



## Council

Date and time Thursday 15 March 2007 at 4.00 pm

Place The Council Room, George Thomas Building

Present Dame Valerie Strachan (*in the Chair*), Professor I T Cameron, Dr S J Deuchar, Dr S Duckworth, Professor A D Fitt, Professor N H Foskett, Dr M O Gobbi, Professor J K Hammond, Professor R Holdaway, Professor J D Kilburn, Mr M S Killingley, Ms V Lawrence, Professor P A Nelson, Mr B Purkiss, Professor M Ratcliffe, Dr M P Read, Ms R Rivaz, Mr B Rogers\*, Mr M J Snell, , Mr R H M Symons, Professor C A Thomas, Professor W A Wakeham, Professor A A Wheeler, Mr C Whittaker\*, Professor D M Williams and Mrs J Wood

By invitation Mr P Staniczenko for item 49 and Professor B Makhoul for item 51

With The Secretary and Registrar, the Director of Finance, and Dr K A Piggott

(\* Members not present for the restricted section of the agenda.)

## Unrestricted

### Welcome

Dame Valerie welcomed members to the meeting, in particular Mrs Jacky Wood, the new member in Class 4 (non-teaching staff). She had taken Chair's action on behalf of Council to approve the decision of the Nominations Committee to recommend this appointment, to enable Mrs Woods to attend this meeting (see minute 58).

Dame Valerie also took the opportunity to congratulate Mr Mike Snell who had been awarded the CBE in the New Year's Honours List.

Dame Valerie reminded members that this was the first meeting using the new pattern of a 4.00pm start with presentations, moving into the business meeting at 5.00pm.

### Presentations

Members received two presentations:

- Professor Bashir Makhoul on 'academic developments at Winchester School of Art'.
- DVC Phil Nelson on 'University research income'.

### Business meeting

#### 42 Obituary

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

Dr Charles Williams, a member of staff of the School of Engineering Sciences, and Manager of the School's Wind Tunnel complex, 11 February 2007.

Nguyen Duc Hung, Year 3, BEng Electrical Engineering, 23 February 2007.

George Patrick John Rushworth Jellicoe, 2nd Earl Jellicoe, Chancellor of the University from 1984 – 1995, 22 February 2007.

43 **Minutes (unrestricted) of the meeting held on 14 December 2006**

**Resolved** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2006 be approved and signed.

44 **Matters arising**

44.1 **Consultation on new structures for sector pay bargaining** (minute 25)

**Received** A copy of the University's response to the UCEA consultation on long-term pay strategy in Higher Education, dated 22 February 2007.

**Noted** The response.

44.2 **Annual Diversity Report 2006 /Disability Equality Scheme 2006-2009**  
(minutes 31/32)

A presentation and discussion on diversity matters would be arranged for a future meeting when Mr Strike was able to attend.

44.3 **Investment Funding for University Spin-Outs** (minute 34)

Members were advised that firm proposals regarding the next generation of investment funds for creating University spin-outs would be brought to Council in July.

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

The Vice-Chancellor reported on the following items:

*Research Council's Clawback*

There were to be significant reductions in Research Council budgets, because of pressures elsewhere in the DTI budget. End of year flexibility (EYF) had been reduced considerably. The EPSRC, from which the University received significant research funding, would be particularly hard hit, losing £29 million.

*Industrial funding of research*

There were significant ongoing difficulties regarding the unwillingness of UK industry to pay the full costs of research; the DTI were reluctant to become involved, preferring to leave this to individual negotiations. There were concerns that if Universities pressed the point, industry would simply move research contracts out of the country. This involved research which included contributions from public funds, and which should not therefore be regarded by industry simply as a business proposition. This was of particular concern now that the allocation of QR funding placed greater emphasis on working with industry (see minute 48).

*Institutional Audit*

Preparations for the QAA Institutional Audit were well in hand.

*Library House Report 'Spinning out Quality: University spin-out companies in the UK'*

This report highlighted the success of UK universities in attracting venture capital income to create spin-out companies, and presented Southampton's position in a very positive light relative to its American counterparts. Members welcomed this information and suggested that Southampton's success could be publicised more widely, including within the DTI.

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

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

Mr Rogers presented his report, and drew particular attention to:

- Plans for the Athletics Union to be more strategic in its allocation of funds, investing in excellence in sport.
- The continued success of the course representative system, such that Southampton was leading the country in this area.
- The establishment of new website about student safety in collaboration with Hampshire Constabulary.
- The effective provision of information to students directly affected by the capital programme; he thanked DVC Wheeler for the time he was putting into this.
- Ongoing discussions about ways in which SUSU and the University of Southampton Society might work more closely together.
- Students' views that despite increased fees they still saw a degree as a worthwhile investment, but would like information as to how additional fee income was being spent; he would work on this with DVC Thomas. The Vice-Chancellor said that he planned a debate with students on the fees issue, but it would be important to do this from a common understanding of the language and a shared information base.

On behalf of SUSU Mr Rogers thanked Mr Lauwerys for all his support and advice, particularly his willingness to give up time in a busy schedule to assist with difficult issues; he wished him well for his retirement, and hoped that he would stay in touch with the Students' Union.

**Resolved** That the report be noted, with thanks.

47 **Financial monitoring, 2006/07** (Agendum 11)

**Received** The financial monitoring statement for 2006/07, as at January 2007, comprising a summary of the overall forecast and trends, with accompanying tables, prepared by the Deputy Director of Finance.

The Director of Finance reported that, setting aside the income from the insurance claim and the sale of New College, which would be reported as exceptional items, a break-even position was predicted for the year. He drew attention to five key points:

Difficulties regarding the benchmark price had been resolved for 2007, which meant that the financial position of the School of Nursing and Midwifery should improve next year. There would be a one-year loss in the region of £500k, but the situation could have been significantly worse.

Progress was being made with the Capital programme. Much depended upon the individual projects being completed within their estimated budgets.

The new arrangements for the payment of tuition fees and bursaries had been introduced effectively. In some instances students were not able to access bursaries because they had not given permission for their financial details to be shared with the University. Work would be undertaken to promote the importance of providing this information.

The insurance claim in respect of the Mountbatten fire remained a major uncertainty and work continued on its resolution.

There was a projected increase in staff costs of 8.2%; this was the inevitable product of the current incrementally-based system and recent pay awards.

**Resolved** That the financial monitoring statement be noted.

48 **HEFCE recurrent grant allocation for 2007/08** (Agendum 12)

**Received** A summary of the HEFCE grant settlement for the financial year 2007/08 drawn up by the Director of Finance and dated 1 March 2007.

The Director of Finance presented the summary, commenting on the disappointing nature of the settlement for the University in relation to research. This stemmed from the decision to create out of existing QR funding a £60m fund to be allocated in proportion to earnings from industrial research contracts. This was an area in which Southampton was not performing well at present. It was therefore the introduction of 'the wrong metric at the wrong time', and illustrated effectively the potentially dangerous consequences for the University of using a metrics-based approach to allocate research funding. This was however likely to be the direction of travel, with an increasing focus on the application of research rather than excellence *per se*.

**Noted** The analysis of the grant announcement for 2007/08.

49 **Key Performance Indicators - Next Steps** (Agendum 13)

**Received** A paper from the Head of Planning, dated 8 March 2007 setting out proposed Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for the University, with proposals for performance assessment and presentation of performance indicators.

The Head of Planning presented the paper, reminding members of the work previously brought to Council in September 2006.

Members were broadly supportive of the CSFs chosen and the approach taken; good progress had been made and colleagues were to be thanked for their work. Some concern was expressed about the time-lag in the availability of data, but it was recognised that this was an almost inevitable consequence of a 'cyclical' system such as operated in the HE sector. In response to a query from Mr Rogers it was confirmed that, with the exception of CSF 1 ('respond effectively to changing demands'), from which all others flowed, the CSFs were not listed in order of importance. Mr Rogers suggested that estimated expenditure might be given against each of the CSFs, but he was advised that this information would be very difficult to disaggregate.

The Vice-Chancellor advised members of new arrangements currently being put in place across the University to encourage greater engagement with risk-management.

**Resolved** That the critical success factors and method of presentation set out in the circulated paper be adopted, and that further work be undertaken to develop the underlying metrics, with a view to presenting CSFs using 'live' data to Council in July 2007.

50 **Strategic Review of the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences, the School of Nursing and Midwifery and the Health Care Innovation Unit** (Agendum 14)

**Received** A report on the strategic review of the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences (SHPRS), the School of Nursing and Midwifery (SoNM) and the Health Care Innovation Unit (HCIU), prepared by Professor Williams and dated 1 March 2007; summary paper setting out the recommendations contained in the review.

Professor Williams presented the review report. Subsequent to the decision that the SoMM should be reviewed alongside SHPRS an agreement on benchmark pricing had been reached, which meant that SoNM would be sustainable in the longer term. This agreement had however had little effect on SHPRS, which could not in its current position achieve long-term financial stability. In academic terms however the School's research was strong, and its educational programmes were highly regarded nationally.

The Vice-Chancellor commented that Policy and Resources Committee (PRC) had expressed concerns that the response from the SoNM to the report indicated that the School's own view of its sustainability in the coming years was overly optimistic, and therefore unrealistic. PRC had therefore asked Professor Williams to explore this further with the Head of SoNM.

Dr Gobbi emphasised that SoNM had been able to generate a surplus in the past. It was confirmed that the financial projections did not make assumptions about additional income streams for the School which were not yet active.

In discussion the following points were raised:

The Vice-Chancellor advised members of the benefits to the institution of remaining engaged in healthcare education. Healthcare was likely to be a growth area for the country, given changing demographics, and Southampton was unusual in the Russell Group in being engaged in such a wide range of these activities. It was however important that the activities were financially sustainable. This was particularly difficult because the NHS was not an easy partner.

Healthcare was likely to be defined much more broadly in the future and there was scope for closer collaboration between all Schools in the Faculty of Medicine, Health and Life Sciences and other parts of the University.

Clearly the details involved in the establishment of the consortium would be key. There were queries about the level of School autonomy within the proposed consortium – for example, would the consortium or individual Schools be the primary budget holder? Might it be appropriate at this juncture to consider more radical steps, such as the appointment of one overall Head? It would be important that developing the consortium did not inadvertently block other interdisciplinary developments. Previous discussions about creating an Institute of Health Sciences had not been well supported, but it might now be that the consortium should develop along these lines, while retaining an identity for the Schools involved.

The impact of the formation of a consortium on student perceptions and recruitment was questioned. It would be important to ensure that the best staff were retained during the transitional period.

The recent difficulties in these Schools had caused them to look hard at their internal organisation, and had identified an opportunity for streamlining. There were presumably lessons which could be learned to apply across the institution, and there might be scope for undertaking similar exercises in other areas where the University was not yet under pressure.

Members endorsed the recommendations in the report, and emphasised the importance of taking forward possible lessons which might be learned for the institution as a whole, in terms of streamlining.

**Resolved** (i) That the SHPRS, SoN&M and HCIU should establish a consortium by the end of the academic year 2007/08, which would enable their academic strengths to be developed on a sustainable financial base.

- (ii) That the SHPRS should restructure itself to reflect the reduction in student numbers, and that this work should begin without delay, with a view to completing the restructuring over the same timescale as the consortium is established.
- (iii) That a new Head for SHPRS should be identified without delay, to succeed Professor Briggs when he retires in October 2007.
- (iv) That the decision of PRC that Professor Williams be asked to explore with SoNM the School's response to the strategic review, with a view to drawing up a more robust response to the challenges that faced the School, be endorsed.

51 **Monitoring report on the Winchester School of Art (WSA)** (Agendum 15)

**Received** A report prepared by the Head of School, Professor Makhoul, on the progress made by WSA in relation to the School's strategic plan approved in March 2006.

Members were reminded that when the strategic plan was approved Council had requested a monitoring report one year after implementation. In presenting the report Professor Foskett emphasised the progress made by the School particularly towards meeting the financial targets, and in recruitment. It was confirmed that the School was almost certain to meet its financial target for 2007/8. Mr Rogers commented that SUSU would be very pleased to work with the School management, particularly to ensure effective communication about the changes in the student experience. DVC Thomas confirmed the importance of working with SUSU, and ensuring an equivalence of experience for students at WSA; she recognised that there were difficulties, for example in relation to service provision.

**Resolved** That the report be noted, and that the School be congratulated for its work towards achieving the targets set.

52 **Textile Conservation Centre** (Agendum 16)

**Received** A report prepared by Professor Foskett, entitled 'the Textile Conservation Centre – future options'.

After detailed consideration of the issues the University Executive Group (UEG) had concluded that the financial position of the Textile Conservation Centre (TCC) was unsustainable and that a range of options for the Centre's future should be explored. Six options had been identified to bring forward to Council, as set out in the paper, but discussions at UEG and PRC had concluded that options 1 (do nothing) and 6 (reorientation of the TCC and integration of selected programmes into WSA) should not be pursued. Professor Foskett outlined the remaining options for members.

The Vice-Chancellor reported the outcomes of his recent meeting with the Lord Douro, the Chair of the TCC Trustees. Lord Douro held that the TCC was an extremely valuable asset for the University, which was so important that it should be sustained despite its making a financial loss (which was relatively small in the University's overall budget). He felt that the University should bear responsibility for the lack of success of the Centre, particularly the lack of recruitment. He was prepared to accept that a different configuration for the Centre might be necessary, but would be reluctant to see a move to another HEI. Sir John Parker, the new Chancellor, had received similar feedback from the former Chair of the TCC Trustees.

In discussion the following points were raised:

The submission prepared by the Director of the TCC was probably an accurate assessment of the prestige with which the TCC was regarded, and there were a

number of high-profile people who were concerned about its future. The move of TCC to the University had been heralded as a significant development and there were therefore potential public relations problems for the University if the decision was now taken to close it.

Further clarification was sought as to why option 6 was no longer under consideration. It was explained that this was because there were issues of strategic fit within WSA – the School's focus was now no longer on history/conservation.

Give the prestige of the TCC, would there be value to the University in sustaining it, as contributing something unique within the totality of the University's activities? The Vice-Chancellor commented that there were some activities which were so strategically significant, and crucial to defining the University's identity, which would be sustained even if not financially viable (eg physics and chemistry). While important, the work of the TCC was not in this same category of strategic significance. When the TCC was brought into the University the expectation had been that it would become a self-sustaining unit. It was now clear that this would not be possible. It therefore either had to be retained as a loss-making activity (subsidised by the rest of the university) or radical action needed to be taken.

Recruitment issues were considered – was there scope to improve recruitment with better marketing etc, or was there simply no market for the programme the TCC was prepared/able to offer? It was noted that option 5 (rationalisation of TCC and transfer to the School of Humanities) included the offering of Masters and undergraduate programmes – however the association with disciplines such as archaeology and history would give a different academic profile. There would also be no conservation services attached to the activity.

It was suggested that option 5 might be looked at particularly closely, as this would potentially avoid some of the public relations difficulties. It was however emphasised that concerns about public relations should not be the primary driver for decision-making; publicity issues could be managed if necessary.

**Resolved** That exploration of options two, three, four and five should continue; and that a recommendation regarding the preferred option should be brought to Council for decision in July.

### 53 **International College** (Agendum 17)

**Received** A paper prepared by Professor Foskett and the Director of Finance, dated 2 March 2007, proposing the setting up of a feeder international foundation college, working with a private partner, to equip international students to enter the University's programmes; Brief background information about the business affairs of Kaplan International Limited, the proposed private partner.

In presenting the paper and the proposed arrangements Professor Foskett emphasised that the strategic purpose of the development was as a recruitment tool to drive the growth of international student numbers, and not to set up an international college for its own sake. The business plan must be seen in this light. Students recruited into the college would progress to the University's programmes provided they met the required standards. The University currently put considerable effort into international recruitment; this development was a step-change to enable a significant increase in numbers which was unlikely to be achieved by other means.

In discussion the following points were made:

Kaplan International Limited had a strong international reputation and experience of operating two international colleges in the UK (with a third opening in

September). These two colleges were both achieving the numbers they expected, and demand was at the upper limits of expectations.

The University had taken some time to decide on the best external partner; there would be a detailed Due Diligence process before any contract was signed. The chosen partner was felt to be the best market fit, as well as providing the best financial deal. This partner was committed to working with Russell Group institutions only (other than their existing arrangement with Nottingham Trent), and was planning to operate only 5-7 colleges, spread across the UK. It was however recognised that other organisations might open competing colleges.

SUSU had been consulted about the proposal and was fully behind it, as a development which would further internationalise the University and was thus good for all students. The increase in student numbers would have implications for SUSU, but could be managed. It would be important to ensure that facilities and student services did not become overcrowded.

In terms of the financial risk, the University would need to lease and refurbish office space in Southampton, at a cost of c. £750k in the first year and c.£250k thereafter. Should there be a problem with operating the college in the early years the University could use the space to move other activities off campus. The next risk would be in bringing the college onto the Highfield or Avenue campus for 2010/11, and this was being considered within the estates plan; any new build would be designed flexibly so it could be used for different purposes.

It was questioned whether the college might involve other disciplines subsequently. While the specific answer to this was not known it was emphasised that the private partner was very market aware.

While being aware of the potential risks members welcomed the proposal and supported the University in its endeavours.

**Resolved** That, subject to reaching contractual agreement, to include Due Diligence, the establishment of the International College with Kaplan International Limited be approved on the basis of the proposal and the timeline set out in the circulated paper.

54 **Governance matters: Amendments to the Charter and the Statutes (First Reading) and to the Ordinances** (Agendum 18)

**Received** A report from the Secretary and Registrar, dated March 2007 with detailed papers setting out proposed changes to the Charter (annex A), Statutes (annex B), and Ordinances (annex C), with a rationale for the changes; errata paper relating to the amendments to Statute 31.

The Secretary and Registrar drew attention to the rationale for the proposed changes, particularly the revised Statute 31 and associated definitional Ordinances. He reminded members that changes to the Charter and Statutes required two readings by Council and must then be submitted to the Clerk to the Privy Council for final approval. The intention was for the second reading to take place at a special meeting of Council on 10 May 2007. The Ordinances could be amended by Council by a majority of at least two-thirds of those present and voting, and no second reading or Privy Council approval was required. In both cases consultation with the Senate was required, and the Secretary and Registrar drew particular attention to the detailed consultation with Senate members and the UCU which had been undertaken in relation to Statute 31. He also highlighted the issues which had been raised when the proposed changes were considered by Senate on 28 February, together with the management response now presented to Council.



Members supported the proposed changes without dissent.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the proposed amendments to the Charter set out in annex A be approved subject to such amendments as the Privy Council may require.
  - (ii) That the proposed amendments to the Statutes set out in annex B and the associated Errata paper be approved subject to such amendments as the Privy Council may require.
  - (iii) That the proposed amendments to Ordinances set out in annex C be approved.
  - (iv) That pending Privy Council approval of the revised Charter and 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 Secretary and Registrar (Registrar and Chief Operating Officer from June 2007) provide any necessary guidance on this point.

55 **Report from the meeting of Senate held on 28 February 2007** (Agendum 20)

**Received** The report from the above meeting of Senate.

Attention was drawn to the change in the student complaints procedures (item 2 appendix 1) which removed the provision for students to submit a grievance to Council. The purpose of the change was to speed up the procedures, given the easier access to external review of student complaints now available through the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. Council had previously given its agreement in principle to this change (July 2006, minute 77).

**Resolved** That the unrestricted report from Senate be noted.

56 **Report from the meetings of Policy and Resources Committee** (Agendum 21)

56.1 **18 January 2007**

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

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

56.2 **15 February 2007**

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

Attention was drawn to item 2 *the University pension scheme PASNAS* and the decision to increase the employers' and employees' contributions to 14% and 6% respectively. It was possible that staff and the relevant Trades Unions might raise objections to this.

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

56.3 **8 March 2007**

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

In relation to item 2 relating to *Chancellors' Courts* the Secretary and Registrar stated that the formal report had now been received. The conclusion was that there had

been failures in the project management of the work, but there was no evidence of dishonesty or fraud. Appropriate management action would be taken, and the full report would be considered by the Audit Committee.

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

57 **Report from the meeting of Standing Committee of Council held on 18 January 2007** (Agendum 22)

**Received** The report from the above meeting of Standing Committee of Council.

In relation to *item 4 INNOS Limited*, DVC Nelson was pleased to report that the contract with Polymer Vision had now been signed.

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

58 **Report from the meeting of Nominations Committee held on 15 February 2007** (Agendum 23)

**Received** The report from the above meeting of Nominations Committee (tabled).

It was explained that the report had been tabled to enable the Secretary and Registrar to complete consultation with nominees before recommendations were made to Council.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Mr Rex Symons be nominated for reappointment as Vice-Chair of Council for a period of one year immediately after his current term of office expires on 31 July 2007.
  - (ii) To note that minor changes to standing order 24(5) to eliminate the stipulation that appointments and reappointments of officers or members aged 70 or over requires a two-thirds majority vote by Council in favour will be brought to Council in due course.
  - (iii) That Dr Stephen Deuchar, Dr Stephen Duckworth and Mr Andrew Jukes be reappointed as Class 2 members on the expiry of their current membership for a further term of three years.
  - (iv) That Dr Martin Read be reappointed as a Class 2 member on the expiry of his current membership for a further year until 31 July 2008.
  - (v) That the action of the Chair of Council in approving the appointment of Mrs Jacky Wood to Council in Class 4 membership for an initial period of three years, from 1 March 2007, be endorsed.
  - (vi) That Dr Harris, the Chair of the Board of the NHS South Central Strategic Health Authority be invited to become a member of the Court for an initial period of three years, from 1 March 2007.
  - (vii) That the following members of Court in Class 10 (b) be reappointed for a three-year period: Professor Forbes, Mr Jay, Mr Keightley, Mr Packham, Dr Sharland, and Professor Sir William Taylor.

59 **Health and Safety Matters** (Agendum 26)

59.1 **Deputy Vice-Chancellor's Annual Health and Safety Report 2007**

**Received** The annual report from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor responsible for overseeing health and safety across the University, dated February 2007, highlighting key health and safety issues to be taken forward during the current year.

**Resolved** That the report be noted.

#### 59.2 **External Review of the Health and Safety Office**

**Received** A report from the DVC Nelson, dated 19 February 2007, to update Council on the outcomes of the external review of the Safety Office commissioned by the Director of Human Resources, and the action taken subsequently.

**Resolved** That the report be noted.

#### 59.3 **Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Improvement Notice issued under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974**

**Received** A report from the Vice-Chancellor, dated 7 March 2007, to advise Council of the outcomes of an HSE inspection of the BRF Unit, Tenovus, which had led to the issuing of an HSE letter to the Vice-Chancellor and a formal Improvement Notice, and outlining the actions now required by the University in order to comply with the HSE's recommendations.

The Vice-Chancellor commented that the outcome was particularly disappointing because there had been no significant changes since the previous inspection, when the results had been entirely satisfactory. An extension was to be sought from the HSE to comply with the Improvement Notice, as it was not possible to purchase the necessary equipment to implement the interim solution within the timescale; informal feedback was that this would be acceptable to the HSE.

**Resolved** That the report be noted, and that Council be informed of progress at its next meeting.

#### 60 **Incorporation of the Russell Group** (Agendum 27)

**Received** A paper reporting the successful incorporation of the Russell Group on Tuesday 6 February 2007 as 'The Russell Group of Universities', Company Number: 6086902.

**Resolved** That the Incorporation of the Russell Group be noted.

#### 61 **Annual Review, 2006** (Agendum 28)

**Received** A printed brochure entitled 'University of Southampton Review'.

Dame Valerie advised members that while this document was of significant interest to members of Council, and might be forwarded to the Court for information, it should not be regarded as the formal annual report and as such did not require approval.

#### 62 **Valediction**

Dame Valerie reminded members that this was the Secretary and Registrar's last meeting before his retirement. On behalf of members, Dame Valerie thanked him for his tireless work in support of Council; he held the institutional memory and his knowledge and advice had been invaluable to successive Chairs. She wished him a long and happy retirement.

The Secretary and Registrar thanked the Chair for her kind words, and presented Council with an engraved gavel, which was ceremonially used to close the unrestricted part of the meeting.

+ + + + +

## Restricted

### 63 Minutes (restricted) of meeting held on 15 December 2006

**Resolved** That the Minutes (restricted) of the meeting held on 15 December 2006 be approved and signed.

### 64 Matters arising

There were no matters arising from the restricted Minutes of the meeting on 15 December 2006.

### 65 The Vice-Chancellor's report

**Received** A report concerning the appointment of the new Registrar and Chief Operating Officer, *vice* Mr Lauwerys (tabled).

**Resolved** That the appointment of Mr Simon Higman as Registrar and Chief Operating Officer with effect from 1 June 2007 be formally approved and noted with pleasure.

### 66 Report (restricted) from meeting of Senate held on 28 February 2007

**Received** The report (restricted) from the above meeting of Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor was pleased to highlight the conferment of the title of Emeritus Professor on Professor Joe Hammond, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering Sciences and Mathematics, with effect from the date of his retirement from the University.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the list of promotions to the title of Reader, and to the grade of Senior Lectureship, Principal Research Fellow and Principal Teaching Fellow, as set out in Annex 1 to the report, be noted with pleasure.
  - (ii) That the title of Emeritus Professor be conferred upon Professor J Hammond with effect from the date of his retirement from full-time service of the University.
  - (iii) That the restricted report from Senate be noted.

### 67 Report from Review Groups for the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences (Agendum 37)

**Received** A report from the Director of Human Resources, concerning the implementation of the recommendations related to staffing as set out in the linked report considered as an unrestricted item (minute 50). A paper from the University and Colleges Union (UCU) headed 'UCU response to the strategic review of the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences, School of Nursing and Midwifery and the Health Care Innovation Unit – Report to Council', dated 12 March 2007.

It was noted that having approved the recommendation that there should be some restructuring of the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences, this implied a reduction in the number of staff. The recommendations in the paper from the Director of Human Resources concerning the establishment of a redundancy committee therefore followed as a consequence.

Particular attention was drawn to the paper submitted by UCU expressing concerns about the proposed levels of staff reductions.

- Resolved**
- (i) That it is desirable that there should be a reduction in academic and administrative staff in the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences as outlined above.
  - (i) That, in accordance with (i) above, a Redundancy Committee of Council be established to give effect to the decision and report back to Council on the numbers of redundancies and individuals selected by it September 2007 meeting.
  - (ii) That pursuant to Section 31, Part II, of the Statutes, the following appointments to the Redundancy Committee be approved or delegation be given to the Chair of Council to approve names later proposed:  
A Deputy Vice Chancellor (as Chair),  
Two lay members of Council,  
Two representatives of Senate.
  - (iii) That all possible steps be taken to avoid the need for compulsory redundancies by exploring redeployment, early retirement and voluntary severance.
  - (iv) That a report on the steps taken be considered at the September 2007 meeting of Council in the light of recommendations made under (ii) above.

68 **Report from Review Group for the Textile Conservation Centre** (Agendum 38)

**Received** A report from the Director of Human Resources, concerning the implementation of the recommendations related to staffing as set out in the linked report considered as an unrestricted item (minute 52).

Council was being asked to set up a redundancy committee in advance of deciding the most appropriate option for the Centre; this was an enabling resolution, and the committee would not be activated unless it was needed; however, having the mechanism in place would speed up the process, and thus reduce uncertainty for affected staff.

Some members were however concerned about this, as resolving that 'it is desirable that there should be a reduction in academic, research and support staff in the TCC as determined by the options identified' could appear to pre-judge the final decision. After a brief discussion it was therefore agreed that this item would be withdrawn pending a final decision on the desired options.

+++++

The meeting finished at approximately 7.30 pm.

Ref CC9/3

J:\Legal Services\Secretariat\COUNCIL\COUNCIL\MINUTES\march07.doc