

AR/2001/1118

LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

Minutes of a meeting of the Council
held on 5 October 2001

PRESENT: Mr J. B. Heron (in the chair), Vice-Chancellor, Professor N. Abercrombie, Mrs E. M. Blamire, Mr R. Daly, Professor R. B. Davies, Mr J. C. Dunning, Mr P. R. Elliott, Mr R. Emslie, Dr P. G. S. Entwistle, Professor K. A. O. Fulton, Mr R. W. Goodall, Mr M. Hart, Dr R. B. Henig, Professor S. Henig, Mrs C. T. Hensman, Mr G. Johnson, Lord Judd, Councillor P. Lee, Mr P. M. W. Lewis, Professor R. Macdonald, Ms T. McGrath, Mr H. Morris, Mr H. Nichol, Dr C. C. Park, Professor M. I. Reed, Professor P. Rowe, Mr K. Royales, Mr A. Whitaker, Ms J. M. Whiteside.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr C. Adams, Ms F. M. Aiken, Mrs M. E. McClintock, Mr E. T. McGregor, Mr A. Madeley, Ms E. Nutt, Ms V. Tyrrell, Ms V. C. Walshe, Mrs V. Watkins.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Mr D. Boyle, Mr W. M. Davies, Mr H. Dawson, Mr A. Dick, Councillor P. C. Jackson, Ms C. A. Johnson, Mr W. S. Lunn.

CO.2001/48 Death of a member

The Council stood in memory of the late Gordon Inkster, an officer of the university appointed by the Senate, who had died on 18 July 2001.

CO.2001/49 Welcome to new members and officers

On behalf of the Council, the Pro-Chancellor welcomed the following new members:

Mr R. Daly
Mr J. C. Dunning
Councillor P. C. Jackson
Mr G. Johnson
Mr H. Nichol,

and the following persons in attendance:

Ms E. Nutt
Mrs V. Watkins.

CO.2001/50 Thanks to departing member

On behalf of the Council, the Pro-Chancellor noted its thanks to Mr D. M. Dunn, the chairman of the Finance and General Purposes Committee.

CO.2001/51 Pro-Chancellor's introduction

The Pro-Chancellor noted the concern of the university for all those affected by the events of 11 September 2001, especially students from North America and their families.

The Pro-Chancellor further reminded the Council of the importance attached to members acting or being perceived to act impartially and not being influenced in their role as governors by social or business relationships. Any member who had a pecuniary, family or other personal interest in any matter under consideration at Council or one of its committees should disclose any such interest and might be asked to withdraw while the particular matter was under discussion. Members should state any interests in the register kept for the Council and should subscribe to the Nolan principles for the proper conduct of public business. Finally, members nominated by particular constituencies should not act as if delegated by such a group and no one should be bound by mandates from persons or groups outside the Council.

CO.2001/52 Appointment of pro-vice-chancellors

PROPOSAL (Vice-Chancellor): that the Council ratify the following appointments:

- (a) Professor N. Abercrombie as Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Academic Development and Deputy Vice-Chancellor: re-appointment for the period 1 August 2001 to 31 July 2004;
- (b) Mr A. Whitaker as Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Colleges, Staff and Student Affairs: re-appointment for the period 1 August 2001 to 31 July 2005;
- (c) Professor R. Macdonald as Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Resources: appointment for the period 1 August 2001 to 31 July 2005.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the proposal.

CO.2001/53 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2001 were confirmed, subject to the substitution, in resolution (iii) of CO.2001/33 of the words 'on what action must be taken to bring the university back on course for the financial strategy already approved by the Council for the university's future viability' (in place of 'showing how the academic decisions being considered might help to fulfil the requirements of the university's corporate plan, the paper').

The Council was asked to note that the intention was to present a framework to the Council on 23 November 2001 and a statement and recommendations on 22 March 2002.

CO.2001/54 Matters arising

CO.2001/28: Nurse Unit

The Council noted that a report would be made to the November meeting of the Council concerning the views of the Committee on Relations Between the University and the Students' Union on Section 8 of the report on the Nurse Unit (received by the Council on 22 June 2001).

CO.2001/28: Nolan report: policy on serious malpractice and abuse

The Council noted that a report would be made to the November meeting of the Council concerning the final text of the policy. Discussions on it had been continuing over the summer and the resolution of outstanding issues had been achieved.

CO.2001/33(b): Lancaster Network Services Limited

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the Director of Information Systems Services, Mrs Janice Macklin had retired over the summer, while Professor Shepherd had not been in the best of health. A small group had therefore been set up to review and revise the operation of Information Systems Services, taking into account a range of interconnected issues. An opportunity to take stock of the work proposed under LNSL was welcome, and a further report would be made to the Council later in the academic year.

CO.2001/4: LU Archaeological Unit

Document: VC/01/R307

The University Secretary drew attention to a tabled paper, setting out the actions taken to date on the transfer of the LU Archaeological Unit to the Oxford Archaeological Unit Limited and the terms for the settlement. The

Pro-Chancellor, acting on behalf of the Council, had given his approval for the transfer of ownership to take effect from 1 September 2001. Negotiations had however continued beyond that date, and the current estimated date for transfer was now the week beginning 8 October 2001.

CO.2001/29: appointment of Vice-Chancellor

The Pro-Chancellor reported that the search committee was meeting regularly once a fortnight. The closing date for applications was 19 October 2001 and further suggestions, in addition to the recommendations and responses already received, would be welcome.

CO.2001/55 Charter and Statutes

Documents: AR/2001/1043; AR/2001/1037; VC/01/R306

PROPOSAL (Review Group): that the Council and the Senate approve the amendments to the Charter and Statutes as set out in an attached document, subject to such amendments as the Privy Council may require.

The University Secretary drew attention to the most significant changes, as set out in a tabled paper. She noted the Privy Council had asked that the university continue to keep the size of the Council under review, and the expectation that a new model Statute 20 would be issued in the coming months.

The Council was specifically asked to approve four additional changes that had been proposed since informal consultation had taken place:

- insertion of a limit of terms of office of certain categories of lay members (Statute 9)
- change of method of selection of student members of the Senate from JCR to Academic Council representatives (Statute 11)
- deletion of a redundant sub-clause (Statute 19)
- insertion of a new statute on public disclosure (whistle-blowing) (Statute 22A).

Some concern was expressed that at a university where the college system was integral to its operation, the proposed changes would have the effect of doubly weakening the college representation on the Senate: the former elected senior members were to become part of a pool of 14 members elected by all academic staff, and the election of one student representative per college was to be removed in favour of election of student representatives by LUSU Academic Council. The Council was told that, in both cases, the colleges could exercise a vital role in ensuring that candidates sympathetic to the colleges were elected.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the proposed amendments to the Charter and Statutes and to recommend approval to the Senate.

CO.2001/56 Vice-Chancellor's report

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

(a) Ruskin Library

The Vice-Chancellor reported that £181,000 had been received from the Lottery Fund for conservation work on materials in the Whitehouse Collection.

(b) Visit to China

The Vice-Chancellor reported on a visit he and other senior members of the university had recently made to a conference in China, consolidating connections initially made in 1978. The university was increasingly investing in stable relationships, with a few high calibre institutions in a selective range of disciplines, now including environmental science, and these had been consolidated during the visit. The visit had gone well and at one point he had represented all the overseas institutions which had been invited to the 60th Anniversary celebrations of the Beijing Foreign Studies University, on national television. He and others officers had also visited Hong Kong where a successful lunch with some of the almost 700 Lancaster graduates located there had taken place.

(c) Senior academic positions

The Vice-Chancellor noted that, with the appointment and re-appointment of the three pro-vice-chancellors, together with the appointment of the directors of undergraduate studies and the graduate School, the restructuring of the senior academic management was now complete. He was particularly glad to have a designated post for research and resources, and at the same time wished to pay tribute to the excellent work of Professor Peter Diggle, the outgoing dean for research, particularly in respect of RAE 2001.

(d) Annual UUK conference

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the conference, held at Southampton from 11 to 13 September, had been overshadowed by events in the USA and the relevant minister had been prevented from attending and giving a speech. The agenda had included: equal opportunities as a key priority; leadership; the QAA regime,

where the structures and procedures previously put in place appeared to be scaling back; an analysis of developments in the sector since the White Paper of 1991; procurement; use of IT; and the e-University, where significant issues had to be faced and resolved. There had also been a useful meeting with the new director of UCEA: the next pay settlement was due in August 2002, and there had been a sense that universities' ability to pay would be taken more into account. Issues about student funding had not been raised.

(e) Objectives for 2001-02

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention in particular to the following objectives, all of which were consistent with the Annual Operating Statement. The maintenance of Lancaster in the group of 15 leading and internationally recognised UK universities; the completion of the strategic reviews of all academic areas and identification of the redistribution of resources for restructuring; the continued attainment of a 5% annual surplus; the development of the LEC, InfoLab21 and similar strategic developments; the consolidation of the recovery of student numbers while maintaining the quality of the intake; support to Professor Davies in his work on raising third mission funding, with the expectation that some tangible results would be known early in 2002; the continuation of the rolling programme of refurbishment; and work with businesses in Cumbria and Lancashire, through the work of the Business and Enterprise Board. He expected to see the momentum of the previous three years sustained during the months ahead.

(f) Student recruitment and accommodation

Documents: AR/2001/1052 and AR/2001/1053

The Vice-Chancellor paid tribute to all staff, in departments and the central services, who had worked to recover student numbers in the period from October 2001 to the present. He had not believed that the recovery of undergraduate numbers would be achieved, but the efforts of everyone involved, combined with sensible tactical decisions and appropriate deployment of resources, had brought about an excellent result.

The University Secretary noted that a recent *Sunday Times* league table had placed Lancaster as the top university in the North West. The university had been in Clearing for a week, and had experienced only a small fall in A level points: the undergraduate total also included two hundred overseas students. At postgraduate level there had been some disappointment at the Home/EU acceptance of places, but the overseas student numbers

had substantially increased, and offers to them had stopped on 10 September. Lancaster students on an exchange year to North America had all decided to stay out there, and only three of the expected junior year students from the USA had not arrived: There was however likely to be a significant fall in the numbers expected for the second semester intake of January 2002. The university had now registered 2668 new undergraduates, 137 research postgraduates, and 779 taught postgraduates, the largest entry ever. The College and Residence Office, the LUSU Housing Office and the college officers had worked hard to place people in accommodation. At present the number of undergraduates with guarantees of a place in residence who were in other accommodation had fallen to 21, and efforts were beginning to place the 188 undergraduates who were in university housing but on a contingency basis, to find more permanent locations for the year. Compensation packages had been offered to students as appropriate, and the university was paying for bed and breakfast or hotel accommodation for students with guarantees who were off campus, as well as offering travel vouchers. An analysis had begun of why accommodation had been such a problem in 2001, including the extent to which the prediction of intake in May had resulted in more rooms being released to final year students, the reasons for an additional 5% of Part I students who wanted a room at Bailrigg, and the effects of a big increase in overseas recruitment.

The following points were amongst those made in discussion:

- (a) the Council should receive an analysis of comparative retention rates, including against the national benchmark;
- (b) the importance of welfare support for overseas students, particularly from the USA, could not be over-emphasised;
- (c) the university must learn to market itself more effectively and increase the number of applications it receives: work had already begun on recruitment for 2003;
- (d) the greatest rate of increase in applications from overseas students was from India and China. There were however disturbing signs that a significant proportion of students expected for 2001 had not so far registered, especially those from China;
- (e) the accommodation for overseas students needed to be sorted out and appropriate compensation agreed. The Council was however told that the level of compensation was related to what guarantees particular categories of students had received from the university;
- (f) the Vice-Chancellor expected to receive further requests for resources from departments who had admitted students additional to the extra numbers previously agreed, and some money for equipment and the Library had already been released. He was sure that departments would not adjust the pass rate upwards at the end of Part I, and confident that students would be

- expected to attain only the same level of achievement at that stage as in previous years;
- (g) the university had a good record for its provision of appropriate support for world religions;
 - (h) efforts were constantly being made to increase access and widen participation, but the majority of the university's students came from middle class backgrounds of some kind.

Mr Whitaker, as pro-vice-chancellor for colleges, staff and student affairs, accepted that alongside the positive news of additional students for Lancaster, there had been a lot of anxiety for some students and their parents about accommodation. Many people had been putting substantial effort into remedying the situation, especially the LUSU Housing Office, the LUSU sabbatical officers, the college officers and especially the junior common rooms. More work would continue over the next five or six weeks as rooms became available to complete the process of settling students into Lancaster and enabling them to study.

The Vice-Chancellor, in response to a question from the LUSU President about what steps would be taken to prevent a recurrence of the problems experience in future years, indicated that Mr Whitaker had already agreed to prepare and present a report and recommendations. A member suggested that such a report should clearly identify over which aspects the university had control and should focus on these.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to receive the Vice-Chancellor's report;
- (ii) to place on records its thanks to Professor Diggle for his work as Dean for Research;
- (iii) to approve the objectives set for 2001-02;
- (iv) to note that at its March 2002 meeting reports would be available on (a) retention rates and (b) analysis of the accommodation difficulties and recommendations for the future, following earlier internal discussion of the findings.

CO.2001/57 LUSU President's report

The President of the Students' Union, Ms McGrath, said she wished her report to sum up the experience for new LUSU officers. Introductory Week was hectic for everyone concerned, but she was confident the year had started well. The Freshers' Fair had been busier than ever; involvement in all the LUSU activities had been high, and she hoped this would continue. LUSU had also been examining its environmental and ethical practices, and this had prompted major changes, including a new Community Volunteer Scheme, and a decision to undergo a green audit. The union would also try to achieve an Investors in People award in the current year.

The university had been very successful in its recruitment for 2001 and had scored highly in the popularity stakes. She wished to congratulate the university for the turnaround in admissions, bringing numbers to an all-time high for the university and the Students' Union. She hoped the Council would accept the ramifications of such an increase, especially the crisis over housing for hundreds of students who only had assured accommodation for two weeks. She also hoped that such students would soon find a place to live and be able to forget their traumatic arrival, so that they did not leave Lancaster and describe their initial poor impressions to other institutions, exchange programmes or prospective students. She expressed as wish that the boost of unexpected income would be reflected in services to students, including the replenishment of staff positions at present left vacant.

On the ever-controversial subject of communications the news was mixed. It was disappointing that LUSU was not informed of actions and changes at first hand, and that she had to be given important information in confidence by people who thought she ought to know rather than from the administration. LUSU was keen to work alongside the university in as many ways as possible, and this was difficult if officers were not informed or consulted. She hoped the situation would continue to improve during the year, and wished to thank the university for her inclusion on the Residences Steering Group, which she believed would be beneficial.

LUSU had of course been glad to hear that the issue of student funding was back on the table, and hearing ministers were examining plans to restore grants and to introduce a graduate tax filled student officers with hope and gladness. LUSU hoped that the university would welcome any move to abolish tuition fees and would support its students on this issue.

Students had been glad to see the introduction of a new telephone company and she would like to thank the university for the provision of a better service: an issue that had for five years been a LUSU priority might now disappeared.

LUSU's prime role was to speak up clearly in the interest of students, but not to do this in a destructive or antagonistic way. Students, student officers, staff, and lay members of Council, were all here to do the best for the university and hence for its students. That was the main, and in fact the only, LUSU agenda, and she hoped it was for other members of the Council.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive the LUSU president's report and to thank her for it.

The Council's attention was drawn to the following reports and recommendations.

(a) Development programme

Document: report of Iain More Associates, August 2001

PROPOSAL (University Secretary): that the Council:

- (a) approve the establishment of a university-wide development programme that will attract philanthropic support for the university's key strategic aims from a range of sources, including alumni and other individuals, trusts and foundations, and companies;
- (b) agree to support building long-term links with alumni, in order to encourage their deeper involvement and commitment, financial and otherwise, to the university.

The University Secretary noted that a presentation by the consultants had taken place prior to the meeting. She reported that the recommendation of the consultants was for the university to aim for a target of £5 million by 2004, a level that was felt to be challenging but achievable, with a probable target of £10 million for 2004-09. Reliance would be placed on alumni, major gifts from wealthy individuals, and medium-sized gifts from trusts and business. The expected cost of raising this sum would be 26% in 2001-02, falling to 9% by 2003-04. The key issues for the university were to set goals and determine priorities, refining the present list of five or six projects still further by Christmas. A programme of related events was being planned for the current year, and it was hoped that the telephone campaign starting later in October would raise £80,000 to £90,000 of pledges from alumni. UMAG had considered the risks resulting from not having a programme, as well as factors about not handling it well. The approach of candidates for the next Vice-Chancellor to leadership in fundraising would be a consideration for that appointment, and the intention was to set up an External Development Board that would create positive relationships with influential donors, as well as to develop links with a small number of potentially larger donors: board members would thus make financial and intellectual contributions, as well as of time. A small internal monitoring group would also be set up.

In answer to questions, the Council was told:

- (a) support for postgraduate activity was implicit in several of the short-listed funding areas;
- (b) the 2001 telephone campaign would be given three areas on which to concentrate requests for support;
- (c) the consultants had advised that 90% of funds in any development programme usually originated from individuals. The university had more numerous wealthy alumni than had been assumed and relationships with such people would be developed.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to endorse the proposals;
- (ii) to ask for a report on appointments made to the External Development Board.

(b) Management accounts to 31 July 2001

Document: FO/01/54

The Director of Finance, noting that the management accounts to 31 July 2001 were essentially the draft accounts for the year, reported that the outcome of £4.4 million surplus was better than had been anticipated at the time of the out-turn review, and only £150,000 short of the original target. At mid-year, when a surplus of £3.3 million had been predicted and a shortfall of £1.3 million identified as HEFC(E) clawback and loss of fee income, the university had faced a choice of whether to scale back budgeted expenditure or to commit to existing budgets and introduce additional incentives. The measures taken had been successful both in increasing income and reducing expenditure, and credit for the outcome was due all round the university. There had been a notable change in research grant income, which had risen from £11.7 million in 1999-2000, to £13.2 million in 2000-01, while overheads had increased both in volume and percentage terms. While there was still some way for the university to move by comparison with its peers, the underlying story was good. Controls on expenditure had worked well, and academic services and the administration in particular had achieved favourable variances. The Social Sciences had out-performed its contribution by a notable variance of £476,000, while Environmental and Natural Sciences had achieved the highest absolute contribution of £4.743 million. The residences account showed a net deficit of £180,000, primarily because of lower student numbers and increase utility charges. The balance sheet was in a robust condition, and was the subject of congratulations by the credit

rating agency, Standard and Poor, and the cash position was well ahead of the three-year target. Nevertheless, the problem of the funding gap was still present, and only a 4% surplus was currently budgeted for 2001-02. The increased student numbers would mean that the full permitted reversal of the clawback would take place, instead of the half that had been assumed in the budgeting round. In the meanwhile some equipment and Library funds had been released, additional facilities for the extra Part I students would be necessary, and there would be consequential and additional Part II costs in 2002-03. As the Council had heard, the number of postgraduate students who had not registered was higher than had been assumed, and some £60,000 would have been spent on student support from the measures already described. There were however many risks for the future: the consequences of the events of 11 September 2001, including the anticipated reduction in North American students due to arrive in January 2002; the need to sustain revenue to cope with the expenditure base; the likelihood that trading activities might suffer reduced income from the slowdown in the economy; the rollover of the implementation of the RAE 2001 results for twelve months; and the pressures resulting from long-term restructuring. The Director of Finance believed that congratulations on the outcome were due, but that only very cautious optimism for the future was appropriate.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive and note the report by the Director of Finance.

(c) *Risk management and implementation*

Document: FP/01/58

The Council resolved to note the progress on risk management and compliance with the Turnbull code that was being made. Further reports would be made to provide the Council with updated information on the highest risks facing the university and the controls being implemented in response to those risks.

(d) *Student accommodation in the 21st century*

Documents: AR/2001/1039 and appendices

The Vice-Chancellor reminded the Council that it had agreed in June to the establishment of a steering group, but the work on the critical issue of the provision of additional and refurbished student accommodation in fact dated back to 1999. The group had met twice and had considered an excellent but confidential report from N. M. Rothschild, and it was intended that two groups should now operate; the proposed executive group and a parallel group under

Mr Whitaker's chairmanship that would look at the legitimate concerns of colleges, students and others about the way forward. There was one crucial point missing from the report in front of the Council: the window of opportunity each year to begin using new residential rooms as they became available was just three months i.e. July, August, September, and hence the issue of the OJEC notice at the time and in the form in which it was issued had been critical. The succeeding timescale was also very tight.

In response to questions, the Council was told:

- (a) the fees to N. M. Rothschild would be paid against identified milestones and could be stopped at any stage;
- (b) the target of 80% en suite accommodation dated back to work on the estates strategy undertaken in 1999, and related to a target date seven years from 2001. The target was moveable and might end up lower: the higher the proportion of new building undertaken, the higher the en suite proportion was likely to be. Negotiations would begin with an assumption of a minimum level of new building and the objective was to ensure that the refurbishment of other areas could be financed;
- (c) the accommodation was designed to a student specification, and for residence of at least 35 weeks per year, and the conference trade would only be able to use a fraction of the available accommodation;
- (d) the objective of any external partner would be the recovery of their investment over a period. The university would not wish to be put in the position of having a monopoly external supplier of accommodation, and part of the negotiation would be to agree a mechanism to cap the upper limit of the rent level, especially since one of the selling points for Lancaster was its rent levels relative to other institutions;
- (e) the position on out-sourcing was that university officers had a completely open mind, and must be able to see a strategic advantage before moving in that direction. It was thus appropriate that the matter be discussed and consultation undertaken, with no intention to achieve a particular outcome;
- (f) the priority for the university was to retain strategic ownership of all land within the inner ring road, although the position on other parts of the campus might be more negotiable.

The strategic importance of the proposed financial structure to the university's long-term survival was emphasised.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to endorse the actions taken by the steering group;
- (ii) to approve the laying down of the steering group and the setting up of an executive group, with the terms of reference, membership and delegated authority as set out;
- (iii) to approve the appointment of N. M. Rothschild as financial advisors for the project at a total fee of £300,000 over the life of the project, with milestones and phasing of payments to be agreed;
- (iv) to authorise, subject to report, the appointment of other external advisors, the fees for which would be capitalised over the 25 years of the total project.

(e) Status of current estates business

Document: FO/01/59

The Director of Finance drew particular attention to the following items.

- (a) *Student telephone system*: much effort had been invested to achieve a positive outcome, and while there was still some risk of litigation, the worst case exposure of the university to financial risk had been averted. Further reports to the Council might be necessary.
- (b) *Lancaster Environment Centre*: a preferred contractor had been identified and was at present carrying out detailed redesign work. There was confidence that the budget figure would be achieved without detriment to the science. In answer to a question, the Council was told that the lease with the NERC had still not been signed.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive and note the report.

CO.2001/59 Audit Committee

Documents: Audit Committee annual report; internal auditors' annual report; VC/01/R296

In the absence of the Audit Committee chairman, Mr Hart presented two reports. He drew attention to the greater detail than previously of the Deloitte and Touche internal auditors' report, covering the complete year's work in synopsis form.

Overall, the committee's opinion on the year's work was that the internal controls of the university were adequate. There was however one significant matter to draw to the attention of the Council, and that was the conflict of interest identified in the Management Development Division, where a number of people employed there were also members of companies that contracted to do work for it, thus creating arrangements that were not sufficiently at arm's length. There was nothing wrong with the procedures in place, but they had been ignored.

The Pro-Chancellor indicated the seriousness with which he regarded the issues raised in MDD, reflecting a matter already found in another area of the university. He emphasised the necessity of upholding the Nolan principles in the observance of systems already in place and of a comprehensive and explicit statement of possible conflicts of interests across all departments and sections of the university.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to approve the report of the Audit Committee, and the internal auditor's report, for 2000-01;
- (ii) to receive the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2001;
- (iii) to ask that a report be made back to the Council on the action taken in respect of problems identified in the Management Development Division, the Audit Committee having previously considered it.

CO.2001/60 Health and Safety Committee

Document: SO/01/4

The incoming chairman of the committee, Mr Royales, asked that the Council receive and note the minutes of the meeting of the committee held on 29 May 2001.

In answer to a question, the Council was told that a full emergency plan, including regional activity if necessary, existed for all contingencies. The committee had moreover already agreed to review what provision was in place for major emergencies at its next meeting.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the committee's report.

CO.2001/61 Council appointments to the Court

Ref: CB.1; document: AR/2001/1042

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to confirm the actions taken on its behalf in respect of its appointments to the Court, as set out.

CO.2001/62 Remuneration Committee

Ref: CB.2; document: PS/01/850

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to confirm the actions taken by the Remuneration Committee for 2000-01, as set out.

CO.2001/63 Premature Retirement Committee

Ref: CB.3; document: PS/01/815

PROPOSALS (Pro-Chancellor):

- (a) that the Council note the attached end-of-year report;
- (b) that the Council confirm the budget available for 2001-02.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the proposals.

CO.2001/64 Annual operating statement

Ref: CC.1

The Council received a report that the annual operating statement had been despatched to the HEFC(E) at the beginning of August.

CO.2001/65 College principal: Cartmel College

Ref: CC.2

The Council received a report that the following search committees to appoint college principals had been set up:

Cartmel College

Mr A. Whitaker (pro-vice-chancellor)
Ms C. Giles) senior members of
Dr C. Rogers) Cartmel College
Mr K. Royales (lay member of Council)
Dr M. Bacon (member of Senate)
Ms E. Moules (Cartmel JCR president)

Pendle College

Mr A. Whitaker (pro-vice-chancellor)
Dr G. Brown) senior members of
Mr R. Brown) Pendle College
Mr K. Royales (lay member of Council)
Dr M. Bacon (member of Senate)
Ms R. Wright (Pendle JCR president)

CO.2001/66 Ruskin Foundation: university trustees

Ref: CC.3

The Council received a report that Lord Judd, who had been appointed as a university trustee on the Ruskin Foundation, had indicated that he did not wish immediately to serve on its Management Committee. Professor Jeffrey Richards, another university trustee, had agreed to serve in the meanwhile.