

THE UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER

Minutes of a meeting of the Council
held on 23 March 2001

PRESENT: Mr J. B. Heron (in the chair), Vice-Chancellor, Professor N. Abercrombie, Mrs E. M. Blamire, Councillor A. C. Bryning, Miss H. E. Clish, Professor R. B. Davies, Mr W. M. Davies, Mr H. Dawson, Mr D. M. Dunn, Mr P. R. Elliott, Dr P. G. S. Entwistle, Professor K. A. O. Fulton, Mr R. W. Goodall, Mr E. Greif, Mr M. Hart, Dr R. B. Henig, Professor S. Henig, Mrs C. T. Hensman, Mr G. A. Inkster, Ms C. A. Johnson, Mr P. M. W. Lewis, Mr H. Owen, Professor M. I. Reed, Professor P. Rowe, Mr T. Spence, Mr A. Whitaker, Ms J. M. Whiteside.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr C. Adams, Ms F. M. Aiken, Mrs M. M. Gardner, Mrs M. E. McClintock, Ms T. McGrath, Mr E. T. McGregor, Mr J. J. McGovern (for CO.2001/12), Mr A. Madeley, Mr H. Morris.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Mr D. M. Boyle, Mr A. Dick, Mr R. Emslie, Lord Judd, Councillor S. A. J. Leyton, Mr R. L. Massy, Dr C. C. Park, Mr J. Rawlinson, Mr K. Royales.

CO.2001/1 Thanks to departing members

On behalf of the Council, the Pro-Chancellor recorded its thanks to the following departing or departed members of the Council:

Mrs P. Askew;
Councillor A. C. Bryning;
Mr B. Everett;
Mrs G. L. Webb.

Councillor Bryning said how much he had enjoyed the work of the Council and how he regarded his extended service with the university as part of his personal life-long learning. He was proud that the City of Lancaster has been able to play a crucial role in bringing a university to the area. He wanted to thank all those with whom he had come into contact for their friendship and to wish the university well for the future.

CO.2001/2 Welcome to new members

On behalf of the Council, the Pro-Chancellor extended a welcome to the following new members of the Council:

Mr D. Boyle;
Mr D. M. Dunn;
Mr R. Emslie;
Mr E. Grief;
Professor S. Henig.

The Pro-Chancellor reminded the members of the Council of their duty to disclose any pecuniary, family or personal interest that they might have related to any matters under discussion and noted that a Register of Interests was held and regularly updated by the Clerk to the Council. Members should not act as though they were delegated to proceed in a particular way: no one could be bound by a mandate unless by proxy. The overriding consideration for members of the Council was to pursue the best interests of the university as a whole.

CO.2001/3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2000 were confirmed, subject to noting under CO.2000/66(b) that the university had in 1983 entered into national negotiations about revised salary scales and conditions of service for technical staff.

CO.2001/4 Matters arising

Ref: CA.2

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

Professor Davies reported that steady progress was being made on the transfer of the management of the LU Archaeological Unit to Oxford. The stumbling block had been a large backlog of finds that required documenting and distributing as appropriate, but this matter had now largely been resolved and additional funding obtained to clear the backlog. Otherwise the Oxford Unit continued to be enthusiastic about the transfer and agreement on points of detail was close.

CO.2000/66(f): Senior academic positions

The members of the Council were told the Senate had received an interim report from the Vice-Chancellor on 24 January 2001 and would receive a further report and recommendations at its meeting on 30 May 2001.

CO.2001/5 Court: reports from the meeting of 10 February 2001

Ref: CA.3

(a) *Election of Deputy Pro-Chancellor*

The Pro-Chancellor, on behalf of the Council, congratulated Mrs C. T. Hensman on her appointment as Deputy Pro-Chancellor with immediate effect and until the meeting of the Court in February 2006.

(b) *Higher education for disabled people*

Document: AR/2001/415

The Council received the text of the motion and discussion, and were told that, following the approval by the Honorary Officers on 9 March 2001 that the resolution should be sent to the ministers and others listed in it, the appropriate paperwork had been despatched as agreed.

(c) *Funding of higher education*

Document: AR/2001/420

The Vice-Chancellor noted that widespread sympathy for the motion had been shown at the meeting of the Court. He noted that he would be returning to the issue of differential fees under his report later in the agenda. In the meanwhile he intended to refer the resolution to the working party already set up by the Council.

The President of the Students' Union asked that the working party should meet more often.

CO.2001/6 Nurse Unit

Ref: CA.4; documents: VC/01/R036; VC/01/R084

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor will report on:

- (a) the opening of the Nurse Unit;
- (b) the terms of reference of the review of the sequence of events leading to the establishment of the Nurse Unit in January 2001.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Mr Whitaker, reminded the Council that it had set up a working party with authority to determine the outcome of its deliberations. The Nurse Unit had been opened on 24 January 2001 and early feedback from students had been positive. He wished to thank all

members of the working party, especially the two lay members, for their contributions to its work.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the terms of reference of the proposed review that had been agreed between him and the President of the Students' Union and noted that their lists of persons who might lead it were very similar. Although no announcement could yet be made, they were close to agreement with a particular individual.

The President of the Students' Union indicated that a report to the June meeting of the Council was desirable: if however more time was needed to prepare the report, the Students' Union would be happy for it to come to the first meeting of the Council in 2001-02. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor noted that this flexibility might assist the appointment of a person to take the chair.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the report, the terms of reference for the review, the arrangements for the chairing of it and the timing of the report, as set out.

CO.2001/7 Strategy meeting: 4 May 2001

Ref: CA.5; document: VC/01/R088

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approved the arrangements for its strategy meeting, as set out.

CO.2001/8 Vice-Chancellor's report

Ref: CA.6

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

(a) QAA: subject review of Philosophy

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the department had achieved the maximum number of points available, i.e. 24 out of 24.

(b) Universities UK: residential conference

Document: VC/01/R107

The Vice-Chancellor reported that although the conference held at Newcastle-upon-Tyne on 1 and 2 March 2001 had included a discussion of the Taylor Report on funding options for universities, no option had been ruled out, and it was hoped that the

Government would look seriously at the under-funding of the sector. His sense of the UUK meeting was a general unwillingness to pursue differential tuition fees. The Council noted this position had been reinforced during a recent visit to Lancaster by Mr Blunkett, Secretary of State for Education and Employment, who under questioning had ruled out recourse to differential fees.

(c) External funding regime

Documents: HEFC(E) grant notification for 2001-02; AR/2001/448

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the summary analysis by the Finance Officer of the recurrent grant for 2001-02 and noted that the announcement was in line with expectations. The Director of Finance indicated that there was a reduction in cash terms compared with the original position for 2001-02, and that the forthcoming budget round would be even more difficult than in previous years. The generation of additional sustainable net income was therefore of the highest importance.

The Vice-Chancellor noted the summaries as set out of the Smith Committee and the Byers Committee. He indicated that, although Lancaster was the only university specifically mentioned by name in the latter announcement, the structures and processes by which the resources were to be allocated were a matter of concern to the university. There was to be a meeting of North-West vice-chancellors on 26 March when the use of the compensation funds for Daresbury, including reinvestment there, would be discussed. Lancaster was however involved in two lead projects.

Mr Hilton Dawson, M.P., congratulated the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor Davies) on their efforts to achieve the correct results for the northerly area of the North-West region. The Council noted that Lancaster undertook world-class work and it was appropriate that the institution should be fully involved in North-West initiatives such as the Byers Report, and create its own area of strength independently of the Manchester/Liverpool axis.

The Vice-Chancellor further reported that the university had been notified that £6.3 million had been earmarked for it under the Science Research Investment Fund. The Committee for Research had been invited to help set priorities, onto which the strategic view of the wider university community would be grafted. There had been a useful discussion at UMAG on 21 March of these issues, including the opportunities for investment in the social sciences and management. The university would be required to send to the HEFC(E) by 31 May 2001 its proposals for a programme of projects and the timetable for them.

(d) RAE 2001

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the preparations for the submissions were going well and the members of units of assessment were grateful for the rigorous processes of review of draft submissions that had been put in hand. The results of the exercise were critical for the university's reputation and funding, but the Council could be confident that every effort had been made to optimise the outcome.

In answer to a question, the Council was told that the census date for the inclusion of research-active staff was 31 March 2001, the deadline for the receipt of material by the HEFC(E) was 30 April 2001, and the outcome would be announced in December 2001.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive the Vice-Chancellor's report and to congratulate staff in Philosophy on the result of their subject review.

CO.2001/9 Capital project: Applied Sciences

The Vice-Chancellor told the Council that significant external funding might be available to the university for capital building in relation to Applied Sciences if appropriate action was taken. It was important that the Council should be kept informed of what was taking place and the Pro-Chancellor had agreed an oral report and proposal should be made.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Professor Davies, reminded the Council that, within the Estates Strategy it had previously approved, a major expansion was included that related to the environment, with the next priority being a new building for Computing. In the meanwhile there had been an increasing emphasis on the university's need to develop sustainable business and a growing interest in the commercialisation of its activities, coupled with the pressure to develop attractive buildings that would help to retain staff, create an exciting work environment, and be attractive to students.

Since the summer of 2000 Mr Dawson and the chief executive of the NWDA had been in discussion about support for Lancaster and, while the regional development agency was not ready to announce formally that £5 million had been earmarked for Lancaster, it was in their budget and architects were developing the concept. The NWDA had also raised the possibility of releasing up to £1 million before the end of their current financial year, possibly for notional infrastructure costs: if it were not subsequently spent, it could be repaid. The situation was changing daily on whether the money was or was not available, but a resolution of the position would be needed in the next week and the university had to be able to respond immediately to a firm offer if it were made.

In answer to questions the Council was told:

- (a) that the money would be additional to and earlier than the main sum;
- (b) that the NWDA wished to use the money for the region and for the sector;
- (c) that the money could not under the rules be set against payments on hardware already purchased;
- (d) that because industrial sponsors would not normally pay building costs, the funding potentially on offer would fill a gap that would otherwise be a problem for the university;
- (e) that the university would commit part of its land and the NWDA would provide funding for a building;
- (f) that the timescale and the dovetailing of construction work were to be noted, but a new building was a matter of urgency.

The Council resolved to authorise the Pro-Chancellor and the chairmen of the Finance and General Purposes Committee and the Estates Committee, working with the Vice-Chancellor and Professor Davies, to approve receipt of a sum of up to £1 million if the purposes were in line with the Corporate Plan and any conditions imposed were not unreasonable.

CO.2001/10 Report to the President of the Students' Union

Ref: CA.7

Mr Owen reported that Ms Trish McGrath would be taking over as president of the Students' Union at the start of July 2001. Apart from the elections for sabbatical officers, however, the term had not been smooth.

Intellectual property rights had been one of the big issues of the year. Mr Owen believed that, thanks to the efforts of the University Secretary and the President of the Graduate Students' Association (Mr Grief), the university would now have some of the fairest and most comprehensive regulations in the country. Since intellectual property was a major issue in universities it would have been folly for Lancaster to follow its normal practice of waiting for the prevailing wind to blow it onto changing current practice. Instead the university had taken a positive step towards solving the issue while at the same time raising the profile of the significance of intellectual property.

The Court meeting of 10 February had in Mr Owen's view been refreshing, and the fact it had been entertaining and produced extraordinary election turnouts was a fitting tribute to the concept of the Court and to the principle that those to whom responsibility was given should be elected, not foisted on the institution by other methods. Mr Owen said the same went for internal positions of responsibility, since it would come as no surprise to members of the Council that, in the light of the continuing discussions about the senior management structure, he believed the election of pro-vice-chancellors was essential for reasons of accountability and of trust. Other encouraging aspects of the Court meeting were the ability and willingness of lay members to bring their own perspective to the proceedings, and to remind the university of the world outside.

Mr Owen said he had attended two meetings recently that had shown why the university needed to do more for the region. The first had been a meeting with Mr Dawson and educational workers and businessmen to discuss how best to use Lancaster's often world-class graduates. While the meeting was instructive and lively, and attended by the principal of S. Martin's College, there was no one present from the university other than Mr Owen and a representative of the Careers Service, and this he had found embarrassing. The second had been the visit of Mr David Blunkett, to whom Mr Owen had been glad to speak. For him it made unequivocally clear the weakness of Universities UK and how it had failed the sector. The meeting also threw up issues about funding, since in his view if differential fees were not ruled out in the election manifestos, they would continue as a live issue. All available evidence pointed to a fundamental shift in the attitudes of students who were finding themselves crippled financially, thus affecting their choice of institution and making it obvious that they were likely to attend a university not far from where they lived. Yet the local region probably did not know the university existed, because of its lack of contact with local people or synergy with the City. Its efforts to engage with the area seemed so far to be for one purpose, to raise money from business; but there was more to life than business.

Mr Owen wished to draw attention to the university's marketing and recruitment drive since, if entry targets were not reached in October 2001, the university would begin to admit it was in crisis. He would like to see the university use students better; perhaps by arranging for ordinary students to visit more local schools, giving presentations on student life and advice on financial matters. Additionally, the university should use the expertise of students more widely, including in an academic framework. The university needed to start putting on courses that students wanted, rather than what it thought they should be doing, since there was a question about why students should incur large debts for a degree they would rather not be taking.

Because of Mr Owen's enthusiasm for vocational training, and the value of workplace experience, he had been somewhat saddened by the shift in attitude in some senior members to the downscaling of Independent Studies, one of the few departments of true benefit to the region. It was also recruiting well, suggesting it was attractive to students. At a recent meeting Mr Dawson had said how glad he was that students' unions were intending to work with chambers of commerce to develop more ways of local firms employing students, to assist them with their finances or to use the university's consultancy project. This was the M.A. scheme, mounted by Independent Studies, that gave firms the services of graduate students with bright ideas and offered students excellent experience of the real world of industry.

Mr Owen reminded the Council of some still unresolved issues:

- (a) an alcohol-free space for students and staff. Efforts were under way to get it off the ground, but the action should be completed;
- (b) the budget for LUSU, where the university was asked to honour its commitment to raise the block grant by the cost of the Women's Safety Bus;
- (c) the monitoring of admissions for 2001 by LUSU and the collection of information on current students;
- (d) the news, received earlier in the day, that a large conference had been booked in over Easter 2001 that would make use of the sports pitches, in contravention of an agreement that LUSU and the Sports Centre would be consulted about such bookings, and at a time when the pitches were in dire need of the work on them scheduled to take place over Easter.

Finally, Mr Owen read favourable comments from two first-year students about whether students felt Lancaster was a top-20 institution.

Comments made in discussion included the following:

- (a) that the whole provision of social space for students would be improved by October 2001, including pressing forward with the provision of non-alcoholic social space;
- (b) that Mr Dawson strongly supported Independent Studies and would like to see the university back that sort of programme that built on synergies with the City;
- (c) that Mr Dawson admired the actions taken by officers of the Students' Union in relation to recent problems faced by the Women's Refuge.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive the report of the President of the Students' Union.

Ref: CA.8; documents: FO/01/01; FO/01/18; FO/01/11; FO/01/12

Mr Goodall, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, introduced the following items.

- (a) *Budget-setting process for 2000-01*: including the headline assumptions set out in Appendix II.
- (b) *Capital programme as at 15 March 2001*: the Director of Finance indicated that no major projects had been added. He noted that the SRIF required matching funding of 25% by the university and this had been built into the schedule, drawing on sums already included but not previously allocated. He was pleased to draw attention to the additional £0.25 million from the ESRC for computing facilities, and these had already been delivered and installed. The impact of expenditure on the refurbishment of teaching space had been reduced to £700,000 for 2000-01, a sum that had now been released by the HEFC(E), and this would be spent on the principal teaching areas, thus deferring improvements to University House. The LEC project had gone out to tender and the university's responsibility for the total project was thus shown in the schedule with the matching contribution by the NERC. The decision had also been taken to accelerate the provision of data wiring to student rooms, by completing the connections in the summer of 2001 and thus facilitating a revenue stream.

In answer to questions, the Council was told:

- (a) that the LEC project was at present on budget, that there were reasonable contingencies in the budget, and that the design and build form of contract being used was helpful;
- (b) that the university was responsible for over-runs on the LEC project in proportion to its input i.e. that on the project overall, the share was roughly one-third to the university and two-thirds to the NERC, and for dedicated areas the whole cost was borne either by the university or the NERC as appropriate;
- (c) that the client for the LEC project was the university, represented by Mr McGregor with the support of GTMS and the team within the Resources Division. The project executive was meeting on a regular basis and there were clear linkages with the management and the governance structures of the university. The risk to the university was small compared to previous projects and, while risk could not be avoided, every effort had been made to evaluate the

- level and minimise it. Careful monitoring of the project would take place;
- (d) that in the case of the Library Extension the final accounts had been cleared. A formal settlement had been reached with the contractor (Laings) and the university was serially pursuing the professional team: two of them had settled, but the Quantity Surveyor was taking the university to arbitration, where the outcome was less certain and the legal and witness costs were high. The final hearing would be in September, after which the university would seek a settlement with the architect;
 - (e) that in the case of the Ruskin Library, the stage of the final accounts had not yet been reached, since there were construction and design defects still outstanding, including the continued ingress of water in heavy rain. Because of the innovative nature of the design, maintenance costs would always be high. The university had little leverage over either the contractor or the architect on this project, but in the meanwhile there was a cashflow benefit from not having settled the accounts;
 - (f) that the annual surplus, allowing for non-cash items such as depreciation, was essentially being attributed to the capital programme, and the bottom line of the schedule was in accordance with the financial forecasts.
- (c) *Management accounts to 31 January 2001; out-turn review:* the Council was told that the Finance and General Purposes Committee could discuss whether to include regular summaries of the results from the wholly owned subsidiaries.
- (d) *Benchmarking criteria in relation to competitor institutions.*

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to:

- (i) approve the budget-setting process and the assumptions in Appendix II, as set out;
- (ii) approve the capital programme and budget as at 15 March 2001;
- (iii) receive the management accounts to 31 January 2001 and the out-turn review;
- (iv) receive and note the benchmarking criteria and to ask that they be updated on an annual basis.

Ref: CA.9; document: AR/2001/475

The University Secretary, introducing the annual report on recruitment for 2000-01, indicated that the document was designed to inform policies and strategies of UMAG, the Academic Division, and departments and faculties. Its main focus was on mainstream students and certain categories, such as part-time undergraduates, or postgraduate continuing professional development, or the general raising of the university profile, were not covered. She noted that the university had not succeeded in making its targets in 2000, but although the portfolio of courses was disadvantageous, Lancaster had performed better than other institutions with similar portfolios. Lancaster was managing to maintain the quality of its applicants. There appeared to be some confusion in potential students' minds between the universities of Lancaster and Central Lancashire.

Lancaster was interested in recruiting mature students, but the trend in that area was downwards, and as a group they were not prepared on average to travel the same distance as younger students. Only four institutions had a mean travelling distance for its students of over a hundred miles, and Lancaster was one of the four. It was also clear that students from less well-off families were not prepared to travel long distances. At postgraduate level Lancaster information had been compared with other northern universities: Lancaster overseas students were increasing, especially from China, but there was a drop in home and EU registrations and a heavy reliance on the Management School.

The university faced a challenging target in 2001 of an additional 400 students over the previous year. While there were national factors that the university could not affect, such as demography, graduate employment and student debt, it was possible to influence the university's geographical catchment and its conversion of applicants to entrants. The conversion ratio had been set as a priority for 2001, and although the process was at an early stage so far, there were encouraging signs of an increase in the conversion rate from 14% to 20%.

UMAG had persuaded departments who could do so to increase their targets while not reducing others, and hence some additional resource would be made available to compensate certain departments for the extra numbers, in terms of space, teaching fellows and non-payroll expenditure. Students were being used to man fairs and visit schools and the university's studentship schemes had been reworked. Encouragement had been given to the development of new programmes and new modes of delivery, and postgraduate programmes in particular were being assessed for economies of scale.

The University Secretary reminded the Council that the admissions and recruitment processes were complex: they involved all members of the university and were being closely monitored. UMAG had received the report now laid before the Council and had asked for specific proposals in relation to its broad recommendations. The Academic Division were implementing its commitments and departments were producing strategic plans that would contribute to the future.

The President of the Students' Union said he wished to applaud the report. He noted that the question of fee levels was out of student hands: it was nevertheless clear that the trend for students to live at home would increase, and it was interesting how many pupils of one local secondary school were planning to enter either S. Martin's College or the University of Lancaster. He would like to see more current students going to local schools and believed they would have a positive effect for, although the local catchment population was too small for the university's overall intake, the institution needed to make fuller use of people not on the payroll. At present the university barely existed for potential day students, and although resident students must be sought, non-resident students were likely in future to be more significant, making events designed to involve parents and other local residents more important. The University Secretary noted that the preference was to send staff to schools, because the university could be sure of what they would say, and teachers expected staff to visit them: nevertheless, a recent departure from the Academic Division meant that the shortfall of visits had to be made up.

Other points made in discussion included the following:

- (a) the university would be well advised to target colleges rather than schools because that was where the majority of post-GCSE people were to be found;
- (b) the University of Central Lancashire regarded Lancaster as a competitor and it would be useful to know how Lancaster was positioning itself, for example, in relation to Preston. The university should also look more seriously at South Lakeland;
- (c) more efforts had recently been made to recruit in South-East England;
- (d) the former polytechnics knew their niche markets: a university like Lancaster was in danger of trying to respond to too many prospects;
- (e) because of the substantial lead time for the introduction of new schemes of study, the university was already too late to introduce new schemes in October 2002 that would appear in prospectuses. The Council was however asked to note that, while schemes might not appear in prospectuses, they could be made available more quickly;

- (f) the university should segment the market by level and type of students, develop flexible delivery, and appeal to students who the institution might otherwise not reach, including non-resident students. An example was the University of California at Berkeley where certain facilities and staff were ring-fenced for honours work and other students received cheaper provision;
- (g) the forthcoming departmental plans would indicate where new academic developments were leading. Nevertheless, the distinction between full-time and part-time students was lessening as more students undertook paid employment which cut across their academic work commitments;
- (h) the university had previously had an excellent record with mature students and there were still thousands of adults in the area who had not benefitted from higher education. The Council was invited to note the pilot Foundation Degrees that were currently under development for this type of market, although the take-up for them was uncertain;
- (i) the university had recently appointed a new Web editor, in order to improve the presentation of the university's offerings. While postgraduates made extensive use of the Web, undergraduates and their advisers were currently more likely to use paper-based information. The key factor was to bring potential students to the university, since their conversion to entrants then became much more likely. Open days, visits and interviews were all used as appropriate;
- (j) the issue of recruitment was sufficiently critical for a high level task force to be set up. The Council was told the Vice-Chancellor already had a team of people working to him on recruitment matters.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to thank the University Secretary and Mr McGovern for the report and to receive and note its comments.

CO.2001/13 Charter and Statutes: review

Ref: CA.10

The University Secretary reported that she had hoped the current meeting of the Council would be the occasion of the first of two formal consultations that should be no more than three months apart, with a meeting of the Senate between them. The Privy Council had been approached informally soon after Christmas, as they had requested, with the proposed changes, and had said they would respond within six weeks. The Office had not however met the university's timescale. The main concern seemed to be about the extension of membership of the university to all its staff and the consequences for the role of the Visitor. It was hoped that their reply would be received by the end of the month, which would make it possible to complete the process during the Summer

Term, if a special meeting could be arranged earlier on the day of the strategy meeting. The alternative was to leave the formal consultation process until the Michaelmas Term.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to note the report and to await the response of the Privy Council.

CO.2001/14 Health and safety

Ref: CA.11; documents: AR/2001/421; SO/01/1D; SO/01/2

The chairman of the committee, Councillor A. C. Bryning, introduced the following documents:

- (a) revised statement of safety policy, including changes by the Health and Safety Executive, the Health and Safety (Consultation with Employers) Regulations, the changed role of the Safety Office in the procedures for carrying out health and safety audits, and other minor amendments;
- (b) the annual report of the safety and radiation protection officer;
- (c) minutes of the meeting of the Health and Safety Committee held on 6 February 2001.

Councillor Bryning drew attention to the revised policy statement on health and safety, which had been agreed by the Health and Safety Committee subject to one minor amendment about consultation with non-union employees via trade union representatives. He indicated that the Committee on Health and Safety would at its next meeting, with input from Personnel Services, consider the lack of attendance by staff at compulsory health and safety events that had been picked up by the Audit Committee. He further drew attention to the annual report of the committee, and the Council noted with pleasure the reduction in the number of false fire alarms, especially relative to a competitor institution.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to:

- (i) approve the revised statement of safety policy, subject to the amendment notified, and to the deletion of 'and the Senate' in paragraph 6;
- (ii) receive and note the annual report of the university health and radiation protection officer for the calendar year 2000;
- (iii) confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2001.

CO.2001/15 Nolan Report: policy on serious malpractice and abuse

Ref: CA.12; document: PS/00/849

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Mr A. Whitaker, invited the Council to consider and approve the attached policy statement concerning the procedures for the reporting of serious malpractice and abuse (whistle-blowing), as set out.

The Council received a report that the proposals had been approved by the Employment Policy Committee and had been the subject of consultation with campus trade unions, whose views had been taken into account, where possible, in re-drafting the text.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Mr Whitaker, reported that there had been an earlier suggestion that the policy might be incorporated into the revised Charter and Statutes, but it had been decided that a separate procedure should be drawn up. The document laid before the Council had drawn on advice supplied by Universities UK: since it had been circulated to members, some useful points of clarification had however been received and discussed with the Director of Personnel Services, and the document was therefore not in its final form. In answer to a question, the Council was told the procedures were believed to comply with the provisions of the Human Rights Act.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to accept the proposals as set out in principle;
- (ii) to incorporate changes already notified and any others sent to Mr Whitaker by Council members;
- (iii) to let the trade unions see the finally revised document;
- (iv) to authorise the Pro-Chancellor to approve the revised policy, subject to the final document being received by the Council.

CO.2001/16 Nominations Committee

Ref: CA.13; document: AR/2001/422

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to endorse the actions recommended by the Nominations Committee, as set out, and noted the intention for members to be circulated with a request for proposals for future co-opted members of the Council

CO.2001/17 Timetable of Council meetings, 2001-02

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve proposals set out in a tabled paper for the timetable of Council meetings in 2001-02, subject to the approval of the chairmen of the Finance and General Purposes Committee and the Audit Committee.

CO.2001/18 Finance and General Purposes Committee

Ref: CB.1; document: AR/2001/390

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to confirm the actions of the committee taken at its meeting on 23 February 2001, with particular reference to:

- (a) the arrangements for donors in the USA to make their gifts in a tax-efficient way;
- (b) risk management and internal control.

CO.2001/19 Audit Committee

Ref: CB.2; document: VC/01/R092

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to confirm the actions of the committee taken at its meeting on 2 March 2001.

CO.2001/20 Committee constitutions: promotions

Ref: CB.3; documents: AR/2001/426; AR/2001/427

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (a) to approve the revised terms of reference, membership and procedures of the Promotions Committee, as set out;
- (b) to approve the terms of reference, membership and procedures of the A/L/C Review Group.

REPORTS

CO.2001/21 Appointments and resignations

Ref: CC.1; document: AR/2001/429

The Council received the following reports:

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

CO.2001/22 Grants in aid of research

Ref: CC.2; document: AR/2001/430

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

CO.2001/23 Written reports of meetings

Ref: CC.3

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

- (a) Senate, meetings on 24 January and 28 February 2001 (AR/2001/416);
- (b) Academic Planning Committee, meetings on 14 December 2000 (VC/01/R013) and 19 January 2001 (VC/01/R022);
- (c) Estates Committee, meeting on 8 February 2001 (AR/2001/236).

CO.2001/24 Student Support Services: annual report

Ref: CC.4

The Council noted that a report on the work of Student Support Services for 1999-2000 was available for any member of the Council who would like to receive one.