Council

Date and time Thursday 14 December 2006 at 5.00 pm

Place The Council Room, George Thomas Building

Present Dame Valerie Strachan (in the Chair), Professor I T Cameron, Dr S J Deuchar, Professor A Fitt, Dr M Gobbi, Professor J K Hammond, Professor R Holdaway, Mr A J Jukes, Professor J D Kilburn, Mr M S Killingley, Ms V Lawrence, Professor P A Nelson, Professor M Ratcliffe, Dr M P Read, Mr B Rogers*, Mr M J Snell, Mr R H M Symons, Professor C A Thomas, Professor W A Wakeham, Mr A J Walker and Professor D M Williams

With The Secretary and Registrar, Director of Corporate and Marketing Services, Director of Estates and Facilities, Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources and Dr K A Piggott

By invitation Mr J Munson, Director of Development and Alumni Relations, for item 17

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

Welcome

Dame Valerie welcomed all members to the meeting.

Unrestricted

15 Obituary

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


Emily Riall, year 3 BSc Psychology (course suspended from 3 December 2004 due to illness), 16 October 2006.

Mr Jeremy Seddon, the former Chair of the Board of the University of Southampton Science Park Limited, 16 November 2006.

16 Standing Orders of Council (Agendum 2)

Received A copy of the Standing Orders of Council, dated July 2006.

At the suggestion of Dame Valerie it was proposed that, for future meetings, the introductory notes to the agenda should include a reminder that members should declare any potential conflicts of interest. It was clear that members were already making such declarations as necessary, but a reminder would be useful for clarity.

Resolved (i) That the Standing Orders of Council be noted.
(ii) That for future meetings the introductory notes to the agenda should include a reminder to members that they should declare any potential conflicts of interest.

17 Minutes (unrestricted) of the meeting held on 28 September 2006

Resolved That the Minutes (unrestricted) of the meeting held on 28 September 2006 be approved and signed.

18 Matters arising

18.1 Mountbatten rebuild (minute 5)

The Secretary and Registrar was pleased to report that planning approval for the Mountbatten rebuild had been received.

18.2 Vice-Chancellor’s Annual Health and Safety Report: review of the safety office (minute 7)

A draft report on the review of the Safety Office was now available, but as this had not yet been considered within the University, it was not felt appropriate to bring this to Council at present. Members would be informed of progress at the next meeting.

18.3 Corporate Performance Indicators (minute 11)

A small working group (Dame Valerie Strachan, Mr Walker, the Secretary and Registrar and DVC Wheeler) had been set up to work with the Head of Planning on the development of effective corporate performance indicators, taking into account the comments raised by members at the last meeting. The Vice-Chancellor reported that the performance indicators and risk register were also now due for review under the annual internal audit cycle. It would be important for these reviews to be conducted in ways which led to outputs which were helpful to the University in taking this work forward, rather than simply highlighting problems of which the University was already aware and seeking to address. The quality of external input to the process would be crucial in this regard.

19 The Vice-Chancellor’s report

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the following key issues:

Specialist Diplomas for 14-19 year olds

The Vice-Chancellor drew members’ attention to the Government’s decision to introduce new Specialist Diplomas for 14-19 year olds. It was claimed that this would help to increase the number of state school pupils progressing to University, but there was concern among Russell Group institutions that the arrangements would have the opposite effect, because of a lack of resources in many schools to offer an increasingly wide range of qualifications. He invited DVC Thomas and Professor Ratcliffe to provide a more detailed update. Professor Ratcliffe explained how the Specialist Diplomas were being developed and piloted, emphasising that as no school would be in a position to offer all the Diplomas, regional collaboration would be essential. There would be implications for the School of Education in training professionals who would be equipped to teach these new Diplomas. DVC Thomas drew attention to the potential implications for University entrance, including the possible use of University entrance tests to enable equivalency of qualifications to be assessed, and the need for curriculum adjustments.

Mr Snell emphasised the importance of the University’s being seen to engage proactively with such developments, ideally in influencing Government at the early
stages, to avoid giving the impression that Universities were only concerned to retain A levels. The Vice-Chancellor however pointed out that on this occasion there had been no opportunity for discussion – rather the decision had simply been announced at Russell Group Vice-Chancellors’ meeting.

University of Winchester and University of Chichester – research degree awarding powers
Southampton currently accredited the research degrees of both the University of Winchester and the University of Chichester. However, the University of Winchester had recently applied for research degree awarding powers with immediate effect, despite having secured taught degree awarding powers only within the past year. The University of Chichester, which had been awarded taught degree powers much earlier, had not applied for research degrees powers. Solent University also had no plans to seek degree awarding powers in the short term.

Under this heading the Vice-Chancellor indicated that he would write to Professor Van Gore, currently Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Southampton Solent University, to offer congratulations on his appointment as Vice-Chancellor there.

Russell Group
Dr Wendy Piatt, formerly Head of Education at the Institute of Public Policy Research, and currently Deputy Director in the Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit, had been appointed the Director General of the Russell Group, with effect from January 2007.

RAE review
DVC Nelson reported that as a result of the recent national consultation it had been agreed that the Research Assessment Exercise would continue to include a quality measure, alongside indicators based on research income and postgraduate numbers. For science, engineering, technology and medicine the quality indicator would involve bibliometrics, while for other subjects, including maths, a light touch peer review would continue to be used. The University had assumed that such change was likely, and had been undertaking work on this basis.

National Student Survey (NSS)
The University had achieved 8th position in the NSS, which was an excellent result, and a tribute to both staff and students.

20 Report from the President of the Students’ Union (Agendum 6)
Received The report from the President of the Students’ Union.

Mr Rogers, the President of the Students’ Union, presented his report, drawing particular attention to the efforts being made to develop good relationships with the local community through a variety of means.

He was pleased to report that over 10% of students were now engaging in volunteering activity. Significant steps were taking place to develop the course representation system, and there were now over 440 representatives. Training was underway to enable representatives to perform their roles effectively. In respect of student feedback, it was important that students ‘owned’ their own feedback and learning; discussions were already taking place about this. If the University could improve students’ satisfaction with the feedback they received, it should be possible for the University to secure a place in the top 5 in the National Students Survey.

He thanked the University for the recent reforms to Security, and the improved visibility for security personnel following their move to the EEE building. SUSU was encouraging people to report any incidents not only to the police but also to University security.
Resolved  That the report be noted, with thanks.


Received  The audited accounts, including the Treasurer’s report and a statement on corporate governance, for the University and its subsidiary companies for the year ended 31 July 2006, together with a covering business analysis of the financial statements from the Director of Finance, and a Management Letter prepared by the External Auditors.

In presenting the final accounts the Director of Finance highlighted that 2005/6 had been a difficult and unusual year financially, given the problems related to the Mountbatten fire and the insurance claim, the need to adopt fully the provisions of Financial Reporting Standard 17 (FRS17), and a transfer of assets from the University to the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) under the new Memorandum of Understanding. A surplus of £7m had originally been predicted, but this had been reduced to £1.5m at year end. However, more than £4m of the difference was explicable by three significant non-cash movements:
- a higher than projected FRS 17 charge for retirement benefits;
- a greater proportion of equipment spend being charged to revenue rather than capital and then depreciated,
- the correction of the accounting treatment of a grant awarded in 1998/99 to the Textile Conservation Centre.

Despite the reduced surplus, the year-end position was nonetheless better than Council had been expecting at the point at which the budgets were set, which was effectively break-even on the assumption of a £2m FRS 17 charge (actual charge £3.6m).

The growth in student fee income (c 15%) was very pleasing. However, growth in research income had slowed, which was a significant concern; DVC Nelson would be taking forward discussions about this and would report to Council in due course. The rate of increase in expenditure on salaries had slowed compared with previous years, with salary payments increasing by 6.1%. This was consistent with predictions made by the Human Resources department at the time of the introduction of the new pay framework. Non-salary expenditure was distorted this year by the transfer of assets to NERC under the new Memorandum of Understanding, and by essential expenditure required as an immediate result of the Mountbatten fire. The cash balance had increased by £7.5m, which was consistent with predictions. A loan of £10.5m had been drawn down in Spring 2006. A further drawdown had been made of £14.5m in September 2006 (ie after the balance sheet date) to complete the utilisation of the Barclays Bank loan facility.

Members were advised that three University Companies (wholly–owned subsidiaries) had made small losses and required letters of support: Manor Centre Limited, Southampton Consulting Limited, and Southampton World Learning. None of these presented a significant risk to the University, and Council was therefore asked to confirm that it was content for a letter to be written to each Company stating the University’s continuing support.

The Treasurer reaffirmed that this had been a difficult year, and commended the Director of Finance and his team for all their work in the face of these problems. He felt that the University faced three key challenges:
- How to present next year’s accounts in such a way was would make clear the reason for the unusual figures, when there would be a much greater difference between the cash and accounting positions as a result of the expected receipt of the insurance funds for buildings and equipment destroyed in the Mountbatten fire;
- The need to control staff costs;
- The need to address the stalling of the increase in research income.

From the Audit Committee’s perspective Mr Killingley confirmed that the committee and the external auditors were satisfied with the accounting treatment for the Mountbatten fire and the subsequent insurance claim. The committee had been kept informed and well briefed throughout.

Council agreed that it would be essential to include in the accounts for 2006/07 clear explanations of the unusual figures resulting from the fire and insurance claim, and from the sale of the New College site, particularly as the University would at the same time be seeking to curb expenditure in what was a very difficult period financially. It would be helpful for Council to have early sight of proposals for accounts presentation.

**Resolved**

(i) That the External Auditors’ Management Letter and the action in train be noted.

(ii) That the Audited Accounts and the Treasurer’s report be approved for submission to the Court.

(iii) That a letter to confirm the University’s continuing support be sent to Manor Centre Limited, Southampton Consulting Limited and Southampton World Learning.

**Financial monitoring 2006/2007** (Agendum 12)

**Received**

The financial monitoring statement for the academic year 2006/07, dated 23 November 2006.

The Director of Finance presented the financial monitoring statement, and drew particular attention to two areas of deterioration:

- The increased deficit in the School of Nursing and Midwifery, resulting from the failure of the NHS to implement the new contract price for 2006/7 and reductions in student numbers; similar issues affected the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences.

- The new partial exemption method for VAT recovery agreed with HM Revenue and Customs, which was detrimental in its effect.

The Treasurer commented that while the predicted £7m deficit in Schools and Professional Services was understandable, given the current focus on investment, clearly this was not sustainable in the longer term, and Council would expect to see this being turned round. He was pleased to see close monitoring of budgets by Schools, recognising that some, such as Nursing and Midwifery, faced difficulties which were outwith their control.

**Resolved**

That the financial monitoring statement for 2006/07 be noted.

**Audit Committee: Annual report** (Agendum 13)

**Received**

The Annual Report from the Audit Committee for the year ended 31 July 2006, together with the Annual Internal Audit Report, 2005-2006, compiled by KPMG.

Mr Killingley, Chair of the Audit Committee, was pleased to report that the position described in the Annual Report was entirely satisfactory. There were no areas of material concern in the external audit, and the systems of internal control had operated in a satisfactory manner during the year. The Audit Committee had discussed in some detail the issues relating to the impact on next year’s accounts of
the Mountbatten fire and the subsequent insurance claim, and had agreed that clarity of presentation and explanation would be crucial.

It was noted that the contracts for both internal and external auditors were due to expire; work was already in hand to put the contracts to tender, with presentations planned for March 2007.

Resolved That the Annual Report from the Audit Committee for the year ended 31 July 2006 be noted.

24 Estates Strategy: decision points for consideration and approval (Agendum 14)

Received A paper from DVC Wheeler seeking Council’s formal endorsement of the University’s Estates Strategy and the associated capital plan.

In DVC Wheeler's absence the Secretary and Registrar presented the paper, reminding members of the information they had previously received about the estates strategy, both through formal Council meetings and the presentation which had taken place on 9 November. Much of the strategy was already being progressed in the light of Council's previous decisions but it was felt that it would be helpful to have a formal endorsement of the overall plan and framework. Members supported this approach.

Resolved (i) That the Estates Strategy be adopted.

(ii) That the associated capital plan be endorsed subject to:
 a. It being limited to a total expenditure of £236M.
 b. Regular reports being made to Council on progress in implementing the Estate Strategy and associated capital plan.
 c. Proposals for new capital expenditure on buildings in line with the capital programme being to Council in the normal manner.

25 Consultation on new structures for sector pay bargaining (Agendum 15)

Received A discussion paper, prepared by the Director of Human Resources, entitled ‘consultation on new structures for sector pay bargaining’, dated November 2006.

In presenting the paper the Director of Human Resources highlighted that a national consultation on this matter was currently underway. The purpose of considering the issues at this point was to seek to influence national discussions – no recommendations were being put to Council at this point, and the University did not yet feel in a position to make an unequivocal statement about its preferred position.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would welcome advice from any members of Council who had experiences of changing from a national to a local pay bargaining arrangement, in either the public or private sectors. He would particularly value input in terms of cost/benefit data.

It was suggested that it would be helpful for the University to have more control over its own destiny with regard to terms and conditions, although it was recognised that this might lead to an increase rather than a reduction in staff costs. The Secretary and Registrar commented that the difficulty of retaining a unitary system was that universities were now extremely diverse bodies, such that it was hard to argue that the same pay structure was appropriate for all. The University could use its staff budget more effectively if it could make its own arrangement -for example by moving away from incremental awards for time served, to a system based on
rewarding performance. Mr Rogers asked that in any change the possible position of students in industrial disputes be considered – under a local bargaining arrangement SUSU might potentially become more involved in such disputes. It was noted that there were options between local and national bargaining - a Group within the Russell Group was also currently exploring such options.

**Resolved**

(i) That any member with relevant experience or information regarding moves from national to local pay bargaining who would be willing to share this within the University should contact the Vice-Chancellor in the first instance, with the possibility that a small group might be set up to advise the Director of Human Resources and the Vice-Chancellor on this matter.

(ii) That the discussion paper be noted.

**Governance Issues: proposed amendments to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances (including Introduction of the Revised Model Statute)**  
(Agendum 16)

**Received** A paper informing Council about progress in taking forward proposed amendments to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances, including the introduction of the Revised Model Statute, dated December 2006.

The Secretary and Registrar reminded members that a number of amendments were required to the Charter, Statutes, and Ordinances as a result of changes to the University’s senior management team and to the composition of Council, and to the complaints procedures for students. Minor amendments were also required for updating and for clarity. In addition arrangements were now in hand to amend the Model Statute, and to streamline procedures. The proposed revisions were being presented to Council for information, prior to formal consultation with Senate and the Campus Trades Unions. All amendments would then be put to Council at its next meeting for a formal First Reading. The Director of Human Resources confirmed that the changes to the Model Statute would simplify and modernise existing arrangements, thus enabling the University to be managed more effectively than under the current Statute 31. Procedural details would be moved from the Statutes into Ordinances, so that any future changes would require only Council, rather than Privy Council, approval.

**Resolved**

(i) That the draft Revised Model Statute and definitional Ordinances as set out in the paper be accepted as the basis for consultation with representative groups.

(ii) That the draft Revised Model Statute and definitional Ordinances be circulated to members of Senate following the meeting of Council, to commence consultation on behalf of academic members of staff.

(iii) That, subject to the conclusion of consultations, final versions of the Revised Model Statute and definitional Ordinances be submitted to Senate and Council at their meetings on 28 February 2007 and 15 March 2007 respectively; and that a special meeting of Council be convened on 10 May 2007 for the Second Reading of the Revised Model Statute.

(iv) That, subject to the conclusion of consultations, the procedural Ordinances be submitted to Senate on 20 June 2007 and to Council on 12 July 2007.
(v) That other changes to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances previously advised to Council and as outlined in the paper be taken forward to the same timescale.

27 Annual Report from the Development Office  (Agendum 17)

Received The annual report to Council for the Southampton University Development Programme and Southampton University Development Trust 2005-6, prepared by Mr Munson, Director of Development and Alumni Relations.

Mr Munson presented the report, and was pleased to advise Council that the fund-raising programme should reach its goal of £1.5M once gift aid etc. was taken into account. There were other gifts coming into the University which were not being handled through the Development Trust; he would be working with the Director of Finance to consider how such monies might be recorded and acknowledged as falling within the University’s development programme. The Development Office had been building its infrastructure, which included cultural change in engaging Schools and Faculties in supporting the development programme. One of the key challenges would be to recruit appropriately qualified staff to fill the remaining posts. The infrastructure of the Southampton University Development Trust Board was also being developed, including bringing on board new volunteer trustees.

Development costs were currently 53p in the pound; next year if the target of £3m was met this would reduce to 33p in the pound, reducing further to 22p the year after, which would bring Southampton into line with the best fundraising operations in the country in terms of cost-effectiveness.

In response to a query about Southampton’s position in comparison with our competitors, Mr Munson commented that the four top fundraisers (Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh and LSE) all raised between £6m-£12m per annum; the performance of the latter two was not too different from that of Southampton. If all gift income coming into the University was recorded through the Development Trust, Southampton should be within this range within about five years.

Mr Munson paid tribute to the Secretary and Registrar for his commitment to and support for the Development Trust – without his assistance one of the largest gifts would not have been brought to fruition.

Resolved (i) That the annual report be noted.

(ii) That Mr Munson and his team be thanked for all their work, and encouraged to take these important activities forward.

28 Report from the meeting of Senate held on 29 November 2006  (Agendum 20)

Received The report from the meeting of Senate, held on 29 November 2006.

Resolved That the comments and information provided by Senate be noted.

29 Reports from the meetings of the Policy and Resources Committee

29.1 12 September 2006  (Agendum 21.1)

Received The report from the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 12 September 2006.
Resolved That the report from, and the decisions taken by, the Policy and Resources Committee be noted.

29.2 12 October 2006 (Agendum 21.2)

Received The report from the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 12 October 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the update on the programme of fire risk assessments, which Council had requested should be presented to PRC. DVC Nelson confirmed that the report on the fire risk assessment had been presented to Safety and Occupational Health Committee in November. Members of Council were content that appropriate action was now being taken.

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

25.3 9 November 2006 (Agendum 21.3)

Received The report from the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 9 November 2006.

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

25.4 14 December 2006 (Agendum 21.4)

Received The report from the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 14 December 2006; An appendix to this report (appendix 1) entitled ‘the Faraday Building’, prepared by Professor Hammond and DVC Wheeler, dated 11 December 2006.

Referring to item 1, future funding of the Universities Superannuation Scheme, the Vice-Chancellor reported that, following a period of consultation, the trustee company had now announced that, rather than increasing member institutions’ contributions by two per cent, the costs of early retirements between the ages of 55 and 60 would be borne by the relevant member institution, with immediate effect. USS had however agreed that where early retirement arrangements had already been approved, the previous arrangements would continue to apply. There was considerable concern among Russell Group institutions about the speed of the consultation process, and the fact that other aspects of the scheme were not reviewed at the same time. Mr Strike commented that the change would affect the University’s ability to manage difficult situations through the use of early retirements as such arrangements would now be much more costly for the institution.

In connection with the review of the School of Health Professions and Rehabilitation Sciences, members were reminded of the factors which had affected the funding for the School, and the national context of these changes. As the School of Nursing and Midwifery faced similar financial pressures this School would also now be the subject of an equivalent review, and the reports would both be brought to Council at its next meeting. Professor Williams emphasised that universities needed to be able to secure a position to influence and lead national healthcare policy before decisions were taken. It was noted that it had not yet proved possible for the Vice-Chancellor to meet with the Chief Executive of the Strategic Health Authority; all the universities in the area had now written to him to seek a meeting, but so far without success. The Vice-Chancellor emphasised that the two Schools were undertaking excellent work, and clearly the University wished to be involved in provision in these areas; however, it would neither be appropriate nor feasible for the University to continue to subsidise these activities at the current level for any length of time.
With regard to the Administration Systems Replacement Programme it was noted that, rather than opting for an Enterprise solution, the University had selected Northgate as the suppliers of the HR, Payroll and Pensions system, and Agresso for the Finance and Procurement system.

At PRC members had requested that further information be presented to Council in relation to the *proposed refurbishment of the Faraday building*. Council therefore received a further paper prepared and presented by Professor Hammond (circulated as appendix 1 to the PRC report). In presenting the paper, Professor Hammond outlined the current difficulties with the Faraday building, and the rationale for proceeding with the refurbishment project at this point, including the benefits of collocation for staff in three affected Schools. He explained the history of the building options, which had resulted in options 8 and 9 being put forward. While option 9 was the more expensive (£19.1m as against £17.8m), moving the staircases to the outer edge of the building would be truly transformative for the building, and would make the space more useable and flexible. This option would result in a building which was a flagship for sustainability, and an appropriate ‘home’ for a 5* School. The figures included the costs associated with decant and migration.

In response to a query from Dr Read, the Director of Estates and Facilities confirmed that option 9 would involve a significant transformation of the building externally and internally – it would be far more that a simple improvement of existing facilities.

Provision for the refurbishment had been made within the financial envelope for the capital programme, but the costs of option 9 were over the initial budget for the project, thus placing a pressure on the overall envelope. Estates Policy Committee (EPC) had been aware of this when it took its original decisions to support option 9. Mr Snell congratulated Professor Hammond and colleagues for all their work in connection with this project; he would vouch for the detailed interrogation which EPC had undertaken of the possible options, and financial consequences.

**Resolved**

(i) That the report from, and the decisions taken by, the Policy and Resources Committee be noted and endorsed.

(ii) That option 9 for the refurbishment of the Faraday Tower, as set out in appendix 1 to the PRC report, be approved

30

**Report from the meeting of Standing Committee of Council held on 9 November 2006 (Agendum 22)**

**Received** The report from the meeting of Standing Committee of Council held on 9 November 2006.

In presenting the paper the Secretary and Registrar was pleased to draw attention to the successful progress towards the disposal of the New College site, which it was hoped would now be completed before Christmas. The University had been well served by its Agents and its solicitors in bringing this to a successful conclusion. A late challenge from the estate of Edward Hulse, a former owner of the land, to enforce an old covenant, would need to be addressed. The issue relating to the insurance bond had been resolved, as it had been confirmed that this was as satisfactory for the University as a bank guarantee. The University had secured a very good deal, selling the site for over £21.5m, with the possibility of up to £4m overage – the site had originally been purchased in 1997 for £3m.

Following the brief discussion at Council in September, Standing Committee had considered further the arrangements for the programme of presentations and tours for members of Council, and proposed to adopt a similar pattern to that currently
used at senate, whereby the formal meeting began with a presentation. For Council this would mean starting at 4.00pm with an hour-long presentation, with the business meeting starting at 5.00pm and continuing until about 7.30pm. Members supported this proposal, but suggested that it would be helpful, where appropriate, for presentations to be linked to the business of the meeting.

A query was raised about contingency arrangements should there be delays with the appointment of the new Registrar and Chief Operating Officer. The Vice-Chancellor commented that a further round of interviews had now been arranged for January.

Resolved  
(i) That meetings of Council should begin at 4.00pm with an hour-long presentation, related to the business which follows, where appropriate, with the business meeting then continuing to approximately 7.30pm.

(ii) That the report from, and the decisions taken by, Standing Committee of Council be noted and endorsed.

31  
**Annual Diversity Report 2006** (Agendum 27)

Received  
The annual report on equality and diversity monitoring.

Dame Valerie proposed that there should be a more detailed discussion of diversity and equality matters at a future meeting.

Resolved  
That the Annual Report be noted.

32  
**Disability Equality Scheme 2006-2009** (Agendum 28)

Received  
The University’s first Disability Equality Scheme, covering the period 2006-2009, together with an action plan

It was noted that the University had a statutory duty to produce a disability equality scheme, to ensure that the University complied with its duties under the Disability Discrimination Acts 1995 and 2005.

Dame Valerie proposed that there should be a more detailed discussion of equality and diversity matters, including disability, at a future meeting.

Resolved  
That the Disability Equality Scheme 2006-2009 be approved.

33  
**University Bursaries 2007/08** (Agendum 29)

Received  
A paper from the Director of Finance and DVC Thomas setting out proposals for the level of bursaries in 2007/08, and associated minor amendments to the Access Agreement; together with a covering note updating information in the Access Agreement regarding the University’s performance against the location-adjusted HEFCE/HESA Benchmark.

It was noted that the proposal, which involved a minor change to the upper limit of the residual household income band, thus increasing the number of students who would be eligible to receive a bursary of £500, had been endorsed by PRC.

Resolved  
That the proposed changes to the bursary scheme under the Access Agreement, and the minor amendments to the Agreement, be endorsed.
Investment Funding for University Spin-Outs – the Minerva Project
(Agendum 30)

Received A briefing paper from the Director of the Centre for Enterprise and Innovation, dated 28 November 2006, concerning the activities currently in train to explore options for the next generation of investment fund for creating University spin-outs once the current funds (SULIS and IML) were fully invested.

It was noted that recommendations would be brought to a future Council meeting. Mr Read emphasised the value of working in partnership, and commended the progress which had been made through the current arrangements.

Resolved That the briefing paper be noted.

City of Southampton Strategy – Consultation Draft (Agendum 31)

Received An extract from the draft city of Southampton Strategy setting out the new vision for the City of Southampton.

The Secretary and Registrar sought Council’s agreement to propose to the City that there should be a greater emphasis in the vision statement on the knowledge economy as a key element in the City’s future development, and this was endorsed.

Resolved That feedback be given as part of the consultation process that the vision statement should include a greater emphasis on the knowledge economy as a key element in the City’s future development.
Minutes (restricted) of the meeting held on 28 September 2006

Resolved That the Minutes (restricted) of the meeting held on 28 September 2006 be approved and signed.

Matters arising

There were no matters arising from the restricted Minutes.

The Vice-Chancellor’s report

The Vice-Chancellor was pleased to draw attention to the following:

Nomination of the next Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Science and Mathematics

The next Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Science and Mathematics, vice Professor Hammond, would be Professor J D Kilburn, currently Head of the School of Chemistry, with effect from 1 August 2007.

Promotions to personal Chairs

The title and status of Professor would be conferred upon the following, with effect from 1 December 2006:

- Dr P Reed   School of Engineering Sciences
- Dr I Sinclair  School of Engineering Sciences
- Ms J Steele  School of Law

Resolved That the senior appointments listed above be endorsed with pleasure.

Report (restricted) from the meeting of Senate held on 29 November 2006 (Agendum 40)

Received The restricted report from the meeting of Senate, held on 29 November 2006.

Attention was drawn to the report from the Special Committee set up to address a student’s grievance. Although the committee had concluded that there was no case to answer, the student had taken his grievance to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). This was the first case for the University, although it was not yet clear whether the OIA would be taking up the case.

Resolved (i) That the appointment of Emeritus Professor Dilys Hill as Public Orator from 1 January 2006 for a three year period in the first instance be noted with pleasure.

(ii) That, on the recommendation of the Honorary Degree Committee, Honorary Degrees be conferred upon the candidates below, subject to their consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Proposed degree</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Ashburton</td>
<td>DUniv</td>
<td>Former merchant banker and Chairman of Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dame Carol Black</td>
<td>DSc</td>
<td>President, Royal College of Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroness Betty Boothroyd</td>
<td>DUniv</td>
<td>Life Peer; Chancellor of the Open University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Name | Proposed degree | Occupation
---|---|---
Professor Roger Brown | DUniv | Vice-Chancellor, Southampton Solent University
Professor Sir David Cox | DSc | Statistician
Professor Sally Davies | DM | Director of Research and Development for the Department of Health
Mr Stephen Hope | MA | Member and examiner of the UK KDS (Karate-Do-Shotokai) Executive
Mr Mans Jacobsson | LLD | Director of the International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC Funds)
Mr Peter T Jones | DUniv | Director, Biffa Waste Services Ltd
Dame Helen Mirren | DUniv | Actor
Mr Peter Molyneux | DSc | Computer games maker and Alumnus
Mr Stephen Payne | DSc | Vice-President of Carnival Cruises and Alumnus
Lord Sainsbury | DSc | Former Under-Secretary of State for Science and Innovation
Mr Richard Thomas | LLD | Information Commissioner and Alumnus
Dr Roger Urwin | DSc | Group Chief Executive, National Grid and Alumnus

(iii) That, on the recommendation of the Academic and Research Staff Committee, the title of Emeritus Professor be conferred upon Professor Helen Simons on her retirement from the University.

(iv) That the comments and information provided by Senate be noted.

#### 40 Report (restricted) from the meeting of the Standing Committee of Council held on 9 November 2006 (Agendum 42)

**Received** The report (restricted) from the meeting of the Standing Committee of Council, held on 9 November 2006.

It was noted that the report covered the same Special Committee as was referenced in the restricted report from Senate above.

**Resolved** That the report be noted.

#### 41 Update from the Redundancy Committee relating to undergraduate programmes in History and Theory of Art and Design, Winchester School of Art (Agendum 43)

**Received** A report from the Director of Human Resources recording that the three members of staff on whom Council had resolved (13.07.06) that dismissal notices by reason of redundancy should be served had each reached voluntary agreements with the University to leave prior to the effective dates of their dismissal.

**Resolved** That the report be noted.

+++++

The meeting finished at approximately 7.45 pm.
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