costs and Benefits' from the Chief Financial Officer and the University Secretary, dated 4 May 2010.

The circulated paper contained the information requested at the last meeting about the costs of the change programme.

Resolved To note the report.

99.3 Council Effectiveness review (minute 81.3)

The University Secretary reported that the University had been accepted into the Leadership Foundation pilot programme and he and Dame Valerie would be attending a workshop in May. Further information would be presented to the July meeting.

100 Publication of unrestricted papers

Resolved That the papers designated as commercial in confidence should not be published on the open access site.

101 University Strategy

101.1 Core Business Model (agendum 5.1)

Received A paper from the Chief Financial Officer headed 'Core Business Model' dated 10 May 2010.

The Chief Financial Officer commented that, as members began to focus on the details of individual plans, it would be easy to lose sight of the core purpose and intent of the new strategy. The new strategy was a strategy of growth and it would be important to keep this in mind, despite the focus on funding cuts etc. This paper was intended to set out the fundamentals:

- Excellence in research quality must be secured, both through high-quality recruitment and performance management of existing staff.
- Sustainable growth in student numbers was needed; this was explored in some detail in the paper, including links to growth in academic staff numbers.
- There would need to be an expansion in the number of academic staff, plus a significant number of replacement appointments, to cover academic staff turnover or retirements. Minimum thresholds of performance would be set which new staff would be expected to meet or exceed.
- Growth in student numbers would have implications for the estate, and will pose challenges for the University in maintaining the quality of the student experience.
- The need for cuts in administrative costs (£7million), to fund the major part of the University's new Investment fund (£10million). The remainder would come from increased student fee income and improved academic staff performance (all new Faculties should be operating with a sustainable surplus).

A query was raised about the University's distinctiveness – other Russell Group institutions would be pursuing similar strategies, so how would Southampton highlight its distinctiveness to encourage recruitment? This was particularly an issue because the City Council was perhaps not as proactive as it might be in promoting Southampton overseas. Professor Fitt commented that there was considerable evidence that students wanted the educational experience Southampton offered – at present applications significantly exceeded the number of places available. The Vice-Chancellor emphasised that the focus was on sustainable growth; maintaining the student experience would be crucial. The University had started from a relatively low base for international recruitment, but had since invested heavily in the International Office and rates of growth now matched or outstripped our comparators. In response to a query from Mr Jukes the Vice-Chancellor confirmed that maintaining the quality of the student intake was vital – the growth strategy would not be pursued at the expense of quality of students.

It was suggested that a significant rise in student numbers could be problematic in terms of relationships with the City Council. The Vice-Chancellor commented that there had been a meeting with the City Council earlier in the year to explain the new strategy. Their concerns related largely to accommodation ('student ghettos', and houses of multiple occupation) and transport but they were not opposed to growth *per se*. The University would therefore need to deal sensitively with these issues.

Some concern was expressed that an increase in tuition fees as a result of the Browne Review, or changes in demographics, might have a dampening effect on home student numbers. It was emphasised that the University had not assumed any changes to home/EU tuition fees in its planning, and the 'constrained path' modelled in the paper assumed no growth in home/EU undergraduate student numbers. The raising of the education leaving age (assuming this was carried forward by the new government) should also increase the proportion of young people going into higher education.

It was agreed that the paper was a very helpful summary – it was important always to be mindful of the direction of travel.

Resolved To note the report.

101.2 **Strategic plans for Research and Education** (agendum 5.2)

Received The strategic plans for research and education, dated May 2010.

In Professor Humphris's absence Professor Nelson presented both of these plans, highlighting that a number of changes had been made since the drafts were presented to Council in March. As well as changes to content, the risk analysis had been brought into one place, the resource implications clarified, and a contextual section added. The core business model (agendum 5.1) also provided important context.

In discussion the following issues were explored:

- There was a brief discussion about the importance of innovation and enterprise activity. Professor Nelson commented that this was an important area for growth and development, and was one of Southampton's key distinctors – however it was not part of the University's core business in the same way as research and education. He agreed that the University could not rest on its laurels in this area, particularly as it was likely this would remain high on the new government's agenda.
- Questions were raised about the process for recruiting, and then monitoring the performance of, new academic staff. It was confirmed that although in some cases the new appointees would bring research grants with them, others might require start-up funds, although this was likely to vary across disciplines. The University would however expect to get a return for its investments.
- In response to a query regarding the timing of the development of new Faculty strategic plans, it was explained that the current planning round was being undertaken in the new Faculty configurations; once the new Deans were in place they would finalise firm plans for the new Faculties.
- It was confirmed that benchmarking of research performance (1.1) was already in progress, although it now seemed likely that the Research Excellence Framework would be postponed for at least a year.
- A question was raised about multi-disciplinary research, and Professor Nelson outlined the role of the University Strategic Research Groups (USRGs). The existing USRGs would be reviewed in June, and progress evaluated. A dynamic and flexible approach was being taken to both investment and disinvestments. With regard to Industry Sector Teams this was a new development (the first meeting of the Aerospace Team would take place on 21 May) and it was not yet entirely clear how these would best fit into the new Faculty structure.
- The Chair highlighted the importance of the priorities under section 7 of the education strategic plan (*'Reforming our education and its delivery to provide a more flexible, personalised educational experience that achieves improved employment outcomes relative to our comparators in the Russell Group'*), which she suggested was the centrepiece of the plan, and would transform the nature of the University's educational offer. Professor Nelson commented that Professor Humphris was working very hard to remove barriers to collaboration and flexibility wherever she found them.

Resolved That the strategic plans for research and education be approved, recognising that these are 'living' documents which must remain dynamic and flexible, and open to modification as required, in particular in response to changing external circumstances.

101.3 **Draft support plan for Human Resources** (agendum 5.3)

Received The draft human resources support plan, dated May 2010.

The Director of Human Resources presented the plan, which was still a 'work in progress', and drew particular attention to the following:

- The plan was developed with a focus on the research and education strategies, to assist in delivering a step-change in performance. Delivery of the plan required the engagement of all those involved in people management across the institution – it was not solely the role of Human Resources.
- The University needed professional development and reward structures in place which were aligned with the strategy, and work was ongoing to take this forward.
- Work was also needed on enhancing performance review, ensuring individuals were set clear

objectives and were held accountable for delivering them. This would require a culture shift.

- Attracting the number of new high-performing individuals the University needed would require significant and well-planned recruitment activity. Internal talent would also be identified/nurtured.
- There would be a focus on creating 'freedom to act' – empowering managers to manage (especially to manage underperformance), creating flexibility and providing practical tools to help. The aim was to encourage managers to be risk aware not risk averse.
- We need to ensure that staff understood and applied the University's values and expected behaviours. Two way communications with staff would remain fundamental to culture change, and there would be active consultation with the Trades Unions.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- There was support for the principles expressed, staff being the University's most important asset. However, several members emphasised the need to include explicit reference to strategies for addressing poor performance.
- The delegation of both responsibility and authority needed to be made explicit, and it was suggested that the language in the paper might be tightened accordingly. Professor Holdaway offered assistance with the next draft.
- It was emphasised that staff needed training when they moved into management/leadership roles.
- It was suggested that there should be a focus on leadership rather than management, as such language might be more acceptable to the academic community.
- There was a brief discussion about the current arrangements for personal performance and development review (appraisal), and the ongoing work to develop and improve the system.
- The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that discussions at UEG had also emphasised the need to strengthen the toolkit for managing underperformance. The University was currently well placed to review research performance; this was not yet the case for performance in teaching, but addressing this was part of the education strategy.

Resolved To note the draft support plan for human resources as 'work in progress', and that the final version would be brought back to Council at the July meeting.

101.4 **Infrastructure support plan** (agendum 5.4)

Received The draft infrastructure support plan, dated May 2010.

Professor Wheeler explained that the support plan, which had two sections covering estate and ICT, was 'work in progress, and the Core Business Model paper set the context for current thinking. For the estate, a Minimal Capital Programme was outlined; other developments listed would be contingent on the success of the core business model in growing the University economy. These developments were largely enabling, strategic or tactical projects to ensure that the University could synchronise the development of the estate with the increased student numbers and changing requirements resulting from the implementation of the new Strategy.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- It was noted that large numbers of the actions in respect of the estate required significant management effort – was this resource available? The Director of Estates and Facilities (E&F) indicated that the University had only limited management resource for the major projects and would need to buy this in. The facilitating projects could be managed in-house, although a 'breathing space' would be needed - resources were currently stretched as the University was approaching the end of the existing capital programme.
- The long-standing issue of long term maintenance (LTM) was raised. The Director of E&F confirmed that this remained a significant concern. Major problems had been addressed in the last few years (for example, Boldrewood) but, in his view, the University was still underinvesting in LTM by c. £4million p.a. In response to a query about refurbishment, he commented that the only major academic building in a very poor state, and which was probably not refurbishable, was Building 54.

He agreed that there were always concerns that unexpected problems might be found when refurbishment commenced; unexpected issues could also arise as a result of new legislation, which could be very costly.

- It was suggested that it would be helpful in the near future for Council to receive a list of all the projects, prioritised and with approximate costings, for discussion.
- It was questioned whether retaining the Winchester campus was beneficial for the University, particularly taking into account the student experience available there ('being a Southampton University student in Winchester'), and Winchester City Council's strong commitment to the University of Winchester. The Vice-Chancellor indicated that the issue had been fully discussed by the UEG recently. UEG had considered the option to withdraw but concluded that it was important to have a footprint in Winchester and to develop its potential as a second campus. The site is well located with some scope for expansion, and Winchester offers great potential as a venue for 'high-end' postgraduate teaching. There had been discussions in the past six months with the Winchester City Council, who were enthusiastic about growing higher education in the City.
- With respect to the reference to developing a stronger relationship with the Science Park, Ms Lawrence highlighted again the concerns expressed at the last meeting about the Science Park (minute 70.2). Members were advised that as yet the University Executive group (UEG) had not had any further significant discussions beyond those already represented in the Research Strategic Plan.
- The Director of iSolutions emphasised that the ICT plan was fundamentally linked to the University strategy. He highlighted the risks associated with not delivering the priorities and the co-dependencies with the rest of the plan.

Under this heading the Chair reminded members that the Director of iSolutions would be leaving the University very shortly to take up a post in Australia. On behalf of Council she thanked him for all he had achieved at the University and wished him well in his new role.

Resolved To note the draft infrastructure support plan as 'work in progress', and that the final version would be brought back to Council at the July meeting.

102 **Proposed changes to the University's Charter and Statutes: Second reading** (agendum 6)

Received A paper from the University Secretary, headed 'Second reading of the proposed changes to the University's Charter and Statutes' dated 12 May 2010.

The University Secretary presented the paper, reminding members that the first reading of the proposed changes had taken place at the March meeting. At that meeting Mr Henderson had advised that because the Charter made explicit reference to Faculties in its opening Articles, the term 'Faculty' or 'Faculties' should be inserted to Articles 20 c) and 21 and throughout the document where appropriate. Council had agreed and these changes had been incorporated in the version presented for the second reading. This version also included changes to correct a small number of drafting oversights overlooked in the initial redrafting. These amendments were entirely consistent with the initial proposals approved by Senate and Council. Members of Senate had been formally notified of the additional changes.

If approved by Council, the proposed changes would be submitted to the Privy Council for approval. A revised set of Ordinances would be presented to Council for consideration in July 2010, after consultation with the Senate in June 2010.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the proposed amendments to the Charter set out in Annex 2.1 of the circulated paper be approved for the second time, subject to such amendments as the Privy Council might require, and forwarded to the Privy Council for approval.
 - (ii) That the proposed amendments to the Statutes, set out in Annex 2.2 of the circulated paper, be approved for the second time, subject to such amendments as the Privy Council might require, and forwarded to the Privy Council for approval.

103 **Education in South East Asia** (agendum 7)

[This item is commercial in confidence and a separate confidential minute is circulated to members of Council only.]

104. Health and Safety

104.1 Vice-Chancellor's annual health and safety report (agendum 8.1)

Received The Vice-Chancellor's annual health and safety report 2009, with the Director of Health and Safety's annual report 2009 attached.

The Vice-Chancellor reminded members that the report largely covered the period prior to his appointment. He commented that a strong commitment to health and safety was now being shown by senior management. He thanked those who had been instrumental in taking this forward and providing leadership at the highest level - Ms Rivaz, Professor Kilburn and Mr Harmsworth, the Director of Health and Safety. In his view the University was now in a much better position, although there remained a number of areas for improvement, which were honestly highlighted in the report. Appropriate action was planned, as shown in the 'technical summary'.

Mr Jukes drew attention to the closing statements in the Director's report, regarding the need for a corrective programme for the management of health and safety, improvements in the health and safety culture, and management training. Clearly there was no room for complacency.

Resolved To endorse the Vice-Chancellor's annual health and safety report 2009.

104.2 Report from the Health & Safety Audit and Assurance Committee 4 May 2010 (agendum 8.2)

Received The report from the Health and Safety Audit and Assurance committee (H&SAAC) setting out reflections arising from the annual reporting process.

In the absence of the Chair, Ms Rivaz, Professor Powrie presented the report, reminding members that it was the committee's role to assure Council that the University was complying with statutory and other health and safety requirements (including its own procedures) and was managing risks appropriately.

H&SAAC had recognised that there was a strong commitment to health and safety from senior management, with demonstrated leadership and engagement. While there was clearly work to be done members had no doubt that the University was taking a positive approach to safety, and making good progress. Members had however identified that a more proactive stance might be taken with regard to occupational health.

As a member of H&SAAC he commented that this was a very rewarding group to be part of; meetings were well chaired and members worked closely together with a view to sharing their expertise, and acting as critical friends in a way that was supportive of the University.

On behalf of the University the Vice-Chancellor thanked Ms Rivaz and all the members of the committee for their valuable input.

Resolved To endorse the H&SAAC's assessment of the University's health and safety performance, together with the suggestions for further work and areas for consideration identified by the committee as part of its review of annual reports.

105 Professorial and Senior Salaries Committee – Recommendation to revise scope (agendum 9)

Received A paper proposing changes to the scope of the Professorial and Senior Salaries Committee.

Dame Valerie, as Chair of Professorial and Senior Salaries Committee, presented the report, commenting that the proposed change of scope also led to a proposal for a change in the committee's title. She drew particular attention to the proposal that the committee should report annually to Council on the conduct of its business under the restricted agenda; this was welcomed by Council.

Resolved

- (i) That decisions regarding the salary progression of individual professors and Level 7 School and Professional Service staff should no longer fall within the scope of the PSSC, but instead rest with the Vice-Chancellor or his nominated representative. The scope of the committee then being:
 - a) the determination of the Vice-Chancellor's salary.
 - b) Receiving recommendations from the Vice-Chancellor on salary progression

- and PRP payments for members of UEG.
- c) Agreement to the scheme/rules by which salaries of UEG members are set.
- d) Retrospective audit oversight of Professorial and Level 7 School and Professional Services based staff costings and equal pay monitoring data.
- (ii) The name of the committee be changed from the 'Professorial and Senior Salaries Committee' to the 'Senior Salaries Committee,' maintaining its current membership.
- (iii) The Senior Salaries Committee should make an annual report to the Council in the restricted agenda on the conduct of its business.
- (iv) That these changes be put into immediate effect.

106 HEFCE Financial Memorandum – Disclosures required for Charity Act Compliance (agendum 10)

Received A paper from the Chief Financial Officer, headed 'HEFCE Financial Memorandum – Disclosures required for Charity Act Compliance' and dated 9 May 2010.

The Chief Financial Officer presented the paper and highlighted the information on Council members which it was proposed to publish in the Annual Financial Statements from 2009/10. It would also be necessary to maintain and publish a list of other charities for which Council members acted as Trustees. With regard to the suggestion that for 2010/11 and beyond members' attendance at Council meetings should also be published, members considered this entirely reasonable and supported the proposal.

Resolved (i) That the following information be included in the Annual Financial Statements for 2009/10 and thereafter: name of member, type of membership, date originally appointed, end date of this period of appointment, membership of any other University Committees.

(ii) That information on members' attendance at Council meetings be included in the Annual Financial Statements for 2010/11 and thereafter.

107 MCE update (agendum 11)

[This item is commercial in confidence and a separate confidential minute is circulated to members of Council only.]

108 The future of University IT Infrastructure (agendum 12)

[This item is commercial in confidence and a separate confidential minute is circulated to members of Council only.]

109 HEFCE Assessment of Institutional Risk (agendum 13)

Received A letter from the Chief Executive of HEFCE to the Vice-Chancellor, dated 31 March 2010, setting out HEFCE's assessment of institutional risk. The letter confirmed that the University was 'not at higher risk'.

The Chief Financial Officer briefly drew attention to the benchmarking figures set out in the annex to the HEFCE letter.

Resolved To note HEFCE's assessment of the University as 'not at higher risk'.

110 Financial monitoring 2009/2010: Management Accounts March 2010 (agendum 14)

Received The March 2010 Management Accounts, with a covering paper from the Chief Financial Officer, dated 13 April 2010.

The Chief Financial Officer presented the paper, commenting that the current position was generally satisfactory, but that there was ongoing concern about the slow growth in income from external research grants and contracts. The April management accounts were now also available and showed a broadly similar position. A £3m surplus was predicted; this did not take into account any possible effects of acquiring the Broadlands Archive, and also assumed that substantial voluntary severance payments would not be recognised in this financial year.

Professor Nelson confirmed that the research funding shortfall was disappointing; however there was some good news, as four of the highest earning Schools were continuing to perform very well, meeting or exceeding the original tough 'InEx' targets. During June he would be undertaking an analysis of those Schools which were significantly missing their targets. He emphasised that the external environment was

currently very difficult, with increasing competition for Research Council funding. The Chair suggested that Professor Nelson should feed the results of his analysis into discussions at the next meeting.

- Resolved** (i) To note the University management accounts as at March 2010.
(ii) That the results of Professor Nelson's analysis of Schools' research funding performance should feed into discussion at the July meeting.

111. **Update on the Capital Programme** (agendum 15)

Received A report from Professor Wheeler, 'update on the capital programme' dated May 2010.

With regard to the one 'red-flagged' item, Building 85, Professor Wheeler commented that this project was in the closing months and there were some difficulties in maintaining progress to time; however there was sufficient stability in the project for him to feel confident that the building would be open and occupied for the new academic year.

Resolved To note the report.

112 **The Vice-Chancellor's report** (agendum 16)

Received A written report from the Vice-Chancellor, dated 11 May 2010; an additional report headed 'Addition to Vice-Chancellor's report: Government Reviewing Spending Plans Committed Recently/ Budget 22nd June 2010' (circulated by e-mail and tabled).

The Vice-Chancellor presented a written report under the following headings:

- University Restructuring
The Vice-Chancellor had agreed with the Chair of Council that a full report on progress would be presented at every second Council meeting, and a summary of progress at alternate meetings. A summary of progress and risks was therefore circulated with the report.
- Volcanic Ash Incident
- Election period
- Smith Review of Post Graduate Education
- Alumni Events
- New Research Awards
- Ilika floatation on AIM
- Press coverage
- UEG decision log, covering the period 1 February to 16 March 2010.

The Vice-Chancellor also drew attention to the circulated addition to the report, which alerted Council to specific areas where the University might be vulnerable to reviews of spending decisions or bids made during 2010. With regard to the Web Science Institute project he was pleased to report that the Southampton staff involved were now in contact with the new government, although not yet with BIS. The other two specific bids listed were not new initiatives, were long standing, and had been submitted and considered through transparent processes - he therefore remained hopeful of a positive outcome. Responses were also awaited to the University's bid to the HEFCE modernisation Fund and bid for Additional Student Numbers.

The report also highlighted the likelihood of severe cuts in the block grant settlement for 2011/12 and 2012/13. It would be possible to give an indication of the likely impact to Council in July.

Resolved To note the report.

113 **Report from the President of the Students' Union** (agendum 17)

Received A written report from the President of the Students' Union.

In presenting the report the President drew attention to the following:

- Progress with the strategic review, including the development of a new mission statement for the Union '*through shared voice, support and communities we give all students the power to have the time of their lives*'.
- The decision to close the Union Travel Centre - although this regrettably meant that four staff had been made redundant, this was clearly the right financial decision for the Union.

- The outsourcing of cleaning services.
- Restructuring of departments within the Union, including the plan to recruit a Winchester School of Art Union Manager and the employment of a member of staff for Representation and Democracy.
- In response to feedback SUSU would be considering what action it could take to provide a physical space for postgraduate students.
- International students would also be a high priority. SUSU was reviewing its sabbatical officer profile, and having a sabbatical for international students was a possibility. In the meantime the International Officer had now been upgraded to an Executive Officer post.

The President indicated that his successor was Mr Billy Fitzjohn, who would attend Council in July.

Resolved To note the report.

114 **Report from the meeting of the Audit Committee, 2 March 2010** (agendum 20)

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2010 had been previously circulated to Council members.

Mr Morgan reported that the key issues discussed by the committee had included:

- An update from the Vice-Chancellor on progress with the new University Strategy and organisational structure.
- The content and format of the Risk Register, which would now be revised.
- A helpful update on current issues produced by Mazars for the higher education sector.
- Progress on responses to Internal Audit recommendations, particularly regarding business continuity planning, the maintenance of the residential estate, and carbon footprint measurement and it was recognised that this work was ongoing.
- Various Reports from the Internal Auditors.

Under this heading, arising from minute 43 of the Audit Committee (confidential section), the Chief Financial Officer also reported the outcome of the exercise to market test the appointment of the internal auditors.

- Resolved**
- (i) To note the minutes of the Audit Committee 2 March 2010
 - (ii) That PricewaterhouseCoopers be appointed as the internal auditors for the University for a three year period commencing on 1 August 2010.

115 **Report from the Nominations Committee** (agendum 21)

Received A report from the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer on behalf of the Nominations Committee concerning Class 2 membership of Council, and dated 7 May 2010.

Resolved That Mr Michael Burrow be appointed to Class 2 membership of Council for an initial period of three years from 21 May 2010.

116 **Key Performance Indicators: update on 'red' KPIs** (agendum 22)

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer reported that all the 'red' KPIs had been addressed as part of discussions on other major items on the agenda.

117 **Sealing of documents** (agendum 23)

Received A paper listing the documents sealed since the meeting of Council on 25 March 2010.

Resolved To note the list of sealed documents.

118. **Valediction**

On behalf of all members Dame Valerie thanked Mr Steve O'Reilly for his very valuable contribution to the work of Council during his period of office as President of the Students' Union, and wished him every success in the future.