

**COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING HELD ON 9th OCTOBER 2020**

Members		Meeting 1 09.10.20	Meeting 2 27.11.20	Meeting 3 12.02.21	Meeting 4 26.03.21	Meeting 5 14.05.21	Meeting 6 023.07.21
Independent Members	Ms Julia Palca (Chair)	✓					
	Professor Sir Paul Curran (President)	✓					
	Ms Kru Desai	✓					
	Dr Paula Franklin	✓					
	Mr Simon Harding-Roots	✓					
	Mr Adrian Haxby	✓					
	Ms Philippa Hird	✓					
	Professor Chris Jenks	✓					
	Mr Thomas Lee-Warren	✓					
	Dr Andrew Mackintosh	✓					
	Ms Jen Tippin	A					
Mr Ron Zeghibe	✓						
Staff and Student Members	Ms Mary Luckiram	✓					
	Mr Saqlain Riaz	✓					
	Ms Liz Rylatt	✓					
	Professor Debra Salmon	✓					

Key: ✓ In Attendance A Apologies P Part Attendance N/M Not a Member S Sabbatical

In Attendance	Reason and Meeting Section
Professor David Bolton	Deputy President & Provost (DP&P)
Ms Sandra Brown	Equality & Diversity Athena SWAN Manager (Items 13 & 14)
Dr Jessica Jones-Nielsen	Programme Director, Psychology, RESCAT Co-Chair (Items 13 & 14)
Professor Andrew Jones	Interim Deputy President
Dr William Jordan	College Secretary
Ms Sarah Lawton	Governance Administrator
Ms Natasha Mutch-Vidal	S&AS, Member of HSFRG (Items 13 & 14)
Ms Hunada Nouss	Chair of Historic Sources of Funding Review Group (Items 13 & 14)
Professor Zoe Radnor	Vice-President, Strategy and Planning
Professor Paolo Volpin	Dean of Cass Business School
Ms Abby Wilson	Head of Fundraising, Secretary to the HSFRG (Items 13 & 14)

MINUTES SECTION A – OPEN FOR PUBLICATION

Part One – Preliminary Items

- 1. Highlighted Items**
Council **agreed** the highlighted items.
- 2. Minutes**
The minutes of the meeting held on 3rd July 2020 were approved.
- 3. Matters Arising**
Council noted the table of actions arising from past meetings.

USS Update

Employers were currently being consulted on the Technical Provisions for the March 2020 valuation. USS had elected to conduct the consultation in a series of consultation stages and discussion amongst USS employers and commentary from UUK confirmed City's view that it was very difficult to respond to this consultation in advance of later consultations in the autumn on the covenant and other matters. The economic impact of Covid-19 also created additional complexity in responding on

issues of risk appetite and measures to support the covenant. The illustrative ranges of employer and employee contributions indicated levels of contribution which would be unaffordable for employers and would lead to greater numbers of staff leaving the Scheme. City's concern remained to ensure a sustainable and affordable pension scheme for staff.

The consultation concludes on 30th October and was expected to include the involvement of the governing body. The draft consultation responses would be submitted to the Chair of Council prior to wider circulation amongst Independent Members of Council for their comments. **[Action]**

JNCHES Update

The University and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA) remained in dialogue with the Trade Unions at national level on the pay round for 2020/21. The employers' strong mandate remained that a pay uplift from August 2020 was not possible, because of the impact of Covid-19 and other underlying financial difficulties. UCEA continued discussions on other non-pay elements of the negotiation, such as guidance to institutions in addressing equal pay gaps.

The Executive noted that discussions with the Trade Unions continued regarding staff redundancies and that they had discussed the plan to undertake a portfolio review to ascertain which programmes were less viable. This approach, in the view of the Executive and Deans, was preferable to applying salary reductions for all staff across the institution. The Unions' response to this approach remained that City should borrow to meet its needs this year, as the level of recovery for 2021 was not yet known.

Council noted that it was generally inadvisable to take out loans to cover short-term shortfalls in income. The Interim DP noted that this view echoed the Executive's general opinion about commercial loans, but City would consider taking advantage of the proposed Government "Sure Scheme". The details would be announced in due course, but it was possible that the basis of the scheme would be 75% loan and 25% grant.

4. Conflicts of Interest

The President noted that he had joined the Board of USS; and had therefore declared an interest in Item 3 (above).

5. Items Specially Brought Forward by the Chair

Business School Name

A steering committee had been established with responsibility for overseeing the method of choosing a new name for the Business School, chaired by Hunada Nouss and a working group had also been established with responsibility for undertaking the groundwork, co-chaired by Professor Volpin and Professor Caroline Wiertz. A brand agency had been appointed and wide consultation was taking place to ensure that all interests were represented.

Appointment Process for Dean of the Business School

The Chair was delighted to confirm that Professor Paolo Volpin had agreed to an extension of his appointment; Paolo would continue to lead the School until 31st August 2021. This reflected a decision to extend the search process with the aim of shortlisting and interviewing in the spring.

City of London Academy Islington (COLAI)

All strands of work to transfer COLAI to the City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT), for a Supplementary Funding Agreement to be in place, had been completed with relevant legal documents signed by all parties and forwarded to the DfE in August. Eventually, this will require formal Council sign-off. **[Action]**

Informal Staff Meetings

The Chair hoped to be able to meet with Trade Union representatives in January. Any Council members who wished to attend that meeting should inform the College Secretary. **[Action]**

The Chair noted that the Senior Elected Senator had requested a meeting with her to discuss the NSS results. Philippa Hird had expressed an interest in attending this meeting if it took place and if any other members wished to attend they would be welcome to do so. **[Action]**

6. Council Calendar

Council noted the calendar. The Chair expressed her hope that face-to-face meetings could resume in 2021.

7. Verbal Report from the President

The President gave a verbal update and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The President had put in place a new temporary senior management structure for the next almost ten months. The new temporary structure would maintain City's existing education and student-related committees; but ET and ExCo would no longer meet; and there would be an Executive Board with clear lines of sight to all of City's activities. Further details of the new temporary management structure were included for information at agenda Item 23.
- Finsbury Square negotiations had continued but had been complicated by a flood in the basement of the building. However, this had been resolved and City should be able to sign the agreement later in the month, as soon as the papers arrived from the landlord's lawyers. It would then take 6 weeks until completion, with a view to occupying the building from early 2021 and to begin paying for it in 2022. The President noted that while the long-term rationale for proceeding with FSQ remained unchanged, the addendum to the Financial Plan paper at 10.3 suggested that further discussion of the issues would be helpful.
- The *Guardian University Guide*, which was based exclusively on undergraduate education metrics, had been published last month. Given the weakness of City's latest NSS result it had been anticipated that City would decline in the ranking. However, strong performance on the 'graduate outcomes' (employment in graduate level positions) and 'value added' (difference between the level of incoming and outgoing qualifications) metrics saw City move up two places to 95th and 12th in London.
- The provision of Covid-19 testing centres was geographically variable across the country, with the current "local" one for City being 50 minutes' walk away. City was being considered for its own indoor centre, but progress was slow. With regard to student infections, the current reported number was low as a result of City having fewer students in halls and possibly because of a relatively low level of infection in Islington. The number of student infections reported, as of the previous day, was 8. Universities were now required to report daily to the Government if infection numbers are above 25. The UUK check-list for self-isolating students had been published earlier in the week.
- The President had, earlier in the day, been sent a letter from the Secretary of State for Education, calling on Universities to sign up to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of anti-Semitism by the end of the year. The Chair noted the sector-wide significance of this request.
- Public Health England commended City on the support it has provided to its students during the pandemic. Thanks were particularly due to colleagues working in Student and Academic Services and to the Return to Campus Working Group.

8. Students' Union Report

Council received the report and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The SU had concluded the first year of its 2019/22 Strategic Plan. Remote working had had a substantial impact on several strategic projects, but progress was good.
- An internal activities process audit had been completed in Autumn 2019 to streamline student group processes and was revisited in the wake of Covid-19 to ensure that all aspects of the current SU activities would be available online.
- SU reserves would be used to recruit an Academic & Money Advisor to support new Money Advice services.
- In the spring, the SU had completed an Access and Participation Plan (APP) funded research project into the experience of disabled students at City aimed at creating an accessible and supportive community, strengthening their voice and creating a Disabled Students Network, led by the priority four group.
- The SU had been undertaking regular targeted checks on students living in halls and some key themes from those conversations were beginning to emerge, for example, feedback to date showed that students valued any personal contact they received from City.
- The SU President had also been running focus groups for students and from these sessions it was evident that students valued time spent on campus and overall were content that City took their safety and wellbeing seriously and were managing Covid-19 arrangements well.
- The SU President would at the next meeting provide a report on the key themes that emerged from Covid-19 related discussions with students. **[Action]**

Part Two – Major Items for Discussion or Decision

9. Coronavirus: Update

Council received a verbal update and the following points were noted:

- City had responded and adapted well to providing online education and to returning to campus.
- The Dean of Health echoed the SU President's view that students were delighted to be on campus, noting that a key aspect of becoming a health professional was about creating face-to-face relationships. In addition, the NHS expected City's health students to undertake their studies in the appropriate environment to prepare them for work on the front line – and that is what City's students also expected!
- Policing the use of face coverings on campus was proving to be challenging but, as very few people were on campus at present, it was felt that the most appropriate way to manage this for the time being was by enlisting Student Ambassadors to remind individuals to adhere to the rules. This activity would be taken forward by the Director of Registry & Student Services.
- The Return to Campus Working Group continued to monitor advice on planning in the event of a local lockdown. If this were to happen, City was well placed to move the majority of its teaching online (most was already online) but the School of Health would need to reconsider how it managed its clinical teaching provision. However, the Government's aim was to keep places of education open and City's position would mirror that aim.
- Given that one of City's key priorities for this year was to focus on the student experience it would be beneficial for the Executive to receive regular data to be able to measure progress. Each School was conducting pulse surveys and the data would be reviewed at the newly formed Student Experience Task and Finish Group (reporting to Education and Students Committee), although it was still very early in the term. Education and Students Committee had produced a briefing which outlined the measurement mechanisms in place.

- It could sometimes be useful to issue very short questionnaires on a regular basis in times of crisis in order to gather the latest feedback/mood and often recipients appreciated the contact. But this approach could also have a negative impact if, for example, students asked for something which cannot be delivered.
- The SU President noted that, with appropriate and targeted communications, students' expectations with regard to Term 2, for example, could be well managed. The Executive Board would continue to work with the SU and the Director of Marketing on a communications strategy.
- The Deputy President & Provost noted that, through promotional activity, students suffering from digital poverty were being directed towards making an application to the hardship fund and up to 30 cases (which had satisfied the criteria) had already been dealt with.
- Some requests from students were not for funding but for space on campus as their accommodation was not suitable for study and these requests too were also being addressed where possible.

10. Finance

10.1 Financial Performance Report Q4 Year End 31 July 2020

Council received the report and in discussion the following points were noted:

- Subject to any final amendments, the results would be reported to the OfS at the end of October as part of the Interim financial data collection.
- The Chair congratulated the CFO and her team for the report which presented a good result for the end of 2019/20.

10.2 OfS Timetable for reporting the 2020 Financial Plan and Budget for 2020/21

Council noted the report which provided an update on the revised reporting requirements for providing Financial Forecasts to the OfS and set out the plan for reporting the latest Financial Plan and Budget for 2020/21 to SIPCo and Council over the coming months.

10.3 Five-year Financial Plan 2020/21 -2024/25 and Draft Budget 2020/21

Council considered the Financial Plan and draft Budget 2020/21, along with an addendum to the original paper and in discussion the following points were noted:

- At the Finsbury Square Project Board there had been further discussion about the financial implications of the decision to relinquish the Cass brand and of Covid-19. The strategic case for signing the contract remained unchanged, but the Project Board was keen for Council to be made aware of the potential future short-term financial challenges facing the Business School.
- The addendum to the financial plan had accordingly been produced to ensure full transparency at Council, before the contract for FSQ was signed, of the funding shortfall that had emerged at City. Concerns focussed in particular on the speed of recovery in Postgraduate Taught student recruitment in the Business School.
- The Dean of the Business School noted that the School's medium to long term plan was unchanged and additional space was still required. Bunhill Row was only intended to cater for 800 students and it still needed to be refurbished. More space for teaching was required as the mode of teaching would not change, and the Business School's USP was that of providing an excellent face-to-face teaching and learning experience in London. The Dean agreed that the financial issues facing the School needed to be brought to the attention of Council so that it was aware of the potential risk – as it now seemed very likely that Covid-19 would have a longer term impact on the School's finances than previously anticipated.
- The Director of PAF felt that not proceeding with FSQ would require a major piece of work to be undertaken to scope-out the space requirements for the

Business School. If FSQ was not acquired, the Director of PAF noted that even with the most aggressive approach to agile staff working, the Business School would still struggle with space and if its intake picked up again, 200 Aldersgate would have to be retained. However, he also noted that, if City was to defer, or not sign, it would probably take Liverpool a long time to find another interested party and so it could be possible that the deal would still be available in several months' time, if the decision were taken to delay signing.

- The Chair of SIPCo noted that there did not appear to be any fundamental change in the Business School's strategy in the medium to long term, that City did still have the problem of needing to refurbish Bunhill Row and that would remain even if the strategy changed. Revisiting the July Council paper, he reflected that although the deterioration in City's finances, which spanned two years was not trivial, he believed on balance the deal should proceed.
- The Interim Deputy President noted that the decision was difficult and finely balanced but that the long-term health of City as an institution was critically dependent on the long-term health of its Business School.
- It would be important for City to be able to sub-let if it needed to and the Director of PAF confirmed that in the summer a realistic assessment was undertaken of what it might mean for City if it needed to divest itself of the property. It may only be able to let it out on a floor-by-floor basis and the option to do this had been retained in the planning consent which provided City with that flexibility. Exercising the option to sublet on this basis might at that point carry some cost for City (if the sub-tenanted rental were lower), but it was realistic to expect that City could still sub-let the lease if need be.
- One contextual factor for Council to bear in mind was that in discussion about the work of the Cost Reduction Group, the Trade Unions had made it clear that, in their view, City was essentially prioritising buildings over staff and this was unacceptable to them when staff redundancies were being discussed.
- Summarising the discussion, the Chair noted that after much intensive discussion at previous meetings of Council, there was now a wide agreement that City should proceed with the acquisition of the Finsbury Square lease: the financial position had deteriorated, but the space was still needed for the future development of the Business School and the University, and City retained the option of sub-letting the property prior to investing in its refurbishment. It was in everybody's interests that the Business School should flourish. A robust communications plan, however, should now be developed which explained to City's staff Council's rationale for adopting this way forward.

10.4 Student Numbers Update

The Deputy President and Provost gave a verbal update and the following points were noted:

- The latest figures were based on registration numbers and showed UG home and EU were slightly above the March target and UG overseas were broadly on the March target. Overall UG numbers were currently on the March target.
- PGT numbers for Home and EU students represented around 74% of the March target; while International PGT recruitment stood at around 50% of March target and was not anticipated to exceed 60% overall.
- Around half of the International postgraduate students who had been registered would be studying online until at least January.

11. Cleaning and Catering Staff

Council considered the papers which included UNISON's request for City to insource its cleaning and catering staff and the following points were noted:

- UNISON's request for City to insource its cleaning and catering staff had been raised with the Chair of Council at her annual meeting with the Trade Unions

in January; and the request has subsequently been followed-up through correspondence with the Chair in recent months.

- The papers provided to Council set out UNISON's arguments for City to insource cleaning and catering services and a paper from City's HR Director setting out the nature of the discussions of this issue by the Executive and of discussions with UNISON on this issue, and the related issue of the impact of Covid-19 on the staff normally employed by contractors to work at City.
- The SU President noted that although he understood the financial pressures currently facing City, from the SU's perspective, this matter should be a priority moving forward and referred Council to the SU Statement included in the papers.
- One specific SU concern was that in the event of illness or necessary self-isolation, cleaning and catering staff would receive only Statutory Sick Pay (£95 per week) and so there was a danger that many of these staff might continue to go to work, putting not only their own health but that of staff and students at risk. The risk to staff and students however, was not high given the low current occupancy of campus and the limited interactions between staff and students and cleaning and catering staff.
- Summarising the discussion the Chair noted that (i) for the reasons thus far discussed on the agenda, in the framework of the current financial constraints, uncertainty and operational challenges facing City, now was not a time at which City could take on the additional costs of bringing cleaning and catering services in-house; (ii) the Executive Board could helpfully consider further whether additional support might be offered to catering and cleaning staff at City, for example, in relation to sick pay.

12. NSS analysis 2020 and Action Planning 2020-21

Council considered the report and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The results of the NSS 2020 were very disappointing and wholly unacceptable. Considerable effort had been made to address City's poor NSS results in recent years, but these had not led to better outcomes.
- The report provided an overview of actions taken, in the context of planning the Covid-19-ready emergent education offer and wider student experience for 2020-21, to address institutional poor performance, and an update on work commenced in 2019 to address NSS poor performance. Appendices A to J provided more detailed data and information on NSS 2020 results. Business School programmes in particular had not done nearly as well as anticipated and this had had a large impact on NSS results for City as a whole.
- For the current year, it was likely that students' experience of online education would be a major factor in NSS results. On this City had prepared successfully for the current term across all Schools; and monitoring had been put in place – looking at online student engagement – to enable City to react in a timely fashion if issues were flagged. Initial feedback in Term 1 from students and staff had given reason to believe that they were feeling reasonably confident with the teaching experience thus far, which was due to a big effort from the staff involved.
- Work put on pause as a result of the pandemic, including work to define what was expected of a City Academic, would now be picked up and taken forward. Further changes also need to be made to the leadership of this agenda in Schools. As with the EDI agenda there was a need for cultural change across the institution.
- The SU President noted that the SU NSS results had also taken a dip and noted that the NSS as a metric was problematic, as its core focus was not the quality of the teaching and learning experience. There was in fact a case for saying that to improve in the NSS, City needed to stop focusing on it. The SU stood ready and willing to work further on this agenda with the Executive.

- The Chair noted the importance of keeping the NSS and ensuing actions to address the poor results under review. The Interim Deputy President noted that this was on the list of priorities for the Executive Board and he was keen to move forward in collaboration with the SU.
- The Chair summarised by thanking the SU President for his offer of support in driving this agenda forward; noted that the incoming President would no doubt be keen to lead the necessary culture change; and requested that Council receive regular progress reports.

Items 13 and 14 were considered after Item 6 with the following colleagues in attendance for both items: Ms Sandra Brown, Dr Jessica Jones-Nielsen, Ms Hunada Nouss, Ms Natasha Mutch-Vidal and Ms Abby Wilson.

13. Tackling Racial Inequalities

13i Race Equality Charter (REC) Update

Council received the update and in discussion the following points were noted:

- City had pledged commitment to the Race Equality Charter's aim of improving the representation, progression and success of minority ethnic staff and students within higher education. City had become a member of the Charter (a national scheme run by AdvanceHE) in May 2019.
- The REC provides a framework through which institutions work to identify and self-reflect on institutional and cultural barriers standing in the way of minority ethnic staff and students. City would apply for Bronze accreditation through submission of a comprehensive self-assessment, coordinated through a Race Equality Charter Self-Assessment Team.
- The Race Equality Charter Self-Assessment Team (RECSAT) is led by the VP S&P/EDI, as the Executive Sponsor and had two Deputy Co-Chairs, Dr Jessica Jones Nielson, Associate Dean in SASS and Phil Gilks, Chief Executive of the SU. The original aim had been to submit City's application by February 2021 but due to the pandemic City's revision submission deadline was now February 2022. In total 60 staff and students were collaborating on the REC project.
- The work aimed to address the systemic issues of staff and student progression by looking closely at ways of working and the processes used. The two Staff Subgroups received data from HR for their respective sections to begin a detailed analysis. The Student Pipeline subgroup was currently analysing data. The Teaching & Learning subgroup would be holding a series of workshops with students and staff to gather information on good practice.
- Under the Charter it was compulsory to conduct a staff survey and student survey, both provided by AdvanceHE.. The REC staff survey had been launched in July 2020 and had run until August. Almost 1000 responses were received: a very high response rate, particularly against the backdrop of Covid-19. This was a unique opportunity to gain a rich data set for the application and demonstrated that City continued its work on race equality during the pandemic, recognising the urgency and importance of this work.
- Wider Race Equality Initiatives and Engagement activities included: The Diversify Your Mind Book Club, Reciprocal Mentoring Scheme, Collaborative Virtual Events with London Metropolitan University and the REC Lecture Series.
- There was currently a momentous opportunity at City, as well as in the world more generally, to take advantage of the energy, in large part generated by the Black Lives Matter movement, and the desire to see significant, sustainable change. Much work was being taken forward across City by BAME leaders and their colleagues, but it was essential that the work had the support of Council and the Executive. The Chair noted that the President-elect was currently an EDI lead in Government and as such she was confident that he would carry this work forward with great enthusiasm and commitment.

13.ii Aligning Tackling Racial Inequalities at City

Council noted the paper and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The paper provided an overview of some of the key activities taking place across City, while the table outlined the five demands of City's Network for Racial Justice's (NRJ – formerly the Staff Affinity Group) in its "Call for Decolonising City" and showed how they mapped onto existing work.
- The NRJ's demands were identified as having five themes: (i) Recruitment, Progression and Success of BAME Staff, (ii) Recruitment, Progression and Success of BAME Students, (iii) Senior Management and Leadership, (iv) Institutional Structures and Processes and (v) Culture and Environment. During Autumn 2020, subgroups comprising members of NRJ and members of ExCo would be meeting to discuss the demands.
- From those meetings a set of priorities and an action plan for implementing them should emerge. The document could be used to help identify any further actions which Executive Board or Schools could lead on and/or where the EDI delivery plan should be amended or RECSAT could consider further action.
- As with the REC this work was not about one person, one team or one network and must be institutionally led. City would need to review its curriculum, language and behaviours and a huge amount of work had begun in the Schools.

13.iii BAME Staff Selection and Progression

Council received a brief verbal update from the HR Director on her meeting with NRJ champions in relation this theme; and in discussion the following points were noted:

- At the first meeting of this group, the discussion had been rich and valuable.
- The agenda for staff selection and progression was large and not much had yet been achieved.
- Greater diversity on recruitment panels was certainly possible for professional services but would be more challenging for academic positions. This linked directly to the limited number of BAME colleagues in senior roles and work was needed to better understand the mechanisms behind how appointment panels and membership thereof were determined.
- The meeting had concluded that there was an urgent need for diversity of thought across the institution in this area.

13iv BAME Student Progression and Attainment

Council received a brief verbal update from the Deputy President & Provost about his meeting with NRJ champions in relation to this theme; and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The first meeting with NRJ colleagues had begun with an acknowledgment of the themes that had emerged from discussion at the Town Hall meeting on race inequality and the impact that it had had on members of the Executive.
- Much work had already been undertaken on analysis of attainment gaps between BAME and white students; and so the group had considered the list of activities which were in train as a result of City's Access and Participation Plan (APP).
- Further consideration needed to be given to one specific demand of the NRJ – in relation to financial support e.g. PhD Studentships for black students.

Overall Comments on Item 13, Tackling Racial Inequalities

- Introducing a more general discussion of Item 13, the Chair noted that there had been much discussion about committees and sub-groups but was keen to understand how the work was actually being prioritised.
- The VP (S&P/EDI) noted that the President had already written out to Deans to request a timeline for BAME representation to be established on all senior boards in their respective Schools.

- The VP (S&P, EDI) noted her intention to recruit a BAME applicant into the new role of Assistant Vice President for EDI issues, to demonstrate City's commitment to tackling this agenda seriously.
- More generally, priorities for action would be determined by the Executive board in the light of discussions between Executive colleagues and NRJ champions. This would take account of resourcing issues and constraints.
- The RECSAT Co-Chair noted that the work being undertaken was not easy for any of those colleagues involved and Council should recognise that nothing is going to happen overnight. Council should also recognise that this work would prove difficult and uncomfortable for the many white privileged members.
- The VP (S&P, EDI) asked that Council members give their support Black History Month and consider participating in one of planned events listed in CityWire, which would be circulated following the meeting.
- The VP (S&P/EDI) noted that in setting up the groups for REC and EDI Strategy, over 40 responses for membership had been received from staff across all grades and departments. EDI messaging and stories continued to be circulated via CityWire on a weekly basis and the two EDI forums were attended by over 150 staff. These examples demonstrated good reach, but it was nowhere near 100%. Not all staff were on board with the race equality work. For example, some feared that the application for the REC might just be a box-ticking exercise.
- Council members agreed that the work needed to be about looking at the fabric of City and that this should be seen not so much as an initiative, but more as creating a new way of working and being. Currently City was an institution which did not look like the people it served and therefore it required a sustained, long-term cultural change which would not come about without much self-reflection.
- Council needed to ask itself what will it do differently to take this agenda seriously and where could be of help. One possibility worth further consideration would be to allocate part of the Council Away Day in February to a facilitated session on tackling racial inequalities. **[Action]**
- An article in *The Guardian* had suggested that Universities could go some way to tackling race equality issues by employing their own graduates. City did employ a number of staff from among its graduates and the data on this could be provided to Council at a future meeting. **[Action]**

14. **Historic Sources of Funding Review Group Final Report**

Council received the final report of the Review Group. The background to the report was that:

- On 10th June 2020, the President had commissioned a review of historic sources of funding of City. This was prompted by reports that Sir John Cass, whose name had been adopted to name the Business School following a donation from the Sir John Cass Foundation in 2002, was connected to the Atlantic slave trade.
- Hunada Nouss was invited to Chair the Review Group which commissioned research by Dr Matthew Stallard, an independent academic with oversight and advice from Professor Richard Drayton, an independent senior academic, with specific expertise in the legacies of colonialism. The findings of the research, along with recommendations from the Group, were outlined in the report.
- In the context of the broader Black Lives Matter movement, the review formed part of City's wider focus on advancing race equality and challenging racism.
- The findings of the review were twofold. First, that apart from its honouring of Sir John Cass, City has no direct, or easily identifiable, association with African slavery. Second, however, that African slavery played a significant part in making possible the land, gifts, support and patronage which underpinned City and its antecedent institutions.

- The specific recommendations arising from the work of the Review Group lay in four areas:
 - *Communication*: The Chair of the Review Group noted that it was fortuitous that the report was being launched during Black History Month and the group was considering how the findings of the report might be more widely disseminated.
 - *Further Research*: The Group had been constrained in its research because of Covid-19, time limitations and lack of access to City's archives, as such, there remained an academic curiosity and interest in doing more.
 - *Changing the Business School Name*: The process which City adopts and the approach it takes to the name change would be regarded as a visible indicator of its appetite for the challenge to eliminate barriers across the institution.
 - *Reparation*: To demonstrate meaningful institutional commitment to racial equality at City by taking a proactive approach to recognising and understanding the ways in which racial inequality manifests itself at City and pursuing actions to achieve equality and 'repair' for the Black community at City. It was important that any actions were not tokenistic but thought through to ensure a difference was made.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- Ms Natasha Mutch-Vidal, Student Engagement Officer, Student and Academic Services and a member of the Review Group noted that she had very much appreciated the "call out" inviting staff at all levels of seniority to become members of the group.
- Reading and re-reading the report in would enable Council to gain a better understanding of what needed to be done in relation to this agenda. It would be important to identify a 'champion' for the implementation of the report and for Council itself to drive progress. The agenda should be treated with the same urgency as the changes made to education following the move to on-line learning.
- Council fully endorsed all the work of the Review Group and thanked all those involved for their hard work and commitment. The Chair noted what was needed now was action to address the recommendations in the report and the Tackling Racial Inequality agenda more widely at City. It was critical that success could be measured, with a timeline and dashboard of progress to determine if and how City was improving on these issues. The Chair asked for proposals from the Executive Board to come back to the next meeting of Council on 27th November. **[Action]**
- Council noted that work would continue to be led by the VP (S&P) but that its expectation was that all members of the Executive would play an important role in leading the cultural change that was required.

Ms Sandra Brown, Dr Jessica Jones-Nielsen, Ms Hunada Nouss, Ms Natasha Mutch-Vidal and Ms Abby Wilson left the meeting.

15. Change Support Unit and University Operating Model

Council noted, for information, the presentation which was given to SIPCo at its meeting on 24th September.

16. CGNC Recommendations for the Reappointment of Council Members

Council **approved** CGNC's recommendation that the following Council Members should be reappointed for a further three years:

- Ms Julia Palca as Chair
- Mr Adrian Haxby
- Ms Mary Luckiram
- Professor Debra Salmon.

The Chair noted that there were vacancies for positions on SIPCo, ARC, CGNC and the Fundraising Group and asked those independent members, who were not currently on a sub-committee, to give consideration joining one of these. **[Action]**

Mr Thomas Lee-Warren offered to become a member of the Fundraising Group.

The Chair reminded independent members of the importance of attending at least one meeting of Senate during the academic year. A list of future Senate meeting dates would be circulated by the Governance Team. **[Action]**

Part Three – Items for Information

17. Minutes for Note

17.1 Senate, 16th September 2020

17.2 SIPCo, 24th September 2020

17.3 ARC, 28th September 2020 (*circulated following the meeting*)

18. CUC Higher Education Code of Guidance

Council received the revised guidance.

19. Data Protection Report

Council noted the report.

20. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

20i EDI Strategy and Delivery Plan Implementation

Council **received** the update.

20ii Athena SWAN Update

Council **received** the update.

21. Graduate Outcomes Survey

Council noted the survey findings.

22. Strategic Estates Project Update

Council noted the update.

23. Temporary Senior Management Structure

Council noted the temporary structure.

24. Events at City 2020/21

Council noted the report.

25. FOI Review

Council **agreed** that no changes were required.

26. Date of Next Meeting

Friday 27th November 2020, 9am.

Part Four – Meeting of Independent Members

There was a brief informal discussion among the independent members.

Julia Palca, Chair of Council, October 2020.