

THE UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER

**Minutes of a meeting of the Council
held on 6 October 2000**

PRESENT: Mr J. B. Heron (in the chair), Vice-Chancellor, Professor N. Abercrombie, Mrs P. A. Askew, Mrs E. M. Blamire, Councillor A. C. Bryning, Miss H. E. Clish, Mr W. M. Davies, Mr P. R. Elliott, Mr B. Everett, Professor K. A. O. Fulton, Mr J. Groves, Mr M. Hart, Mrs C. T. Hensman, Mr G. A. Inkster, Lord Judd, Councillor S. A. J. Leyton, Mr R. L. Massy, Mr H. Owen, Dr C. C. Park, Professor M. I. Reed, Professor P. Rowe, Mr K. Royales, Mrs G. L. Webb, Mr A. Whitaker.

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

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Mr H. A. Cann, Professor R. B. Davies, Mr H. Dawson, Professor R. Deem, Dr P. G. S. Entwistle, Mr R. W. Goodall, Dr R. B. Henig, Mrs C. A. Johnson, Mr P. M. W. Lewis, Mr J. Rawlinson, Councillor D. B. Stanley, Mrs J. M. Whiteside.

CO.2000/46 Membership of the Council

The Pro-Chancellor welcomed the following new members:

Mr G. A. Inkster
Mr R. L. Massy
Mr H. Owen.

He also reported the resignation of Mr K. Parker, whose work was taking him abroad a good deal, and placed on record the Council's thanks to him for his services to date.

CO.2000/47 Pro-Chancellor's introduction

The Pro-Chancellor reminded Council members of their duties and responsibilities as members of the ultimate governing body of the university, and their shared obligation to act in accordance with the Nolan principles. The Council has responsibility for agreeing the strategy and policy of the university and monitoring its performance, and members

should take decisions in a corporate manner, acting collectively as a single body rather than by separate groups. The information collected annually for the Register of Interests was a further reminder that Council members should act impartially, not influenced by family, pecuniary or business interests that were undeclared, nor functioning as representatives with a mandate from a parent body. The minutes of the Council were in the public domain and there were clear procedures for how they were to be used.

The Pro-Chancellor further reported that work on the revision of the Charter and Statutes was almost complete. Assistant staff membership of the university was close to being secured and, in part because of the provisions of the Human Rights Act, consideration was being given to moving some material from the Statutes into Ordinances. The intention was to consult the Privy Council informally by the end of the calendar year. The Pro-Chancellor further drew attention to the national debate about the Visitorial function, although current thinking was that it probably did not come into conflict with the Human Rights Act. In answer to a question about whether the university should before deciding on what action to take, wait for any impact the Human Rights Act might have cases involving the Visitor, the Pro-Chancellor commented the Privy Council's view was that universities should continue with their reviews of statutes without waiting for a conclusion on this matter.

CO.2000/48 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2000 were confirmed.

CO.2000/4 Matters arising

CO.2000/19: Pro-Vice-Chancellor

The Pro-Chancellor reported that he had, on behalf of the Council, approved the outcome of the election and the appointment of Professor R. B. Davies for the period 1 August 2000 to 31 July 2003.

CO.2000/21: Lancaster Concerts

The Vice-Chancellor indicated his pleasure that the concert series was continuing, that Professor McCaldin was to continue as director for at least another year, and that the Friends of Lancaster Concerts were working hard to support the series. He wished to encourage members of the Council to show their support by attending the concerts.

CO.2000/21: Nurse Unit

Document: VC/00/R327

Mr Whitaker reported that further discussions had taken place since the meeting of the working party held on 11 September. The University Management Advisory Group had recently discussed and approved his recommendation that the Nurse Unit should not open until the medical protocols were in place, and this gave time for pause and reflection. He had met two members of the current medical practice on 27 September to discuss the provision of protocols, and useful clarification for both parties had resulted. There were no further matters outstanding in relation to the suite of contracts and both sides had clean copies deposited with their respective solicitors. Mr Whitaker would continue his dialogue with the practice and planned to hold another meeting of the working party as soon as possible.

CO.2000/21: Restructuring of Chemistry

Professor Abercrombie indicated that the transfer of the Polymer Group staff to the University of Sheffield would be beneficial for Lancaster. The chemists' work had not been as well integrated with related groups at Lancaster as it could have been, and Lancaster was too small to be able to afford a wide base of science provision. While there would be no major Chemistry degree, chemistry staff would join Biological Sciences and teaching and research in the subject would continue.

Mr Whitaker reported that full information about teaching for 2000-01 would be presented to the relevant groups of undergraduates at the beginning of the following week. He was pleased that teaching (including practical laboratory work), assessment and the appropriate quality assurance were in place, and he wished to place on record his thanks to all those who had worked hard to conclude these arrangements.

Mr Whitaker noted that the position in relation to postgraduate research students was more difficult, and arrangements had to be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. While the majority of the students affected had decided to transfer to Sheffield, there were two whose future was still uncertain and being actively discussed. There were also problems for students and staff in Chemistry who would remain at Lancaster, since in the last few days difficulties had arisen about the proposed transfer of basic equipment that should remain at Lancaster. He was pleased to report that Professor Soutar, with whom Mr Whitaker had had a discussion, had been alarmed by this information and had given an undertaking that any equipment inadvertently moved to Sheffield would be subject to investigation and return of it to Lancaster as appropriate.

In answer to questions, the Council was told:

- (a) that the transfer of staff to Sheffield was not cost-free but the impact would be slight and the net cost would be reported to the Council;
- (b) that while the potential for litigation was normally present in such cases, every effort had been made to minimise disruption to students;
- (c) that the staff who were transferring had not yet all physically moved to Sheffield: however, those chemists who were remaining at Lancaster would bear the brunt of the teaching activity over the next two years, while those who were transferring had nevertheless agreed to continue to teach at Lancaster. Meanwhile new staff were being appointed and would shortly be in post.

CO.2000/22(a): differential fees: appraisal of options

Mr Whitaker reported that the joint working party of the Council and the Senate that had been authorised by the Council had been set up. Its first meeting had recently taken place and, while no conclusions had yet been reached, the working position of the group was that funding for undergraduate teaching across the sector had fallen too low, that quality was therefore at risk, that additional sources of funding must be found, but that top-up fees were not the preferred route. Although in recent days Baroness Blackstone had been quoted as dismissive of differential fees, it nevertheless seemed unlikely that the debate had been halted. Mr Whitaker indicated the group had agreed it should continue to meet for a period of nine to twelve months, culminating in a report and set of recommendations to the Council.

In answer to a question, the Vice-Chancellor indicated that most vice-chancellors and universities were considering what policy might be adopted in relation to differential fees but had reached no firm conclusions.

CO.2000/22(c): Bridging Summer School for Access

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the three-year pilot phase of the scheme had been completed. It had been externally audited for quality and had demonstrated over the three years how access could be widened and participation increased. While it was ahead of the government's own agenda, the paradox was the difficulty of acquiring funds to continue and the uncertainty about whether it would take place in 2001, despite the achievements already in place. Of the 80 students on the 2000 programme, 70 of them had gone on to higher education at Lancaster, its associated institutions or other universities. While the scheme did not make a contribution to the university's overheads, it was not loss-making. The annual report of the school was available if members of the Council

wished to see it, and the Vice-Chancellor hoped that he would be in a position to make a further report in twelve months' time.

Members of the Council congratulated the Vice-Chancellor on his report. In response to questions, the Council was told:

- (a) that while local businesses had been approached for funding, the sums contributed had been relatively small and had been used to assist students with their maintenance costs;
- (b) that efforts were made to contact schools in the region about the scheme, including for potential participants in the earlier secondary school years, and about 800 expressions of interest had been received in the preparation for the 2000 Summer School;
- (c) that the scheme needed secure, recurrent funding to enable the university and the agencies that proposed students for it to plan ahead with confidence.

The Council resolved:

- (i) to receive and note the actions taken;
- (ii) to invite further reports on the Nurse Unit and the costs of the Chemistry transfer.

CO.2000/50 Vice-Chancellor's report

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

(a) *Mr Jason Queally*

The Vice-Chancellor reported that Mr Queally, who had achieved a gold and a silver medal in the recent Sydney Olympics for cycling, was a graduate of Lancaster who had also worked for a period in Biological Sciences.

(b) *Objectives and priorities for 2000-01*

The Vice-Chancellor, in considering objectives for the year ahead, reminded the Council of the full year of activity and effort in 1999-2000. He drew attention to the completion, on time and within budget, of almost all major and minor building works, representing significant investment in the improvement of teaching and learning facilities, and of some student residential areas. A number of competitive bids had been put together for post-Daresbury funding, work had proceeded with the university's partner colleges, especially on Foundation Degrees, and preparations made for the 2001 research assessment exercise. While later in the agenda an account of admissions for 2000 would

appear that contained some apparently gloomy information, the Vice-Chancellor wished to draw attention to the good and solid work by departmental admissions offices and central staff to produce the high number of good quality student intake at all levels. While there might be a temporary shortfall in numbers, the Council should not denigrate the excellent and coordinated work of so many staff to bring students of high quality to Lancaster, and to make them welcome and cared for on arrival. In addition, the new Millennium Summer School, funded by the HEFC(E), had brought 160 disadvantaged students from inner cities to Lancaster over the summer, and the university had been asked to repeat the exercise in 2001 for 180 students.

The new targets for 2000-01 were:

- (a) to raise the profile and image of the university, and awareness of its work. Conversely, the institution should not, as it had a tendency to do, make too much of relatively minor concerns and problems. The process of raising the university's profile would become still more important as the formation of the fundraising campaign gathered speed but, while some investment was needed, the task was important for the university as a whole, and should be made the first priority;
- (b) to complete the Corporate Plan with well-integrated departmental strategic plans that included new schemes of study and other developments, and demonstrated how new net income would be generated. The Corporate Plan was not only an institutional document, but needed to be supported by ownership from the component elements of the university. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor would undertake the work of integrating the departmental elements into the institutional framework;
- (c) to deliver on time and within budget the agreed major capital works, notably the Lancaster Environment Centre;
- (d) to ensure, with the Dean for Research and the academic departments, that an optimal series of submissions be prepared for the 2001 research assessment exercise, which was vital for the university. In answer to a question, the Council was told it now seemed unlikely that RAE 2001 would be the last such exercise;
- (e) to achieve the university's financial targets in order to generate a secure financial base that supported its core activities;
- (f) to improve the rate of success in attracting and admitting students of high quality, including short and medium term operational and attitudinal improvements to the process;

- (g) to continue to strengthen regional and local links, both for access and wider educational provision of diverse kinds, and for third-leg funding. The university had achieved HEROBC funding of £0.5 million from the HEFC(E) and needed to build on that with spin-out, technology transfer, teaching company schemes and other similar initiatives. It was essential to convince the university and the local region that these activities were now part of the core business of the university;
 - (h) to focus investment of time and effort in selected overseas locations for recruitment and collaboration: China was one prime area;
 - (i) to continue the reshaping of the university in order to position Lancaster to take advantage of trends and policies in UK higher education. This was not easy, and would include revision of what and how teaching was carried out, as well as building up the infrastructure of selected areas for growth. While judgement and guesswork were needed, this task represented perhaps the most important aspect of strategic planning.
- (c) *CVCP residential conference at Stockton-on-Tees, 12-14 September 2000*

The Vice-Chancellor reported the sense of unease about the new quality assurance regime that had been widespread at the conference, and opposition in relation to both need and cost, as well as heavy criticism of its conceptual and operational bases. Science-based funding would be expected to increase by 7% per annum, both by formula and by bid, and this was good news for Lancaster. There had also been a hint that the 1% annual efficiency gain might not be repeated, and that the funding level might have reached its base level. Other issues at the conference had included an excellent review of student funding, discussion of a new name for the CVCP and its future strategy, equal opportunities, health-related university activity, and the role of the Visitor. All documentation from the Conference had been passed to appropriate officers of the university.

The following points were amongst those raised:

- (a) the response to the Institute of Learning and Teaching and its future role had at best been lukewarm;
- (b) the extent to which the CVCP or its successor body wished to or was capable of acting as a single integrated body was uncertain and problematic. The individual universities continued to wish to defend their autonomy and there were inherent conceptual difficulties in the way of acting as a unified or cohesive body. In the view of a lay member it

- was likely in the future that each institution would have to fight for its own ends;
- (c) no discussion of the future of national pay bargaining had taken place as part of the formal agenda.
- (d) *Undergraduate and postgraduate admissions for October 2000*

The University Secretary drew attention to the summary information included in the agenda about undergraduate and postgraduate admissions for October 2000. She reported that at the undergraduate level the university had achieved very similar figures to 1999, but on the increased targets the shortfall was 150 students, or 7% of the total. That provisional outcome should however be seen in the context of 13000 of the extra 17000 additional places nationally not having been filled. Recruitment had been patchy, and it appeared that in some areas demand had peaked. The current year was the first time in a decade that the university had not met its target: a task force had been set up to consider action, particularly on how to improve the conversion of applications into places, and the Academic Planning Committee had adjusted the targets so that the university could make up the shortfall in 2001. Part I registration had however gone well, and the university was no more than twenty short of the number of home/EU students it expected: the overseas numbers were however still uncertain. Postgraduate numbers were better, above the national average and showing a 5% increase in the number of overseas students.

In response to questions, the Council was told:

- (a) that the university would not take the risk of assuming the shortfall in admissions could not be repeated, especially since the decrease for 2000 was greater than the national average;
- (b) that the national demand for places was lower than the DfEE had expected and well below the government target for increase;
- (c) that work was being undertaken to investigate the causes of the shortfall, and would include the position of other campus universities similar to Lancaster, including the issues of tuition fees and students who wished to live at home;
- (d) that the tuition fees question might be too narrow a cause, and consideration should be given to the total cost of a university education to students and their families;
- (e) that the problems of admissions reinforced the importance of finding better ways to promote the university and its quality.

(e) *LU Archaeological Unit*

The Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of Professor Davies, noted that the unit was not now an academic area but more akin to a trading activity. For some time it had been struggling to meet its financial targets, but the shortfall in revenue had been recurrent month on month. Since 1998 the university had been examining the best future for the unit. This review was not a criticism of the staff of the unit, most of whom were on short-term contracts: the quality of the work was good and a credit to the university, especially within the North-West region. The level of commercial competition, the margins for overheads required, and the general reduction in opportunities had however all operated strongly against its financial future, and these external factors were not improving.

For about eighteen months the university had been in close negotiation with the University of Bradford, who already had a large and highly-rated archaeology department and who had approached Lancaster to seek a transfer; and the staff of the unit were fully aware of and involved in those discussions. All went well until the end of June 2000 when Bradford pulled out, essentially as a result of their appraisal of the unit's finances. In July UMAG had agreed to explore three other options: a take-over of the unit by its members; a take-over of it by one of two units in Edinburgh or Oxford who had expressed serious interest; or an orderly rundown. These options were also properly and individually communicated to the staff in writing, and Professor Davies had met them collectively to discuss them. Negotiations were still continuing and the contracts of all the fixed-term staff had been extended even though direct support funding was not available.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that Council would appreciate the difficulties of the timing of these events over the summer, and the need for managerial action, including the need to remove uncertainty for the staff involved. Professor Davies had worked assiduously on this matter and had had full and frank discussions with the staff of the unit.

(f) *Council briefings*

The Vice-Chancellor indicated that he would like to see a resumption of the pre-Council information and briefing sessions to members on key items of Council business. The issue of attendance at them was of course recognised.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to receive the Vice-Chancellor's report and to endorse the priorities he had set;
- (ii) to congratulate Mr Jason Queally on his Olympic achievements;
- (iii) to congratulate all staff involved in registration of new students for the absence of queues;
- (iv) to ask for a report on the analysis of reasons for the shortfall in admissions and the remedial action being taken;
- (v) to ratify the actions taken over the summer in relation to the LU Archaeological Unit;
- (vi) to ask that consideration be given to the provision of pre-Council briefings.

CO.2000/51 Report by the President of LUSU

Mr Owen, in considering his initial months in office, reported that it was the unexpected issues that arose or were dormant that had taken much of his time, including the admissions shortfall, college and estates issues, the content of Scan, or differential fees. In his view most of these issues could have been avoided by consultation, but little of this occurred except at the point where financial decisions were made. He believed the university was neglecting its duty to consult and that a small group of senior managers applied pressure for success. On specific items, he suggested that the uncertainty about differential fees would only end when the university had reached a clear position: he believed that the debate should be widened beyond the working party, and noted that LUSU would be watching developments closely. The Fylde coffee bar for mature and overseas students had failed to deliver the service or facilities promised and this difficulty appeared to indicate that the university did not value such students. The Olympic medals won by Mr Queally had in Mr Owen's view been achieved in spite of the university, for the sporting facilities were not strong, and the impression given that expenditure on a new hitching post was more important than sport. There was also a need to tie up quickly the remaining loose ends on the Health Centre. Mr Owen was an enthusiastic supporter of the university and hoped that he and his fellow students would be able to work with it.

In a discussion of the Health Centre, a member stated that in his view, it had become a major preoccupation and the new Nurse Unit a source of financial embarrassment. The Director of Finance outlined the intended future legal and financial arrangements between the developer of the new health centre, the university and the health practice, and reminded the Council that it was the health authority who decided which health practice the university should use. He further noted that the general practitioner service was obliged to offer nursing support, and the Nurse Unit would be an additional facility that would make extra choice available to students and staff.

The Vice-Chancellor, in response to the concerns expressed about the lack of communication over the matters raised by the LUSU President and other items of business, including some in the area of estates, noted that while he recognised the importance of communication, in his view consultation with the student body had improved.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive the report of the LUSU President.

CO.2000/52 Finance and General Purposes Committee

Documents: FO/00/44; FO/00/51; VC/00/R357; VC/00/R345

(a) Management accounts to 31 July 2000

The Vice-Chancellor, in the absence of Mr Cann, invited the Director of Finance to present the management accounts. Mr McGregor drew attention to the surplus of £5.4 million which was consistent with the out-turn review of £5.45 million. He reported an overall income of £76.8 million against the out-turn projection of £75.7 million, while noting the under performance on postgraduate income projections over a period. He drew particular attention to the improvements in the balance sheet, placing the university in a better long-term position, showing the benefits of restructuring the bond, and producing a positive ratio of current assets to current liabilities. The cash balances were healthy and the university had been able to comply with all its covenants. The immediate area of risk was student recruitment, both in the postgraduate area but more immediately for undergraduates. While the position was improving by comparison with the figures shown in the Gold Report, the possibility of clawback by the HEFC(E) was still the largest risk. It would be possible to take mitigating action for 2000-01, and in the short term there was no need to take more than the obvious measures, such as possible deferral of the release of reserves or some areas of expenditure. The university had out-performed in three consecutive years, and there was some headroom. In the longer term there were risks to additional income, including bids for additional numbers. Since the recruitment problem had occurred across the sector, however, the HEFC(E) might limit the penalties it imposed.

In answer to questions, the Council was told that a broader look at postgraduate recruitment might be appropriate, including the greater use of bursaries; and that while there would not be full occupancy of residences during the year, some rooms could and would be let to external parties.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to congratulate the Director of Finance and all those involved on the predicted outcome for 1999-2000.

(b) *Lancaster Environment Centre*

The Director of Finance drew attention to the information about the progression of the project to detailed design stage and to the revised management structure. He reported that the NERC had now decided it could fund upfront the £225,000 for the relocation of teaching into the Faraday Building, instead of paying it as rental over a period, which would slightly improve the university's cash position.

The following comments were amongst those made in discussion:

- (a) that the original contingency had been between 17% to 18%, but some releases from it had been possible during the process of detailed design. The full 10% contingency currently allowed would be carried forward into the tendering process. The project was required to be delivered to cost, and the specifications for expensive high technology equipment would be covered by the scientists concerned bidding to external bodies. The VAT planning would reduce the adverse impact on cashflow, and at the end of the project might achieve a final saving of 70% of the VAT liability;
- (b) the NERC representatives were properly members of the steering team because of the level of the council's contribution to the project and its own public accountability. There should be an equal balance on the team, while ensuring that the university's proper interests were protected;
- (c) while there was an issue about whether the HEFC(E) would provide further funding for the relocation of classes from their present location within Biological Sciences to the Faraday complex, a minimal funding scheme was already in place to effect the relocation by June 2001;
- (d) no additional external funding sources other than the VAT planning scheme and the applications to funding bodies by the scientists to reduce the level of expenditure by the university below £4 million had been identified, although the project had been tested in the initial consultancy exercise for fundraising. Bids by the scientists included two under the JIF scheme of £1 million each, and the intention was to design their laboratory space to optimise the case with which additional facilities, once funded, could be added in.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the steps taken to progress the LEC project, and the revised management structure for it.

(c) Fundraising for the university

The University Secretary apologised for tabling a paper which had only the day before been forwarded to her by an absent colleague. She briefly outlined the steps taken by CCS to interview as many people as possible in a short period, and their findings about the weak external profile of the university and the variety of reactions to the proposed projects. She indicated that the consultants had recommended a campaign should commence in January 2001 to raise £2.5 million in the first instance: this proposed level had been a disappointment to management, and in addition the consultants had made clear their view that until the profile of the university had been raised, no funds could be generated.

In discussion the following points were amongst those raised:

- (a) the consultants had recommended that they should largely take the responsibility for raising the funds. An alternative model would be to place the main responsibility on members of the university;
- (b) the level of information so far presented was not necessarily sufficient to reach a conclusion about whether to proceed, particularly since it was not clear why the proposed campaign would be more successful than the one in the early 1990s;
- (c) the university had no option but to proceed: given the current external funding regime and level of competition between universities, the real strength of the institution lay within itself. There was no painless way of raising funds, including the use of senior management time, and the crucial element was the brief given to the fundraisers;
- (d) the use of an in-house capacity was a high-risk approach and, while the university would draw as far as possible on others' experiences and knowledge, the track record of at least one university with a profile similar to Lancaster's was discouraging;
- (e) the university should consider how best to use its alumni, including the LUA;
- (f) the key to the exercise would be the choice of attractive projects and the certainty of a few large gifts at an early stage.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to agree in principle that a fundraising campaign should take place;

- (ii) to ask the University Secretary and others to consider other fundraising firms;
- (iii) to endorse the efforts over the next three months to locate more alumni, to enhance the university's web sites, and to improve its external and internal communications;
- (iv) to ask the University Secretary to prepare a further paper for consideration by the Council at its meeting in December, including how the university is addressing the concerns raised by the consultants about the university's state of readiness for a fundraising campaign.

(d) *Commercialisation of research and development*

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to receive and note the paper prepared by Professor Davies on the extension of links between the university and industry, and the commercialisation of intellectual property.

CO.2000/53 Audit Committee

Documents: AR/2000/1044; report from the committee to the Council; report by UNIAC to the Council

The chairman of the committee, Mr Davies, reported that in the opinion of its members the university's financial controls were adequate. Their first concern related to the delay by UNIAC in the production of internal audit reports: consideration after the year end had been given to a number of them, and there were still three outstanding. The other concern they had related to the periods and timings of appointments of members of the committee, and suggestions had been made to the Nominations Committee about improvements that could be made.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED:

- (i) to receive the attached reports and to thank the committee for its work;
- (ii) to note the appointment of two co-opted members to the committee (see also CO.2000/60).

CO.2000/54 Council Steering Group

Ref: CB.1; document: AR/2000/1058

The Council received a brief report on the operation of the new Council Steering Group.

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve its proposed modus operandi.

CO.2000/55 Finance and General Purposes Committee

Ref: CB.2; document: AR/2000/1042

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to confirm the actions taken by the Committee on its behalf, as set out.

CO.2000/56 Appointments by the Council to the Court

Ref: CB.3; document: AR/2000/1004

The Council received a report of a meeting held to consider appointments by the Council to the Court. Letters had subsequently been sent to all those people affected by the outcome of the meeting.

The Council resolved to approve the actions taken on its behalf.

CO.2000/57 Membership of the university

Ref: CB.4

The Council resolved to approve the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that continuing membership of the university be offered to the following persons who have retired:

Mr L. Cheles
Mr M. Hammond
Dr J. M. Howarth
Mr C. F. Jex
Dr B. K. Jones
Mr J. E. S. Mowat
Dr L. M. Newman
Dr C. J. Peacock
Mr E. Phillips
Dr A. Pringle
Ms M. C. Tanton
Dr R. J. Watts-Tobin

CO.2000/58 Emeritus professors of the university

Ref: CB.5

THE COUNCIL RESOLVED to approve the Vice-Chancellor's recommendation that the status of professor emeritus be conferred on Professor H. J. Perkin with effect from 1 August 2000.

CO.2000/59 Trade Union Negotiating Sub-Committees

Ref: CC.1

The Council received a report that the above committee, which had not functioned for several years, had been laid down.

CO.2000/60 Audit Committee: co-opted members

Ref: CC.2

The Council received a report that the Audit Committee had agreed to recommend that Mr J. C. Hadfield and Mr B. McKenzie be co-opted as external members for the period 1 August 2000 to 31 July 2003. Information about these members had been circulated to members of the Nominations Committee, and no queries were raised by them.

CO.2000/61 Finance and General Purposes Committee: search committee

Ref: CC.3

The Council received a report that the Pro-Chancellor, acting on its behalf, had approved the following group to consider who might be invited to take the chair of the Finance and General Purposes Committee:

Pro-Chancellor
Vice-Chancellor
Dr P. G. S. Entwistle
Ms F. M. Aiken
Mr E. T. McGregor