Minutes of Meeting of Council

Date: 19 October 2015

Present: Mr Pedder, Pro-Chancellor (in the Chair);
Ms Harkness, Pro-Chancellor; Mr Young, Treasurer; Professor Sir Keith
Burnett, Vice-Chancellor; Professor West, Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
Professor Labbe, Pro-Vice-Chancellor; Mr Belton;
Professor van den Boom, Ms Hague, Mr Kelly, Mrs Legg, Mr Lewis,
Mr McMorrow, Ms Prout, Professor Phillips, Professor Vincent;

Secretary: Dr West

In attendance: Mr Dodman, Ms Green, Mr Jones, Mr Lilley, Mr Rabone, Dr Strike, Mr Swinn

Apologies: Dr Eden, Mr Mayson

WELCOME

The Chair welcomed the following members to their first meeting: Professor Jackie Labbe
(Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Faculty of Arts & Humanities), Ms Gaynor Hague (a new member in
Class (5)) and Mr Christy McMorrow (President, Students’ Union). Also welcomed were Mr
Ian Jones (Head of Accommodation Services), Dr Tony Strike (Director of Strategy, Planning
and Change), Mr Keith Lilley (Director of Estates & Facilities Management), who were
attending for specific items; Ms Sally Green (Corporate Policy Adviser), who was attending
as an observer; and Mr David Swinn, who was attending in place of Ms Sue Stephens to
whom Council extended good wishes.

AGENDA

1. DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were declared.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2015, having been circulated, were
approved and signed.

3. MATTERS ARISING ON THE MINUTES

Matters arising on the Minutes were noted as follows:

(a) Minute 3(a), Incidents: With respect to an instance of fraud in a University
subsidiary, action was being taken by police investigators to seek to recover the
University’s loss through the formalities of the Proceeds of Crime Act and a
provisional court date had been set.

(b) Minute 3(b), District heating system: With respect to the major failure of the
district heating system, repairs in the Netherthorpe Road area were completed
on 18 September. A further leak in the system had been identified in the
Mushroom Lane area, and repair was scheduled to take place within the next
two weeks. Discussions regarding contract re-negotiation are continuing with legal advisers. The substantive risk was, however, much reduced.

(c) Minute 3(c), Executive structure: Interviews for the position of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Medicine, Dentistry & Health) had been held in October; an offer of appointment had been made. Professor Weetman had agreed to remain in post until March 2016. The fractional position of Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) was advertised internally and Professor John Derrick (Computer Science) appointed. The position of Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning & Teaching) was currently being advertised.

(d) Minute 3(e), Jonas Court: Consideration was continuing concerning future possible alternative uses for Jonas Court, which remained in use as student accommodation. Any further proposals would come back to Finance Committee and Council in readiness for the next academic year.

(e) Minute 4(a), Future approaches to teaching quality assessment: The University had submitted a response to the HEFCE consultation on future approaches to teaching quality assessment. Responses to specific questions relating to the role of governing bodies were informed by discussion between the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning & Teaching) and the Pro-Chancellors over the summer and indicated that, while there was scope to enhance Council oversight of academic matters, a suggestion that governing bodies should have a role in safeguarding comparability in the sector was not appropriate.

(f) Minute 4(a), Apprenticeships: Information provided following the previous meeting indicated that the number of University of Sheffield apprentices as at mid-July 2015 was 35.

(h) Minute 4(f), USS changes: Following the member consultation in the Spring, the changes to be made to the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) have now been published. As part of a suite of changes, the Final Salary benefits section would close on 31 March 2016, with all future benefits accruing on a career average basis from 1 April 2016. A defined contribution section would also run alongside the career average section and is due to launch in October 2016. This would impact all 4700 current members, who would also pay a higher contribution rate. The cost to the University of higher employer contributions was estimated to be approximately £4 million per year. A communications plan was being put in place to ensure that staff understood the impact of the changes and details were available online at http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/hr/guidance/usschanges

(i) Minute 7, Asset Backed Funding: The proposal approved by Council in July to fully fund the current USPS deficit by means of an Asset Backed Funding agreement was successfully completed on 31 July 2015. The effects of the arrangement will be reflected in the University’s 2015 Financial Statements.

(j) Minute 9, The Diamond: A detailed update on The Diamond was circulated to Council by email on 25 September. The building was open for teaching on 28 September with contractors currently undertaking final ‘snagging’ works to complete the project. The building had been widely commended with positive feedback from students and staff and Council conveyed its thanks to all of those involved in the project.

(k) Minute 12.1, Decarbonising the energy economy: The University position statement had now been published on the web. On 14 October, the University in association with People & Planet had hosted a debate on the question, ‘What is the most effective way for the University of Sheffield to contribute to the
decarbonisation of the world’s energy supplies?'

(l) Minute 13, Statute amendments: Amendments to the Statutes relating to the composition of Council had now received Privy Council approval. These increased the flexibility to operate within the maximum of 20 members prescribed in the Statutes and also make provision for the new role of Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

(m) Minute 17, Estates Committee: Recommendations concerning the membership of the Estates Committee would form part of the Committee’s report to Council in November 2015.

4. RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY

Council received an update on the development of the Residential Accommodation Strategy, building on previous work and a review by external consultants whose findings had been reported to Council in October 2014. The overarching Steering Group had facilitated consultation with Faculties and relevant Professional Services, the Students’ Union and Sheffield City Council that had identified seven strategic aims for Accommodation Services for the period 2015-20 that would support the themes in the new University Strategic Plan (see Minute 9.1, below). It was noted that the cyclical nature of HE meant that arrangements for 2016 were already at an advanced stage.

Particular attention was drawn to plans to:

- expand the accommodation guarantee;
- increasing capacity to meet planned growth in students numbers with related action to enhance the provision of University-led residence-based student support services and facilitate greater integration between different groups of students;
- provide greater levels of flexibility within the accommodation offer to meet evolving business needs and use requirements, especially short and medium term stays and addressing the needs of postgraduate students.

Clarification was provided about the significant proportion of overseas students who transitioned to the University from USIC without accessing ACS services; this was reflected in the anticipated requirements for additional capacity and the matter would also be considered as part of broader efforts to enhance integration in student residences.

Council endorsed the proposed direction of travel, noting that the issues raised in discussion had been considered by the Steering Group. A final version of the Strategy would be presented to Council for approval in due course and it was agreed that this should express the underlying strategic rationales, enable a more proactive approach to planning future accommodation needs and incorporate an underpinning business plan.

5. UPDATE ON THE CAMPUS MASTERPLAN

Council received a presentation from the Director of Estates & Facilities Management in which he outlined the progress of works to implement the Campus Masterplan. Sheffield City Council had been closely engaged to ensure that work on the University campus and wider city planning were complementary and this had helped the University to leverage additional funding through the Sheffield City Region Investment Fund. Members noted a summary of planned works, indicative budgets and related governance structures. The Project Executive Group, whose membership included Council and University representation, was in the process of appointing a contractor to start the first phase of work in November 2015. The initial focus would be to
provide quicker and safer access across the campus and to extend the city’s ‘Gold’ pedestrian route through the campus from the city-centre in a manner that was complementary but retained an element of distinctiveness on campus. Colleagues from the Department of Landscape were contributing to the design of green spaces and a design competition had provided an opportunity for local artists to input directly. It was clarified that the Masterplan included work to enhance the appearance of the Western Bank concourse, designs for which would be considered by Estates Committee in due course; the dedicated project group would include Students’ Union representation.

6. CAPITAL PROGRAMME; UPDATE

Council received an update report on the University’s capital programme providing details on progress towards delivery of projects under the current five-year capital programme, ongoing development work to inform the new Estates Strategy and a summary of capital business cases approved through the normal governance processes. In particular, Council approved the business case for the refurbishment and redevelopment of 38 Mappin Street, which had previously housed St George’s Library prior to the opening of the Diamond, to create flexible flat floored centrally bookable teaching space that could support after-hours Student Union activities. The refurbishment would also resolve two pre-existing priorities by providing enhanced Muslim prayer facilities and additional examination space. It was noted that a further priority was to address the need for more campus-based rehearsal and performance space; the refurbishment of 38 Mappin Street could potentially meet this requirement, subject to existing work that was making positive progress.

7. VICE-CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

Council received and discussed the Vice-Chancellor’s report, in which he provided information on key current and forthcoming developments across a range of areas. Points noted in particular included the following:

(a) **Higher Education Funding:** The replacement of undergraduate student maintenance grants with loans represented a major change. It had been introduced with little discussion about the significant impact this would have on students, which would be exacerbated by potential changes to the loan repayment. It was unclear whether the effect of this change would count towards the 30-40% reduction that BIS was expected to be required to make to its budget. Current indications suggested a significant reorganisation and reduction in the number of BIS’ partner organisations, driven to a large extent by continued assertions about the inefficiencies of HE; for example significant revisions to the structure of research councils.

(b) **Regulatory Changes:** The Universities Minister, Jo Johnson, MP, had delivered two key speeches setting out his proposals for the future of UK HE, centred on delivery of training and skills that met the demands of parents, students and employers; and driving widening participation. An anticipated government green paper on HE was expected to propose the introduction of a Teaching Excellence Framework in 2016 that would be used as the basis for permitting individual institutions to increase their home undergraduate tuition fees at the rate of inflation from 2017. Any period of consultation would be subject to particular time-pressures given that institutions would need to agree and announce 2017 tuition fees in early 2016.

There was also significant concern across the sector about the practicalities of a TEF. In particular the suggestion that assessment criteria would focus on output measures; devising an effective and appropriate methodology was
particularly complex due to the lack of available relevant underpinning data that also took into account relevant contextual data to present a rounded view. Furthermore, the UK’s existing quality assurance processes were globally recognised as excellent and discussion about the TEF had created uncertainty given that HEFCE had launched a consultation on the future of QA before the UK General Election. The University had submitted a response to this consultation, which had been circulated to Council for information. The University and the sector continued to engage with colleagues in BIS in order that any new systems and methods of institutional evaluation were fit for purpose and avoided any unforeseen consequences.

(c) Vocational and Further Education: It was noted that a report from the Policy Exchange think tank had reiterated the significant decline in funding for FE compared to HE and the impact of removing the cap on student numbers in HE. It was unfortunate that the two sectors were being set in opposition to each other, which was likely to lead to lengthy discussions about what was the most effective and sustainable approach to funding in general. Nevertheless, the University was well-placed to contribute to any such debate due to its experience in developing and supporting vocational education through the widely acclaimed and expanding apprentice training programmes offered by the AMRC Training Centre.

(d) International Students: Home Office proposals to introduce more stringent English language requirements as part of new visa rules for international students would have severe implications for the recruitment of overseas students, particularly those with advanced skills but weaker English language ability. Although it was positive to note that the Home Secretary’s speech to the Conservative party conference that outlined the plans had been roundly condemned by the HE sector, business and industry and a number of politicians, the continuing anti-immigration rhetoric was one of the most significant threats to long-term institutional sustainability and, importantly, the wider national interest. It was suggested that the sector as whole could do more to counter the stance of the Home Office, notwithstanding the University’s leading role and expansion of its #weareinternational campaign. However, it was essential that leaders in business and industry were strident in advancing the national economic case for overseas students and that the wider benefits to the UK of the hundreds of thousands of overseas alumni were celebrated. It was further noted that students themselves could play an important role and there was scope for a much greater coordination of effort between UUK and the NUS.

(e) Devolution and the Northern Powerhouse: MPs had debated the second reading of the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill on 14 October. The role of the emerging Advanced Manufacturing District had generated positive coverage and placed the University in a central, leading role. The University’s Great Ambassadors (China) Scheme aimed to support Sheffield-based SMEs with plans to trade in China as part of a wider ‘Sheffield in China’ collaboration with the City Council and Sheffield Hallam University. The University was also engaging in the wider debate about regional devolution, notably a public debate about issues of democratic accountability, hosted by the Department of Politics.

(f) Student recruitment: The positive overall 2015 student recruitment position was confirmed, having been communicated to Council via email during the period of Confirmation, Adjustment and Clearing. The stance of the Home Office continued to represent a substantial challenge to overseas recruitment (see also Minute 7(d), above). Sheffield International would be particularly focused on enhancing recruitment from the Asian sub-continent, where this challenge was particularly pronounced, as part of wider efforts to diversify the
international student population. Council agreed to return to a wider discussion about institutional recruitment strategy at a future meeting during 2015/16.

(g) **Strategic Projects:** The University had secured £1.6m HEFCE Catalyst funding to develop and pilot innovative new pathways into HE for apprentices. The implementation of the recommendations of the Biomedical Life Sciences review would increase in speed and scale over the course of the year. With respect to the Postgraduate Support Scheme, the University had attracted strong applications and awarded 220 scholarships to students who met WP criteria, with match funding from HEFCE. The report on the project was launched at the HEFCE national conference in Sheffield in September and a further event to consider the findings of the report would be held in the Houses of Parliament on 26 October. This was the final year that matched funding for scholarships was available before the introduction of the PGT loans scheme in 2016.

(h) **Draft Financial Results 2014/15:** The draft results indicated a strong outturn position that was ahead of forecast and budget, even when the impact of a substantial extraordinary item was discounted: the receipt of funds from HMRC in respect of a Research and Development Expenditure Claim (RDEC) had resulted in a net contribution to the operating surplus of £11.2m. It was reported that HMRC may challenge the claim in due course and so spending plans had not been made in respect of the additional income. Finance Committee had considered and reviewed the possible measures by which to address the trend whereby expenditure was significantly less than budget. With respect to the impact of the RDEC claim across the sector as whole Council recognised the importance of articulating both the one-off nature of this income and the wider context that institutions now needed to generate substantial operating surpluses in order to achieve their strategic objectives, especially funding of capital projects where public funding was no longer available. This was particularly important in the context of the Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review and continued misperceptions about the strength of the financial position of the sector.

(i) **Learning and Teaching:** Achieve More was the University’s initiative to enhance the undergraduate curriculum. Implementation of the scheme continued to involve significant effort on the part of staff in order to ensure that events were successful and delivered a positive, beneficial experience for the students involved. It was noted that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Learning and Teaching would be invited to provide Council with an update at a future meeting. Two newly created posts of Director of Digital Learning aimed to facilitate and drive technology-based curriculum enhancements. Attention was also drawn to the University’s developing response to the report issued earlier in the year by the Competitions and Markets Authority, which included a series of recommendations for HE providers. The University continued to monitor developments in this area in anticipation of increased scrutiny of the sector by the CMA.

(j) **Research Awards:** In the context of strong growth in research awards for the twelve month period to 31 August 2015 it was particularly pleasing to note the continued success of AMRC and NAMRC in attracting funding. With respect to European sponsored awards the move from Framework 7 to Horizon 2020 had, as expected, been less positive compared to the previous twelve month period.

(k) **International Developments:** The appointment of a new Director to lead the White Rose office in Brussels was welcomed, the consortium having demonstrated its value in a number of specific areas, in particular its success in establishing Centres for Doctoral Training backed by research council funding.
Negotiations about the establishment of a proposed joint institute were continuing between the Faculty of Science and Nanjing Tech University.

(l) **Industrial Relations:** Recent negotiations about the 2015/16 national pay award had been positive and the risk of industrial action was significantly reduced. On the basis of strong positive feedback from staff and responses to the previous Staff Survey, the University was in the process of applying to be included in the Sunday Times Top 100 Best Companies to Work For, in which no universities currently appeared, and would be informed of the outcome by early 2016. To mark the 30th anniversary of an institutional approach to staff development a pan-University event was planned to take place during November. Entitled ‘Thirty30’ the aim was to showcase the breadth and quality of staff development provision available by encouraging staff to take 30 minutes to reflect on their own CPD requirements.

(m) **PREVENT:** The provisions of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act contained institutional responsibilities that had applied to universities from September 2015. The University sought to build on the existing processes that it had successfully developed with input from the Home Office in order to meet these new and additional requirements, working with other organisations that were subject to the legislation, for example the City Council. It was essential that in complying with the Act the University remained a supportive and inclusive place to work and study where ideas could be exchanged and issues freely debated.

8. **STRATEGIC PLAN 2010-15: ANNUAL REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE**

Council considered a report on progress against the non-financial Performance Indicators (PIs) supporting the University’s Strategic Plan 2010-15, noting that this formed the first part of a two-stage annual review, and that a report on financial sustainability and relevant PIs would be presented to Council in November as part of the annual accountability return to HEFCE.

In an accompanying presentation, the Director of Strategy, Planning & Change drew attention to the following and provided clarification on a number of points:

(a) **Performance against specific PIs:** The following points were noted in respect of the University’s performance against three PIs compared with that for the previous year:

(i) **Average Tariff:** The latest available comparative data showed a decline in average A-level entry tariff, which had fallen to 437. This placed the University slightly below the Russell Group lower quartile. It was noted that, although a minimum offer and entry tariff had been applied the decline was due in part to the University having recruited greater numbers of students at the minimum level in order to achieve and exceed increasingly ambitious home undergraduate intake targets. The market for this group of students remained volatile and it continued to be necessary to achieve a balance between student recruitment and maintaining quality. Further discussions about the implications of target setting on quality were planned to take place at UEB, with Heads of Departments and at Senate and Council.

(ii) **Student FTEs per academic FTE:** There was positive performance against the numbers of UG, PGT and PGR students per academic FTE and the University was close to achieving its targets on all three PIs. Attention was drawn to a range of initiatives that were likely to have made a positive difference to recruitment in all student categories and the impact of which was expected to continue in future years due to the time lag in data.
Particular initiatives included Achieve More, the Postgraduate Support Scheme and Doctoral Academies, as well as wider efforts to diversify the overseas student population, especially of PGTs.

(iii) **Student Satisfaction:** The University's student satisfaction score (based on responses to the NSS) had increased to 90% but it was now one of seven institutions that had achieved this score. It was pleasing to note that responses to questions about assessment and feedback had resulted in an improved score for this measure but it would remain an area of focus. The Student’s Union had again been voted the best in the UK, the fourth consecutive year in which it had achieved the feat, and five subjects had been ranked first nationally. It was noted that the University was also highly ranked in other measures of student satisfaction, for example the THE Student Experience Survey.

(b) **Research:** REF performance was at the Russell Group median for both research power and grade point average and was broadly in line with target. Although citation rates had increased, reaching the target of the top 10 in the Russell Group would necessitate a significant rise. Research income had grown to the extent that the University was on target to achieving the target of the Russell group median by 2015/16. It was noted that recent growth in academic staff should translate into increased opportunities for new research awards in future years. A related matter was the increase in total income per academic FTE and an improved ranking in the Russell Group but further significant increases would be required for the University to achieve its target of the Russell Group upper quartile.

(c) **Widening Participation:** The University’s performance against widening participation PIs and the sector as a whole was an area of strength. It was above the Russell Group upper quartile for both entrants from state schools and colleges and entrants from low participation neighbourhoods. However, success at entry needed to be matched by successful outcomes upon graduation; the percentage of first degree leavers who were employed or studying one year after leaving HE was slightly below the target of the Russell Group median although the proportion of graduates continuing to further study was above average; and the rate of unemployment of PGT students was above the national average. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Learning and Teaching would be leading efforts to enhance employment rates, with priority activities planned to improve institutional links with employers and embed the concept of employability in the curriculum.

(d) **Forward Look:** This was the final report on the PIs supporting the current Strategic Plan. A new set of PIs was under development to measure performance against the new Strategic Plan (see Minute 9.2, below).

9. **STRATEGIC PLAN**

9.1 **Proposed Strategic Plan**

Council approved the new University Strategic Plan for the period 2015-2020, subject to the additional points noted below and any comments from Senate, which would receive the final draft on 21 October. Content had been informed by wide-ranging and comprehensive consultation exercises and the overall process overseen by a Strategy Development Group. It was noted that the design and presentation of the final document was currently under discussion. The overall Strategy would be underpinned by supporting strategies that addressed specific areas of the University, some of which were already under development informed by the emerging plan, including initial thinking about a
new Students’ Union Strategy when its current plan expired in 2016.

The Strategic Plan had been written as a high level and outwardly looking expression of institutional values and objectives. An internally focused implementation plan would be devised to support internal activities to deliver the plan and the measures of success (see Minute 9.2 below) and would be presented separately from the Strategy document. Work had already begun on both the implementation plan arising from the planning cycle and on the measures of success.

The following additional points were raised:

- Further checking of the document should aim to ensure that it did not imply an underlying assumption of growth in student numbers but that this was actively considered during the annual planning round.
- Whilst teaching and research had been highlighted as institutional values the plan could more clearly articulate their interrelationship, for example the commitment to research-led teaching.
- Agility was considered important in a volatile and changing environment.

9.2 Measures of Success

Council considered a paper setting out a planned approach to developing and reporting on indicators of success against the new Strategic Plan from Autumn 2016, when UEB and Council would receive a report on progress during the first year of the plan period.

A series of six guiding principles were noted, against which a new set of PIs would be developed to reflect the themes and success criteria of the new Strategic Plan. The intention was to provide a line of sight between performance at institutional level and that of faculties, departments and academics. This approach aimed to better represent the contributions of different parts of the University to overall objectives; use qualitative and quantitative measures; enable discipline-specific benchmarking; and may include indicators where external comparative data was not available if they supported analysis of progress towards strategic objectives.

The development of new PIs would seek to facilitate a more holistic evaluation of progress under the Strategy. This could include reflecting on the University’s position in the overall educational profile of the city region and as well as its national and international standing. More specifically the implementation plan would need to consider the cumulative effect of the funding regimes for teaching and research on the overall profile of the University.

9.3 Communications

Council approved a proposed approach to communicating the new Strategic Plan to external and internal stakeholders and engaging these different groups in its delivery, informed in part by responses to pertinent questions in the most recent University Staff Survey. External presentation of the plan provided an opportunity to showcase institutional strengths, to share objectives and to demonstrate the University’s ambition for the future. Internally, it was important to foster a sense of inclusion amongst staff by ensuring that they understood the future plans of the University and were aware of how their individual contributions enabled success. A range of print and digital communication tools and a series of related events were planned to maximise coverage and ensure that key messages were disseminated to each audience in the most effective
way. This would require the support of and collaboration with relevant staff in faculties, professional services departments and the Students’ Union. Council noted a proposed schedule for the implementation of the plan and a related timetable to formally launch the plan to external and internal audiences.

10. **ANNUAL COUNCIL EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE**

Council received a report on the outcome of individual discussions between members of Council and the University Secretary relating to the operation and effectiveness of Council, including areas for potential future action or further consideration. It was noted that this exercise preceded the formal Council Effectiveness Review that would be undertaken later in 2015/16, in accordance with the HE Code of Governance. Members agreed that the scope of this review might usefully include such matters as volume of business and the increasing range of issues facing the sector; means of enabling Council to support the Vice-Chancellor in strategic matters; and facilitating greater opportunities for interactions between Members.

11. **COUNCIL BUSINESS PLAN 2015-16**

Council received a draft outline business plan for 2015/16 that was intended to be kept under review and regularly updated throughout the year as a point of reference to help guide Council business. The plan would be updated after each meeting of Council and it was agreed that each proposed item of business should be assigned a particular meeting date. Members with additional feedback were requested to contact the University Secretary.

12. **PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE STUDENTS’ UNION**

Council received and approved terms of reference and membership of a task and finish group to undertake the periodic review of the Students’ Union constitution, as required by the Education Act 1994; under which Council was charged with assuring the Students’ Union democratic operation and financial accountability. The previous review was undertaken between April-October 2011 and it was agreed to reprise the approach that had operated successfully at that time. Mr Belton had agreed to Chair the group and Dr David Fletcher, a former University Registrar & Secretary and former member of the NUS Trustee Board, had again agreed to act as external adviser. Council would receive a report from the task and finish group in due course.

13. **POLICY ON THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF COUNCIL PAPERS**

Council received and approved proposed updates to the policy on the public availability of Council papers, following a review of the existing policy in the context of Freedom of Information and Data Protection legislation and in comparison to the sector as a whole. It was pleasing to note that the University’s approach compared favourably to the sector and the review had not identified any concerns over legislative or regulatory compliance. Minor amendments to the policy were required to reflect the current committee structure, existing work-streams on specific matters and in order to raise awareness amongst the authors of Council papers.

14. **REPORT OF THE COUNCIL NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE**

(Business conducted by correspondence)

Council approved the Report and in so doing the appointment of Mr David Bagley to Class (3) membership of Council with immediate effect and to serve on Finance Committee with effect from 1 August 2016. Clarification was provided that the Committee welcomed nominations from all Members of Council and that its deliberations took account of equality and diversity concerns. It was confirmed that the Committee used a skills matrix to identify where the collective knowledge of Council should be enhanced. It was noted that the University’s instructions to the
executive search agency that was used in 2014 had been specifically tasked with finding suitable candidates with protected characteristics.

15. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF COUNCIL PAPERS

Council received and approved recommendations concerning the publication on the web of papers presented at the meeting, in accordance with previously agreed proposals on the disclosure of information. It was noted that a number of papers were confidential and would not be made publicly available.

These Minutes were confirmed

at a meeting held on 27 November 2015

............................................... Chair