

# Council

## Minutes

15 March 2011

Present:

Ms J Evans (Chair)  
Mr A Bicknell  
Professor N Brown  
Mr J Cochrane  
Ms N Coker  
Mr M Draper  
Professor S Hilton  
Professor P Hughes  
Professor A Johnstone  
Dr A Kent  
Professor P Kopelman  
Mr K Lewis  
Dr D Mackintosh  
Mr D Rawaf  
Mr M Stevens  
Mrs S Thomas  
Mr G Turner  
Mr L Turner

In attendance:

Mr M Bery, Director of Finance and Resources  
Mrs S Bowen, Secretary and Academic Registrar  
Ms S Trubshaw, Clerk to Council

Mr S Fitch, International Programme Manager (Minute 79)  
Mrs L Kearney, Director of Planning (Minute 81 & 82)  
Mr A Khadia, Strategic Information & Analysis Manager (Minute 81 & 82)

Apologies for absence were received from: Ms Isabel Nisbet, Professor Richard Smith and Professor Sir Nicholas Wright

### 69. Remarks from the Chair

Reported:

#### (i) Risk Management Training

That risk management training had been deferred to a future meeting.

#### (ii) Remuneration Committee

That the CUC had published guidance on the operation of the Remuneration Committee. It had been recommended that governors should be more involved with the processes *guiding senior staff remuneration*. It has been agreed that an additional meeting of the Remuneration Committee would be held before the annual Remuneration Committee meeting.

#### (iii) Hutton Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector

That the Hutton Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector had been published on 15 March 2011. A response to the report had been prepared in anticipation of any subsequent consultation.

## 70. Minutes

Received and approved:

- (i) Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 December 2010.  
**Paper Council/4/A**
- (ii) Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 25 January 2011.  
**Paper Council/4/B**
- (iii) Minutes of the Council Sub-Group Meeting held on 10 February 2011.  
**Paper Council/4/C**

## 71. Matters arising from the Minutes

There were no matters arising from the Minutes.

## 72. Nominations and Honorary Awards Committee

### (i) Nominations for Honorary Awards

Reported:

That the nominees for Honorary Awards, approved by Council on 25 January 2011, as set out below, had all accepted their awards and would be attending the Presentation Ceremony on 11 July 2011 at the Barbican.

Sir Graeme Davies	Honorary Fellowship
Professor Hamid Ghodse	Honorary Fellowship
Dr Julian Tudor-Hart	Honorary Degree

An Honorary Fellowship would also be awarded to Mr Ivor Berresford, the architect who designed St George's Hospital and Medical School buildings. Mr Berresford had been unable to accept his Honorary Fellowship in 2010, and instead would be attending the Presentation Ceremony on 11 July 2011.

### (ii) Vacancies on Council

Reported:

That there was currently a vacancy on Council, and both Ms Isabel Nisbet and Mr James Cochrane would be stepping down from Council in July 2011. Professor Peter Scott has retired on 31 December 2010.

The following had been agreed:

- (a) That three vacancies would be advertised externally.
- (b) That Professor Julius Weinberg, Vice-Chancellor (elect) of Kingston University would be invited to be a member of SGUL Council.

### (iii) Membership of Committees

Reported:

- (a) Mr Michael Draper had agreed to become Chair of the Audit Committee with effect from 1 August 2011.
- (b) Mr Mike Stevens had agreed to become Treasurer and Chair of the Finance Committee with effect from 1 August 2011.
- (c) Mr Anthony Bicknell had agreed to become a member of the Estates Committee with immediate effect.

(d) That all other vacancies would be filled from the new appointments to Council (5 (ii): Vacancies on Council).

(iv) Council Student Ambassador

Reported:

That Mrs Susan Thomas had agreed to become the Council Student Ambassador.

**Paper Council/4/D**

(v) Effectiveness Review

Reported:

That an Effectiveness Review of Council would be undertaken at the end of the session 2010-2011. A short questionnaire would be used.

(vi) Personal Review/Appraisal of Independent Members of Council

Reported:

That The Chair of Council would conduct a Personal Review with all independent members of Council before the end of the 2010-2011 session. Reviews would then be conducted every two years.

For new members reviews would be carried out in the first and third year of the appointment and every two years subsequently.

The Chair thanked those members of Council who had agreed to take on new roles, and to become members of committees.

## Health and Safety

### 73. Health and Safety Issues

Received:

A report from the Safety Management Committee, and any issues that have arisen since the meeting of Council held on 15 December 2010.

Reported:

That it had been agreed that Fire Safety training would be provided for all staff, as it had been a number of years since that last all-staff fire safety training programme had been conducted.

**Paper Council/4/E**

## Principal's Report

### 74. Report from the Principal

Reported:

(i) **THES Survey**

That in a recent survey by the THES, SGUL had been identified by the students as the best quality student experience in London. SGUL was ranked 27<sup>th</sup> in the Country, and the 7<sup>th</sup> most improved. It was noted that the student sample was small

**(ii) Department of Health**

That the White Paper 'Developing the Healthcare Workforce' proposed changes to medical education and training. The establishment of Health Education England (HEE) was intended to deal with strategic issues including commissioning education and training that can only be undertaken at national level. The national body would be underpinned by a local skills network made up of providers, universities, social care and public health representatives. The SW London Academic Health and Social Care Network (AHSN) was well placed to become a local skills network for SW London, and a proposal had been put forward on this basis.

**(iii) Tuition Fees**

That Mrs Sophie Bowen had convened the Forward Funding and Finance Group which was considering tuition fee levels and also SGUL's Access Agreement. The Access Agreement including the proposed fee levels was due to be submitted by 19 April 2011 to the Office of Fair Access (OFFA) who would respond by 11 July 2011.

**(iv) HEFCE Grant Letter**

That in anticipation of the HEFCE Grant Letter to individual institutions, analysis had been undertaken on the basis of the letter attached at Paper F. SGUL was likely to face a combined shortfall of £1.6 million in funding for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Further savings would need to be made beyond the £4.4 million already achieved. Council had set a target of £6 million.

**(v) Workload Distribution**

That it was noted that a number of staff were undertaking a considerable amount of additional work in support of recent SGUL developments. It was expected that the introduction and completion of the annual Personal Review period would recognise the contribution made by individuals, and help to achieve a *better workload* balance across all staff in the future.

## Contextual Issues and INTO Proposals

### 75. HEFCE Letter and Commentary

Reported:

That the grant announcement for individual HEIs would be made on 17 March 2011. On the basis of the general figures detailed in the letter from HEFCE (February 2011), *it had* been possible to forecast the likely level of the cuts on a pro-rated basis. The HEFCE grant for the financial year 2010-2011 would be reduced by £700,000, and that funding for the 2011-2012 financial year would be reduced by c £900,000, a total of £1.6 million. This would be reviewed again in detail on receipt of the actual grant allocation letter from HEFCE.

Currently modelling suggested that SGUL would need to set fees at £9000 in order to realise a modest surplus for 2012-2013 and subsequent years. At £8000- £8,500 it was likely that *SGUL that-delete* break even would be achieved. Further modelling would be undertaken to include differential fees across subjects.

The forecast for 2010-2011 (including the predicted clawback) would be breakeven, and for 2011-2012 (including the predicted reduction in the grant) there would be a deficit of approx £250,000. A number of assumptions had been included in the modelling that had not previously been included, and there was still some further adjustments to be made before the Five Year Forecasts could be completed.

**Paper Council/4/F**

## 76. Office for Fair Access

Received:

The press release from the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) regarding Access Agreements (issued 7 March 2011). The guidance could be found at <http://www.offa.org.uk/publications/>.

Reported:

That detailed guidance had now been received and further work was being undertaken by the four subgroups of the Forward Funding and Finance Group looking at:

- (a) The financial support package
- (b) Tuition fee setting
- (c) Access Agreement
- (d) Communications

There would be a meeting on 17 March 2011 to consider the work of the sub-groups. Good progress had been made on drafting the Access Agreement. There would be a further meeting on 30 March 2011 to finalise the Access Agreement prior to submission to the extraordinary meeting of Council on 8 April 2011. (See Minute 80: Delegation of Authority.)

Paper Council/4/G

## 77. Finance

Reported:

- (i) That the Financial matters relating to INTO were circulated with the INTO papers contained at Paper I.
- (ii) That the Five Year Forecasts would be discussed at the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council to be held on 8 April 2011 at 3.00 pm. This would be subsequent to the receipt of the Institutional HEFCE Funding Letter.

## 78. Voluntary Severance/Early Retirement Scheme and Salary Savings Scheme

Received:

A report from the Director of Human Resources.

Paper Council/4/H

## 79. INTO

Papers	
Paper I	Covering Paper
Appendix A	Summary Business Plan
Appendix B	BDO Report – 4 February 2011
Appendix C	BDO Supplementary Report – 3 March 2011
Appendix D	Financial Business Case
Appendix E	SGUL Actions/Response – BDO Supplementary Report
Appendix F	Horton Halls Phase II Development
Appendix G	Legal Commentary – Property
Appendix H	Legal Commentary - General

Reported:

### Background

Council, at its meeting on 25 January 2011, considered the proposal to form a Joint Venture partnership with INTO University Partnerships Ltd ('INTO') to deliver Foundation and Higher Education programmes marketed primarily to potential international students. Students recruited to the Joint Venture's programmes would be outside of the capped international student numbers that SGUL was permitted for existing programmes. (Summary Business Plan attached at Appendix A).

Council agreed that a Sub-Group should be established to take action on its behalf with regard to the approval of the INTO proposals. The Sub-Group met on 10 February 2011 and considered a number of areas of work undertaken subsequent to Council's January meeting, including:

- A report from BDO LLP reviewing the underpinning Financial Business Case, and undertaking further due diligence related to INTO. (Appendices B and C)
- Further interrogation by SGUL of the Financial Business Case provided by INTO;
- Progress on outstanding legal matters;
- Initial work relating to the property transactions required to underpin the Joint Venture.

The Sub-Group agreed that development work should be continued with INTO and that final proposals should be presented to Council at its meeting on 15 March 2011, with an updated business plan being presented to Finance Committee members on 7 March 2011 prior to the Council meeting.

Specifically the Sub—Group requested:

- (i) That the business model should provide a breakeven position by 2013-2014 showing profits subsequently that would cover the costs of the first two years.
- (ii) That Ingleby House/Education Centre transactions should be removed from the business case.
- (iii) That the development of Horton Halls should be undertaken by SGUL and should not be part of the Joint Venture.
- (iv) That there was clarity about the 'cash flow' requirements, for the Joint Venture; in particular the timing of cash provided by each of SGUL's subsidiary companies and, for INTO's subsidiary, and an understanding as to how this would be arranged.
- (v) That consideration be given to reducing numbers in the first year and delaying the start of the Higher Education programmes.
- (vi) Other property costs to be included in SGUL's capital and I and E forecasts (ie refurbishment of Jenner Wing and Horton Halls Phase II Developments)
- (vii) Further consideration to be given to marketing/management fees.
- (viii) SGUL's start up costs to be reassessed and included in the Business Case,
- (ix) An expulsion event to be included in the legal agreement, and the list of events that would trigger expulsion to be expanded.

Further work has been undertaken on all of the issues detailed above.

Subsequent to the Sub-Group meeting, SGUL served a Contract Award Notice to INTO, to comply with OJEU procurement regulations. Before issuing the Contract Award Notice, legal advice was taken and the Notice was issued on the basis of each side continuing to bear its own costs as work continued towards agreeing the terms of the contract, and without obligation to enter into a contract if terms could not be agreed.

### **Financial Forecasts**

Council's requirement for the business plan to produce a break-even position by 2013-2014 (and to consolidate relatively small losses in the early years of operation) was discussed with INTO at a meeting held on 1 March 2011. This has resulted in the following concessions (detailed in Appendix D):

- The INTO marketing and management charges would now be based upon the number of students recruited to the Joint Venture. Within these costs were set-

up costs for establishing a medical programme focussed admissions office and this has been agreed;

- A market rent has been used for the use of D block;
- Accommodation has been removed from the Joint Venture forecasts from 2012/13 onwards;
- The effects of adjustments made have been included in the revised forecasts.
- A detailed analysis of each element of the TRAC costs included in the financial model had also been completed. Details of the marginal costs SGUL would incur within the project were also included.

The following assumptions had been included in the model:

- Student intake – September only.
- VAT included on all INTO costs and agents' commissions to the Joint Venture
- Income inflated at 6% and expenditure at 3%
- Marketing charge based on percentage of tuition fees
- Rent for Middlesex Street included for one year only
- SGUL's costs based on TRAC data plus an uplift in relevant areas (c 30%)
- Bad debt provision included at 3%
- Residences out after one year, D Block space a capital cost to SGUL and a commercial rent to the Joint Venture
- Reduction in the level of scholarships
- The Joint Venture will be an eligible body for the purpose of exempting its tuition fees from VAT

Following a review of the forecasts by BDO, a surplus position would not be achieved until 2014-2015. It was also noted that the original surplus predicted by 2017-2018 had been £7.2 million and under the most recent forecasts this had been revised and was now £2.7 million. In addition SGUL would recover reimbursements of costs on TRAC rates. This includes a premium, and the financial analysis demonstrated that this was sufficient to cover actual likely costs.

### **Cash Flow**

Cash would be required to underwrite the operating position of the early years of the Joint Venture. The forecast indicated that a cumulative deficit of c £2 million would need to be underwritten in the year 2012-2013. SGUL's share would be £1 million. The cash requirement would be £500k in the first year, and a further £500k at some point between 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. It was anticipated that this would be funded from SGUL's cash reserves.

### **General Comments**

The following points were noted:

- (1) That if the Joint Venture did not proceed, *comma* the Halls of Residence could be used for SGUL students or rented out to other organisations. Block D could also be used for other purposes, such as housing the Faculty of Health and Social Care Sciences (FHSCS), rent currently paid would be saved.
- (2) That capital funding of £8 million would be required for the Halls of Residence and £4 to £5 million for D Block, Jenner Wing. This was a commitment to £12 to £13 million of capital funding if the Joint Venture with INTO was approved by Council.
- (3) That all current available capital funding (CIF1, CIF2 and SDF funds) was committed to the current redevelopment of Level 2, G Block.
- (4) That the redevelopment of D Block would contribute to improving space utilisation, which would be essential for any further capital funding from HEFCE.
- (5) That the cost of SGUL setting up its own networks and agents would be circa £650,000 for three years, and it was unlikely to achieve the level of spread and penetration that would be supplied by INTO.

- (6) That embarking on the joint venture would increase the institution's risk profile and require additional management capability if it were to be delivered successfully.

### **Property Arrangements**

Mills and Reeve had provided a summary of the *legal issues relating to property*. The report focussed on the occupational arrangements that were being put in place for the limited liability partnership (LLP) which was being set up as part of the larger joint venture arrangement with INTO. The report covered the following issues:

- (a) 102 Middlesex Street
- (b) Ground Floor and Basement of D Block, Jenner Wing
- (c) Horton Halls and Pacific Court

The costs and financing of the property arrangements was included in the financial forecasts as set out above.

### **Legal Agreements**

Good progress had been made at the meeting held with INTO on 1 March 2011 in obtaining comfort for SGUL with regard to a number of key areas, via:

- Remedies for failure to meet minimum performance criteria, and the timing of these criteria's introduction
- Expulsion event for material breach
- Remedies, and an expulsion event, for reputational damage
- Expulsion event should INTO dispose of more than 50% of its interests in similar joint ventures
- Change of control clauses

It was noted that there were a number of issues still under consideration. It was expected that agreement could be reached on most outstanding issues with some further negotiation.

### **US Activities**

A meeting had been held with INTO to explore the wider US dimensions related to the Joint Venture. With regard to clinical placements, several options had been identified by INTO, including partnership activities with the University of South Florida, with the intention of developing clusters of student placement activity. SGUL's preference would be for a maximum of three clinical placement clusters given the necessity of arranging quality assurance procedures for these placements. A more wide spread distribution of placements would make quality assurance difficult and expensive.

### **Newcastle University Site Visit**

An SGUL delegation had recently visited Newcastle University (NU). NU would welcome its fifth intake of INTO students in 2011. A range of issues had been discussed, including financial aspects, reputational and governance risks, recruitment, admissions, the student experience, course design and quality assurance, and property matters. The visit had provided significant reassurance to the SGUL delegation regarding the risks of a potential Joint Venture with INTO.

### **Principal's View**

The Principal reported that given the very challenging public funding environment if SGUL wished to continue as an independent medical and health services university, then it would need to lessen its dependency on public funding and find alternative sources of funding and this would involve taking risks. International activity had been identified as a means of diversifying its income stream, and the development of an International Strategy was part of the SGUL Strategic Plan approved by Council in October 2010.



International numbers for medicine were capped by Government, because of the need for clinical placements and the provision of jobs available post qualification. The INTO proposal would allow students to undertake their clinical placements in the US and to qualify for the USMLE. Other universities had gained considerable benefits from partnerships with INTO. The alternative to taking a risk with a partnership with INTO was most likely to be merger with a larger institution. SGUL's previous experience of merger had shown that it was unlikely that SGUL would survive as a distinctive entity, and was more likely to be taken over by a larger multi-faculty institution, particularly if they already had a medical faculty.

#### **Professor Richard Smith**

Professor Smith had been unable to attend the meeting but had sent written comments. Professor Smith had commented on the financial case, the difficulty of providing a 'private medical school' alongside or within a 'public medical school', the provision of US clinical placements, the lack of contribution to research, and the possible deterring of other international partners. Professor Smith had also commented on the impact on SGUL's reputation and the ability of the staff to cope with the increased demands of the project. Overall Professor Smith was not in favour of the proposal.

#### **Halls of Residence and D Block**

As noted in the General Comments above, SGUL would need to borrow £8 million for the Horton Halls Phase II, and £4 to £5 million for the redevelopment of D Block. A short list of five banks had been drawn up to provide this borrowing for both developments. It was felt that the business case for the Halls of Residence was robust, and by year seven would show a surplus based on 42 week occupancy and 98% uptake. It was noted that as the students were international it was likely that they would want occupancy for more than 42 weeks, as they were unlikely to travel home for shorter holidays.

#### **Agreed:**

Following a show of hands there was a majority vote in favour of approving the INTO project subject to:

- (i) Further discussion of the financing for the Halls of Residence and D Block at the meeting to be held on 8 April 2011
- (ii) The agreement of the outstanding legal issues in favour of SGUL.

**Paper Council/4/1**

#### **80. Delegation of Authority**

Considered:

A paper requesting the delegation of authority to an Extraordinary Meeting of the Finance Committee to be held on 8 April 2011.

Reported:

That the outstanding issues to be considered were:

- Approval of the Access Agreement (including proposed level of Tuition Fees)
- Halls of Residence (Tenders for borrowing)
- Borrowing for D Block (as set out in Minute 79)
- Five Year Financial Forecasts

It was felt that these were not matters that should not be delegated to the Finance Committee and that they needed to have Council approval. It was suggested that either the papers for the meeting could be circulated to all Council members for comment, or that all Council members could be invited to the meeting.

**Agreed:**

That the meeting arranged for 8 April 2011 would become an extra-ordinary meeting of Council, and all members would be invited to attend. Papers would be sent to those members unable to attend for comment in advance of the meeting.

Paper Council/4/J

## Strategic Issues

### 81. Strategic Plan Implementation

Reported:

**(i) General**

That the activities within the Strategic Plan which had been highlighted as priorities by Council were all in progress and would be completed to agreed timescales. A report on progress was made every two weeks (approx) to the Strategy Implementation Review Group, and on a monthly basis to the Strategy, Resources and Finance Committee (SPARC). The report to Council showed progress over the last six months.

**(ii) Education Strategy**

An Education Strategy Steering Group had been established. A detailed portfolio review was in progress of the BSc in Biomedical Sciences, the MBBS programmes and the MPharm, which was looking at direct teaching costs and workload distribution. A final report would be made to SPARC at its meeting on 6 April 2011. Prior to this an Education Strategy Workshop would be held on 16 March 2011, and the outputs would be fed into the Forward Funding and Finance Working Group on 22 March 2011.

**(iii) Student Experience and Funding**

The Forward Funding and Finance Group had been established to consider tuition fees and to develop the Institutional Access Agreement as required by OFFA. Forecasting models had been produced with available data but would be populated with actual figures on receipt of the HEFCE Funding Letter on 17 March 2011. Sub working groups had been established to look at:

- (a) The financial support package
- (b) Tuition fee setting
- (c) Access Agreement
- (d) Communications

The NSS working group looking at the results of the NSS Survey 2010 was meeting regularly and monitoring the outcomes of the improvement activities undertaken in response to the survey results.

**(iv) International**

As reported at Minute 79: INTO.

**(v) Research**

A Research Centre Business Planning workshop was held in December 2010. The Research Centre plans would inform both preparation for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and the development of the Research Strategy. It was proposed that a REF pilot exercise would be conducted during the summer.

**(vi) Sharing Knowledge/Opportunity**

The University of Nicosia franchise had been launched and implementation was underway. Other overseas initiatives were under active consideration with Malta and Taylor's University in Malaysia. It had been indicated that the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) money would continue at current levels and SGUL would continue to be supported. A draft Enterprise Strategy was under development.

**(vii) Partnerships**

As part of the SGUL/SGHT Active Alliance programme (Minute 56 – 14 December 2010) a scoping exercise was being undertaken to look at possible areas of shared services. Progress was reported on a fortnightly basis to an Joint Executive Group, and to the St George's Joint Strategy and Operations Group on a quarterly basis. A final report would be made at the end of March 2011.

An annual planning submission had been made by the Faculty of Health and Social Care Sciences (FHSCS) including plans to meet a £1.9 savings target over the next five years. A review of the administrative services and financial framework supporting FHSCS was ongoing.

**(ix) Organisational Process and Infrastructure**

A range of projects were ongoing including:

- Preparation for the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Institutional Visit
- Development of Key Performance Indicators
- Upgrading the SGUL website
- Updating the Information Strategy following wide consultation
- Development of divisional business plans
- Continuation of the Jenner project following the award of Capital Infrastructure Funding (CIF2)
- Development of Five Year Forecasts for submission to HEFCE in mid April.
- Reviews of all administrative areas

**(x) Staff**

Implementation of the new Personal Review system was underway. An internal staff Leadership conference had been held in January 2011 and feedback from the conference was being reviewed. Communications had been highlighted as one area where improvements might be made.

**Paper Council/4/K**

**82. Key Performance Indicators**

Reported:

That the KPIs had been developed in the light of suggestions made by Council at its meeting on 15 December 2011. It has been possible to include two of the suggested KPIs, but data (including benchmarking data) was not currently available for the remaining four suggested KPIs.

The resulting seven KPIs were as follows:

- NSS Results
- Destination of Leavers
- Spend per FRE User
- Student/Staff Ratio
- Research Income and Market Share
- Widening Participation
- Financial Performance

The KPIs were based on data available from Higher Education Information Database for Institutions (HEIDI) which in turn drew its data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). Benchmark groups were a Peer Group and the Russell Group, except for the NSS results, where it was only possible to compare results for medicine in a like for like manner, and the benchmark group was 'other institutions offering medicine'.

Using HEIDI as a data source ensured that comparisons were being made on a like for like basis between institutions. There was a time lag in publishing data sets (for example the majority of data used was for the year 2008-2009) and these were also updated at different times of the year.

Each KPI report would contain the source of data, the strategic plan objective it supported, the current position, and the benchmark group. It was noted that the KPIs were underpinned by more detailed PIs which were kept under review by the owners and reviewed periodically and informally by the Principal's Advisory Group and formally by SPARC. It was suggested that each report should also contain comments and analysis by the KPI owner.

**Agreed:**

That the KPIs were approved for presentation to Council subject to the addition of a commentary by the KPI owner to each report.

**Presentation/Paper Council/4/L**

## **Partnerships**

### **83. SWan (Southwest London Academic Network)**

Reported:

By Dr David Mackintosh, Chair of the Management Board, that consideration had been given to the future of SWan, following the cessation of HEFCE funding in July 2010, and in the light of the unsuccessful proposed merger between SGUL and Royal Holloway, University of London (RHUL). The three institutions, Kingston University (KU), RHUL and SGUL had agreed to fund the project for a further year from 2010 to July 2011 during which time a reassessment of its future focus and purpose would take place.

It had been agreed that SWan should continue, but that it would focus on a number of aspects. These were:

- Research
- PGR Students
- PGT Students (particularly with regard to the overseas market and synergies with research)

The three institute model would be disbanded, and these activities would be embedded within the three partner institutions. A fund would be established and bids for activities could be made up to a maximum of £150 k. There would also be changes to the governance arrangements for SWan which would allow SWan to become more deeply embedded within all three partner Institutions as a result of greater engagement at Faculty/Division level. An indicative budget had been included. It was noted that the Business Development Manager post had now been withdrawn from the budget.

Care would be taken to preserve the strengths of SWan including the development of the brand which it was felt had developed genuine currency together with a national, and in some instances an international reputation. It was also noted that Roehampton University was not a member of SWan, it was hoped that Roehampton could join the network which would further strengthen SWan within the SW London sector.

**Paper Council/4/M**

## Students' Union Issues

### 84. Students' Union Report

Reported:

- (i) That the Student Submission to the QAA Institutional Audit was nearing completion. This followed an extensive student questionnaire conducted by the Students' Union. The results of the questionnaire would be shared with SGUL staff.
- (ii) That the Students' Union (SU) charity registration was progressing well, and the final submission would be submitted to the Charity Commission shortly. Interviews for Trustees were underway. Two staff Trustees had been appointed, namely Professor Pat Hughes, Dean for Staff and Students and Mr Mark Bery, Director of Finance and Resources.
- (iii) That the SU had appreciated the opportunity to be members of the Forward Funding and Finance Group, and being invited to take part in the discussions around future fee levels.
- (iv) That the new Commercial Manager had taken up appointment on 14 March 2011.
- (v) That RAG had raised £24,000 for charity. This would be used for SU Community projects and charities.
- (vi) That the SU was taking part in the Mental Health Awareness Week, and also the 'Go Green Week'.

## Audit Issues

### 85. Audit Committee

Received and noted:

A report from the Chair of the Audit Committee.

Paper Council/4/N

Agreed:

That the Value for Money Policy and the Value for Money Plan be approved.

Paper Council/4/O

## Risk Management

### 86. Risk Management

Received and noted:

- (i) The Summary Risk Register
- (ii) The Key Risk Indicator Table
- (iii) The New Strategic Risk Register
- (iv) The Old Strategic Risk Register

Paper Council/4/P

## Estates

### 87. Estates Committee

Received and noted:

A report from the Chair of the Estates Committee.

Paper Council/4/Q

## Human Resources

### 88. Human Resources Committee

Received:

A report from the Chair of the Human Resources Committee.

Reported:

That UCU had balloted on two matters:

Pay Negotiations and job protection  
Reforms to USS

The outcome of the ballot on pay and job protection at a national level voted in favour of strike action and action short of a strike. The results of the ballot on reforms to USS had been reported on a work place basis. SGUL had voted not to take strike action on this issue, with the majority in favour of action short of a strike. UCU was expected to make an announcement with regard to its plans for action shortly. SGUL was putting in place plans to mitigate the impact of industrial action. All staff had been informed that SGUL rejected partial performance and that action short of a strike would result in the withholding of pay.

**Paper Council/4/R**

## Education

### 89. QAA Institutional Audit

Received and noted:

The Institutional briefing paper.

**Paper Council/4/S**

### 90. Senate Report

Received and noted:

A report from Senate on quality issues.

**Paper Council/4/T**

## Equality and Diversity

### 91. Equality and Diversity

Received and noted:

A report from the Equality and Diversity Committee.

**Paper Council/4/U**

## HEFCE and other External Matters

### 92. HEFCE Letters and Consultations and other External Consultations for Information

Received and noted:

A report on HEFCE letters and consultations and other external consultations, with responses to date.

**Paper Council/4/V**

# Matters for Report

## 93. Minutes of Meetings

Committee	Date of Meeting	Available from:
Audit Committee	8 March 2011	By email from s.trubshaw@sgul.ac.uk
Risk Management Committee	24 February 2011	By email from s.durkin@sgul.ac.uk
Finance Committee	7 March 2011	<b>CONFIDENTIAL</b> Available from d.baldwinson@sgul.ac.uk
SPARC	15 December 2011 19 January 2011 23 February 2011	By email from s.trubshaw@sgul.ac.uk
Senate	28 February 2011	By email from d.baldwinson@sgul.ac.uk
Human Resources Committee	1 March 2011	By email from m.luckiram@sgul.ac.uk

## 94. Actions by the Chair

Reported:

- (i) The Chair of Council had upheld three appeals for a discretionary third and final attempt at an examination under the Programme Regulations and remitted these to a Hearing Committee. The Chair of Council had rejected seven appeals.
- (ii) The Chair of Council had rejected an appeal under the *Procedure for representations from assessment candidates concerning provisional assessment results or decisions of Boards of Examiners*, for the reinstatement of a Progression Point Resit attempt.

## 95. Dates of Meetings 2010-2011

All meetings commence at 5.00 pm in Boardrooms 1 & 2

Thursday 31 May 2011 – Away Day, Dorich House, Kingston Hill

Tuesday 5 July 2011

ST/16 March 2011