

**LANCASTER UNIVERSITY**

**Minutes of a meeting of the Council  
held on 15 December 2000**

**PRESENT:** Mr J. B. Heron (in the chair), Vice-Chancellor, Professor N. Abercrombie, Mrs E. M. Blamire, Councillor A. C. Bryning, Mr H. A. Cann, Miss H. E. Clish, Professor R. B. Davies, Mr W. M. Davies, Mr H. Dawson, Professor R. Deem, Mr P. R. Elliott, Dr P. G. S. Entwistle, Professor K. A. O. Fulton, Mr P. Graham, Mr M. Hart, Mrs C. T. Hensman, Mr G. A. Inkster, Lord Judd, Mr H. Owen, Dr C. C. Park, Professor M. I. Reed, Mr K. Royales, Mr A. Whitaker.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr C. Adams, Ms F. M. Aiken, Mr R. Daly, Mrs M. M. Gardner, Mr W. S. Lunn, Mrs M. E. McClintock, Ms T. McGrath, Mr E. T. McGregor, Mr A. Madeley, Mr H. Morris, Mr T. Spence, Ms V. Tyrrell, Ms V. C. Walshe.

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Mrs P. Askew, Mr A. Dick, Mr B. Everett, Mr R. W. Goodall, Dr R. B. Henig, Ms C. A. Johnson, Mr P. M. W. Lewis, Mr J. Rawlinson, Professor P. Rowe, Mrs G. L. Webb, Ms J. M. Whiteside.

**CO.2000/62 Farewell to departing members**

The Pro-Chancellor, on behalf of the Council, thanked the following members for their services to it:

Professor R. Deem;  
Mr P. Graham;  
Dr J. Groves.

**CO.2000/63 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2000 were confirmed.

CO.2000/64 Matters arising

CO.2000/49: Nurse Unit

A member noted his concern about the university apparently wishing to become more involved with a non-core activity, and about the state of the relationship between the university and its medical practice. He was glad that a resolution of the situation had been achieved.

The University Secretary reminded the Council that the university had previously been paying the salary costs of nurses that had no reporting line to it. A suite of contracts with the medical practice had now been signed, the relevant nursing staff would be managed by the university, and medical protocols would be put in place so that the nurses could operate within their own competence and within the supervision of the practice as appropriate, thus giving legal protection to the university. The nurse unit, which would be a facility for the main areas of risk to students, would be advertised to students as soon as the paperwork had been completed.

The Director of Finance, in response to a question about the relocation of the Health Centre to new premises on the Bailrigg site, indicated that the developer with whom the university had negotiated a lease had intended to complete the new building by the end of July 2001. Because of various delays the building would not be completed by this deadline and the medical practice would therefore continue in Bailrigg House for the time being, although some minor modifications within the building would give the university access to the first floor. The discussion of the longer-term developments in this area, as part of the Estates Strategy, had temporarily been suspended.

In answer to a question about a further meeting of the Council working party about the Nurse Unit, the Council was told that the rate of progress on negotiations would govern the date of the next meeting.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive the above report.

CO.2000/49: Chemistry transfer

Document: VC/00/R459

The Council received a paper setting out an assessment of the impact on the university of the transfer of the Polymer Chemistry group to the University of Sheffield.

CO.2000/50(a): Student recruitment

Document: VC/00/R440

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to tabled figures showing that in the last few days it had become evident that the university had under-recruited not only on home and EU, full-time undergraduates, but on postgraduates (taught and research) and part-time students (undergraduate and postgraduate taught), resulting in a total of up to 427 full-time equivalent students and drawing the university into the range where clawback of funds by the HEFC(E) was possible. The Academic Planning Committee, at a meeting held the previous day, had considered what factors might have contributed to this shortfall. While members had accepted that postgraduates were discouraged by growing indebtedness, a particular concern about the nature of Lancaster's postgraduate schemes of study had been identified, since there continued to be a tendency for departments to mount courses that they found interesting, rather than to consider what it was that would appeal to the student market. The financial consequences of under-achievement in the core business of teaching were casting a shadow over future financial projections.

The University Secretary drew attention to a paper setting out actions being taken in order to improve recruitment for 2001, and noted that the modest increase in funds recently approved by the Budget Review Group would also be available for postgraduate recruitment. In answer to questions, the Council was told that it was too early in the current academic year to evaluate how Lancaster's recruitment patterns compared with the rest of the sector: a number of adverse factors had all moved together. In addition, for the first time, a proportion of postgraduate students who had firmly accepted places had not arrived at Lancaster to take them up. The Council was however invited to note that the figures for part-time undergraduate students, especially for Continuing Education who admitted students throughout the year, were not yet in a final form.

In discussion the following points were amongst those made:

- (a) that the Vice-Chancellor was to be congratulated for his candid presentation of the current student numbers, and that comparative information with other institutions was important;
- (b) that in addition to the content of schemes of study, the Council might have a concern about favourable variances in departments that could indicate difficulties in attracting high quality staff. The Council was assured there were no significant staff vacancies and that the volume and quality of staff for the 2001 research assessment exercise was expected to be as high as in 1996;
- (c) that the university must safeguard all aspects of its provision, including both course content and student facilities;

- (d) that the quality of the city and region was also a factor in attracting students to the university.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to receive the reports;
- (ii) to ask that a full report on all types of student recruitment, including comparative information, and coupled with the university's marketing strategy for students, be presented to the Council at its meeting in March 2001.

*CO.2000/50(e): LU Archaeological Unit*

Professor Davies reminded the Council of the negotiations, previously reported to it, about the future of the LU Archaeological Unit. He was pleased to report that, after other options had been tried but had not achieved success, a verbal agreement with the Oxford Archaeological Unit had been reached on 11 December, by which it would take on the Lancaster unit as a northern arm of its business with effect from 1 February 2001. This solution, which was subject to final agreement, would place the LUAU under the management of a high quality educational trust, and would do so at somewhat less cost than the cost of closure.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive the report.

CO.2000/65 Finance and General Purposes Committee: chairman

*Ref: CO.2000/61*

PROPOSAL (Council Search Committee): that Mr D. Dunn be appointed to the chair of the Finance and General Purposes Committee for the period 11 February 2001 to 31 July 2004.

PROPOSAL (Nominations Committee): that Mr D. Dunn be co-opted to the Council in the room of Mr H. A. Cann with effect from 11 February 2001.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to approve the above proposals;
- (ii) to put on record its appreciation of Mr Cann's outstanding chairmanship of the committee since 1997, his energy and input into many aspects of the university's business, and his wider help and support for its activities.

CO.2000/66 Vice-Chancellor's report

The Vice-Chancellor and others reported on the following items of significance.

(a) *QAA subject reviews*

The Vice-Chancellor reported that two recent subject reviews had resulted in a maximum score of 24 for Religious Studies, and a score of 23 for Politics and International Relations.

(b) *Future government funding for higher education*

*Document: extract from a CVCP circular*

The Vice-Chancellor noted that, following a rally of all campus trade unions except the AUT on 13 December, peaceful lobbying prior to the Council meeting by members had taken place. The issues had been well set out by the trade unions: the first was pay, where systematic underfunding of the university's sector had led to a relative decline. Secondly was the implementation of the Bett proposals, where there were two main issues: the mechanisms for negotiation, and the multiple recommendations of the Bett Report, all of which had cost implications.

The trade unions, except for AUT, had legitimately balloted their members about strike action in respect of pay and the implementation of Bett, including pay bargaining and the role of a national council, and the outcome had been support for industrial action short of a strike. Lancaster had given its institutional view on these matters earlier in the year, as part of a comprehensive process of consultation with employers by UCEA, and the result was a clear mandate to UCEA to maintain the present position. There was therefore a lot of controversy surrounding the implementation of the Bett Report, but the picture was fluid. It was nevertheless the case that progress on key recommendations in the report was dependent on additional government funding for the sector.

The Vice-Chancellor's management advisory group had carefully considered all the above issues but had concluded there were no grounds to alter the advice already given to UCEA; that is, for its role in national pay negotiations to continue, alongside the practice of handling terms and conditions locally. Until further information was forthcoming from UCEA or the HEFC(E), the Vice-Chancellor would not recommend change.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to a tabled CVCP note about the £1 billion additional funding for the sector, confirming his view at the previous Council meeting that the steady decline in funding was to be reversed but that the additional funding, much of it earmarked, would not necessarily bring significant new money into the university. In particular, the £50 million for the financial year 2001-02 would have to cover the recruitment and retention of staff and the modernisation of management processes, as well as a fair and negotiated settlement for non-teaching staff, and would in any case be divided between all the higher education institutions. While the Vice-Chancellor had considerable sympathy for the trade unions, the new government funding would not address some fundamental problems.

The Vice-Chancellor concluded by inviting the Council to acknowledge the commitment and hard work of staff at all levels, especially over the past five years, when their efforts had been a major factor in the university's rate of recovery. A process of work intensification had taken place, but while this was widely recognised, it was not clear how adequate rewards could be made available without extra funding.

The following points were made in discussion:

- (a) the university's willingness to get round a table with the campus trade unions was welcome, and even more of the same process should take place;
- (b) while top-up fees were not expected under the current government, the Council had set up a working party to help the university take a position on them;
- (c) vice-chancellors should be encouraged not to adopt immediate market solutions but to act in a unified manner over an agreed approach for higher education;
- (d) while it was correct that the university had never to date entered into national negotiations on terms and conditions of service, there was disappointment amongst members of the campus trade unions that the university appeared to wish to ignore the recommendations of the single most important report on employment issues for many years. There would inevitably be problems if the university appeared to ignore the recommendation for a national council or declined to discuss it, even in principle.

(Subsequent to the meeting, the UCEA Board announced its intention to conduct a formal consultation in the new year on longer term strategy, on shorter-term considerations about the new national bargaining machinery, and on potential approaches to terms and conditions.)

(c) *Raising the university profile*

The Vice-Chancellor reported that he wished the important issue of raising the profile of the university to be a standing item on the Council agenda. He indicated that a recent dinner that he had hosted had been a success in this area, and recent press cuttings showed positive messages about the university achieving a wider circulation. He had also asked all heads of departments to put this item of business on their next departmental agendas.

(d) *The fundraising programme*

*Document: VC/00/R436*

The University Secretary drew attention to a report setting out action taken with respect of fundraising, including the appointment of Iain More Consultants. This represented a change in strategy, since the new firm would both raise funds but would also transfer skills in fundraising to members of the university, as well as making use of the idea of an Annual Fund that could be regularly topped up. They had advised that it would be beneficial to establish a paper organisation in the USA that would enable donors to comply with the requirements of the US Internal Revenue Service. The costs of the campaign would be separately identified in the monthly management accounts, and regular reports on progress would be made to the Council.

In answer to questions the Council was told:

- (a) that the change to an in-house operation would require the appointment of extra staff, but approval of such appointments would have to follow the normal procedures and such appointees would be required at least to cover their costs;
- (b) the sum of £156,000 over two years for the consultants would cover all their expenses, but the provision of £40,000 would be used for the travel, subsistence and expenses of university staff, including necessary hospitality. It was unclear how the costs would be divided between raising the profile of the university and the fundraising.

A member suggest that the presentations made at the university dinner might be repeated for the Court.

(e) *Charter and Statutes: review*

*Document: VC/00/R439*

The University Secretary invited the Council to note the revised timetable for formal consideration of changes to the Charter and Statutes, and the changes that had been made in the draft document since Council's previous consideration of it. She noted that the Privy Council Office was now involved and would give its informal guidance prior to the university's formal consideration.

A member noted the importance of the review for the work of the university, and received an assurance that it would feature as a major item at a meeting of the Council.

(f) *Senior academic positions*

*Document: VC/00/R438*

The University Secretary drew attention to a report on the current debate, primarily at Senate, about senior academic positions and related issues, and outlined the process of consultation that was currently in train.

A lay member noted in his view some fundamental questions were being raised that were a matter for the Council: there was a need for greater clarity in some areas of management and an opportunity within the review to bring about a structure that would help the university to move forward.

In response to a question about when a statement would be made about the renewal of the Vice-Chancellor's contract after the summer of 2002, the Council was told that the Pro-Chancellor would review the future with the Vice-Chancellor during the current academic year and an appropriate statement and recommendation would be made by the end of it.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to receive and note the Vice-Chancellor's report;
- (ii) to congratulate the departments of Religious Studies and Politics and International Relations on the excellent results in their subject reviews;
- (iii) to confirm the appointment of Iain More Consultants for the university's fundraising from 1 January 2001 for two years, on the terms set out;
- (iv) to approve in principle the establishment of a tax-efficient organisation in the United States of America for the purposes of fundraising and to delegate authority to the

Finance and General Purposes Committee at its meeting in February 2001 to approve the form and establishment of the organisation.

CO.2000/67 LUSU: President's report

The President of the Students' Union, Mr Owen, noted that the Michaelmas Term was the most difficult for the union, as members prepared for the new student intake and the operation of new procedures. The sabbatical officer elections to Council had now taken place, and Mr Owen wished to thank Dr Groves and Mr Graham for their contributions, and to welcome Mr Greif and Mr Spence.

A high priority for the Students' Union had been the welfare of female students: now the focus had shifted slightly towards men. Increasingly the union was coordinating campaigns on men's health issues, reflecting the increasing needs of this often overlooked area, and including Men's Health Week. Similarly, the new course representative system was developing, at a time when students saw education as a financial transaction and wanted value for money. The key to the system is the feedback mechanisms of departments and faculties, ensuring that students were receiving the best possible education and having matters that affected them suitably addressed.

Mr Owen recalled the concern at the October meeting of the Council about the marketing of the university, and expressed slight disappointment that LUSU, the major area in the university with student marketing expertise, had been under-utilised. The union had shown time and again that it was close to Lancaster students and in tune with their opinions, not least for the sake of the union's own commercial services. During the current term the union had been conducting research into Lancaster students, involving tracker groups who would keep in touch with students during their entire time here, including their habits, spending trends and facility needs. The union was the only part of the university that could properly carry out such work year on year, and the union hoped it was useful; for example, amongst the present first year undergraduates, four out of five owned mobile telephones, over half had their own computers and wished to bring them to Lancaster, and 35% of them owned their own cars.

Mr Owen noted that since the last meeting of the Council, communications appeared to have improved and coincidentally issues dealt with slightly better: the two points might be connected. While there was still no non-alcoholic social space, LUSU was carrying out some market research on what students want, and it was hoped that the research would show how necessary the project was.

The issue of differential fees had been taking up most of Mr Owen's time: the working group set up by the Council had met only once, and Mr Owen would be contributing to the debate by proposing to the Court that differential fees should not be allowed at Lancaster. There was to be an event on 1 February involving all the parliamentary candidates for Lancaster and Wyre, to which the national press and local schools would be invited. If Lancaster agreed to rule out the extra expense, it would be able to raise its admissions and improve its performance, as the universities had in Scotland, and would embed itself in the region rather than pricing the local population out of the market. The Secretary of State should not pretend he was giving money to higher education while the funding per student was reduced year by year: the government had managed to make its actions look like charity, while leaving the universities to deal with differential fees. Nearer to the General Election the union would be taking a keen interest in the statements of each party on differential fees: in the meanwhile party members were invited to tell the government how weak it was on funding, and how it could not attempt to increase participation while off-loading funding problems to the universities.

Finally, Mr Owen drew attention to issues that he would like to see addressed quickly: the sports pitches that had not been played on for the whole term, the future of campus healthcare and the complaints of international students about the telephone company that had a ten-year contract with the university.

In response to a question, the President assured the Council that students had not been involved in the recent night-club disturbances in Lancaster.

A student member suggested that the university could not tie its hands by ruling out completely the introduction of differential fees.

The Council resolved to receive the report of the President of LUSU.

CO.2000/68 LUSU: annual accounts for the year ending 31 July 2000

The General Manager of the Students' Union, introducing the accounts, noted the stages of approval through which they had passed. He drew attention to the significant surplus on income and expenditure, and the achievement of income targets in all areas. He noted the strong performance of the Sugar House, a facility in which the university had invested, and which was now showing a 30% rate of return. The union's assets were now valued at just over £1 million, and the reserves were being built up for the future development of students facilities. Finally, Mr Elliott thanked officers and members of the Council for their support and advice.

The chairman of the Audit Committee reported that the committee would in the future review the LUSU accounts on a more formal basis. In the meanwhile, on the basis of the external auditors having found nothing to challenge in the accounts, the Audit Committee recommended adoption of them by the Council.

The Council resolved to adopt the LUSU accounts for the year ending 31 July 2001

CO.2000/69 Finance and General Purposes Committee

*Documents: annual accounts; FO/00/62*

The chairman introduced the following items.

(a) Accounts for the year ending 31 July 2000

The chairman congratulated all those involved in the achievement and presentation of excellent results.

The Director of Finance noted that the 5% surplus had been achieved, and that a notable increase of 8.7% in income had been reached. The restructuring of the debenture stock had assisted both the cashflow position and the balance sheet. The HEFC(E) grant had increased in value, but had declined as a percentage of the total income received, thus progressively lessening the university's reliance on this source. Overseas student fee income had increased and Lancaster was holding its market share: nevertheless, treating this income stream as core funding represented a vulnerability for the university, and some other institutions had decided to cap it. A further risk was the outcome of the 2001 research assessment exercise, particularly if the ratings of units of assessment were to fall. The volume of research funding, after reaching a plateau for several years, had now begun to rise, but the challenge was to continue the increase year on year. The cash balance was now large enough to fund one medium-sized department. There had been a considerable investment in staff, and there was a risk in the assumptions made about the extra income they would generate, especially now that severances and early retirements were now taking place at a modest level. It was important to continue to work at increasing other operating income so that there was no danger of returning to the former negative spiral. Interest costs had peaked and would now decline: while the cash cost was about the same, the repayment of capital meant that this item was a declining percentage of the whole. The Council was invited to note that the sum of £1.1 million from the sale of gilts had originally been included in the net operating cashflow, but this had been corrected in the final version to appear

under capital expenditure and financial investment, thus necessitating a small change of the relevant indicator of financial health. The debt service reserve was at the required level and was capable of meeting eighteen months of repayment of interest on the debenture stock, and there was now for the first time for a number of years a net asset position of 1.2:1, two years ahead of the required target. Members would notice that assets had declined by £2.5 million: this was because the building programme had been suspended and depreciation costs had been in excess of capital additions: this would be reversed as the LEC scheme and other activities flowed through the accounts. Reserves stood at £21.3 million overall, thus improving some indicators of financial health, but there was still a high level of gearing and the institution was carrying a debt that equated to the cost of a medium-sized faculty. The aim was to invest up to £130 million over ten years on the capital expenditure programme, and the university had to consider how to balance increased expenditure against the need for further development of the estate. Nevertheless, the year had been successful, and Standard and Poor's had now increased the credit rating of the university to BBB+, making it credible within the sector.

The following points were made in discussion:

- (a) the striking financial achievement had been made at great cost to staff, and there was a question about whether these human assets could continue being so productive. The Council was told it was hoped not to need to increase the financial stringencies still further, coupled with an acknowledgement that the university was surviving on staff who saw their work as a vocation rather than a job;
- (b) the university should seek to increase its wealth from its intellectual property and to maximise the talent of staff;
- (c) the burden of staff working long hours could be eased by being more efficient and optimising staff time for their prime activities.

The chairman of the Audit Committee advocated adoption of the accounts.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to adopt the accounts for the year ending 31 July 2000;
- (ii) to acknowledge the work of all staff who had contributed to the outcome.

(b) *Management accounts to 31 October 2000*

The Director of Finance indicated that the university was in danger of clawback by the HEFC(E) of between £350,000 to £600,000 in respect of under-recruitment, while the current year's tuition fee budget was short by £200,000 to £300,000. There was thus a potential shortfall on budget for the year of up to £1 million, some of which might be recurrent. A difficult opening position for the next budget round was therefore to be expected.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive and note the management accounts.

CO.2000/70 *Audit Committee*

*Document: VC/00/R428*

The chairman of the committee, introducing the report of its meeting held on 27 November 2000, reported that no items of significance had been raised by the external auditors in their management letter.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to confirm the actions taken by the Audit Committee.

CO.2000/71 *Lancaster Environment Centre: detailed design*

*Documents: FO/00/70 (main text only); AR/2000/1576*

PROPOSALS (Estates Committee; Capital Projects Control Group):

- (i) that the report of progress in relation to the design, financing, organisation and timing of the Lancaster Environment Centre project be confirmed;
- (ii) that the co-ordination of the parties involved, and of the type and form of construction contract, be noted;
- (iii) that the intention to proceed to the generation and approval of tenders, subject to subsequent reports as appropriate, be noted and confirmed;
- (iv) that the Council express its confidence that the outstanding issues with the NERC will be resolved: if however, they have not been by an appropriate time, the university will not proceed with the letting of the contract until a resolution has been achieved.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor indicated that the project was important and would provide a facility for a number of departments for research work that could not be undertaken anywhere else in the UK. The new building complex would also provide the means for the movement to Bailrigg of

NERC staff currently housed at Merlewood in Grange-over-Sands, and the combination of the two groups would constitute a large concentration of expertise and people working in related areas. The financial envelope within which the project must be completed was already fixed, and the current report was about progress within that framework. The meeting on 13 December between the university members, the NERC representatives and the professional team, undertaken on behalf of the Council, raised some issues that remained to be resolved, and hence the university would not proceed with the placing of contracts until they were settled.

The Director of Finance noted that the project would continue within the agreed cost envelope, and in line with the approvals of the Council. Completion was expected by late 2002, although some areas could be phased for earlier dates. The intention was to go out to tender in mid to late February and to start work on site in the late spring. A 45-year lease was being negotiated with NERC that would govern the primary relationship: despite the fact that the document had been in draft since the summer, there were still some difficult issues to be resolved and the building contract would not be let until there were signatures on the contract with the NERC. The university would not normally relinquish a key site unless the benefit for its research activity justified the special terms: since the terms offered to the NERC had been abated from the full market value, they would not be applicable to alternative tenants. The university therefore had to ensure that its interests were appropriately safeguarded in the contract with the NERC.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve resolutions (i) to (iv).

CO.2000/72 Business and Enterprise Board

*Document: AR/2000/234*

Professor Davies reported that the university had been awarded £550,000 under the HEROBC initiative, and the board was intended to oversee the work of the unit, in parallel with the teaching committees and the Committee for Research. The terms of reference mirrored those to which the university had already made a commitment to the HEFC(E), and were designed to accelerate the necessary change of culture within the institution.

A member of the Council stressed the great importance of the work in this area for the city of Lancaster and for the North-West region. The potential for new investment and enhanced job opportunities was substantial.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the interim terms of reference, membership and procedures of the Business and Enterprise Board, as set out.

CO.2000/73 Health and Safety Committee

*Document: SO/00/06*

The chairman of the committee, introducing the report of a meeting held on 24 October 2000, noted that departmental safety audits were well under way. He drew attention to the unacceptable number of accidents to cleaners as the result of sharp objects being placed in waste disposal bags: solutions included the use of stronger bags, and the support of the Students' Union.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the report.

CO.2000/74 Finance and General Purposes Committee

*Ref: CB.1; documents: AR/2000/1495; FO/00/68*

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to ratify the recommendations of the committee as set out in the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2000, and in particular the revised capital programme as at 23 November 2000.

CO.2000/75 Appointing committees

*Ref: CB.2; document: AR/2000/1329*

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to ratify proposals for the constitution of appointing committees with effect from 1 January 2001.

CO.2000/76 Equal opportunities monitoring

*Ref: CB.3; document: PS/00/820*

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive and note the attached report from the Equal Opportunities Committee, and to note the following comment:

'although much was being achieved the lack of resources available to the committee was still hampering progress'.

CO.2000/77 Grizedale College: principal

*Ref: CB.4*

The Council received a report that the Pro-Chancellor, acting on its behalf, had approved the following search committee:

Mr A. Whitaker (pro-vice-chancellor)  
Dr A. Prior        ) senior members  
Mr A. R. Okey      ) of the college  
Mrs E. Blamire (lay member of Council)  
Dr L. J. Banton (member of Senate)  
Mr D. Crouch (JCR President)

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to ratify the appointment of Dr Mark Bacon as principal for the period 28 November 2000 to 31 July 2003.

## REPORTS

CO.2000/78 Appointments and resignations

*Ref: CC.1; document: AR/2000/1528*

The Council received the following reports:

- (i) new appointments for formal acceptance;
- (ii) extensions of appointments;
- (iii) determining or determined appointments;
- (iv) resignations.

CO.2000/79 Grants in aid of research

*Ref: CC.2; document: AR/2000/1527*

The Council received a report of grants received in aid of research.

CO.2000/80 Written reports of meetings

*Ref: CC.3*

The Council received the following reports for information and, where appropriate, confirmation:

- (a) Senate, meetings on 11 October 2000 and 15 November 2000 (AR/2000/1519);
- (b) Employment Policy Committee, meeting on 10 November 2000 (AR/2000/1529);
- (c) Estates Committee, meeting on 12 October 2000 (AR/2000/1229).

CO.2000/81 Report on harassment issues, 1999-2000

*Ref: CC.4*

The Council received the annual report from the harassment network.

CO.2000/82 Risk management: human resources

*Ref: CC.5*

The Council received a report prepared by UNIAC on a review of the risk management of human resources at the university.

CO.2000/83 Colleges' annual report

The Council received the annual report of the colleges for 2000-01.