MINUTES SECTION A – OPEN FOR PUBLICATION

Part One – Preliminary Items
The Chair welcomed Ms Rima Amin, President-Elect of the Students’ Union to her first meeting as a Member following the early resignation of Giulio Folino.

In its plenary session, Council had received a presentation by the Dean of Cass on the report commissioned by the School from the consultants Carrington Crisp. This sought to review what changes were required for Cass to move into the top 10 of European Business Schools. Council noted that the decisions in respect of the report’s recommendations were delegated to the Executive. Council saw the report as a first step in a debate and would welcome further work being undertaken in respect of the future
strategic options for Cass by both the Executive and the School as part of the programme of work to develop the University's new Vision and Strategic Plan.

1. **Highlighted Items**
   Council agreed the highlighted items

2. **Minutes**
The minutes of the meeting held on 23rd May 2014 were approved, subject to the inclusion of the attendance record for the meeting held during the Away Day on 24th January 2014 and insertion of the word “Deputy” into the second line of the decision in Item 12.2 – “he would end his term as Deputy Pro-Chancellor”.

3. **Matters Arising**
   Council noted the table of actions arising from past meetings and raised the following points in discussion:
   - **Action 5, Minute 11.4, 11.10.13:** Council agreed to remove the action inviting members to an Information Technology tour.
   - **Action 11, Minute 11, 28.03.14:** Council agreed that it would consider the results of the pulse survey planned for November and review progress on the staff survey results at the most appropriate Council meeting in the early 2015.

4. **Conflicts of Interest**
   Council agreed that Members would indicate any conflicts of interest at the time of the item to which those conflicts pertained.

5. **Items Specially Brought Forward by the Chair**

5.1 **Staff Member of Council**
   A Panel had been convened under the Ordinances and an interview held conducted with the staff member nominated by the Vice-Chancellor - Ms Mary Luckiram - for membership of Council. The Panel had comprised the Pro-Chancellor, Deputy Pro-Chancellor and Council Member Carolyn Regan.

   **Decision**
   Council agreed to appoint Ms Mary Luckiram, Director of Human Resources, as a Member of Council for three years starting on 1st August 2014.

5.2 **Council Link Scheme**
   The Pro-Chancellor and University Secretary had discussed the Council School Link Scheme in order to refresh the arrangements. The University Secretary would communicate with Council members on amendments to be made to memberships.

5.3 **Dean of the Cass Business School**
   The Pro-Chancellor had agreed with the Vice-Chancellor that two independent Council representatives would participate in the appointment process for the new Dean of the Cass Business School. The authority for the process and the appointment of the Dean was delegated to the Vice-Chancellor. Ms Hunada Nouss, Council link member for Cass, would participate as a member of the interview panel and the Pro-Chancellor would meet the candidates. Both would be involved in the preliminary job specification and shortlisting processes.

5.4 **Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability**
   HEFCE had published a Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability which replaced the Financial Memorandum. This would be circulated to members.
5.5 **Council Appraisals 2014**
All Council Members had participated in the 2014 appraisal round. The regular Council attendees (who were not Council Members) had completed the appraisal form for the first time this year. There was an agreed continuing improvement in the performance of Council and there were no substantive issues to raise. There was for the first time good alignment between the Executive and the Independent Members on personal and overall performance. Corporate Governance and Nominations Committee would discuss the detailed report at its next meeting and report back on any actions arising. The President of the Students’ Union had asked how students should connect with the operational management of the University and this question had been referred to the Vice-Chancellor who would consider whether the introduction of an appropriate forum for this purpose would be helpful e.g., attendance at part or all of the ExCo meetings. Council members were content with the content of the appraisal questionnaire and the appraisal process.

5.6 **Outgoing Members**
The Pro-Chancellor led Council in thanking the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development), Professor Dinos Arcoumanis, for his contribution as a Member of Council as his term of office would end on 31st July 2014 when he retired as Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Council also thanked the outgoing President of the Students’ Union, Mr Giulio Folino, for his contribution over his two years of office.

5.7 **MBE**
Council congratulated the University Secretary, Mr Frank Toop, on being awarded an MBE for services to Higher and Further Education in the Queen’s Birthday Honours.

6. **Council Calendar**
Council noted the rolling Council Calendar and the following points were raised:
- The topic for the plenary discussion in November 2014 would be Institutional Culture and the Pro-Chancellor had invited several Independent Council Members to share their experiences of implementing major change programmes.
- Members were reminded that following the March plenary there had been a useful dinner for Independent Council Members at the Vice-Chancellor’s house. There would be another on 3rd September if Members wished to attend.

**Part Two – Major Items for Discussion or Decision**

7. **Vice-Chancellor’s Report**
The Vice-Chancellor highlighted several items from his report. In discussion the following points were noted:
- Changes to the Executive reporting structure following among other things, the retirement of Professor Arcoumanis.
- A recommendation to name the office and teaching block in the newly developed Finsbury site as the Franklin Building in honour of Professor Raoul Franklin CBE, Vice-Chancellor 1978-1998. Council noted that the naming was not in perpetuity.
- The University had reviewed City’s performance in student visa processes following recent Home Office action and assured Council on the processes in place. These would be subject to an internal audit.
• New cleaning and catering contracts would commence with Julius Rutherfoord (Cleaning) and Sodexo/Lexington (Catering) on 1st August 2014.
• UCAS applications for undergraduate study were approximately 2% higher than they had been at the same point in 2012/13 and offers were approximately 10% higher.
• Postgraduate applications were being tracked in detail centrally for the first time. Council noted that a centralised marketing process was in place for all Schools except for the Cass Business School Masters programmes which had a well-established process. Recruitment appeared to be on target but there could be significant changes in the month or so before the start of programmes.
• An event would be held on 4th August to open a display and unveil a plaque in commemoration of the contribution made by City’s staff and students in World War 1.

Decisions
(i) Council approved the recommendation that the office and teaching block in the newly developed Finsbury site be named the Franklin Building.
(ii) Council agreed that when the service standards reports, being developed following PSR, are available then consideration should be given on how these are reported to Council. This might be by a formal reporting cycle together with comments on exceptional items in the Vice-Chancellor’s report to Council.

8. President of the Students’ Union Report
The President-Elect gave a report covering the following points:
• The Union was undertaking reviews of its Governance and Services in conjunction with the University Executive. A Trustee Board away-day was being planned as part of the governance review.
• The incoming Vice-President Education would continue the work on the student representation system focusing on how student representatives worked with University staff. The Union planned to offer training to University staff on how to get the best results from student representation.
• The Union would press the case that students employed directly by Unitemps should receive at least the London Living Wage.
• The President-Elect thanked the outgoing President and Vice-President, Education for their contribution and support during the past year.

9. Finance
9.1 Revised Forecast 2013/14 and Budget 2014/15
Council received the proposed Budget for 2014/15 showing a surplus of £0.1M and the revised Forecast for 2013/14 showing a deficit of £10.8M. In discussion the following points were raised:
• The Executive are still aiming to achieve a deficit below £10M for 2013/14.
• Council noted that the small surplus of £0.1M for 2014/15 had been difficult to achieve and that there remained risks in achieving the cost savings required - around £3M of further savings were needed to reach the surplus position. The reduction in maintenance costs might be acceptable for one year but could not be an ongoing position. A vacancy level had already been assumed in the budget and so could not provide a cushion if there were adverse events.
• The key risk was the achievement of revenue targets and the Executive was asked what actions would be taken if recruitment did not go according
to plan. The CFO noted that the first action would be to determine whether the loss was a one-off event or likely to be continuing. The key levers to adjust spending within year were staff recruitment, information services expenditure and capital expenditure.

- Council asked the extent to which staff across the institution understood the financial challenges and the extent to which the problem was shared. The CFO noted the roadshows being undertaken and the development of a full cost allocation model so as to better understand which activities were profit-making or loss-making. He accepted that more needed to be done to involve staff generally and achieve a sharing of the institutions financial challenges.

**Decision**

Council **approved** the 2014/15 budget.

9.2 Financial Forecasts

Council received the University’s Financial Plan 2016/17 showing surpluses of £6.9M 2015/16 and £12M 2016/17 to be submitted to HEFCE. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The Vice-Chancellor noted, by way of context, the following external financial challenges faced by the University in 2014/15: minimum of a 2% increase in employers USS contributions, the £9k undergraduate fee was not being inflated, national UK/EU postgraduate recruitment continued to decline, the Government’s unhelpful stance on overseas student numbers and visas, inflation set to rise, increases in National Insurance, squeeze on NHS expenditure (contract renewal in London was likely to be a test case for the rest of the country), BIS funding likely to decline in next Comprehensive Spending Review, General Election pending with potential significant policy changes depending on the successful party, including whether the Science budget would continue to be protected. The next few years would be very challenging. There were some possible upsides such as EU recruitment. ExCo would be considering how to respond to these challenges at an away-day in October. The coincidence of these challenges was not well understood across the University and ExCo needed to consider how to change this position.

- The Chair of SIPCo noted his view that a key issue to consider was academic productivity and to focus on improving the contribution achieved from Schools. It would be very difficult to achieve the planned surplus for 2015/16 and the University might have to be more radical to meet the external financial challenges.

- It was noted that it took quite a long time to achieve the income growth assumed by the investment in research-excellent staff. It took at least 12 months for the staff to settle into their new positions. New courses took time to develop and 2-3 years to build their reputation and generate profits.

- One member noted that many organisations faced these challenges. It was right to focus on cost reduction but there must still be a focus on income/profit generation and the University should be willing to approve additional budgeted cost if this could be justified to achieve this. The danger in a cost cutting culture was that additional income/profit generation was not prioritised.

**Decisions**

(i) Council **approved** the Financial Plan to 2016/17 and **agreed** to delegate to the Vice-Chancellor finalisation of the submission to include, perhaps in the
risk section, a more transparent explanation of the financial risks and challenges faced by the University.

(ii) SIPCo to review the full allocation of costs i.e., output from the full allocation of cost model.

(iii) The Executive should consider how to improve understanding of the financial issues across the University and to achieve a shared commitment to resolving the financial position.

10. University Level Risk Review

Council considered the biannual review of the Risk Register which showed 7 red risks out of a total of 22 risks. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The Register had been discussed by Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) and then, following that, reviewed again by the University Executive Team.
- The Chair of ARC reported on ARC’s role and discussions. A key concern of ARC was to ensure that the risks and controls were properly stated. ARC had been concerned to ensure that risks were being managed and had introduced a programme of discussions with individual risk owners. The discussion with risk owners would be extended to include the Deans. The Chair of ARC reported that risk ownership resided at the senior tiers of the University but the challenge is to instil a risk culture/awareness further down the organisation.
- Both the Chair of SIPCo and the Chair of ARC noted that the register had improved significantly.
- A member noted that Senate did not appear often in the control framework and asked whether this was appropriate. It was noted that Senate’s concern was risks that affected academic standards and quality and it was being considered whether Senate should receive relevant sections of the risk register for discussion.
- The further actions required for Risk 8 would be re-worded to reflect that work on the Professional Services Review for the Research Office would have started by June 2014, rather than have successfully concluded.
- Council noted that the destination scores for a number of risks remained red including staff morale. Council noted the Executive’s assessment that improvement in this area would take a long time to be seen, particularly with the planned continuing change agenda and financial challenges. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Strategy & Planning) noted that his focus was on ensuring there was a good understanding of risk rather than that the register was completed in a way that gave the impression that an exact numerical assessment could always be provided. He was not interested in a bureaucratic approach and while sometimes he would challenge the risk owner, if he felt there was good understanding, he would often let the matter rest.

Decisions

Council agreed:

(i) The Executive and ARC should consider the scope for a more quantitative assessment of risk using financial information.

(ii) The Register should be fully reviewed and re-set as part of the development of the next Strategic Plan.

(iii) The Executive and ARC should consider the definition of “Likely” - set at 21-50% likelihood - which could unreasonably elevate a risk score.
11 Progress in Implementing the Strategic Plan

11.1 Professional Services Review
Council received a verbal report on progress made in the implementation of the Professional Services Review. In discussion the following points were raised:

- Further savings of £0.5M from 2015/16 would be proposed to ExCo for Information Services.
- Proposals for Research Office were being developed.
- The organisational structure for Student & Academic Administration was currently being discussed.
- ExCo had extended the brief of the PSR Steering Group and had asked it to consider the potential for further savings which would be discussed in the Autumn.
- It was noted that improvements needed to be made in some Services to meet the required service standards.
- Senate had noted that the ‘Your Voice’ internal student survey results had revealed no evidence that PSR had affected student satisfaction in respect of Information Services.
- Council noted that Restructuring Committee had asked whether an independent person should collect and analyse the feedback on Phase 1.

11.2 Succeeding with Students Work Stream Progress Report
Council considered a progress report from the Succeeding with Students Work Stream. Attention was drawn to one project – articulation of the offer. Council noted the work ongoing to improve retention including the educational analytics project.

Decision
Council agreed to receive the Student Charter for information as part of the Students’ Union report at its next meeting.

11.3 Annual Research Quality Monitoring
Council received a report on the 2014 Annual Research Quality Monitoring Exercise (ARQM) showing that 49% of academic staff had a grade point average greater than or equal to 3 compared to 21% (2011) and 43% (2013). The 2014 report covered publications prior to December 2013. In discussion the following points were raised:

- These data were now used as part of academic staff appraisal and promotion exercises. They were also used to inform new staff appointments.
- A sample of outputs are sent to external referees for evaluation and their ratings are used to calibrate the ratings of the School Panel.
- It was noted that the citation PI was not increasing as fast as anticipated partly due to papers not being put in the repository, the University’s name not being correctly stated, the fact that the repository was only established in 2012 when other institutions had implemented theirs as early as 2005/6 and the low number of papers published in the past. There was a strong relationship between the number of papers and the number of citations. It was also noted that if papers were written in collaboration with international authors this should increase the number of times they were cited. Entering the paper on the institutional repository would become critical as only papers put on line within a certain period of time after publication could be submitted to the next REF.
- Members noted that the academic staff numbers included Visiting Staff. The Dean of Cass noted that he focused on the proportion of full time staff and
asked for both sets of percentages to be shown. It was noted that the
distribution of staff resources in the Schools was at the discretion of the
Dean and therefore that total academic staff resource was seen by the
Executive as the key indicator.

11.4 Institutional Performance against Strategic Plan Milestones
Council received the biannual report which provided an update on the KPIs/PIs at
Institution level against Strategic Plan milestones. In discussion the following
points were raised:
- The Executive reported growing confidence in the ability to close the gap in
  student retention in some areas e.g., work being undertaken by the Dean of
  Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering.
- Council noted that the entry tariff score data was for 2012 and that
  improved performance should be seen when the 2013 data became
  available. There was a balance to be achieved between securing student
  numbers and increasing tariff scores.
- The annual 2% increase planned in the proportion of staff with a doctorate
  equated to 15 FTEs of staff which could arise through new staff coming with
  doctorates or existing staff gaining doctorates. The PI included visiting staff.
  The early estimate of the percentage for 2013/14 was about 63.5% - an
  increase of over 4% when compared to the previous year. The actual figure
  will not be known until the HESA return is completed.

12 Ordinances and Regulations
Council considered the recommendations from Senate and CGNC for revisions to
Ordinance C1 – Senate. These followed work to ensure that Senate was properly
engaged and debates clarifying that Senate’s focus was on academic quality and
standards. The revisions clarified Council’s expectations of Senate, set out
Senate’s primary responsibilities and the circumstances under which Senate would
be consulted on major changes where approval authority was held elsewhere. The
revisions also contained some minor changes to composition. Council also
received for information two Regulations approved by Senate – “Way Senate
Operates” and “Role of Senate in Major Change Projects”. These sought to define
how Senate went about its business.

Decision
Council approved the proposed Ordinance changes.

13. Divisional Reorganisation – Health Sciences
Council considered a proposal to reorganise the School of Health Sciences into 5
divisions. The changes centred upon returning the responsibility for programme
management to the Divisional Lead and making the Research Centres the primary
structures for the development of research activity. The Research Centre
organisational proposal had been approved by the Board of Studies within its
delegated powers.

Decision
Council approved the proposal recommended by Senate to restructure the School
of Health Sciences. This would reorganise and reduce the current divisions from 6
to 5 being:
- Optometry & Visual Sciences
- Language & Communication Sciences
- Health Services Research & Management (encompassing Public Health)
- Nursing (encompassing Adult, Mental Health & Child Nursing and Biology)
• Midwifery & Radiography

Midwifery and Radiography would operate as separate virtual departments for external purposes.

_The Pro-Vice Chancellor, Mr Rob Woodward, left the room for the following item and the Deputy Pro-Chancellor took over the Chair._

14. Appraisal of the Pro-Chancellor
Council considered the five questions set out in the annual process for appraisal of the Pro-Chancellor and also considered the role of the Pro-Chancellor set out in Ordinances. The Deputy Pro-Chancellor would provide feedback to the Pro-Chancellor following the meeting.

Council members were overwhelmingly positive in their comments. They felt that the Pro-Chancellor gave very effective leadership. He held Council Members to account and raised the quality of their contributions. He was approachable and accessible, maintained a good understanding of current Sector issues, was extremely generous with his time and worked very well with the Executive. The breadth of his interests covered all aspects of Council’s responsibility. One Member asked whether the Pro-Chancellor felt that he had enough support and the Deputy Pro-Chancellor undertook to ask this question during his feedback meeting on the appraisal process.

**Part Three – Items for information and not to be discussed unless starred**

The following items were not starred for discussion and therefore not discussed and taken as read with the exception of items 15.4, 17 and 19.

15. Minutes for Note
The following minutes had been approved by the Chair, but not yet by the full committee:
- 15.1 Audit and Risk Committee, 16th June 2014
- 15.2 Restructuring Committee, 17th June 2014
- 15.3 Senate, 18th June 2014
- 15.4 Strategy Implementation & Performance Committee (SIPCo) 1st July 2014

The Director of Property & Facilities would review the market value of the Bath Street site over the summer. It was noted that a sale would help City’s cash balances but also be likely to return the net strategic estate spend to that which had been originally forecast (excluding Abacus House).

**Decision**
Council agreed to delegate authority to SIPCo to agree a sale or lease of Bath Street if a decision was required prior to the next meeting of Council.

16. Health and Safety Mid-Year Report
Council noted the biannual Health and Safety report.

17. QAA Institutional Review 2012 – Action Plan Update
Council noted the QAA Action Plan approved by Senate. The action plan would be published on the University’s website.

18. University Events
Council noted the list of upcoming events.

19. **FOI Review**
   Council agreed the open/closed/restricted classification of items for the meeting as set out in the agenda.

20. **Date of Next Meeting**
   10\textsuperscript{th} October 2014, with a dinner for Chairs of Council Committee on the preceding evening to which other members were welcome.

   The message setting out highlights from this Council meeting would be circulated to staff today.

   Council noted that Xan Kite, Assistant University Secretary, was leaving the University to go to Kings College London as Director of Governance and Legal Affairs Management. Council thanked her for her input and wished her success in her new role.

**Part Four – Short Meeting of Independent Members**

21. **Short Meeting of Independent Members**
   There was a short meeting of the Independent Members, which was not minuted.

Rob Woodward  
Pro-Chancellor and Chair of Council  
July 2014