

Minutes

Meeting title:	Council	
Date:	13 March 2008	Time: 4.00pm
Location:	The Council Room, George Thomas Building	
Present:	Dame Valerie Strachan (<i>in the Chair</i>), Dr S Deuchar, Dr M O Gobbi, Professor R Holdaway, Mr A J Jukes, Professor J D Kilburn, Mr M S Killingley, Dr V Lawrence, Mr P Lester, Ms S Moore*, Professor W Powrie, Professor M Ratcliffe, Dr M Read, Ms R Rivaz, Mr M J Snell, Mr R H M Symons, Professor W A Wakeham, Mr A J Walker, Professor A A Wheeler, Professor D M Williams and Mrs J Wood	
By invitation	Professor J Hammond and Mrs S Lee, for minute 53	
In attendance	The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer, Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources, Professor P A Nelson, and Dr K A Piggott	

Unrestricted

Presentations

Members received three presentations:

- Kamaljit Kerridge-Poonia, Diversity Manager on: '*Diversity: From Compliance to Culture Change*' (related to minute 52):
- Professor Robert Wood, School of Engineering Sciences on '*Tribology: Ancient and Modern*'
- Professor Debra Humphris, Director of the Healthcare Innovation Unit on : '*Health and Social Care Reform: positioning ourselves for the future*' (related to minute 53)

Business meeting

Welcome and background

Members were invited to declare any conflicts of interest. Dr Gobbi declared an interest as a member of the School of Nursing and Midwifery in connection with agendum16 Review of School of Nursing and Midwifery, School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences), and the Healthcare Innovation Unit

43 Obituary

The Chair announced with regret the death of the following members of the University and asked Council to stand as a mark of respect:

Emeritus Professor Peter Davies, formerly ISVR.

44 Minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2007

Resolved That the Minutes (unrestricted) of the meeting held on 13 December 2007 be approved and signed.

45 Matters arising from the Minutes

45.1 Textile Conservation Centre (TCC) (minute 31.2)

Members were advised that the University remained open to the possibility of other options for the TCC but if these were not forthcoming, remained committed to closure in accordance with the previously agreed timetable. Negotiations were beginning about the return of artefacts current held by the TCC.

45.2 **Risk Register** (minute 40)

The Vice-Chancellor reported that further suggestions had been made about the most appropriate form in which to present the risk register to Council. This would take some time to resolve, and it had therefore been agreed that a small group, including lay membership, would be set up to finalise this. Mr Killingley reported that this matter had been discussed at the Audit Committee and it had been emphasised that, where there were conflicting views as to what was required, then the needs of UEG must be paramount, to ensure the KPIs were in the best form to enable University management to monitor risks effectively,.

45.3 **Brand Identity** (minute 43)

SDVC Wheeler was pleased to report that the new brand identity had been successfully implemented, although this had not been without controversy, particularly in the local Echo and in the Blog on the website. He thanked Angelina Bingley, Helen Aspell and their teams for all the detailed work which had made implementation so successful. The President of the Students' Union reported that, although there had been some negative feedback from students through the Blog, SUSU were pleased with the new brand which they felt reflected effectively the nature and quality of the University.

45.4 **Report from the meeting of the Nominations Committee, 8 November 2007: Appointment of Sir David Cooksey as Pro-Chancellor** (minute 48)

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer reported that after the meeting of Council it was identified that formally Sir David Cooksey's nomination should not have been approved without Senate having been given the opportunity to comment on it. The situation was explained to Senate, with an opportunity to comment, at its meeting on 27 February, and Senate had endorsed the recommendation (see also Council agenda 23/minute 56).

Resolved That the previous decision to appoint Sir David Cooksey as a Pro-Chancellor for the period 13 December 2007 to 31 July 2010 be re-affirmed, in the light of Senate's endorsement.

45.5 **Creating a future source of early stage investment funding for University spin-out companies** (minute 51)

The Vice-Chancellor reminded members of the background to the proposed establishment of a new fund to provide early stage investment funding for University spin-out companies, to replace the SULIS fund. Originally the intention had been to work in partnership with Bath, Bristol and Surrey. However, for different reasons, which the Vice-Chancellor explained, both Bath and Surrey had decided not to participate. Southampton and Bristol were still keen to move forward, but under the circumstances and given the recent changes in financial markets, were taking some time to consider options. More information would be brought to Council as thinking developed.

46 **The Vice-Chancellor's report**

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the following:

DVC Thomas: The Vice-Chancellor was very sorry to report that DVC Caroline Thomas was seriously ill and would be away from the University until at least the end of June. Her portfolio had been temporarily reassigned among other members of the senior management team. Dr Ian Giles, Acting Director of the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Unit, would be taking primary responsibility for the 'education' area. UEG would review the position at the end of June. Members joined the Vice-Chancellor in sending DVC Thomas their best wishes.

Insurance Claim: (the Chair registered a conflict of interest.) The Director of Finance gave a brief update on the insurance claim.

UCU ballot outcome and developments: (The Vice-Chancellor pointed out that he was currently Chair of the Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA)). Members were reminded that the 2006 pay settlement had included an agreement to review the national structures for negotiating pay. An agreement had been reached with the support Unions by the original deadline of July 2007, but not with UCU, which had ultimately decided to ballot its members. In the ballot members had voted not to accept the proposed changes to the negotiating framework. UCEA had however determined to move forward with the arrangements with the other Trades' Unions on the basis of the arrangements agreed,

and, emphasising that UCU was welcome to participate. This was clearly a very difficult situation, which could take some time to resolve.

47 **Report from the President of the Students' Union** (agendum 6)

Received The report from the President of the Students' Union

Ms Moore presented the report, and drew particular attention to a number of positive developments taking place. The Chair commented particularly on the Union's important work with the local community through the new Southampton Community Alliance Group.

Resolved That the report be noted.

48 **Financial monitoring 2007/08** (agendum 11)

Received (i) second quarter financial monitoring overview paper prepared by the Director of Finance, dated 27 February 2008;
(ii) management accounts for the period August 2007 - January 2008, prepared by the Deputy Director of Finance, dated 22 February 2008;
(iii) cash statement prepared by the Director of Finance, dated 27 February 2008;
(iv) paper from the Director of Finance, dated 27 February 2008, setting out the capital plan expenditure and funding;
(v) paper from the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer, entitled 'The 'InEx Review' dated 11 March 2008;
(vi) paper from the Director of Human Resources, entitled 'analysis of staff costs growth', dated 6 March 2008;
(NOTE: the latter two papers were not referenced on the original agenda, but were prepared for members of Council at the request of the meeting of PRC on 6 March 2008).

The Director of Finance presented the financial overview paper and drew attention to the continuing risks related to salary costs and the inability to grow research income. There were particular concerns about research income, given that other Russell Group institutions appeared to be growing income at a faster rate. In terms of the management account forecasts, the prediction was a loss on normal operations of c. £2m; there were considerable risks still related to the insurance claim, as explained under the Vice-Chancellor's report; it was hoped that this situation would be resolved by the end of the financial year. If the settlement was not received by the end of the financial year the University would see a significant reduction in cash resources, notwithstanding the drawdown of the £50m loan facility in September 2007.

Under this heading two additional papers had also been circulated, analysing staff cost growth and informing Council about the review of income and expenditure ('the InEx review') initiated by UEG. Presenting this group of papers together was intended to emphasise that to address the current financial position the University must take action both to reduce salary costs and increase income. Reducing staff costs would not of itself be sufficient to redress the balance. The University now had a much greater understanding of the different forces which were leading to the current situation, and how to address them, although more analysis needed to be undertaken particularly on the income side. It was clear that decisive action was needed, to prevent a significant problem from developing into a crisis which could hamper the University's academic endeavours.

The Director of Human Resources presented the paper on staff costs growth. Growth in salary costs at Southampton was comparable with rates in the rest of the Russell Group but slightly higher than average. The paper explained in some detail what was contributing to the growth path. Incremental drift had often been cited as a key factor and increments had a compound effect each year, but the cost of this was actually relatively low as a percentage of the whole increase. The key driver appeared to be the increase in headcount of both academic and administrative staff, together with increasing seniority - there was particular growth at level 7 (professorial level) and such staff were being paid more. There had been a deliberate policy to grow academic staff numbers in the run-up to the RAE, but what was now clear was that the University could not afford its current staffing levels given our failure to grow income at a commensurate rate. Lower growth rates in income at Southampton meant that salary costs were taking a higher proportion of income.

Professor Nelson presented some slides illustrating the University's position on research income growth in comparison with others in the Russell Group. He explained that the University was in a strong position to be able to respond to new cross- Research Council research themes, but would need to capitalise on its strengths to maximise the potential benefits. The review of research strategy recently presented to PRC, the new Enterprise Strategy, and the restructuring of Research and Enterprise Services should assist with this. It was however emphasised that it would take time for successes to have a financial impact.

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer presented the paper on the InEx project, and explained that while the increase in the number of MSA posts was only one part of the problem, this was the area in which it was possible to take greatest action in the short term, with the aim of rolling back the growth in MSA staff numbers which had occurred over the last five years. As a result of the ongoing MSA review he was confident that he would be bringing forward for Council in July a plan which would involve large-scale staff reductions in the financial year 2008-09, with the savings coming in 2008/09 and later years. Addressing the research income side of the equation (including driving behaviour changes to increase academic productivity) would take considerably longer, as there was a delay of anywhere between 9 and 18 months between putting in a research grant application and receiving any income. Increases in international student numbers should produce income growth quicker, although there was a once a year opportunity for student recruitment.

In discussion the following points were raised:

How aware were staff of the current position and the need to work corporately to address the situation? The Vice-Chancellor explained that issues relating to research income had been raised with Heads of Schools over at least the last two years (since the well above inflation pay award 2006 - 2009), and there had been a detailed discussion at the last Senior Managers' awayday. He was visiting every School to reinforce the messages. Professor Powrie confirmed that Schools understood the nature and scale of the problem; he was however concerned that action should not be taken in haste which could hamper the University's longer term academic endeavours.

The pattern of awarding grants was changing (eg more focus on 'big bids' rather than individual grants). This required more active management, so that the University would be in a position to respond quickly, and collaboratively, to opportunities. The restructuring of Research and Enterprise Services should assist with this. It was suggested that the University should be using professional bid writers, spending more time seeking market intelligence, etc. DVC Nelson confirmed that the University was moving in this direction - however, academic input would always be vital in any successful bid. It was noted that the University was still very successful in 'responsive mode' grants (behind only Cambridge and Imperial) but Research Councils were moving money out of responsive mode into "calls" for research that addressed interdisciplinary themes.

It was suggested that different incentives might be needed to encourage Schools and particular individuals. The Vice-Chancellor commented that the current incremental system gave 'rewards' to everyone, based on years of service, and this was a significant problem.

It was questioned whether there might be systemic problems within the University, given that other institutions appeared to be able to grow research income at a greater rate than Southampton. The Vice-Chancellor commented that UEG was still seeking to understand this problem. Detailed work was planned to analyse individual performances in terms of research income, within Schools, and then build up a broader picture from this - it seemed unlikely that there would be systemic influences which acted across all individuals in all schools.

It was questioned whether the current situation implied problems with the University's forecasting mechanisms - should there have been a greater awareness of these problems at an earlier stage? It was pointed out that the University had been fully aware of the position, and projections were monitored; however, information now available about our performance relative to our comparators had added a new dimension to the problem. Research income was also particularly hard to predict, and Professor Nelson had raised concerns over income trends in the past.

The aim of the new enterprise strategy was not simply to focus on developing spin-out companies

(although the university had been very successful in this area) but rather to encourage an 'enterprising culture' in all Schools, engaging more staff in enterprise activities in the broadest sense. An action plan to implement the strategy had been developed.

It would be helpful to have a prioritised list of actions – for example, what are the three most important things which could be addressed, to defined timescales, and with an indication of the savings or income growth which would accrue from each.

An overarching target needed to be set which would bring the University back into surplus. It was perhaps too soon in the process to be able to determine specific figures, but this should be done and shared with Council as soon as possible.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the Overview and commentary on the University financial position by Director of Finance; the Management Accounts with Forecast to End of Financial Year and commentary on variances and changes to expectations; the Cash flow report; and the capital projects expenditure report be noted.
 - (ii) That the analysis of staff costs growth be noted.
 - (iii) That the actions being taken to review income and expenditure (the InEx Review) be endorsed.
 - (iv) That a prioritised list of actions, with defined timescales, and an indication of the savings or income growth which would accrue from each, should be presented to the July meeting.

49 **HEFCE grant allocations**

49.1 **HEFCE recurrent grant allocation for 2008/09** (agendum 12.1)

Received A paper from the Director of Finance, dated 5 March 2008, entitled HEFCE Grant 2008/09.

The Director of Finance reported that HEFCE had indicated that later in the year there were likely to be opportunities to bid for additional student numbers for the financial years 2009/10 and 2010/11. The University should make a further bid if the opportunity arose, to underpin the teaching economy.

Resolved That the report be noted.

49.2 **HEFCE capital allocations** (agendum 12.2)

Received A paper from the Director of Finance dated 6 February 2008, entitled HEFCE Capital Investment Fund, setting out the University's HEFCE capital funding allocation for the period 2008-11.

Council was pleased to welcome the information regarding the capital allocations, which removed a significant financial risk to the University.

Resolved That the report be noted.

50 **University financial support for 100% owned subsidiary companies** (agendum 13)

Received A paper from the Director of Finance, dated 28 February 2008, requesting approval to provide letters of continued financial support to three University 100% owned subsidiary companies and Southampton Asset Management.

Resolved That letters be provided to confirm the University's continued financial support to Southampton Asset Management Limited, Southampton Innovations Limited, Manor Centre Limited and University of Southampton Consulting Limited.

51 **Update on 'red' KPIs**

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer reported that a paper had not been presented on this occasion as the significant remaining red issue '*pay agreement*' had been substantially covered under agendum 11 (minute 48). This would clearly remain a 'red' item for the foreseeable future.

The other 'red' item *health and safety* related to two specific cases which had both now been signed off with the Health and Safety Executive.

52 **Annual Diversity Report** (agendum 15)

Received The Annual Diversity Report 2007

In the absence of DVC Thomas, the Vice-Chancellor presented the report, referring members to the earlier presentation on these issues from the Diversity Manager. He emphasised that while it was clear from the report and presentation that progress had been made, there was still considerable work to be done, and distributed leadership was key to this. It was questioned whether the promotion of diversity was included in the job descriptions for those in leadership roles; the Vice-Chancellor agreed that this would be beneficial, and undertook to make enquiries.

At the request of members it was agreed that the updated race action plan would be presented to the July meeting.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the Annual Diversity Report 2007 be approved.
 - (ii) That enquiries would be made as to whether responsibility for promoting diversity was included in job descriptions for those in leadership roles and, if not, that this should be taken forward with Human Resources.
 - (iii) That the new race action plan would be presented to Council in July.

53 **Review of School of Nursing and Midwifery (SoNM), School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences (SHPRS), and the Healthcare Innovation Unit (HCIU)** (agendum 16)

Received A paper from Professor DM Williams, Professor J Hammond and Mrs S Lee, dated 6 March 2008, entitled 'A new single School comprising the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences, the School of Nursing and Midwifery and the Health Care Innovation Unit'; Letter from the President of UCU to Professor Williams, dated 28 February 2008, setting out a USU response to the new single school proposal (tabled).

Professor Williams presented the paper, reminding members of the background to the original review of the two Schools and the Unit, and Council's support for the proposal that SHPRS, SoNM and HCIU should form a 'consortium' by the end of the academic year 2007/8. After further work it was now proposed that this consortium take the form of a new single School, to present a more unified presence to external partners, and enable more rapid responses to strategic opportunities in a changing environment. Internally the new structure would provide greater financial resilience, and enable a more effective deployment of resources. He referred members to the earlier presentation from Professor Humphris which provided a context for these discussions and had drawn attention to the more integrated approaches now being taken in the health professions areas.

It was emphasised that although 1 August was set as the implementation date for the new School, it would not be the case that all new structures would be fully in place by then. Rather the new School would be formally regarded as in place from that date; the shadow framework and structures would be developed over the next few months and the new Head of School would then have a key leadership role in ongoing detailed planning after that period. Professor Hammond emphasised that the thinking about the structures for the new School needed to be closely integrated with the ongoing work of the MSA review. Staff needed to be put in place to take responsibility for running the new cost centre, to underpin the new School. Dr Gobbi commented that the management of the transition needed to take into account the nature of the academic year. The pace of change needed to accommodate the pressures of existing activities, to avoid destabilising ongoing business.

Would the new School be financially viable? Professor Williams emphasised that it was imperative this was the case. The original review had established a plan which would give one to two years of financial stability, but indicated that further work was necessary to address structural issues; this was now being done through the current project. The Director of Finance commented that implementation of the Benchmark Price had addressed the financial problem affecting the SoNM – therefore there was no reason why the new entity would not be financially viable. It was explained that the primary purpose of establishing the single School was not to save money, although savings should accrue from the

efficiencies inherent in operating a larger unit. It was pointed out that in the paper as presented it was not clear whether there were costs associated with forming the new School and what the ultimate savings were likely to be. For Council to take such decisions clearer information was needed about the financial implications. It was agreed that, while the decision on the specific proposals should not be delayed because of the lack of this information, the relevant financial details should be presented to the July meeting. In future where proposals were brought forward which had financial implications, the relevant figures should always be presented, even where the key drivers behind the proposal were not financial in nature.

Dr Gobbi commented that there had been some concerns as to whether the name 'Health Sciences' appropriately reflected the caring dimensions of the professions involved; it was however appreciated that it would be difficult to find a name of a reasonable length which fully described all the School's activities. The component groups were concerned not to lose their individual professional identities, which were particularly important for student recruitment and external relationships. The scope of activities within the new School needed to be clear. Members agreed that professional identities were important, and suggested that this might be achieved through a strapline. It was pointed out that there were other examples within the University where individual group identities had been effectively retained within a larger entity – for example, in the School of Engineering Sciences.

Attention was drawn to the letter from UCU to Professor Williams, which was tabled at this meeting at the Union's request. Professor Hammond commented that a key element of this letter was a focus on the need for clear communication with staff. This was regarded as a crucial component of the project, and there had been direct communication with staff through open meetings. He recognised that there were concerns about the speed of developments and ensuring appropriate staff involvement – again, communication was key to this, and the project team was fully aware of its importance. In terms of the Head of School appointment it had been agreed that such appointments were a management function, and that this role was no different to any equivalent appointment in another School. Therefore the job and person specifications had been made available to staff in the two Schools and the Unit for information, but not for consultation/comment. It was however emphasised that no decision about the appointment had been made, and there would be an open external competition.

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer gave notice in accordance with Ordinance 3.4 Part IV paragraph 14 that the proposal under consideration could lead to the dismissal of a member or members of staff by reason of redundancy under Part II Clause 7 of Statute 31.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Council endorses the establishment of a new single School comprising the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences, the School of Nursing and Midwifery and the Health Care Innovation Unit with effect from 1 August 2008, and that work should continue towards the implementation of the new School based on the rationale and framework set out in the circulated paper.
 - (ii) That the new School should be titled the School of Health Sciences with effect from 1 August 2008, but that due regard should be paid to concerns about any loss of professional identity for the component elements of the School.
 - (iii) That the letter from UCU dated 28 February 2008 be noted.
 - (iv) That the financial information concerning costs of establishing the new School and potential savings be presented to the July meeting for information.
 - (v) That in future where proposals with financial implications are brought to Council, the relevant figures should always be presented, even when the key drivers behind a proposal are not financial in nature.

54 **Committee Review** (agendum 17)

Received A paper from the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer dated 7 March 2008, entitled 'the Committee Review: a Short Summary of the Proposals'.

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer presented the paper, explaining that this provided preliminary information about the proposed 'direction of travel' for the committee review. The primary aims were to simplify the structure; build UEG formally into the structure, recognising the role it played in all significant University business; and reduce the amount of time which senior management spent in committees discussing business which had already been considered elsewhere. As well as the

formalisation of UEG the other key recommendations were the abolition of PRC, the increase in the number of Council meetings a year from four to six, and the introduction of two types of sub-committee for Senate and Council: 'compliance' subcommittees reporting directly to the parent Committee, and 'Executive subcommittees reporting to UEG and the parent Committee (which would take the place of the existing policy committees). Crucial to the proposals was a wish to involve lay members of Council to a greater extent in the development of strategy at an earlier stage – it was therefore intended that there would be lay representation on each of the Executive Committees.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- There was strong support for the principle that senior management should spend less time in committees discussing 'duplicate' business; it should also be clear that not every member of senior management was expected to attend every committee.
- Increasing the number of Council meetings would not necessarily of itself lead to shorter meetings. More thought was needed as to what business actually required discussion by Council or whether some matters might be addressed outside formal meeting, whether reports from other committees needed to be presented to Council in their current form, how paperwork could be reduced etc, to enable Council to focus on the issues of key strategic importance. Due regard would however need to be paid to wider governance issues. More attention should be paid to ensuring that Council was always fully aware of the financial impact of all its decisions.
- If the number of meetings was increased, and there was also an expectation that lay members would attend executive committees, then it was very unlikely every member would be able to attend every meeting; however this would not necessarily be a major problem, provided there was a commitment to the spirit of the proposal.
- There should be greater clarity as to what the University expected from its lay members, particularly if they were to be asked to give more time to the role. They would willingly do this provided it was clear that their input really added something to the process. Lay members needed to be better informed so that they could more effectively offer challenges to University management. The Vice-Chancellor was concerned that Council was put into positions where it was required to make decisions without fully appreciating all the related issues. Hence his feeling that lay members should be involved more rather than less, but this necessitated people putting in time to understand the issues.
- The informal sessions which Council had held on occasion (for example, regarding the estates strategy) had been very helpful, and there should be provision for this within the programme at least once a year. An awayday to discuss key strategic issues would be very valuable; however this should be regarded as one of the six meetings, not held in addition.
- Would six Council meetings a year be enough to deliver the same level of engagement for lay members and the same level of informed discussion as was currently experienced by those lay members who served on PRC? Six meetings was thought to be the best starting point; Standing Committee meetings could be called on an 'as needed' basis.
- It was important that Council should act as a governing and not a management body.
- One way for lay members to become better informed about the University would be to establish 'twinning' arrangements, whereby each lay member particularly learned about and developed a connection with, particular Schools or Services; the Vice-Chancellor agreed that this was something which might be considered, although it would be important that lay members not become 'advocates' for particular Schools or Services.
- Open advertising for lay members might help to bring in people with different types of skills. The Vice-Chancellor explained that the University had recently gone through such a process; however, as several of the likely candidates had not previously had any involvement with universities, it had been decided to seek to engage them through membership of policy (executive) committees in the first instance.

Resolved That the approach to restructuring the committee structure as set out in the circulated paper be endorsed.

55 **Governance matters: Amendments to the Statutes (First Reading) and Ordinances** (agendum 18)

Received A paper from the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer dated 3 March 2008 setting out proposed amendments to the Statutes and to the Ordinances, together with a rationale for these changes; revised version of the changes proposed (minor wording changes taking account the decision to retain the title 'Department of Student Services' rather than using 'Department of Student Resources').

Particular attention was drawn to the proposed amendment to Statutes Section 14: The Court. When the composition of Council was amended and the Chancellor and Pro-Chancellors were removed from membership, it had inadvertently not been identified that this would also remove them from membership of the Court, as they would no longer be included under current clause a. 'The Members of the Council'. The proposed amendment to the Statute rectified this. On a temporary basis, the Nominations Committee had proposed that Sir John Parker be appointed as a member of the Court under Class 10 (b), which would enable him to chair meetings of Court until the changes to Statutes were approved by the Privy Council (see minute 59.3).

Resolved

- (i) That the proposed amendments to the Statutes set out in Annex A (revised version) be approved on a first reading, subject to such amendments as the Privy Council may require.
- (ii) That the proposed amendments to Ordinances set out in Annex B (revised version) be approved.
- (iii) That pending Privy Council approval of the revised Statutes the revised Ordinances be brought into operation to the extent only that they are compatible with the existing provisions of Statutes; and that the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer provide any necessary guidance on this point.

56 **Strategic review of Counselling programmes** (agendum 19)

Received A paper from Professor Foskett, dated 29 February 2008, concerning the strategic review of Counselling programmes (Note this paper was circulated as confidential to members of Council).

In the absence of Professor Foskett the Vice-Chancellor presented the paper and reminded members that Counselling programmes and staff had been incorporated into the School of Social Sciences following the integration of all New College programmes into Schools. Over time, and after extensive consideration within the School, it had become clear that the programmes did not align strongly with the principal academic mission, strategic priorities and research aspirations of the School. The Head of School had therefore initiated a consultation on the future of the programmes, and as a result of this process and subsequent discussions the view had been taken that the future development of these programmes would be better realised by transferring them to another HEI in the region. Proximity to Southampton was a key consideration, given the nature of the student body. Three positive responses had originally been received; subsequently UEG had identified one institution as the preferred partner, as it offered a more natural 'academic fit'.

Members were advised that although financial considerations had not been the primary driver behind the original proposal, the subsequent introduction of the government's ELQ policy meant there would be financial advantages in no longer offering these programmes.

Resolved That the current position with regard to the review of Counselling programmes be noted, and that final recommendations on the future of the programmes should be brought to Council in July 2008.

57 **Report from the meeting of Senate held on 27 February 2008** (agendum 23)

Received The report from the above meeting of Senate.

Resolved That the comments and information provided by Senate be noted.

58 **Report from the meetings of Policy and Resources Committee**

58.1 **17 January 2008** (agendum 24.1)

Received The report from the above meeting of Policy and Resources Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor drew particular attention to item 3 'participation in collective negotiations through the Universities and Colleges Employers Association' and confirmed that it was the University's policy to remain part of the national negotiating machinery while this lasted, recognising that the existence of UCEA as a negotiating body was not guaranteed in the future.

Resolved That the report from, and the decisions taken by, Policy and Resources Committee be noted.

58.2 **14 February 2008** (agendum 24.2)

Received The report from the above meeting of Policy and Resources Committee.

Particular attention was drawn to the Fitness to Study Policy (item 4) circulated for Council's approval. Mr Snell commented that the circulated policy had been discussed in detail at Education Policy Committee and commended it to members. The Chair suggested that while the policy as written was very helpful, further work might usefully be undertaken to consider issues associated with more extreme cases, such as had occurred recently in America, and members agreed that this would be helpful. Dr Gobbi pointed out that, where applicable, Schools would have also fitness for practice policies, influenced by the requirements of the relevant Professional or Statutory Body.

Resolved (i) That the Fitness to Study Policy be approved.
(ii) That further work be undertaken to consider issues associated with more 'extreme' student behaviour and resulting danger to others.
(iii) That the report from, and the decisions taken by, Policy and Resources Committee be noted.

58.3 **6 March 2008** (agendum 24.3)

Received The report from the above meeting of Policy and Resources Committee (tabled).

Resolved That the report from, and the decisions taken by, Policy and Resources Committee be noted.

59 **Report from the meeting of Standing Committee of Council held on 17 January 2008** (agendum 25)

Received The report from the meeting of Standing Committee of Council held on 17 January 2008

Noted The report from the above meeting.

60 **Report from the meetings of Nominations Committee**

60.1 **8 November 2007** (agendum 26.1)

Received The report from the above meeting of Nominations committee (Members agreed that, given time pressures, they were content for those named in the report to remain in the room when the recommendations were considered, although those named would not take part in any discussion of their appointment or reappointment.)

- Resolved** (i) That Mr Mike Killingley, Ms Vanessa Lawrence, Mr Bob Purkiss and Mr Mike Snell be reappointed to Council, Class 2, for a further term of office of three years.
(ii) That Dr Martin Read be appointed as Vice-Chair of the Council for an initial term of three years, commencing on 1 August 2008.

60.2 17 January 2008 (agendum 26.2)

Received The report from the above meeting of Nominations committee

The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer explained that the appointment of Sir John Parker to the Court under Class 10(b) was necessary as a temporary measure, pending the approval of the proposed amendment to Statute 14 which would restore the Chancellor as an *ex officio* member (see minute 55.)

Resolved That Sir John Parker be appointed to Class 10 (b) of the Court for a three-year period or until the Privy Council approved the amendment to Statute 14.

60.3 6 March 2008 (agendum 26.3)

Received The report from the above meeting of Nominations Committee

Members were advised that reappointments were being proposed for two years because there were plans to review the role of Court.

Resolved That Mrs Drummond, Mrs Hubner and Dr Smith be appointed to Class 1 (i) of the Court for a two-year period which would expire on 31 July 2009.

61 Institutional Audit outcome (agendum 27)

In DVC Thomas's absence Professor Kilburn was delighted to report that the University had secured an overall outcome of 'confidence' both in the 'current and likely future management of the academic standards of awards' and in the 'soundness of current and likely future management of the quality of the learning opportunities available to students'. Nine examples of good practice were highlighted and five things identified which it was desirable (not mandatory) for the University to consider.

Resolved That the successful outcome of the Institutional Audit be noted with pleasure; and that all colleagues involved in the exercise, particularly DVC Thomas and Dr Giles, Acting Director, LATEU, be thanked for their work and congratulated on the outcome.

62 Health and Safety Matters

A brief written report on key health and safety issues would be circulated outside the meeting.

63 Report from the Development Office

Members were advised that, given time pressures, it had been agreed that this item would be deferred until July, when there would be opportunity for a longer presentation and discussion.

64 Annual Review, 2007 (agendum 30)

Received The University of Southampton annual review 2007

Members were reminded that the annual review was presented this year for the first time in its new format, including the annual statement of accounts.

Under this heading the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer was delighted to report that the 2007 University of Southampton Review, focussing on the University's activities related to Global Security, had won the Chartered Institute of Public Relations award for best publication.

Resolved (i) That the annual review 2007 be approved for submission to the Court.
(ii) That the award of the Chartered Institute of Public Relations prize for best publication to the University of Southampton Review 2007 be noted with pleasure.

65 **Development of University of Southampton Science Park Limited** (agendum 31)

Received A paper dated 7 March 2007 concerning the development of the Science Park

The Director of Finance presented the paper, explaining that detailed financial information was not included in the paper because this had already been considered in detail by USH Board, UEG and PRC.

UEG had supported the proposal to proceed with the development of Units 3 & 4 at the Benham Campus, in order to accommodate growth, and therefore supported the qualifying investment in USH to allow USH to make the investment in the Science Park. However, while recognising the value of developing a day nursery at the Science Park, UEG shared the USH Board's reservations about this on financial grounds, concluding that this did not appear to be a priority use of University resources at the present time, and therefore should not be taken forward at this point

Council supported the proposal, as put forward from UEG, recognising that this would mean that available income in the University would be reduced by around £400,000 in 2008/09 (this being the difference between the University's normal level of investment in the Science Park and the investment required).

Resolved That the proposed further investment in USH and ultimately the Science Park, associated with the development of Units 3 and 4 at the Benham Campus be endorsed.

66 **Valedictions**

The Chair advised members that this was Sarah Moore's last meeting, as she was unable to attend Council in July as she would by then have taken up employment. Members thanked Ms Moore for her contributions to the work of Council during her period as President of SUSU and wished her well for the future.
