



Council

Date and time	Thursday 23 March 2006 at 5.00 pm
Place	The Council Room, George Thomas Building
Present	Dame Yvonne Moores (<i>in the Chair</i>), Ms B Barker, Professor I T Cameron, Ms H Chadwick, Dr S J Deuchar, Professor A D Fitt, Professor N H Foskett, Professor J K Hammond, Ms K Harper*, Professor R Holdaway, Mr A J Jukes, Professor J D Kilburn, Mr M S Killingley, Ms V Lawrence, Professor P A Nelson, Sir John Parker, Professor M Ratcliffe, Dr M P Read, Mr M J Snell, Dame Valerie Strachan, Mr R H M Symons, Professor W A Wakeham, Mr A J Walker, Professor A A Wheeler, Professor D M Williams and Mr A Wilson*
By invitation	Dr H G Harley
With	The Secretary and Registrar, Director of Corporate and Marketing Services, Director of Estates and Facilities, Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources and Ms C J Gamble

Unrestricted

Welcome

Dame Yvonne welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular those who were attending their first Council meeting: Professor Foskett and Professor Ratcliffe. She also welcomed Mr Symons to his first meeting of the governing body since he had taken up the appointment as Vice-Chair of Council and Dr Harley, Senior Executive Officer in the Vice-Chancellor and Secretary and Registrar's offices, who was attending the meeting as an observer.

Turning to the agenda, Dame Yvonne reminded members of the addition of Agendum 42 in the restricted section which considered one of the academic programmes at the Winchester School of Art: the History and Theory of Art and Design. The item was one aspect of the report on the strategic plan for the School under Agendum 18.3. It had been circulated electronically on 21 March 2006 and was double starred.

36 Obituary

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

Kevin Alexander, Foundation Year student in the School of Engineering Sciences: 27 January 2006;

Professor Christopher Brumfit, School of Humanities; Head of the School of Education (1997-2000); Dean of the Faculty of Educational Studies (1990-1993 and 1996-1999); Head of the Department of Education (1986-1990); appointed Professor of Education in October 1984: 18 March 2006.

37 **Minutes (unrestricted) of the meeting held on 15 December 2005**

Resolved That the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2005 be approved and signed.

38 **Matters arising**

Corporate performance indicators (Minute 22.1)

The Vice-Chancellor reported that it had not proved possible to complete the task in time for the March meeting and that a revised set of corporate performance indicators would be presented to the Council meeting in July 2006.

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

The Vice-Chancellor reported on the following items:

Student applications

There had been a fall of approximately six per cent in the number of applications for the academic session 2006/07 that had been received by the University when compared with the same period last year. There appeared to be no trends discernable in the pattern of applications in any particular subject area across the sector.

Outcome of bid for new School of Dentistry

The University had not been successful in its bid to establish a new School of Dentistry in partnership with Portsmouth University and in collaboration with King's College.

The Secretary and Registrar stated that he intended to raise, through the Higher Education Regulation Review Group, the matter of the time and cost involved in preparing bids. It had been estimated that around £1m had been spent on the work involved by those institutions which had submitted bids. If the application criteria had been framed more clearly, institutions might have concluded that it would not have been in their interests to apply.

Disputes in matters of intellectual property

The University had lost the case against IDA Limited on appeal to the Court of Appeal and damages had been awarded. It was an important case for the University, and for the sector, because it had highlighted flaws in some of the procedures that had been followed. The Vice-Chancellor emphasized that the lessons that had been learned from the case would be relayed to staff within the Schools as soon as possible. He would also consider how best to make the information available across the sector.

The University had also been unsuccessful in its dispute with Statoil. It was hoped that those involved would arrive at a negotiated settlement. Every effort had been made to tighten up the procedural aspects relating to the commercial exploitation of the University's intellectual property.

European Institute of Technology

The Commission of the European Union had drafted plans for the setting up of a European Institute of Technology (EIT) to improve Europe's research profile and to rival the standing of institutions like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The proposals would entail research intensive universities seconding their best teams to work for the EIT. The Universities UK, the group which represented higher education institutions collectively, had presented alternative proposals. The Vice-Chancellor believed that establishing a European research institute in this way would be to the detriment of the University's success in research. He invited members of Council to convey the University's views to appropriate Government Departments and European agencies if they were presented with an opportunity to do so. Professor Nelson would be able to brief members of the detail of the proposals.

AUT/NATFHE dispute

The Vice-Chancellor summarized the background to the current dispute in respect of the national, annual salary negotiations between the Universities and Colleges Employers' Association (UCEA), and two of the Trades' Unions in the sector, the Association of University Teachers (AUT), which represented academic and academically related staff, and the National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE). The Unions had voted to strike on 7 March 2006, and thereafter to carry out action short of a strike, which would amount to the partial withdrawal of their members' labour. This would involve, among other things, members' refusing to carry out certain activities, such as the setting and marking of examinations. From the information available locally, it appeared that only a minority of the AUT members had taken strike action. However, the picture nationally differed from institution to institution.

The Vice-Chancellor said he had judged that, at this stage, imposing salary deductions on those who had indicated that they were participating in the action would serve only to exacerbate the situation. The matter would be monitored closely and reviewed after the Easter vacation as the start of the examination period approached. Whatever steps were considered, all would depend on the developments at the national level.

Dame Valerie suggested that the University should determine its general policy on the deduction of salary in the context of industrial action, but not to do so when a dispute was in progress.

Appeal against VAT tribunal

The University had lost its appeal against the decision of the VAT Tribunal. Because the VAT amounts involved in the case had been paid, the ruling would not affect the annual year-end accounts. In the long term, the position regarding VAT recovery on publicly funded research looked unfavourable, but there would be some compensating VAT savings in regard to a number of new buildings under construction.

40 **Report from the President of the Students' Union** (Agendum 5)

Received The report from the President of the Students' Union.

Mr Wilson, the President of the Students' Union, introduced his report. He drew attention to the appeal against the decision of the City Council's Licensing

Committee to limit the Union's public music and dancing licence to 1.00 am which had been upheld in part: the Union had been granted two late night openings until 2.00 am.

Highlighting the list of sporting achievements, Mr Wilson was pleased to report that five current and former students would be competing at the Commonwealth Games in Melbourne in March 2006: Gary Hunt (synchronized diving); Chris Jones (swimming); Rachel Parrish (double-trap shooting); Gail Strobridge (swimming); and Rob Tobin (athletics). Ms Parrish had won a gold medal in the pairs event, and a silver in the singles.

All had benefited from the University's sports bursary scheme and the Government's Talented Athlete Scholarship Scheme.

Resolved That the report be noted.

41 **Financial monitoring, 2005/06** (Agendum 11)

Received The financial monitoring statement for the academic year 2005/06, as at February 2006, which comprised a summary of the overall forecast and trends, together with accompanying tables, prepared by the Deputy Director of Finance.

In presenting the financial monitoring statement, the Director of Finance said that he wished to draw attention to three particular areas:

- the tight financial control that was being exercised by the Schools; in the main, they were close to their budgetary targets. The Professional Services group had achieved a similar position, although within the group, the deterioration in the position of Estates and Facilities and Information Systems Services and been mitigated by the large positive variance achieved in Business and Community Services as a result of delayed maintenance work and the postponement of the demolition of South Stoneham Tower.
- the surplus, on a financial accounting basis, which indicated a surplus of approximately £6.9m (Table 6).
- the estimated uninsured loss in respect of the consequences of the fire in the Mountbatten Building in October 2005 which had been reduced from £3m to £2m. Nevertheless, the amount remained an estimate at this stage.

Dame Yvonne thanked the Director of Finance for his overview and invited members to note the comments made in the monitoring statement.

Resolved That the financial monitoring statement be noted.

42 **HEFCE recurrent grant allocation for 2006/07** (Agendum 12)

Received A summary, drawn up by the Director of Finance, of the grant settlement for the academic session 2006/07, awarded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), together with comparative data per unit of assessment and for a number of institutions.

The Director of Finance presented the summary, stating that the recurrent grant settlement for the University was disappointing. The total income was close to the institution's initial budgetary projections at approximately £300k under the forecast figures. When adjustments had been made to take account of the changes in the level of activity and the allocation of specific grants, the main grant settlement had increased by 3.8 per cent, compared with last year's funding. The increase across the sector had been calculated at 4.2 per cent on average.

The Funding Council had announced the release of funds to support research capital expenditure on buildings and equipment over a two-year period from 2006/07, allocated in proportion to the quality-related aspect of the grant and research capability funds, in order to cushion the impact of the change in the allocation of the widening participation element of the teaching grant. The University's share of this fund would amount to £1.496m in each year.

The Director of Finance emphasized that the relatively small uplift in the HEFCE grant reflected the tightness of the financial position of the University and the limits that this would impose on future plans.

Resolved That the report be noted.

43 **Review of effectiveness of Council and compliance with the guidelines published by the Committee of University Chairmen** (Agendum 13)

Received The report from the Working Group, established by Council, to carry out the periodic review of the effectiveness of the governing body and to assess its compliance with the Committee of University Chairmen's guidelines, together with Part I of the *Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK* and an edited analysis of questionnaire responses.

Mr Symons, who had chaired the Working Group prior to his appointment as Vice-Chair of Council, outlined the methods that had been used by the group to carry out its assigned tasks, and presented the main findings of the report. He drew attention to the second recommendation of the report which stated that the membership of Council should be reduced from 37 to 27. The proposed size of Council was broadly in line with the Committee of University Chairmen's (CUC) benchmark of 25 members, quoted in its *Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK*.

Commenting on the deliberations of the Working Group in respect of the size and composition of Council (section 4 of the report), the Secretary and Registrar said that the proposed membership of 27 had been arrived at after having considered the different constituents represented on Council, the requirement that a lay majority be maintained, and the role of the principal groups in the committee structure that reported to the governing body. The rationale behind the proposal would be detailed in the governance statement which was published in the Statement of Accounts at year end. He added that the change that was proposed amounted, in effect, to a reduction in the size of Council by seven members because the Chancellor and two of the Pro-Chancellors did not normally attend meetings. He reiterated the comments that he had made at the meeting of Council in March 2005 on the University's high level of compliance with the CUC Guide. He expressed the view that any further requirements laid upon higher education institutions could be considered as unnecessary and unwelcome given the current regulatory framework.

In discussion, the following points were raised about the report and the questionnaire:

- The comments made in the questionnaire on the perception of Council and its role suggested that more work should be done on explaining what the governing body did. The Council web page would help inform people about Council and its members and therefore it was important that the further work that was required in respect of the website should be completed as soon as possible.
- It was suggested that the most difficult responsibility for Council members to discharge was the one of strategic oversight. Members had to be fully briefed on matters of strategic importance, but not involved in drawing up the detail of policy or strategy. The steps taken to discuss with Council the problems facing, and the possible developments at, Boldrewood were a good example of how to ensure that the governing body was involved in the decision-making process at the appropriate level.
- The proposed membership under Class 3 (Members appointed by the Senate) listed three Deans and three other members with the proviso that, in the event that the number of Deans increased, a mechanism should be introduced to determine which Deans would serve on Council (subsection 4.6). Professor Hammond suggested that further consideration should be given to this eventuality. The Secretary and Registrar said that the overriding consideration had been to secure a majority of lay members.
- Should the restrictions regarding the consideration of 'restricted' matters that referred to individual members of staff or individual students by student representatives be lifted thus allowing them to participate in the discussion of all the items considered by Council? The Secretary and Registrar explained the background to the agreement between the National Union of Students and the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals that had been reached in the 1968 when the first steps had been taken to involve student representatives in the role of University governing bodies. This introduced the principle that student members should not be present for any matters relating to staff or other students, but that they should be considered as equal members on all other issues.
- Was it timely to consider a review of the role of Court? The last review had been held in 1994. Although Senate and Council had recommended the abolition of Court, the Court, as the supreme governing body at the time, had not endorsed the proposal.
- Council might benefit from more frequent reviews of its effectiveness, possibly on a three-yearly cycle. In parallel to this, more thought needed to be given to introducing assessing the effectiveness of members. The other element that contributed to the governing body's effectiveness was the servicing of Council, but this particular aspect had been discussed in the report and recommendations had been brought forward.

Concluding the discussions, Dame Yvonne thanked Mr Symons for the work that had been carried out by the Working Group.

Resolved (i) That the proposals contained in the report be approved and implemented as soon as practicable.

- (ii) That, when appropriate, arrangements be made by the Secretary and Registrar for further discussions to be held on the points raised above, in particular:
 - Changes to the Statutes to allow students to participate in discussions on matters defined as 'restricted'.
 - The abolition of the Court of the University.
 - The introduction of three-yearly reviews of effectiveness and the appraisal of Council members.
- (iii) That Council record its appreciation of work undertaken by the Working Group.

44 **Estate Strategy** (Agendum 14)

Received A copy of the University's Estate Strategy, compiled by the Director of Estates and Facilities, and dated 27 February 2006.

A presentation by Deputy Vice-Chancellor Wheeler which was entitled, 'Estate Strategy, 2006-2021'.

The Vice-Chancellor reminded members of the proposal that the Estate Strategy should be considered in two stages. An overview would be presented first by Professor Wheeler. Members would be invited to comment on the document generally, and to raise any particular points or questions. Those matters would be discussed at the next scheduled meeting of Council in July 2006. He thanked Mr Monaghan, the Director of Estates and Facilities, and his staff for the considerable amount of work that had gone in to preparing the Strategy.

Professor Wheeler introduced his presentation, describing, in broad terms, the vision for the Estate: its design would be aligned to the University's academic priorities of delivering world-class education, research and innovation, giving the institution a competitive advantage among its peers, at home and abroad, and allowing it to sustain its development. The process of articulating this vision had started with the drawing up of the Corporate Strategy and the policy statements that underpinned its aims.

There were clusters of issues that would have to be tackled which included: integrating the transport and car-parking facilities; developing and managing the space available for academic activities; developing a variety of distributed and central social spaces; and ensuring that the services' infrastructure was environmentally sustainable.

Professor Wheeler illustrated the scale of the ambitions that had been drawn up for the fifteen year period from 2006 to 2021. They ranged from undertaking only restorative work at Boldrewood to embarking on what could be considered transformational projects for the University. Each was set alongside a barometer of risk, rising from low to high. Maintaining the status quo, for example, was considered to be of a low risk order compared with undertaking projects that would transform Boldrewood and rejuvenate the Highfield campus; these were considered to be high risk. He invited members to comment on the document and on the presentation.

The following points were raised:

- What was the spread of capital on the vertical (risk) axis? The Director of Finance responded that, over a fifteen-year period, it was the degree of risk that rose considerably, depending on the type of project that was undertaken and the corresponding level of disruption to the University's activities. There was not a significant difference in the capital spend over the period.
- In the longer term, a 'low risk' approach to developing the Estate might transpire to be a high risk strategy because it would fail to assist the University to achieve its aims. The affordability of the Strategy should be set out in greater detail; this information would also help members quantify the risks involved. The section entitled 'Financial Envelope' (p72) quoted expenditure of approximately £302m within the next five years, scaled down to around £250m after taking account of lead times and possible delays.
- Maintaining the status quo held little attraction. It would be useful to consider alternative capital investment profiles over different periods, in addition to drawing out the implications of changing some of the current expectations about the working day, for example, if driving to work were to be discouraged, how would the current transport system be affected?
- It was suggested that the section devoted to the future of the Estate (section 4, pp 45-71) would serve as a good starting point for considering the pace at which developments might be undertaken, and to look at the detail of the arguments for and against centralized, as opposed to local, control of managing resources such as teaching space. It would also provide an opportunity to consider what changes might be expected in higher education in the longer term beyond 2021 and what level of flexibility should be built into the future plans to ensure that the Estate could sustain the University's development.
- It was observed that many of the failings of the Estate should have been addressed at an earlier stage. Members supported the proposal to proceed with the demolition of Boldrewood (Building 62).
- Members expressed their appreciation of the work that had been undertaken by all those involved to bring the Estate Strategy to fruition.

Members endorsed Professor Wheeler's proposal that, because of the complexity of, and the interrelationship between, the issues, a number of sessions should be organized to discuss the points that had been raised in discussion. Dame Yvonne asked whether it would be appropriate to set up a working group of Council members who would consider the detail of the Strategy. She invited members to inform her if they would be willing to take on this task. In the meantime, the first briefing session would be organized on the day of the meeting of Council, scheduled to take place in July 2006.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the plans to proceed with the demolition of Building 62 be supported and that the necessary steps be taken by the senior officers of the University.
 - (ii) That the issues and points raised above be explored in greater depth; and that the first session should be scheduled to take place on the day of the meeting of Council on 13 July 2006.

- (iii) That the Secretary should arrange for copies of the presentation on the Estate Strategy to be circulated to members of Council.

45 **Report from meeting of Senate held on 1 March 2006** (Agendum 17)

Received The report from the meeting of Senate, held on 1 March 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the award of the 2006 Paterson Medal, one of the three principal awards given annually by the Institute of Physics, to Professor Leighton, a member of staff in the Institute of Sound and Vibration Research.

Resolved (i) That the honours and distinctions reported by Senate and the Vice-Chancellor be noted with pleasure.

- (ii) That the unrestricted report from Senate be noted.

46 **Reports from meetings of Policy and Resources Committee**

46.1 **18 January 2006** (Agendum 18.1)

Received The report from the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee (PRC), held on 18 January 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor introduced the report. He explained that three of the items – the fire in the Mountbatten Building, the Strategic Plan for the Winchester School of Art and the contractual arrangements between the National Oceanography Centre, Southampton and the Natural Environment Research Council – would be discussed as part of the two subsequent reports from PRC.

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

46.2 **15 February 2006** (Agendum 18.2)

Received The report from the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee, held on 15 February 2006.

A tabled paper, prepared by Professor Wheeler, on developments with Lloyd's Register, dated 20 March 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor introduced the report and invited Professor Nelson to present the Consultancy Policy (Item 1).

Professor Nelson stated that the aim of the Policy was to provide a source of information and help to members of staff, whatever their areas of expertise, when undertaking consultancy and to bring transparency to the process. Consultation with the Heads of School and Professional Services had taken place at every stage during the drafting of the Policy. Professor Nelson wished to record his appreciation of the work done by Mr Axford, the Consultancy Manager in the Centre for Enterprise and Innovation.

Before presenting his report which had been tabled, Professor Wheeler stressed to members that the content of the report was strictly

confidential. The paper summarized the developments that had taken place since the meeting of Council in December 2005. A series of high level meetings had taken place with key political and governmental stakeholders. The master plan programme envisaged that Lloyd's Register would relocate its Marine Operations Division in 2009 or early 2010, and, in preparation for this, the lecture theatre block at Boldrewood would have to be demolished in the summer of 2007 while temporary lecture theatre facilities would have to be set up for the academic year 2007/08. This would involve additional costs. The date of Lloyd's Register's intended move would accelerate the University's plans which would otherwise have been introduced over a longer period. The joint announcement by the University and Lloyd's Register had been postponed until April 2006, after Lloyd's had completed consultations with its staff and its Board of Directors had formally agreed to the proposals.

The Vice-Chancellor outlined the most recent discussions with Lloyd's Register, emphasizing again the confidential nature of the subject. The change to the timetable would present considerable risks and increased costs to the University. He reminded Council that initially Lloyd's had indicated that it wished to move in 2008 but the University had concluded that it was not in a position to meet this target date. A later date (December 2009/early 2010) had been agreed, but this remained a challenging timescale for the University. Lloyd's had confirmed that the increased costs of approximately £10m that would be incurred would not be for its account.

The Vice-Chancellor said that much thought had been given to securing funding from other agencies. The South East England Development Agency would consider the possibility of providing some funding for a University project, but, under state aid rules, it would not be permitted to support a scheme that involved a company. The Vice-Chancellor expressed his concern that Lloyd's would abandon its plans if the University was unable to absorb the additional costs of £10m. He invited members' views on the way forward.

Members asked the following questions and made a number of suggestions:

- Was it likely that Lloyd's would accept any of the other options that had been presented to Council in September 2005? Professor Wheeler said that the most appropriate of the other options would involve setting up flexible laboratory space and demolishing other areas. It was not a cheaper option.
- The focus of discussions should concentrate on the options that enabled the University to take steps to solve the failings of Building 62 as quickly as possible.
- What would be the consequences of Lloyd's withdrawal from the proposed plans? The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be difficult to quantify. In his view, the company's relocation would benefit the University's standing enormously and enhance the City's profile in the region and nationally. There would be some financial loss.
- Professor Wheeler reminded members that if the plans did not go ahead, with or without the relocation of Lloyd's, in the timescale that had been planned for the School of Management, its

professional accreditation would be affected. Furthermore, the risks attached to demolishing the lecture theatres at Boldrewood were high because the planned changes would directly affect students and staff.

Dame Yvonne invited members to indicate whether, in the light of the facts and views presented at the meeting, they supported the proposal that the senior officers of the University should continue the negotiations with Lloyd's Register to secure agreement to the plans that had been outlined in Professor Wheeler's paper. In taking the negotiations forward, the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to accept the additional costs that had been described in the presentation of up to £10m, but, in any event, he would endeavour to secure the best possible arrangement for the University. Furthermore, he should explore whether the costs could be mitigated by virtue of securing support from the South East England Development Agency, if the plans permitted the Agency's involvement.

The majority of members endorsed the three points of the proposal.

The Secretary and Registrar referred to the item on the rebuild of the Mountbatten Building (Item 5), reporting that the initial concept design of £91m was far in excess of what could be afforded. The Mountbatten Advisory Group had redefined the technical brief and a revised costing was expected within the next two weeks.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the Consultancy Policy be approved; and that the appreciation of Mr Axford's work be noted.
 - (ii) That the negotiations with Lloyd's Register should be taken forward on the basis agreed in the discussions set out above.
 - (iii) That the report from, and the decisions taken by, the Policy and Resources Committee be noted and endorsed.

46.3 **8 March 2005** (Agendum 18.3)

Received The report from the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee, held on 8 March 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor introduced the report, drawing attention to the first item on the Winchester School of Art. One particular aspect of the School's strategic plan had been included in the restricted agenda (Agendum 42), and would be discussed later in the meeting.

Professor Foskett summarized the content of the appended strategic plan which had been drawn up since the appointment of the Head of School, Professor Makhoul, in March 2005. The plan set out the detail of the recovery strategy for the School which was geared to returning it to a position of financial surplus within four years. The implementation of the plan would entail a review of the structure of the current complement of staff.

Dr Deuchar said that, although the plans were exciting in prospect, he was concerned that the proposed increase in the number of students combined with a restructuring of the staff might lead to difficulties with the delivery

of the academic programmes. Was there sufficient depth of staff and was the estimated future number of students overly optimistic?

Professor Foskett explained that the forecasted growth of student numbers and the plans for the portfolio of programmes had been based on a careful market analysis. The international element of recruitment had focused on the development of compact arrangements with a number of universities in China. There was confidence in the leadership of the School to deliver the challenging strategy. The Vice-Chancellor added that the plans, as formulated, were the most appropriate way forward for the School and for the University.

Members were content to endorse the Strategic Plan for the School and noted that a monitoring report would be presented to Council one year after the plan's implementation.

Referring to the item on the agreement concerning the operation and management of the National Oceanography Centre, Southampton (Item 3), the Secretary and Registrar said that the agreement that would replace the current Memorandum of Understanding would bring to a conclusion the discussions that had taken place during the year with the Natural Environment Research Council.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the Strategic Plan for the Winchester School of Art be endorsed; and that a monitoring report be presented one year after the implementation of the Plan.
 - (ii) That the principal elements of the new agreement between the National Environment Research Council and the University relating to the operation and management of the National Oceanography Centre, Southampton be noted.
 - (iii) That the report from, and the decisions taken by, the Policy and Resources Committee be noted and endorsed.

47 **Report from meeting of Standing Committee of Council held on 18 January 2006** (Agendum 19)

Received The report from the meeting of Standing Committee of Council, held on 18 January 2006.

Resolved That the report from, and the decisions taken by, Standing Committee of Council, be noted and endorsed.

48 **Report from the meeting of the Nominations Committee held on 9 November 2005, 18 January 2006 and 8 March 2006** (Agendum 20)

Received The report from the meetings of the Nominations Committee, held on 18 January 2006 and 8 March 2006.

(Sir John Parker withdrew from the meeting for the discussion of Agendum 20.)

Dame Yvonne presented the two proposed appointments, set out in the report, the first of which, the Pro-Chancellorship, had been presented to Senate in accordance with the University's Statutes.

Members approved with acclamation the nomination of Dr Gillings as Pro-Chancellor and the recommendation that Sir John Parker be appointed the Chancellor of the University.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Dr Dennis Gillings be appointed to Council as Pro-Chancellor for an initial term of three years from 1 April 2006.
 - (ii) That the recommendation that Sir John Parker be appointed as Chancellor for an initial term of five years from 1 August 2006 be endorsed and submitted to Court for approval.

49 **Incorporation of the Russell Group: Memorandum and Articles of Association** (Agendum 25)

Received A report, prepared by the Head of Legal Services, on the proposed incorporation of the Russell Group, together with a covering letter from the Executive Director of the Russell Group and a draft copy of the Memorandum and Articles of Association.

Resolved That the content of the draft Memorandum and Articles of Association be approved, and the comments in the Executive Director's letter, dated 14 March 2006, be noted.

50 **Chairmanship of Council**

The Secretary and Registrar led a valediction to Dame Yvonne who would stand down as Chair of Council after the meeting. He reminded members of Dame Yvonne's long period of membership, commencing in 1994 as a lay member, followed by her chairmanship from May 2000. On behalf of Council and the University, he thanked her for the sterling work that she had carried out and for her dedication to the role. She had been unstinting in the time and effort that she had devoted to the University, and to the higher education sector, specifically in the role of Deputy Chairman of the Committee of University Chairmen and as a member of the Council for Industry and Higher Education.

Dame Yvonne thanked the Secretary and Registrar, responding that she had enjoyed the role and the responsibilities enormously. She paid tribute to the lay officers with whom she had worked - Sir John Fairclough, Dr Bruce Smith, Mr Godfrey Whitehead and Mr Alan Walker – to the members of Council, and to the senior officers and the academic members of the University. She thanked the Secretary and Registrar, and members of the Secretariat, for their help and support throughout her period of office.

+++++

Restricted

51 Minutes (restricted) of meeting held on 15 December 2005

Resolved That the Minutes (restricted) of the meeting held on 15 December 2005 be approved and signed.

52 Matters arising

There were no matters arising from the restricted Minutes of the meeting that had been held on 15 December 2005.

53 The Vice-Chancellor's report

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there were no matters that he wished to raise as part of his report.

54 Report (restricted) from meeting of Senate held on 1 March 2006 (Agendum 36)

Received The report (restricted) from the meeting of Senate, held on 1 March 2005.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the recommendation in Annex 1 concerning the recommendations of promotion of Dr Berndt and Dr Quinn in the Faculty of Engineering, Science and Mathematics: the recommendation should read, respectively, Principal Research Fellow and Principal Research Engineer.

- Resolved**
- (i) That, on the recommendation of the Academic and Research Staff Committee, the title and status of Professor be conferred upon Dr J Scanlan with effect from 1 February 2006.
 - (ii) That the list of promotions to the title and status of Reader, and to the grade of Senior Lecturer, Principal Research Fellow, Principal Research Engineer and Principal Teaching Fellow, as set out in the amended Annex 1 to the report, with effect from 1 March 2006, be noted with pleasure.
 - (iii) That the title of Emeritus Professor be conferred upon Professor R d'Inverno and Professor P Cook, with effect from the date of their retirement from full-time service of the University.
 - (iv) That the title of Honorary Readership be conferred upon Dr S Debener with effect from 1 March 2006.
 - (v) That the restricted report from Senate be noted.

55 **Winchester School of Art: Foundation Year and Year Zero**

Received A progress report from the Director of Human Resources on the steps taken to implement the recommendations set out in the report from the Redundancy Committee in respect of two programmes of study at the Winchester School of Art.

Resolved That the report from the Director of Human Resources on the current position concerning the Foundation Year and Year Zero be noted.

56 **School of Biological Sciences: Report from the Redundancy Committee**
(Agendum 41)

Received The report from the Redundancy Committee that had been established by Council in December 2005 to consider the position of the School of Biological Sciences.

A copy of correspondence, dated 20 March 2006, addressed to all members of Council from the Southampton Local Association of University Teachers (SLAUT), responding to the recommendations of the Redundancy Committee, together with a petition that had been signed by members of staff across the University, appealing against the redundancies.

A statement from the School of Biological Sciences Management Team, responding to the statements made in the letter from SLAUT addressed to members of Council, which was tabled.

Dame Yvonne announced that she had received a personal letter from a member of staff within the School of Biological Sciences about the redundancy criteria. She confirmed that she would respond to the individual concerned, reiterating the position.

The Director of Human Resources presented the report in the absence of the chair of the Committee, Professor Thomas. He wished to report a number of developments that had occurred since the report had been compiled:

- a further meeting had been set up provisionally to consider the position of the experimental officers and technical staff. The date suggested was 3 May 2006.
- additional information had been provided in respect of Dr Lillycrop who, as a result, would be moved out of the pool of staff who were being considered for redundancy.
- a further three members of staff had agreed either to voluntary severance or early retirement (Dr Barber, Dr Bennett and Dr Peddie), while discussions were under way with two members of staff with a view to reaching a similar outcome. The number of staff in the pool that did not meet the selection criteria was thus revised from eleven to seven.

The Director of Human Resources requested that a further two weeks be granted to allow the discussions with the two members of staff to continue. He wished to be able to take whatever steps were possible to avoid the need for compulsory redundancies.

Members endorsed the recommendations brought forward by the Redundancy Committee, and agreed that their implementation should be delayed for two weeks to allow the Director of Human Resources to complete the negotiations that were under way.

Professor Williams paid tribute to the Head of School, Professor Shepherd, who had conducted the enormously difficult process of review and preparation for the restructuring with great sensitivity and integrity. He outlined the future structure optimistically, stating that, academically and financially, the School would be in a position to flourish.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the academic staff in the School of Biological Sciences be reduced by up to seven members.
 - (ii) That those members of staff whose names were listed in the Redundancy Committee's report, subsequently revised in line with the update from the Director of Human Resources, be dismissed by reason of redundancy.
 - (iii) That the efforts to avoid compulsory redundancies be continued until the latest possible date.

57 **Winchester School of Art: History and Theory of Art and Design**

Received A report from the Director of Human Resources, dated March 2006, which set out in detail one element of the Strategic Plan for the Winchester School of Art (Agendum 18.3).

Dame Yvonne reminded members that the paper dealt with one particular aspect of implementing the Strategic Plan for the Winchester School of Art. The proposed portfolio of courses would not include the academic programme 'The History and Theory of Art and Design'. It would be phased out. No students had been recruited at the start of the current year; the last cohort of students would be expected to graduate in July 2007.

Members endorsed the proposals contained in the report.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Council agrees that it is desirable that there should be a reduction in the academic staff at the Winchester School of Art, specifically those members of staff employed wholly or mainly to teach on the History and Theory of Art and Design programme until it closed.
 - (ii) That, in accordance with (i) above, a Redundancy Committee be established to give effect to the decision.
 - (iii) That, pursuant to Section 31, Part II, of the Statutes, the Redundancy Committee should comprise a Chair, two members of the Council, not being persons employed by the University, and two members of the academic staff nominated by the Senate.
 - (iv) That, the Chair, on behalf of Council, should appoint the two members of Council to serve on the Committee, and, that the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of Senate, should appoint the two members of the academic staff.

- (v) That all possible steps be taken to avoid the need for compulsory redundancies by exploring redeployment, early retirement and voluntary severance.
- (vi) That a report on the steps taken be considered at the July 2006 meeting of Council in the light of the decisions taken under (ii) above.

+++++

The meeting finished at approximately 8.00 pm.

Ref CC9/3

j:\secretaria t\council\minutes\march06.doc