



CONFIDENTIAL
University of Bristol
Minutes of Council

Friday 23 March 2012

Present: Mr Denis Burn (Chair), Mr Josh Alford, Ms Sophie Bennett, Professor Tim Bond, Professor David Clarke, Councillor Simon Cooke, Mr Roy Cowap, Professor Gary Foster, Dr Andrew Garrad, Mr Colin Green, Dr Moira Hamlin, Professor Sally Heslop, Ms Pru Lawrence-Archer, Professor Nick Lieven, Dr John Manley, Mr Robert Massie, Mr Bob Morton, Mrs Dinah Moore, Mr David Ord, Professor Guy Orpen, Mrs Cindy Peck, Mr Andrew Poolman, Mr Mohammed Saddiq, Ms Victoria Stace, Ms Anne Stephenson, Professor Eric Thomas, Dr Trevor Thompson, Mr James Wadsworth and Mr James Wetz.

In Attendance: Miss Lucy Barling, Dr Alison Bernays, Ms Jane Bridgwater, Mr Patrick Finch, Ms Helen Galbraith, Mr Guy Gregory, Mr Andy Nield, and Ms Lynn Robinson.

Apologies: Mr Gus Baker, Sir Ronald Kerr and Mr Bill Ray.

Session 1:

RECEIVED: A Presentation from the Bursar summarising the key elements of the draft University Estates Strategy. Council NOTED that they would receive a draft Estates Strategy in October 2012.

RECEIVED: A Presentation from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) on progress made against the University Education Strategy.

Council thanked the Bursar and the Pro Vice-Chancellor for their informative presentations and noted both the challenges and opportunities that the University would face in the coming years.

Session 2: Formal Meeting of Council

1. Apologies for Absence / Announcements

1.1 The Chair NOTED the apologies received.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting

2.1 CONFIRMED: The minutes of the meeting held on 10th February 2012.

3. Matters Arising and Actions Register

- 3.1 Members had previously received a copy of the Action Register which had been used to incorporate actions agreed at the 10th February 2012 Council meeting. Completed items were asterisked and would be removed from the Register for the next meeting.
- 3.2 It was NOTED that there were no outstanding actions on the Action Register.

4. Chair's Business

RECEIVED: Council Chair's Business, reference **CN/12/125** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

Summary/Reflection on Council Awayday

- 4.1 The Chair informed Council that further discussions would take place with the Senior Team and Linda Holbeche, Co-Director of The Holbeche Partnership (THP), in order to expand on the key questions which had been raised at the Council Away Day on the 22nd March 2012. Council would receive more information on the outcomes of those discussions in due course. The Personnel and Health and Safety Committee would work in conjunction with the Human Resources Division to review and consider the feedback from the session.

Committee Membership Appointments

- 4.2 APPROVED: The appointment of: (i) Ms Dinah Moore, as a lay member of Council on the Honorary Degrees Committee, with immediate effect until 31st December 2014; and (ii) Dr Moger Woolley as Pro Chancellor on the Remuneration Committee with immediate effect until 31st December 2012 (concurrent with his remaining term as a Pro Chancellor).

Ethics of Research Committee Terms of Reference

- 4.3 APPROVED: An amendment to the terms of reference of the Ethics of Research Committee which was an addition of the Committee's responsibility to receive the annual report from the Human Tissue Working Group.

Council Effectiveness Reviews/Strategic Performance Indicators (SPIs)

Council Effectiveness Review

- 4.4 The programme of one to one meetings between the Chair of Council and/or Chairs of Council committees and members of Council, and the review of governance-related processes and policies would be initiated in due course. A further paper would be presented to Council for comment in July 2012.

Strategic Performance Indicators

- 4.5 Following the discussion at Council on 10 February about the scope for, and nature of, a revised set of Strategic Performance Indicators (SPIs), the topic had been discussed at a Senior Team Away Day on 28 February, and was now being considered by each major Council committee and by the Research and Education Committees. The intention was to take stock of feedback and prepare a final set of SPIs, together with associated data and commentary, for consideration by Council at its meeting in July 2012. These SPIs, or a subset

of them, could then form the basis for the Sustainability Return required by HEFCE in the future. Any further feedback from Council members outside the committee discussions was welcomed, and should be sent to Ms Helen Galbraith, Director of Planning, or Mr Andy Nield, Finance Director.

5. Vice-Chancellor's Matters

- 5.1 RECEIVED: The Vice-Chancellor's Report, reference **CN/11/126** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

University Registrar

- 5.2 NOTED: That the new University Registrar, Robin Gellar, would now be joining the University on the 18th of June 2012.

Expansion of the Russell Group

- 5.3 The decision to expand the Russell Group membership to include Durham, Exeter, Queen Mary and York Universities had empowered the Group significantly. The Russell Group would now become a stronger voice for research intensive universities.

Student Growth Project

- 5.4 Council noted that the University was taking a purposeful and planned approach to this project and had consulted with students throughout the whole process.

Target student numbers and offer strategy

- 5.5 All Home and EU offers needed to be made by 31st March 2012. Planning was continuing for the 2013/14 admissions process.

- 5.6 To date only 20% of those students who the University had made offers to had made their decision, and there were still 3,000 offers to be made. The intention was to be 100 to 200 short of the total maximum student intake in order to accommodate any 'near miss' students and to fulfil the widening participation target. Council noted that the University could not overshoot those numbers due to specific constraints such as student residence space.

- 5.7 Should the University not achieve its target numbers it would utilise the Customer Relationship Management (CRM) admissions system to engage with applicants and encourage them to attend Bristol.

Academic staff and other academic resources

- 5.8 Increases in academic staff numbers in certain areas had been agreed and appointments would be offered from March/April 2012 when firm up rates were available.

Widening Participation

- 5.9 Preparation was underway to implement the step change in outreach activities as outlined in the University's 2012/13 Access Agreement.

Short and long-term teaching / student space requirements

- 5.10 The 2012/13 timetable modelling had concluded there would be adequate centrally bookable physical resource available to house standard teaching for an additional 600 undergraduates.
- 5.11 The University was reviewing longer-term teaching space requirements and it was possible that at least one, or perhaps two, additional large lecture theatres would be needed. Audits of occupancy rates and space utilisation were being undertaken to ensure that the University was making best use of existing space. The impact of increased cohorts on the 2013/14 and 2014/15 timetables was also being assessed.

Study space

- 5.12 Proposals to provide additional student study and social space to cope with increased cohorts were being taken forward. These included: an extension to Library opening hours in key branches during term time and examinations (circa September 2012); refurbishment of the Hawthorns to provide study and group space; conversion of the lower ground floor of Senate House for student space (Summer 2013); refurbishment of the Wills Memorial Library; extension of the first floor computer laboratory in the computer centre by ten seats (September 2012); and the creation of a Student Study Spaces Planning Group in order to progress the above projects and the approach to medium to longer-term open access learning spaces and IT resources.

Short and longer term residential accommodation needs

- 5.13 Additional provision of residential accommodation would be provided through nominations agreements with UNITE in the short-term but with pastoral support provided by the University. The Stoke Bishop plans for 400 additional bedrooms had been progressing and the planning application would be submitted on the 16th April 2012.

Update on Support Process Review and Improvement

- 5.14 The Support Services Review implementation programme had come to a close. Outcomes of the programme would result in further changes and improvements and a communication to staff and managers about the key work that was being taken forward would be prepared. A formal closure report would be presented to Council in due course.

Communications

Impact on support services resources

- 5.15 The impact of expansion on individual support services had been considered and an extension to Library opening hours had been agreed, along with the provision of additional resource in Student Services and the academic space vacated in 2013 in the Centre for Sport, Exercise and Health which would become available for student activities. The impact on examinations was also significant and options were being explored to resolve this.

Admissions Update

Undergraduate applications and offers for 2012 entry

- 5.16 As of 29th February 2012 the University had received 29,148 home applications (this represented a decrease of 3,188 or -9.9% compared with the same time last year) and 6,007 applications from international applicants (this represented an increase of 708 or +13.4% compared with the same time last year).
- 5.17 National figures across the sector had showed that applications from home/EU students totalled 515,734 (a decrease of 49,406 or -8.74% in 2011) and that international applications had increased to 44,831 compared with 2011 (an increase of 13.3%).
- 5.18 As of 29th February 2012, 11,580 offers had been made to home applicants with 3,062 offers made to international applicants. The University had increased the number of offers made across the whole university in comparison with the same date in 2011.

Postgraduate applications and offers for 2013 entry

- 5.19 Postgraduate applications had increased overall by 10% in comparison with this point in the cycle last year.
- 5.20 The primary concern was a 45% decrease in home postgraduate taught programme applications compared with February 2011. Early analysis suggested that this was likely due to the decision to increase tuition fee levels for 2012 entry. Strategies for responding to the situation were being developed and progressed.

Update on the Life Sciences Building

- 5.21 Council noted that the University was still awaiting signature on the final agreement for with the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust regarding the tenants in Sam's House.
- 5.22 The construction project was delayed due to slow progress in having to stabilise the ground around the Centre for Nanoscience and Quantum Information (NSQI) foundations. The main contractor 'Vinci' would begin on site on the 21st May 2012. Post meeting note: it had been necessary to move the meeting date back to the 15th May 2012.

Times Higher Education, World University Rankings by Reputation, March 2012

- 5.23 Bristol was one of only 10 UK universities to feature in the top 100. It had placed in the 91-100 group.

Research grants/awards

- 5.24 The University and its staff and students had recently secured a number of high profile grants and awards. Further information could be found on the University's website at www.bris.ac.uk/news.

Bristol Health Partners

- 5.25 Professor Orpen advised Council that the University (alongside the University of the West of England) was moving rapidly towards formalising its

relationship with the four national health trusts in the city and that this would create a platform for the University's Research and Development and Education and Training strategies.

- 5.26 The University was putting in place a collaborative agreement and in the first month of the partnership the intent was for each partner to contribute £30,000 to appoint a part time Director (recently announced to be Professor Peter Mathieson, Dean of Medicine and Dentistry at Bristol).
- 5.27 Over the next year, a business case would be prepared proposing enhanced investment from the partners of £100,000 a year in order to support the development of health integration teams across the six partners. This would support the implementation of all of the partners' strategic ambitions.
- 5.28 NOTED: That the collaboration agreement was to be signed off within the next few weeks and that as host partner this would not only bind Bristol University to key partners within Bristol city but it would create a powerful engine for health research strategy.
- 5.29 In the 12 months ahead it was likely that Bristol City Council would also become a partner once they had taken over their statutory responsibilities for public health within the city.
- 5.30 The Vice-Chancellor emphasised that the recent Health Bill would have implications for universities nationally as a result of the recent transformations of healthcare commissioning and delivery. Council NOTED that Sir Ronald Kerr and other University colleagues would provide a presentation on those implications for Bristol University and nationally at the July 2012 Council meeting.
- 5.31 Council were advised that the Plymouth and Exeter Medical School had recently separated and that Exeter University may join the Academic Health Sciences Network.

Students' Union Elections

- 5.32 NOTED: The outcomes of the recent UBU elections for 2012/13 were as follows:
- (i) President – Paul Charlton
 - (ii) Vice President Education – Tom Flynn
 - (iii) Vice President Community – Alice Peck
 - (iv) Vice President Welfare & Equality – Alessandra Berti
 - (v) Vice President Sport & Health – Hannah Pollak
 - (vi) Vice President Activities – Martha West

6. Finance Report

- 6.1 RECEIVED: The Financial Update report from the Finance Director, reference **CN/12/127** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

Overall Financial performance

- 6.2 The current year forecast surplus had been increased to £6m which represented £4m better than budget. One of the most significant factors for the increase was the confirmation from HEFCE that there would not be an in year grant cut. The contingency provision had therefore been reduced to £2.3m.
- 6.3 Operating cash flows were positive with net cash inflow of £23m, but this would reduce over the next few months due: to the progression of the capital programme; a reduction to the positive in-year working capital position on student fees and HEFCE grant; with a forecast increase in net debt from £38 to £76m, by the year end.
- 6.4 Forecast capital expenditure for the year was £54m. Expenditure to date was £31m.
- 6.5 The Finance Dashboard for February 2012 was attached at **CN/12/127/Appendix A.**
- 6.6 Council would receive a presentation on the University budget at it's meeting in May 2012.

HEFCE grant funding

- 6.7 HEFCE would announce detailed grant allocations for 2012/13 on 19th March 2012. *Post meeting note:* The total grant allocated was £103.2million (a reduction of 9.8% compared with 2011-12) in line with expectations.
- 6.8 HEFCE had issued a consultation paper 'Student numbers and controls and teaching funding – consultation on arrangements for 2013/14 and beyond' which was due to close for comments on 25th May 2012. The proposals in the consultation did not indicate any major surprises.
- 6.9 The Undergraduate home fee level of £9,000 would remain for 2013/14 and the University assumed that it would also apply for 2014/15.
- 6.10 HEFCE had recently published its annual report on the financial health of the HE sector. The key points were:
- (i) There were no forecasts for 2012/13 onwards – this had been deferred until summer 2012.
 - (ii) The sector reported strong financial performance in 2010/11.
 - (iii) Forecast performance for 2011/12 was positive, but reductions in public funding would see projected surpluses reducing sharply.

Treasury

- 6.11 Council was reassured that the University was continuing to give very careful consideration to its investment strategy in challenging market conditions. At the previous Council meeting turbulence in the corporate bond market had

been reported, but that was now easing and the University had taken the opportunity to dispose of some longer maturity corporate bonds with banks which had recently been downgraded.

- 6.12 The University's overdraft facility of £2m (which it had with its clearing bank National Westminster to cover any inadvertent overdraft position) had never been called upon and National Westminster had recently carried out a review of their compliance procedures. Approval from Council was required in order to reconfirm the long standard overdraft facility as part of their service provision.
- 6.13 APPROVED: A resolution required by the University's clearing bank in respect of a long standing overdraft facility as contained within the report and set out below:

"After due consideration of all the circumstances and on being satisfied the proposed group overdraft facility (the "Overdraft") is necessary in order to pursue the course of action intended by the Council;

- a) whether the terms of the proposed overdraft are reasonable having regard to the status of the University as a prospective borrower;
- b) on the ability of the University to repay the Overdraft on those terms and;
- c) that it is proper for the University to enter into a Group of Accounts (Currency) Agreement between the University and National Westminster Bank Plc acting through The Royal Bank of Scotland plc (the Agreement) in the form now produced in respect of a group overdraft facility including a balance management arrangement not exceeding a net limit of £2,000,000 at any one time from National Westminster Bank Plc (the "Bank") and incorporating the Bank's Group of Accounts (Currency) Terms."

And that the Vice-Chancellor or Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the Finance Director be authorised to sign on behalf of the University the Agreement and any other documents required by the Bank in connection with the Agreement.

University of Bristol Pension Assurance Scheme (UBPAS) update

- 6.14 The forthcoming actuarial valuation process was scheduled for July 2012 and as part of the process, the UBPAS trustees would undertake a formal review of the strength of the University of Bristol covenant. Demonstrating a strong covenant was an important part of agreeing a future deficit recovery plan.
- 6.15 The University, together with the UBPAS Trustees, was looking at options for risk reduction including changing the proportion of the scheme assets which were invested in return-seeking instruments.
- 6.16 Since July 2009, the funding position had benefited from the £15m deficit recovery payments that the University had made and the change to CPI

indexation of pensions in payments, which had resulted in a gain of c £27m. However, the impact of the reduction in discount rates had more than absorbed those gains. Although the funding level percentage had improved from the July 2009 position, the absolute level of deficit had increased.

- 6.17 Gilt yields at 31 July 2012 would be critical in determining the overall valuation position and the potential impact on the current deficit recovery plan.

7. Matters for Discussion and/or Approval

Access Agreement

- 7.1 RECEIVED: A report from the Director of Student Recruitment, Access and Admissions recommending a change to the University's student finance package as described in the University 2012 Access Agreement, reference **CN/12/128** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).
- 7.2 NOTED: The University had intended to submit the full 2013 Access Agreement to Council at its May meeting, but timing of submission to the Office of Fair Access (OFFA) meant that this version would need to be near final as it would need to be submitted to OFFA shortly after the May Council meeting.
- 7.3 NOTED: That, in preparation for submission of Bristol's 2013 Access Agreement, the following was being undertaken:
- (i) Discussions were underway with OFFA to assess the potential to use progress measures more supportively. While Bristol was unlikely to change the way in which it measured its progress with diversifying intake, it had flagged to OFFA the possibility that measures may need to be revised (downwards) to reflect the impact of AAB deregulation and higher fees.
 - (ii) Discussion was taking place with the Admissions, Recruitment and Widening Participation Strategy Group and wider stakeholders, with the aim of refining/building on 2012 outreach plans to ensure that future efforts were targeted as effectively as possible. Careful consideration was being given to the potential pros and cons of increasing the emphasis placed on widening participation factors within the admissions process itself.
 - (iii) Preparations were in hand for inclusion of PGCE and part-time programmes. PGCE-related changes are due in OFFA by the 31 March and will therefore need to be reported to Council retrospectively at its May meeting.
- 7.4 OFFA was keen to receive strong evidence from Universities of key strengths and weaknesses in their Widening Participation activities and the University was therefore likely to include greater investment in monitoring outcomes in the 2013 Access Agreement.

- 7.5 The student representatives informed Council that they had appreciated being involved in discussions about the Access Agreement and that they considered the recent discussions about the work programme for Widening Participation to be extremely encouraging.
- 7.6 APPROVED: (i) the introduction of an option for students to convert £2,000 of their fee waiver entitlement to a cash bursary; and
- 7.7 (ii) an approach to the Office of Fair Access (OFFA) to seek permission to implement the above change in respect of students entering the University from 2012 onwards.

Senate Report

- 7.8 RECEIVED: The report of the Senate meeting on 27th February 2012, reference **CN/12/129** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).
- 7.9 At its meeting on 5th December 2011 Senate had approved the final report of the Faculty Boards Planning Group which had set out a series of proposals requiring each Faculty to establish a new Faculty Board and Faculty Assembly. Faculty Boards as presently constituted would be disbanded and replaced by Faculty Boards of a more compact composition based on the current Faculty Planning & Resources Committees (which would thereafter cease to exist).
- 7.10 APPROVED: By Special Resolution the proposed amendments to Statute 22, Ordinance 12 and 17 of Faculty Boards Planning Group contained in the report and as set out below:

Statute 22

Faculties

1. Schools shall be allocated to faculties as determined by Senate.

Faculty boards

2. Each faculty shall have a faculty board as determined by ordinance. ~~This shall comprise the Vice-Chancellor, the dean of the faculty, the professors, heads of school, readers, senior lecturers and lecturers in the faculty, and such others involved in the academic work of the faculty, including members of other faculties, as the faculty board with the approval of Senate shall decide.~~

Responsibilities of faculty boards

3. Faculty boards are responsible to Senate for the academic activities carried out in the faculty, including the education and assessment of students and the promotion and encouragement of research, and for such other matters as Senate may require.

Committees

4. Faculty boards may establish committees to advise them on any matter, for such periods as they think fit, with such membership as they may approve. Faculties may establish committees jointly with another faculty or faculties.

Faculty Assemblies

5. Each Faculty shall have a Faculty Assembly as determined by ordinance.

Remit of Faculty Assemblies

6. The remit of the Faculty Assembly is to discuss issues which merit consideration by the Faculty as a whole.

~~2 July 2010~~

(2) **Ordinance 12**

The Deans of the Faculties

1. Role

"The dean of the faculty shall be a member of the University Planning and Resources Committee and Senate. Advised by the faculty ~~planning and resources committee~~ board, the dean is responsible to the appropriate Pro Vice-Chancellor

(3) **Ordinance 7**

Faculty Boards and Faculty Assemblies

Faculty Boards

Membership of Faculty Boards

The Faculty Board shall comprise the Dean of the Faculty (Chair), the Head of each constituent School of the Faculty, the Faculty Research Director(s), the Faculty Education Director(s), the Faculty Manager, the Faculty Financial Controller and the Faculty Human Resources Manager. Other persons, including student representatives, may attend one or more meetings of the Faculty Board at the invitation of the Dean. A Head of School who is unable to attend a Faculty Board meeting may nominate a deputy to attend on his/her behalf. A Faculty Board may co-opt up to three additional members as determined by Standing Orders.

Responsibilities of ~~f~~Faculty ~~b~~Boards

The Faculty Board debates and advises the Dean on the education and research strategies of the Faculty and is responsible for their ~~management~~ implementation ~~of these~~. The Faculty Board is also responsible for management of the Faculty generally. The Faculty Board may delegate to Faculty committees or to its members such work as is appropriate, and shall ensure that the Board, directly or through its committees or members, discharge its responsibilities.

Subject to the overriding authority of Senate, the activities of the ~~f~~Faculty ~~b~~Boards will include:

~~a) approving curricula~~

~~b) a) _____ recommending to Senate changes and additions to statutes, ordinances and regulations~~

~~c) determining the progress of students~~

~~d) approving the award of prizes~~

~~e) appointing examiners~~

- ~~f)b) appointing examiners (other than examiners for higher degrees, who are appointed by the Deans, as set out in paragraph 2 of Ordinance 17: Assessment for Academic Awards).~~
- ~~g) regulating the conduct of examinations and assessment of students~~
- ~~h) approving the creation of and appointment to faculty office~~
- i)c) advising the ~~d~~Dean of the ~~f~~Faculty
- j)d) dealing with any matter referred by Senate
- k)e) _____ bringing to the attention of Senate matters of concern in the ~~f~~Faculty
- h)f) arranging election of Faculty representatives on Senate in accordance with statute and ordinance
- m)g) _____ discharging any other duty given to it by the University or its statutes, ordinances or regulations, or required of it by any other legitimate regulatory body
- n)h) _____ establishing appropriate procedures to ensure effective communication within the Faculty of the issues discussed and decisions taken by the Faculty Board.

Faculty Assemblies

Membership of Faculty Assemblies

The Chair of the Faculty Assembly will be appointed as provided by Faculty Assembly Standing Orders. All members of the Faculty and not less than ten of the Faculty's elected Faculty and School student representatives may attend the Faculty Assembly. The arrangements for appointment of such student representatives to the Faculty Assembly will be determined by the Faculty Assembly's standing orders. The Chair may invite other persons to attend as appropriate.

Meetings and Authorities of Faculty Assemblies

The Dean will schedule at least two meetings of the Faculty Assembly per session, and may schedule or call further meetings of the Faculty Assembly as appropriate. A meeting of the Faculty Assembly may also be called by constituent members of the Faculty Assembly in accordance with provisions to be set out in Standing Orders. The Faculty Assembly may formulate for consideration by the Faculty Board a resolution or opinion on any matter of relevance to the Faculty, but shall have no further authority. The Faculty Board shall, however, take into account in its future decision making such views expressed by the Faculty Assembly.

Standing orders

Faculty ~~b~~Boards and Faculty Assemblies will adopt standing orders to govern their procedure, having regard to the template approved by Senate. ~~The quorum of each faculty board shall be decided by Senate on the recommendation of the board concerned.~~

- 7.11 APPROVED: The appointment of the following Visiting Professors:
- (i) Dr Frances Cowan, Honorary Consultant and Senior Lecturer in Perinatal Neurology, as a Visiting Professor in the School of Clinical Science.

- (ii) Professor Geoffrey Robinson, Chair of Mathematics at the University of Aberdeen, as a Visiting Professor within the School of Mathematics.
- (iii) Professor David York, Research Fellow and leading Chemist/Chemical Engineer, at Proctor and Gamble, as a Visiting Professor in the School of Chemistry.
- (iv) Dr Sarah Cook, Director of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, as a Visiting Professor in the Centre for East Asian Studies.

7.12 NOTED: That Senate had considered and approved a report from the Structure of the Teaching Year Working Group, setting out a proposed new model for the structure of the academic year. The overall aim of the proposal was noted to be enhancement of the quality of the student educational experience.

7.13 NOTED: That Senate had approved the University's REF Code of Practice which set out how the University would incorporate equality of opportunity into its selection processes for REF staff. The Code had been subject to extensive consultation of key staff.

Report from Nominations Committee of Court

7.14 RECEIVED: The report of the Nominations Committee of Court meeting on the 8 February 2012, reference **CN/12/130** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

7.15 Council noted the content of the report and that it was still a priority of the Nominations Committee of Court to source the people with the necessary skills and experience as well as to address the gender and ethnicity balance. The Nominations Committee of Court had also agreed that, due to the growing emphasis on 'employability' in light of the increased tuition fee regime, the University would this year aim to recruit an expert in graduate recruitment, particularly from a large global business.

Gender Diversity on Council and Committees

7.16 RECEIVED: A paper outlining recommendations relating to gender equality with a particular focus on women in governance roles, reference **CN/12/139** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

7.17 The report had been approved by UPARC and Senate at their meetings in November 2011. The recommendations relating to membership of Council and Council Committees had been approved by the Nominations Committee of Court in February 2012 and subsequently endorsed by the Personnel and Health & Safety, Estates, Finance, Student Affairs and the Ethics of Research Committees.

7.18 AGREED: That in addition to the recommendations set out in the report, the University should offer potential candidates an opportunity to discuss the role with existing lay Council members before they submitted a formal application

as this would enable them to identify whether the role was suitable for them. Ms Anne Stephenson offered her support in implementing this.

7.19 APPROVED: Proposals 1 – 7 as contained within the report and set out below:

Proposal 1: Development of a new Lay Member Role Specification and associated advertisement which clearly sets out the time commitments involved and which includes ‘positive action statements’ aimed to encourage women to apply. The Role Description should also highlight the assistance that the University offers to Lay members, e.g. assistance with childcare costs, travel costs, training and development etc. Wherever possible, the wording of the role description should avoid governance jargon and would be written in such a way so as not to deter people with little or no board-level experience from applying.

The Role Description would define and distinguish between those skills/experience/attributes which were ‘essential’ and those which were ‘desirable’ so that potential applicants could have a better understanding of the Nominations Committee’s selection criteria.

Proposal 2: Similarly, it would be beneficial for Council to re-define the essential skills and experience that were required ‘around the table’ to effectively discharge its duties and responsibilities. There would, of course, be a need to recruit/retain lay members with critical skills but with space for 19 lay members on its Council, Bristol was in a position to appoint a small number of less-experienced members, who may have ‘softer’ skills and/or less traditional backgrounds but who would bring a fresh perspective and challenge.

Proposal 3: Council should consider the ways in which it might engage potential governors in University and/or Council business and/or events. For example, would it be appropriate to co-opt potential Council members onto committees so that they can gain more experience?

Proposal 4: Council should also consider whether it might be possible to develop and implement a mentoring/coaching programme for new/less experienced Council members, and what form this might take.

Proposal 5: Implementation of a new recruitment strategy for lay members that focused not only upon national/local advertisements but also on informal networking and forging links with professional networks (including virtual networks) and through word-of-mouth. This strategy has resulted in considerable success with appointing senior female academics by tapping into these informal channels/networks. The University’s Resourcing Manager and Equality and Diversity Manager would be able to assist in the identification of appropriate networks, for example local business women’s networks or local professional networks.

Proposal 6: When succession planning for Council and Council committee vacancies, the Nominations Committee had traditionally sought to identify members with specialist skills and experience which were specific to the committee. The Nominations Committee has suggested, however, that as long as a committee included members who possessed the critical skills and experience needed to be able to make informed decisions and to allow the Committee to discharge its responsibilities, it would not be necessary for all lay members (whether Council or non-Council lay members on committees) to be 'expert' in that particular field. Instead, it could be beneficial to appoint some "non-expert" members who had strong management and/or governance experience, and who could bring a wider perspective and a fresh challenge to the decision-making process. This thinking could also be applied when appointing committee Chairs. The Nominations Committee suggested that a new approach which moved away from the traditional 'specialist skills' focus could help committees to increase their overall diversity and at the same time to increase their overall effectiveness.

Proposal 7: In order to allow Council to take a strategic overview of the constitution of its committees, it could establish an 'appointment panel/group' which meets once per year (much of the follow-up work could be dealt with by correspondence) to consider the following:

- (i) Current and forthcoming vacancies on Council committees – and succession planning strategies for chairs/members.
- (ii) An annual review of diversity of council committees (to include lay, staff and student members).
- (iii) An annual review of the skills requirements of council committees.
- (iv) An annual review of committees' terms of reference (informed by feedback from the committees).
- (v) Undertaking an annual review of Council committee diversity and submitting an annual report to Council.
- (vi) Developing proposals for co-opting members onto committees where there is a significant lack of female or male representation.
- (vii) Consideration of training and development needs for members of Council committees.
- (viii) Preparation of an annual report to the Nominations Committee which sets out any expertise/skills gaps on key committees and/or any diversity issues. This report would then inform the Nominations Committee's lay member recruitment strategies. The Nominations Committee could also forward the CVs of any Council applicants to the relevant committees if there appeared to be a good skills match.

The appointment panel/group would typically only need to meet once per year, in June/July to review the composition of Council committees and to

plan its recruitment strategy for new members. A series of recommendations could then be made to Council in October so that new members could take up positions on committees from 1 January.

The group's membership would comprise:

- Chair of Council (Chair)
- Chairs of Council committees (or their nominees)
- Equality and Diversity Manager

8. Other reports

Equality and Diversity Annual Report

- 8.1 RECEIVED and NOTED: The Equality and Diversity Annual Report, reference **CN/12/131** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).
- 8.2 Council were informed that although there had not been any significant progress with objective 3 (to see a steady increase in representation of women at Grade M professorial level) and objective 5 (to see a steady increase in the representation of women at Head of School level), constructive discussions had been held at UPARC about how faculties could engage on both of those fronts and the Deans had embraced the suggested approaches and were fully engaged in moving this forward.
- 8.3 The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the University had a duty to monitor and review gender balance in both directions i.e. male **and** female proportions, and that this should include staff and students (post and undergraduate).
- 8.4 UK BME student registrations were reported to be low and that student satisfaction levels appeared to be lower for BME students than for white students. The Deputy Registrar was investigating further with the Student Union's Vice President and Equality and Diversity Officer.
- 8.5 To date, no numerical target had been set for female representation among Grade M Professors or Heads of School because the ability to increase the number of female professors/Heads of School depended on the representation of women in the career "pipeline" and this number varied significantly by discipline.
- 8.6 AGREED: That further information about senior academic staff gender representation would be provided along with a briefing on the activity being undertaken to support progress in this area.

Action: HR Director

Capital Investment Programme Board

- 8.7 RECEIVED: A report outlining recommendations and decisions from CIPB meetings on 14 October 2011, 30 November 2011 and 23 January 2012, reference **CN/12/132** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).
- 8.8 NOTED: Approval of the allocation of capital funding for the Physics Refurbishment Programme given by the Finance Committee namely:

- (i) Up to £4m which had already been allocated within the approved capital programme. This programme would include improvements to the glazing and facade of the building, the foyer and refurbishment of parts of the basement and various office areas for the Interface Analysis Centre (currently located in Oldbury House). A further case was made to CIPB to support the creation of materials laboratories and a clean room.

8.9 NOTED: Approval of the allocation of capital funding given by the Vice-Chancellor, on the advice of CIPB and UPARC, namely:

- (i) Up to £440k for the creation of a permanent base for the Faculty of Medical and Veterinary Sciences faculty centre in the Medical Sciences Building. A temporary solution had been reached for the interim period. (October meeting).
- (ii) Up to £250k for the purchase of nuclear magnetic resonance equipment (November meeting).
- (iii) Up to £250k for the purchase of electron microscopy equipment. Both pieces of equipment were deemed a priority for the Science faculty and would be heavily-used by academics working on a number of projects. Such non-project specific equipment was no longer funded by the research councils (November meeting).
- (iv) Up to £466k for the refurbishment of regenerative medicine laboratories. This amount took into account the funds already raised for this project and CIPB noted the potential for further fundraising (November meeting).
- (v) Up to £300k as a contribution towards the cost of purchasing an Equine Scanner at Langford, on recognition of the importance of this equipment in securing case load for the Equine Surgery; and to authorise an additional £100k providing savings could be secured on other Langford Projects (November meeting). Note: The Chair of CIPB reported that the purchase of the Equine scanner had since been put on hold.
- (vi) Up to £305,114 as matched-funding for a bid to the Royal Society / Wolfson lab refurbishment scheme for funding for the refurbishment of laboratories for multiphoton imaging within the Medical Sciences Building. This funding would only be required if this bid was successful (January meeting).

8.10 NOTED: That CIPB had approved various small amounts of capital funding up to £250k as referenced in the report.

8.11 NOTED: The following decisions which had been taken by CIPB:

- (i) The proposed expenditure on reboiling and heating works (£1.25m in 2011/12 and £625k for 2012/13) in context of the approval by Finance Committee in June 2011 for the allocation of £3.4m over three years (November meeting).
- (ii) To approve the extension of the lease of University Gate and 93/95 Woodland Road until the end of 2013 (January meeting). Note: The Chair of CIPB reported that the extension of the lease of University Gate and 93/95 Woodland Road would now only be extended until June 2013 in order to accommodate significant expansion within the

Faculty of Engineering (this decision had been taken at, and since, the 15th March 2012 meeting of CIPB).

Student Appeals, Complaints and Disciplinary Matters*

8.12 RESERVED BUSINESS

Staff Grievances and Appeals against Dismissal*

8.13 RESERVED BUSINESS

Chair Appointments

8.14 RECEIVED and NOTED: A report setting out the Chair appointment activity that had taken place since the previous meeting of Council in February 2012, reference **CN/12/135** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

9. Committee Reports

Personnel and Health and Safety Committee

9.1 RECEIVED: An oral report from Mr Bob Morton on the key business considered by the Personnel and Health and Safety Committee at its meeting on 2nd March 2012.

9.2 NOTED: That Health & Safety and Equality and Diversity had been incorporated into the Committee's remit and that this was becoming well established. The Committee had received evidence that health and safety risk management arrangements were working appropriately.

9.3 NOTED: That the Committee had agreed the University's equality objectives as part of the requirements of the Equality Act 2010.

9.4 NOTED: That the Committee had discussed proposals to support staff performance enhancement and that the proposals had been strongly supported by the Academic members of the Committee. The Committee also discussed the 2012 national pay negotiations and agreed that a move to local pay arrangements would be detrimental to all concerned.

9.5 NOTED: That the Committee had reviewed the diversity of its membership, and considered the appropriateness of some suggested performance indicators as part of the overall University review of SPIs. Council was pleased to note that the Committee had already achieved a 50/50 gender balance.

Student Affairs Committee

9.6 RECEIVED and NOTED: The report of the Student Affairs Committee meeting on 5th March 2012, reference **CN/12/136** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

9.7 NOTED: That of the six Sabbatical Officers that had been elected for 2012/13, four were female.

9.8 NOTED: The Committee had had a constructive dialogue about the Union's block grant negotiations. It was envisaged that the Students' Union would be

in a position to confirm the outcome at an earlier time in the academic year in 2012/13 and that this would make financial planning more fluid.

Ethics of Research Committee

- 9.9 RECEIVED and NOTED: The report of the Ethics of Research Committee meeting on 6th March 2012, reference **CN/12/138** (previously circulated, copy in the minute book).

10. Date of Next Meeting

- 10.1 NOTED: That the next meetings of Council had been scheduled as follows:
Friday 25 May 2012
Friday, 6 July 2012