MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

at the
Forty-first Meeting of the
COUNCIL
of the
IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE

The Forty-first Meeting of the Council was held in the Council Room, 170, Queen’s Gate at 10:30 a.m. on 1st April 2005, when there were present:

The Lord Kerr of Kinlochard (Chairman), Dr. E. Buttle, Dr. G.G. Gray, Mr. D.P. Hearn, Dr. J. King, Professor R.I. Kitney, Dr. M.P. Knight, Mr. A.D. Roche, Professor S.K. Smith, Dr. D.J. Wilbraham, the Rector, the Deputy Rector and the President of the ICU, together with the Clerk to the Court and Council.

In attendance: The Assistant Clerk to the Court and Council.

Apologies: Mr. G. Able, Sir Peter Gershon, Mr. B. Gidoomal and Mr. J. Newsum.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed members to the first Meeting of the Council in its new, reduced format and, in particular, welcomed Professor Richard Kitney to his first meeting as the elected staff member.

MINUTES

Council – 11th February 2005

1. The Minutes of the Fortieth Meeting of the Council, held on 11th February 2005, were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

MATTERS ARISING

Southside Project and the Section 106 Agreement (Minutes 21 - 35)

2. The Clerk reminded members that Westminster City Council (WCC) had granted planning permission to the College for the demolition and reconstruction of the Southside Hall of Residence, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, and that consequently they had, at their last Meeting, approved the Southside Project at a total cost of £54.1M. Since then, the College had been moving the Project forward on a number of fronts. A tendering exercise was under way for the demolition of the existing Hall of Residence; 5 tenders had been received and a demolition contractor had now been selected. Similarly, an advertisement had been
placed in the European Journal (OJEC) for tenders for the construction of the new building. Eight contractors had pre-qualified and a short-list of four were currently tendering. The decanting programme for the current occupants of Southside was also proceeding apace, while the Mayor of London had confirmed that he was minded not to object to the College’s proposals. In anticipation that the Project would still go ahead as planned, the College was also arranging for additional student accommodation to be provided at two halls of residence, Orient House and Piccadilly Court, both of which were run by Unite.

3. With regard to the Section 106 Agreement, the Clerk said that it had been hoped that this would have been finalised at a meeting of the WCC Planning Committee on 10th March. Unfortunately, because of illness and a bereavement affecting the WCC planning team, this meeting had been postponed until 14th April. Meanwhile, the Knightsbridge Association had put forward its own suggestions for the legal undertaking into which the College would have to enter. Many of these had been frankly unrealistic, but the College had discussed them with the Association and it was hoped that the various points of disagreement had all now been resolved. It was therefore expected that the Agreement would be concluded at the WCC Meeting on 14th April. However, the delay could mean that final planning permission would now probably not be received until the beginning of June. Although this would make the timings very tight, it was still hoped that demolition could commence on schedule at the beginning of July.

**Imperial Innovations Ltd (Minutes 36 – 47)**

4. The Chief Finance Officer, Dr. Knight, reported that the private placement was progressing well, albeit slightly slower than initially expected, partly because of the Easter break. 70% of the shares had now been placed and there were still several investors who were interested but had yet to commit. The investors attracted so far were all prestigious and he was optimistic that the final shares would be placed within the next week or so. He confirmed that, once all the shares had been placed, the College would issue a press release regarding the sale.

**Paddington Waterside (Minutes 3 - 4)**

5. The Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, Professor Smith, said that it was unlikely that a decision on whether or not to proceed with the Paddington Waterside Project would be taken until the Autumn, after the General Election. However, he cautioned that there was concern that the NHS did not have sufficient funds to finance the Project and that there was little or no leeway to provide any sort of contingency. It was therefore possible that the Project might not be approved.

6. The Rector commented that, in addition to these funding difficulties, the Government was placing considerable emphasis on establishing centres of medical excellence in Manchester and Newcastle and appeared reluctant to commit significant funding to London, Oxford or Cambridge. In his view this showed the Government’s failure to understand that, if they were to encourage developments in the biosciences, this had to be linked to excellent, research-based hospitals. The Deputy Rector agreed, saying that the Government appeared to be ignoring the best research centres because they found it politically uncomfortable to provide more funding for London. Instead they were trying to boost the regions, despite the fact that the chosen universities there were rated considerably lower than Oxford, Cambridge and Imperial. The Chairman suggested that the Council should discuss this in more detail at its next meeting.
RECTOR’S BUSINESS

Staff Matters (Paper A)

7. The Rector presented Paper A and highlighted in particular the quality of staff now being attracted to the College. Professor Fotis Kafatos, who would be joining Imperial in June from the European Molecular Biology Laboratory in Germany, was, he said, a world leader in research into malaria. His recruitment would enhance Imperial’s reputation and would also tie in with the existing work at the College on public health. This was not an isolated example, but was part of a trend of recruiting high profile senior academics and their research teams to the College that should be welcomed. In this vein, the Rector also congratulated the Faculty of Engineering: their advertisement for a new Head of Materials had been prominently placed in the front pages of the Journal ‘Nature’, not lost among the ‘situations vacant’ columns. This would increase the College’s profile and should garner some excellent applications.

Environmental Sciences at the College

8. The Deputy Chairman, Dr. Buttle, asked how the development of an Environmental Sciences Programme was progressing. The Deputy Rector reminded members that, as part of the restructuring of the Faculty of Life Sciences, a review of Environmental Sciences was being conducted to see if expertise in this field which was currently scattered across the College could be brought together within a coherent framework. He said that initially this had been considered primarily as an issue for the Faculty of Life Sciences; however, it had quickly become clear that it was a matter of College-wide importance. The aim now was to provide a structure within which the related disciplines could flourish without denuding individual strengths in particular areas. As part of this, consideration was also being given to the development of national policy on the environment, and how this would affect the College’s strategy. These various strands were now being drawn together and a proposal was being prepared for the Management Board to consider at its next meeting in April. Meanwhile, Life Sciences’ staff were being kept informed of developments.

9. Dr. Buttle asked how this might affect the College’s preparations for the next Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) as Environmental Science was an area in which Imperial had not done well in past exercises. The Deputy Rector acknowledged this, but said that the time needed to create the new structure would be such that the College had to look beyond the next RAE, important as this was. The College had already had two unsuccessful attempts at producing a strong environmental sciences grouping and could not afford a further failure. Although important, maximising performance in the next RAE could therefore not be the sole criterion for determining the future structure of Environmental Sciences within the College.

10. Professor Borysiewicz went on to say that he had also been looking at other institutions which had successfully integrated Environmental Sciences and policy to see if there were any lessons that might be applicable in Imperial. In this context, he had visited MIT. In the 1940s MIT had discovered that US industry would only engage with its scientific research if this was supported by strength in Economics. Consequently, from an early stage its development of Environmental Sciences had been linked to the study and development of environmental and economic policy. MIT had also considered two models for integrating economics and science. One was to embed economists in scientific departments; the other was to create separate
It was clear from MIT's experience that the latter model was preferable as it provided a peer group within which the economists could hone their research interests.

Dr. King, who had visited MIT with the Deputy Rector, said that MIT was very keen to develop closer links with Imperial. They had a newly established Department of Bioengineering which wanted to work with the College's own Bioengineering Department. MIT was also interested in developing joint courses with the College. MIT staff would be visiting Imperial in early June to explore options for this, as well as opportunities for collaborative research projects. She felt that these were very positive developments, although the College would need to consider how such links could best be developed in line with its own strategies.

Professor Kitney, who is also a Visiting Professor at MIT, confirmed that there was much positive interest at MIT in working with the College and that MIT viewed Imperial as its natural partner in the UK.

**Wye Campus**

The Chairman noted that the conduct of Imperial’s merger with Wye College was due to be discussed at the Court’s Meeting that afternoon and he asked the Deputy Rector to give the Council a progress report on the reviews of the Faculty of Life Sciences and the future of the Wye Campus.

The Deputy Rector replied that the issue of the merger had been raised by a staff member of the Court, Professor Berkeley Hill, who was also a former Governor of Wye College. Professor Hill had written to the Chairman to ask that the subject be included on the Court’s Agenda. His letter had contained a number of statements about Imperial’s conduct following the merger that were factually incorrect. The Heads of Agreement between the two Colleges, which had been jointly approved in 1998, had clearly stated that, once two years had elapsed from the date of the merger (1 August 2000), activities at Wye would be subject to Imperial's normal review procedures. The College had therefore fully complied with the Heads of Agreement.

Turning to the current situation, the Deputy Rector stressed that there were two distinct issues. The review of the Faculty of Life Sciences that he was conducting had been necessitated by the significant annual deficit the Faculty was generating, almost half of which was attributable to the Department of Agricultural Sciences at Wye. Since the merger, Imperial had, in effect, been subsidising activities at the Wye Campus by between £2M and £3M per annum. The College had no option but to address these losses and also determine an academic structure that would allow the Faculty to move forward. The future of the Wye Campus was a separate, College-wide issue and was therefore the subject of a separate review by the former Deputy Rector, Professor Peter Bearman. The Faculty Review had determined very quickly that the structure of Life Sciences was sub-optimal and had recommended that its Departments should be re-organised. It had also been agreed that seven courses at Wye which were academically and financially unsustainable should be closed down. (Between them they had recruited some 30 students in the previous year). The one successful course at Wye, the Applied Business Management degree, was continuing.

Referring to the Review of the Wye Campus, Dr. Buttle said that the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was changing: payments to farmers would be moving to a system based on the amount of land used rather than what it produced. This could
be supplemented by additional payments based on environmental protection. Although the formulae on which payments would be calculated were extremely complex, it was likely that the revised CAP would result in significant changes to the funding received by individual farmers. As some of the land at Wye was rented to local farmers, these changes could have significant financial implications for Wye. She therefore believed that it would be important for Professor Bearman to obtain professional advice to ensure that these factors were taken into account in his consideration of Wye’s future.

17. The Chairman said that his study of the files confirmed the Deputy Rector’s view that the College had acted in good faith and had complied fully with the agreements made with Wye College before the merger. As for the future, he said, this was a matter for Professor Bearman’s Review and any discussion at the Court Meeting should avoid pre-empting his conclusions. The Rector agreed, but said that it was clear that funds for investment in the future at Wye would have to be generated there. Because of its location, teaching was not a long-term option: Wye’s future had to lie in developing its research. Furthermore, this was not just the College’s view. Imperial had, he said, approached the HEFCE to discuss additional funding to support the maintenance of agricultural science teaching at Wye but HEFCE had indicated that the discipline was no longer a funding priority.

The University of London

18. The Rector said that for quite some time the degree of contact between the University of London and its constituent Colleges had been reducing and Imperial, in particular, now had very little connection with the University. However, the University’s new Vice-Chancellor, Professor Sir Graeme Davies, had been trying to strengthen the federal University. He had circulated a paper calling for suggestions on how this might best be achieved. This had caused some disquiet and Professor Malcolm Grant, the President and Provost of UCL, had responded by publishing his own consultation paper on the future of the University. In this he had proposed a number of possible models, including its disbandment. The Rector said that Imperial paid an annual fee of some £800K to be a part of the University, but gained very little benefit from the relationship. Of Professor Grant’s suggested options, disbanding the University and allowing the larger constituent Colleges to become universities in their own right was the preferred option for Imperial, as it was for UCL, Kings and the LSE. The Rector cautioned, however, that the issue was not straightforward. For example, the College had a continuing interest in the University’s estate and, before any move towards disbandment, there would have to be an agreement about the distribution of these assets to the Colleges.

The Science Museum Library

19. Moving on, the Rector reminded the Council that the Science Museum Library occupied a large amount of space within the College’s Central Library, but for some considerable time had not paid a service charge or rent for the use of this space. In the last two years the Science Museum had had protracted discussions with the College about closing its Library and relocating its collections elsewhere. To this end it had been in negotiation with the British Library and the College about the dispersal of its books and it had already moved some of its staff out of Central Library. However, it had recently obtained some additional funding from the DfES and, contrary to earlier indications, was now proposing not to move out of the College’s space.

20 The Deputy Rector said that the College had now issued the Science Museum with
an invoice for unpaid service charges and would be seeking its prompt payment. He went on to report that the Director of Library Services had been conducting a review into the future of library provision and was proposing to centralise the service and place more emphasis on electronic media. There was also pressure for the Library to move to 24-hour opening to provide a better service for students. In order to make all of these changes Imperial needed the space currently occupied by the Science Museum Library and the Museum’s abrupt volte-face could therefore seriously hinder the College’s plans for its future Library services.

21. The Chairman noted that the Rhodes Trust had recently resolved a similar long-standing dispute with the Bodleian Library, who would from now on pay for space occupied at Rhodes House. The Chairman of the Rhodes Trust was also Chairman of the Science Museum: contact with him might be productive.

22. Mr. Hearn asked if a period of disagreement with the Science Museum would have any impact on the College’s research. The Rector confirmed that, unlike the Natural History Museum, the Science Museum conducted very little research and its academic contact with the College was minimal.

Faculty of Medicine

23. At the invitation of the Rector Professor Smith reported on recent developments in the Faculty of Medicine. The Faculty had, he said, been successful in its bids to the Department of Health in two of the UK’s new clinical trials networks: Diabetes and Medicines for Children. The Faculty would be the coordinating centre for the UK Clinical Trials Network for Diabetes, while the Medicines for Children Clinical Trials Network would be led in collaboration with the University of Liverpool. The Faculty had also recently agreed a joint initiative in the discovery of new cancer therapies with the University of Texas’ M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, which was probably the best cancer hospital in the world. One of the stipulations of the agreement was that joint trials would only proceed if the standard of care matched that at the M.D. Anderson Center. The Faculty was also in discussion with the University of Chicago about developing joint projects in cardiovascular medicine and research. Concluding his Report, Professor Smith said that the Faculty was also conducting a necessary restructuring of two of its Divisions, as had been reported to the Council at its last meeting.

Faculty of Engineering

24. The Principal of the Faculty of Engineering, Dr. King, then reported on developments in her Faculty. The Department of Materials had recently moved into newly refurbished accommodation in the Royal School of Mines. Imperial’s was the largest Materials Department in the country and it now had excellent facilities to match its status. The space it had vacated in the Bessemer Building was being refurbished for use by the new Institute of Bioengineering. This Institute had been very successful in attracting funding, and would now be concentrating on delivering its research strategy. Moving on, Dr. King highlighted other developments in the Faculty, including the new Centre for Internet Technology, the Railway Research Centre, and the Centre for Risk Management which was being set up in conjunction with the Tanaka Business School. The last of these would be able to offer advice on business, financial and engineering risks as well as looking at the interaction between them. This multi-dimensional approach would be of particular importance to industry and the railways.

25. Dr. King went on to note that a new Centre for Material Modelling was also being
proposed. This would be led by Professor Adrian Sutton, who was coming to Imperial from Oxford. The Faculty had also been successful in obtaining funding of £2.5M from the EPSRC for the purchase of an ultra-high performance electron microscope. This instrument, with a resolution of 0.14nm, would be located in the Materials Department and would support research programmes at the London Centre for Nanotechnology. Concluding her Report, Dr. King said that the Faculty, like Medicine, was engaged in some restructuring, which was likely to affect a small number of academic and technical staff.

26. Mr. Roche thanked Dr. King for her interesting Report and suggested that the Risk Institute might also be of interest to insurance and audit companies as the relationship between engineering and business risk was an area of increasing importance for them.

**ACCESS AGREEMENT WITH THE OFFICE OF FAIR ACCESS (PAPER C)**

27. The Clerk formally presented Paper C, which was received for information.

28. Dr. Wilbraham noted that the College’s bursaries would be available for Home students and asked if EU students would also be eligible. The Rector said that at present they were not. However, it was possible that the College might have to extend eligibility to EU students in future. He then pointed out that the College’s Access Agreement was probably unique in that it did not include any commitment to meet specific admissions targets, a feature which he felt was very important if Imperial was to maintain its current entry standards.

29. Mr. Roche remarked that the College would be appointing a Director of Access and suggested that it would be important to keep the costs of administering the scheme in proportion with its overall size. The Deputy Rector agreed, but assured him that the costs were relatively low and that this post was crucial to the College fulfilling its obligations under the Agreement.

30. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Arif said that, when added to the maintenance grant and student loan, students in receipt of bursaries would have about £12K per annum, which was more than some PhD students. He also suggested that the College should consider a link to performance, so that students who did well in their first year might be eligible for an increased bursary in their second year.

**FINANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT (PAPER D)**

31. The Chairman congratulated the Chief Finance Officer, Dr. Knight, on the improved presentation of Paper D, and on the helpful highlighting of key issues. Dr. Knight said that, in addition to the changes already introduced in the Report, the Finance Division was preparing some key performance indicators, which he hoped would be ready for inclusion and monitoring from the beginning of the next academic year.

32. Turning to the substance of the Report, Dr. Knight said that the College’s forecast financial performance had improved; however, this would have to be balanced in the annual accounts by some increased provisions for specific items, such as the specialist engineering facility. Moving on, he said that the “over one year” debtor position had fallen to less than £3M for the first time in ten years. However, he was concerned that the overall reduction in the debtor book might be partly due to delays in producing invoices rather than necessarily reflecting improved debt collection. On
the overall cash position, the forecast was, he noted, probably pessimistic since the rate of spend on capital projects was slower than expected and he doubted that an additional £52M would be spent before the end of the financial year.

33. Dr. Knight went on to say that he wanted the Finance Division to improve its treasury management processes and to this end he would be creating a new Treasury Management Section with the new Director of Finance. He also proposed to review the College’s authorisation procedures as they appeared to be too convoluted and were not necessarily providing the degree of management responsibility intended. Essentially, he believed that managers should be given more authority, provided they were accountable for their actions.

34. Dr. Wilbraham asked if the problems with research billings were the result of the recent implementation of the new Oracle Grants IT system and therefore likely to be short-term. Dr. Knight replied that the Oracle Grants implementation process had certainly caused some disruption to normal invoice processing and hence some delays. He also felt that the introduction of this new system meant that different skills were required from the staff which operated it. However, he said, the problem had been recognised and was now being addressed.

35. Dr. Buttle noted that Paper D included a comparison of research income at Imperial, Oxford, Cambridge and UCL at Paragraph 2.f., but that this comparison did not show the intellectual quality of the research projects at each institution nor whether they represented value for money. The Chairman also remarked that Imperial’s overhead rates were higher than those at the other universities. The Deputy Rector said that this was positive as it meant that the College was more successful than its competitors in recovering its overheads, that is the costs of its research. In fact, as these were probably closer to 105% of the direct costs, it was clear that all universities lost money on their research. However, the gradual introduction of full economic costing should help to redress the current shortfall.

36. The Rector agreed, but said there was a concern about how Imperial could demonstrate that it offered value for money when other universities were charging lower overheads. The Deputy Rector said that Cancer Research UK was trying to move to a position where research applications were assessed on the basis of their intellectual quality only. He also noted that under the new full economic costing regime costs to be charged would in future have to be verified by the Treasury. As they would have been externally approved, there should be no argument about the value for money they represented. His main concern was that research council panels might be tempted to amend project costs so as to spread the available funding more widely.

37. Returning to the issue of delays in the production of invoices, Dr. Gray said that this was a common problem in industry where there was often a perception that the first priority had to be to satisfy the client rather than to ensure that the invoices were sent out in a timely manner. The solution was not easy, but had to involve educating staff – including those outside the finance function – to understand that cash collection was one of the most important activities in any organisation. Furthermore, bonuses linked to performance in this area could also be a powerful incentive.

38. Mr. Hearn said that there had been problems with the College’s research administration for several years and that a lot of time and energy had now been invested in making improvements and bringing in new systems. He suggested that these new structures and systems had to be given time to bed in to see if they could deliver the expected improvements. He hoped that Oracle Grants and the new
management structure for research administration would now address the problems Dr. Knight had highlighted in his Report.

CLERK’S BUSINESS

Proposed Amendments to Academic Regulations (Paper E)

39. The Clerk introduced Paper E and said that the proposal to add the Master of Education (MEd) to the list of awards offered by the College had been approved by the Senate. The Council was simply being asked to approve the consequential change to the College’s Academic Regulations.

Resolved: That the addition of the Master of Education (MEd) to the Awards of the University of London listed under paragraph 1.1 (B) of the Academic Regulations, as set out in Paper E, be approved.

Proposed Suspension of the Requirement for the Imperial College Union to Hold an Annual General Meeting (Paper F)

40. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Arif, introduced Paper F and told members that the Union’s Annual General Meeting (AGM) was now an anachronism and was no longer the fairest way of conducting elections for its various junior officer positions. The Union wanted to hold these elections using online electronic voting but the requirement for any change to the Constitution to be approved at two consecutive meetings of the Union Council meant that there was not time to make the change before the next scheduled AGM. He therefore asked the Council to suspend this particular requirement to allow the Union time to finish its review of its own Constitution and to hold these elections using the online system. The Council agreed.

Resolved: That Article 7.4 of the Imperial College Union’s Constitution and Regulation 2.E.25 of its Election and Referenda Regulations concerning the requirement for it to hold an Annual General Meeting be suspended.

THE FUTURE OF THE COURT (PAPER B)

41. Introducing Paper B, the Chairman said that, as he had not yet had a chance to see the Court in operation for himself, he recommended that, for the time being, the Council should choose Option One, that is maintain the status quo and allow the Court to continue in its present form. Although he acknowledged that the level of vacancies on the Court, many of which were internal, and the record of attendance at Court meetings suggested that there were some problems, he would wish to meet its members and see it in operation before forming a view of their significance and how they should be addressed.

42. The Imperial College Union President, Mr. Arif, said that the Court as currently structured might be helpful to the College, for example in relation to fundraising; however, he did not believe that it needed be part of the College’s formal governance structure to fulfil this function. Dr. Buttle concurred with the Chairman’s suggestion and said that a further issue was the need to amend the Charter to make any changes to the Court. The College had, she said, only just received Privy Council approval for a major change to the Council’s structure. To go back to the Privy
Council with further proposals for changes to the Charter and Statutes so quickly would be difficult. If, as the Rector had suggested in his earlier Report, the position of the University of London and its relationship with its constituent Colleges was being reviewed, she suggested that it would be preferable to defer consideration of the Court’s position until that review had been completed. The College would then be able to consider the Court’s role in the context of the possible establishment of Imperial College as a university in its own right.

NEXT MEETING

43. The Council noted that its next Meeting would be held on 13th May 2005.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

44. There was none.
PAPER A

STAFF MATTERS

A Note by the Rector

PROFESSORS

Professor Phillip ALLEN, currently Professor of Physical Sedimentary Systems in the Department of Earth Sciences and Head of the Geological Institute at ETH-Zurich, has been appointed to the Chair in Earth Science in the Department of Earth Science and Engineering with effect from 1 October 2005.

Professor Gordon CONWAY, FRS, previously President of the Rockefeller Foundation and Visiting Professor in the Department of Environmental Science and Technology, has been appointed to the Chair in International Development in the Division of Environmental Sciences with effect from 7 January 2005.

Professor Fotis KAFATOS, currently Director General at the European Molecular Biology Laboratory – EMBL, Germany, has been appointed to the Chair in Insect Immunogenomics in the Division of Cell and Molecular Biology with effect from 1 June 2005.

CHANGE OF TITLE OF PROFESSOR

Professor Mustafa DJAMGOZ, currently Professor of Neurobiology, will change his title to Professor of Cancer Biology with effect from 1 March 2005 to reflect his current and future academic duties.

VISITING PROFESSORS

Professor Martin EARWICKER, FREng, Chief Executive of the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory at Cranfield University, has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering with effect from 1 February 2005 for a period of three years.

Professor Sebastian REICH, Professor of Numerical Analysis at the Institut fur Mathematik at the Universitat Potsdam, Germany, has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Mathematics with effect from 1 January 2005 for a period of three years.

Dr Sami SHOUSHA, Consultant Histopathologist at Charing Cross Hospital, has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Division of Investigative Science with effect from 1 November 2004 for a period of two years.

Professor Michael WORTHINGTON, Senior Research Scientist at Oxford University and previously Chair in Geophysics in the Department of Earth Science and Engineering, has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the same Department with effect from 1 February 2005 for a period of three years.
INTRODUCTION

1. As members are aware, the Deputy Chairman’s review of governance concentrated on the effectiveness of the Council as the College’s governing body. Although this Review led to considerable changes in the Council’s structure and membership and to the disbandment of most of its subordinate committees, it was decided not to make any parallel recommendations concerning the structure and membership of the Court. This was because it was felt that to have done so would have simply added further complications to the College’s proposals and could well have resulted in a delay in receiving approval for these changes from the Privy Council.

2. However, as was acknowledged at the Council’s last Meeting, the Court remains as ‘unfinished business’. The purpose of this Paper is therefore to consider the importance of the Court to the College and to review the options for the Court’s future.

BACKGROUND

3. Prior to the establishment of the Court and Council in 1998 the College had a single Governing Body with 55 members. When the College merged with the medical schools, it was granted a new Royal Charter and Statutes. In line with the then recent recommendations of the Dearing Review and of the Nolan Committee on Standards in Public Life, the Governing Body was replaced with a smaller Council of 32 members. At the same time, a new and much larger body, the Court, was established by Charter and its membership, powers and functions were set out in the College’s new Statutes. It was intended to be a largely formal body with very few powers, its main purpose being to provide the College with access to an extended group of stakeholders.

THE MEMBERSHIP, POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT

4. The Court’s membership is made up predominantly of external members appointed by various outside bodies.(1) These include 13 members appointed by the City & Guilds of London Institute; several members appointed individually by the royal colleges, learned societies and other institutions; as well as representatives of the local authorities of areas in which the College has campuses. The Court also includes members appointed by various Commonwealth Governments and the other colleges and museums that are the College’s immediate neighbours. In addition, there are 28 elected members of staff on the Court and up to 40 co-opted members. The full list of current members is attached at Annex A.

5. The Powers and Functions of the Court are set out in the Statutes as follows:

“(5) Powers and Functions of the Court

1. In this context ‘external members’ means persons who are not employed by the College.
(a) to appoint, on the recommendation of the Council, an external member of the Court as the Chairman of the Court;

(b) to appoint, on the recommendation of the Council, an external member of the Council to be Deputy Chairman of the Court;

(c) to receive annual reports on the workings of the College from the Rector and the Council;

(d) to receive the Annual Accounts and the comments of the Audit Committee thereon;

(e) to discuss any matters relating to the College and convey its opinion thereon to the Council;

(f) to approve amendments to the Charter on the recommendation of the Council, prior to submission to the Privy Council;

(g) to make representations for the appointment of a Visitor, as provided for in the Charter.”

6. As can be seen from this, the Court itself has very few effective powers. Its most important function is to formally appoint the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and even this is done only on the recommendation of the Council. Its only other real power is to approve proposed amendments to the Charter prior to their submission to the Privy Council. (2)

7. The main function of the Court is to provide access to and information about the College for a wide range of stakeholders. It also provides a means for the College to associate itself with a large number of individuals in positions of influence outside the College. Members of the Court receive copies of the Minutes of Council Meetings as well as other College publications. They attend a single, annual Court Meeting at which they receive reports from the Chairman and the Rector on the work of the Council and of the College and they are also invited to attend the College’s degree ceremonies and other prestigious events. Where possible, the College has tried in the past to involve Court members in its work through their membership of Council committees. However, such opportunities are relatively rare and, more often than not, such positions are filled by external members with particular expertise in the area who are not initially members of the Court. It has been the normal practice then to co-opt these committee members onto the Court, and in some instances they have been further co-opted onto the Council.

DISCUSSION

8. The Court offers the College some benefits in that:

a. It provides Imperial with access to a wide range of stakeholders and helps to foster a continuing relationship with the Royal Colleges and other learned institutions.

b. It allows the College to establish a formal relationship with a large number of distinguished individuals. Because they receive regular communications from the College, they are also kept informed of developments at Imperial.

2 Amendments to the Statutes need only be approved by the Council before they are submitted to the Privy Council. However, as any radical change to the Court could require a change to the Charter as well as the Statutes, the Court itself will need to approve the change.
c. It provides the College with access to people whose expertise, experience or influence can be useful to it in furthering its academic mission or in other ways, such as fundraising.

d. Finally, it provides a means by which the College can formally recognise a person’s relationship with the College. For example, external members of College committees and advisory panels who are appointed to these bodies because of their particular skills and expertise are often also co-opted onto the Court.

9. However, the Court brings with it certain disadvantages. These are that:

a. There is a degree of confusion both within and outside the College about the role of the Court and its relationship with the Council. Many people, including some Court members, assume that the Court is the College’s governing body, which it is not.

b. When they are first appointed to the Court, external members are usually pleased to be associated with the College and are keen to become more deeply involved or to offer their assistance to the College in any way they can help. However, because the opportunities to contribute are relatively few (and have become even fewer following the disbandment of most Council Committees), the College is often unable to involve these members in its activities in any meaningful way. There is therefore a risk that, instead of acting as friends and supporters of the College, they may become disillusioned with the College’s apparent indifference to their offers of help.

c. The majority of Court members are appointed by external bodies and the College has no control or influence over who is appointed to these posts. These individuals will usually be chosen according to criteria set by the external body and may not always have the particular skills or experience that would be most useful to the College.

d. The very limited powers exercised by the Court can lead some to conclude that Court membership serves very little real purpose. As with the members who are keen to assist the College, there is a risk that this realisation can in turn lead to a degree of disillusionment in that person’s relationship with the College.

e. It is notable that attendance at Court meetings is relatively poor and has declined steadily since the Court was introduced. (In 2004 only 70 members attended the Court Meeting, i.e. less than half of the serving members at that time). Similarly there are a number of continuing vacancies on the Court which have not been filled for some time, despite annual reminders being sent to the appointing bodies. More tellingly, there are a number of vacancies for elected staff members, which have remained unfilled for the last few years despite a call for nominations being circulated every year.

e. When the College has needed to call on external expertise (for example to serve on the Tanaka Business School Advisory Board or the Development Advisory Committee), it has tended to bypass the Court, and has instead used other means for identifying those people who will be of most use to it.
POSSIBLE FUTURE OPTIONS

10. The possible future options for the Court are to:

a. **Option 1.** Maintain the current *status quo* and make no immediate change.

b. **Option 2.** Give it more powers and increase its role in the College’s governance.

c. **Option 3.** Keep the Court as it is, but increase the involvement of individual Court members in the life of the College.

d. **Option 4.** Dissolve the Court completely.

11. **Maintaining the Status Quo.** This would allow the Court to continue in its current form with its members having only a limited involvement in the College. However, as noted above, the College is now identifying and making use of external expertise and advice from outside the Court, with the result that the latter is becoming increasingly marginal to the College’s governance. Whilst maintaining the *status quo* might be reasonable in the short-term (and indeed this was the option taken by the Council earlier in the year so as not to unduly delay the more important changes to the Council), it is probably not a realistic long-term option.

12. **Increase the Court’s Powers.** While this would increase the Court’s involvement in the College’s governance, it is not a sensible option. Rather than clarifying matters, such a move would be likely to increase the degree of confusion between the respective roles of the Court and the Council. Furthermore, recent guidance on good governance suggests that governing bodies should be smaller and more business-like. The Council has already responded to this trend and has adopted a much reduced, more strategic structure. For it to now consider increasing the role of the Court would be to go against the spirit of the reforms it has only has just introduced.

13. **Increasing Court Members’ Involvement in the College.**

   a. Until recently, the primary means by which Court members were able to assist the College was through membership of the various Council Committees. The lay members of the House, Sport and Leisure, Investments and Health and Safety Audit Committees were almost all drawn from the Court rather than from the Council, and two of the lay members of the Audit Committee were also Court members. However, even with their significant involvement on these committees, only a small proportion of Court members could ever be appointed to the Council’s Committees and even this route has now been removed following the Council’s decision to disband all but two of its Committees.

   b. Even if there were more opportunities to involve Court members in the College, the fact that the College has no influence over the majority of appointments to the Court means that it will not always be appropriate to involve Court members in College life.
14. **Dissolution of the Court.** A more radical solution would be to acknowledge that the Court in its current form has outlived its usefulness and does not have a continuing role to play in the College's governance arrangements. Its primary aims - to provide the College's stakeholders with access to information about the College, and to allow the College to develop useful external relationships - can be met more satisfactorily by other means. Indeed, the College already develops these relationships outside the Court's sphere, only appointing these people to the Court once they have already established a relationship with the College.

**STATUTORY POSITION**

15. As noted above, the existence of the Court is provided for in the College's Royal Charter, with its membership, powers and functions being defined in the Statutes. Changes to both the Charter and Statutes must be approved by the Privy Council before they can take effect, but changes to the Charter must also be formally approved by the Court before they are submitted to the Privy Council.

16. Thus:

a. Options 1 (maintenance of the *status quo*) and 3 (greater involvement of individuals in the College) would require no changes to the Charter or Statutes.

b. Option 2 (an increase in the Court's powers) could be initiated by the Council and might result in amendments to the Statutes depending on what was proposed.

c. Option 4 (dissolution of the Court) would require a change to the Charter and Statutes. This could be proposed by the Council but could only be submitted to the Privy Council with the approval of the Court itself. (3)

**CONCLUSION**

17. The Council is invited to consider the future options for the Court in the light of these observations.

K.A.M.

---

3. The precise terms for amending the Charter are set out in the Charter itself as follows:

“20. The Council may at any time seek to add to, amend or revoke any of the provisions of this Our Charter by Special Resolution, and any such addition, amendment or revocation if approved by the Court shall, when allowed by Us, Our Heirs or Successors in Council, have effect so that this Our Charter shall thereafter continue and operate as if it had been originally granted and made as so added to, amended or revoked, and this provision shall apply to this Our Charter as so revoked or varied.

21. For the purpose of this Our Charter, a "Special Resolution" means a resolution passed at a meeting, of which at least 21 days' notice has been given, of not less than two thirds of the members of the Council by a majority of not less than three quarters of those present and voting at the meeting.”
**Appointed Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointed by The Crown</th>
<th>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Carpenters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Charlotte Lucy Chothia</td>
<td>Mr P Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ram Gidoomal CBE</td>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Tallow Chandlers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Trevor Phillips</td>
<td>One vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Peter Williams</td>
<td>University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two vacancies</td>
<td>Dame Stella Rimington, DCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths</td>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Clockmakers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Richard Himsworth MD, FRCP</td>
<td>Dr Michael Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worshipful Company of Clothworkers</td>
<td>Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard H Jones</td>
<td>Dr Caroline L Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute</td>
<td>Royal Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Christopher Humphries CBE</td>
<td>Professor Ernest Hondros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David J Willbraham</td>
<td>One Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Young</td>
<td>Royal Academy of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Coopers)</td>
<td>Dr M Shears CBE FReNg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eur Ing Michael Heath BSc ACGI CEng</td>
<td>Royal Society of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICheM E</td>
<td>Dr D Giachardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Painter-Stainers)</td>
<td>Royal College of Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reverend Graham Blacktop</td>
<td>Professor Stephen Bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Wheelwrights)</td>
<td>Royal College of Surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Neville Joseph</td>
<td>Professor Valerie Lund FRCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Farriers)</td>
<td>Royal College of Anaesthetists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S J Curtis</td>
<td>Professor Ronald M Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Dyers)</td>
<td>Royal College of General Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M W M Rowlandson</td>
<td>Ms Jane Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Horners)</td>
<td>Royal College of Obstetrics &amp; Gynaecologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Knowland CBE</td>
<td>Professor PM Shaughn O'Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Guilds of London Institute (Worshipful Company of Paviors)</td>
<td>Royal College of Opthalmologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One vacancy</td>
<td>Mr N Astbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal College of Pathologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal College of Psychiatrists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Steven Hirsch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council
1st April 2005

Royal College of Radiologists
Professor Graham Bydder

Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health
Professor Alan W Craft

Royal Aeronautical Society
One Vacancy

Royal Statistical Society
Professor D J Hand

Royal Institution of Naval Architects
Professor John van Griethuysen

Royal Agricultural Society of England
One Vacancy

Royal Horticultural Society
Dr Valerie Payne

Institution of Chemical Engineers
Dr Trevor J Evans

Institution of Civil Engineers
Mrs Jean Venables MBE

Institution of Electrical Engineers
Professor Charles Sandbank

Institution of Mechanical Engineers
Mr Anthony D Roche

Institute of Materials, Minerals and Mining
Dr John D G Groom

Institute of Biology
Professor Alan D B Malcolm

Institute of Management
Mr Christopher Edge

Institute of Physics
Professor Dennis W Hill

Society of Chemical Industry
One vacancy

British Computer Society
Mr N Geoffrey McMullen

British Society for the History of Science
Professor P J Bowler

Head Teacher appointed by the Head Masters’ Conference
Mr Graham Able

Head Teacher appointed by the Girls’ Schools Association
Miss Susan A Ross

Head teachers appointed by the Secondary Heads’ Association
Mr M Noble
Mr P O’Shea

Local Authorities
Councillor John Corbet-Singleton CBE
(The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea)
Councillor Mark Page
(City of Westminster)
Councillor Tim Stanley
(London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham)
Councillor Jeremy Hyde
(Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead)

Government of the Commonwealth of Australia
Ms C Jack

Government of Canada
Dr Caroline Martin

Government of India
Mr N Suri

Government of New Zealand
Professor Robin Carrell

High Commission for Pakistan
Mr M K Raja

Government of the Republic of South Africa
One vacancy

Government of the Republic of Sri Lanka
Mr K W S Gauthamadasa

Secretary of States for Foreign & Commonwealth Affairs
Mr M Reilly

Imperial College Union
Ms Sameena Misbahuddin
(Deputy President, Finance and Services)
Mr Samuel Rorke
(Deputy President, Education & Welfare)
Mr Richard Walker
(Deputy President, Clubs and Societies)
Mr John Collins
(President, Engineering Faculty Students Association)
Mr Jonathan Ng
(President, Life Sciences Faculty Student Association)
Ms Lucy Pickard
(President, Faculty of Medicine Students Association)
Mr Alexander Guite
(President, Physical Sciences Faculty Student Association)
Council
1st April 2005

One vacancy

Royal College of Art
Professor Sir Christopher Frayling

Royal College of Music
Dr Jeremy N Cox

Trustees of the Science Museum
Dr Anne Grocock

Trustees of the Natural History Museum
Sir Neil Chalmers

Trustees of The Victoria and Albert Museum
Mr Ian Blatchford

The Corporation of the Hall of Arts and Science, Royal Albert Hall
Mr C Fairweather

Members of the Commons House of Parliament
Mr Mark Field MP
Mr Clive Soley MP
The Rt Hon Michael Portillo MP

Ex Officio
The Rector
The Deputy Rector
Pro-Rectors
Deans
Faculty Principals
Faculty Vice-Principals
Provosts
President, ICU
Presidents of the Constituent College
Associations

Elected Staff Representatives (Engineering)
Dr Krysia Broda
Professor Peter Y K Cheung
Professor Dorothy S Griffiths
Professor Christopher L Hankin
Professor Dame Julia S Higgins
Professor Sandro Macchietto
Professor Michael R Warner
One vacancy

Elected Staff Representatives (Medicine)
Dr Jan Domin
Professor MA Ghatei
Professor Christopher Kennard
Professor Dame Julia Polak
Three vacancies

Elected Staff Representatives (Science)
Professor J Nigel Bell
Professor NWF Berkeley Hill
Professor Z Makuch
1. At its meeting in December 2004, the Council was informed that the College’s Access Agreement was being prepared.

2. Following approval by the Management Board, the Access Agreement was submitted to the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) by the deadline of 4 January 2005. A dialogue subsequently took place and a number of minor revisions were made to the original document.

3. On 11\textsuperscript{th} March, OFFA informed the College that the final version of the Access Agreement had been approved. This has now been published on the website www.offa.org.uk and is presented to the Council for information.

F.V.M.
BACKGROUND

1. This Access Agreement for Imperial College London is framed by the College’s mission, our admissions requirements and our commitment to widening participation.

2. The College is an international university which provides rigorous and intensive degree courses in science, engineering and medicine. Our undergraduate courses are designed to produce graduates for either fast-track graduate employment or postgraduate study. The majority of our courses require A-level passes in physics or physical sciences and in at least one mathematics subject. In order to cope with, enjoy and succeed on these courses, our students need to be well-qualified on entry. The average A-level points score for our academic departments for 2004 entry was 28.5.

3. Our courses are intended to benefit students of high ability, whatever their ethnic or national origin, religion, politics or sex, in accordance with our Equal Opportunities Policy. Our student population is cosmopolitan and diverse: in the 2003-04 academic year, 21% of our full-time undergraduate students were from countries outside the EU. To improve the gender balance among students in the College, efforts are being made to encourage a greater proportion of females to study science and engineering subjects. In 2003-04, our female undergraduates comprised 37% of our undergraduate student population compared with 31% in 1997-98. In terms of students’ backgrounds, HEFCE/HESA Performance Indicators show that in 2002-03 63% of our young (1), full-time first degree entrants were from state schools; an increase of 9% since 1997-98. Similarly, the College’s proportion of full-time first degree entrants from low participation neighbourhoods, as defined by the Government, has increased from 5% to 6.5% during this period. It is intended that the College’s outreach activities and the introduction of the Bursary Scheme, as detailed below, will enable this trend to continue.

Strategy for Admissions and Widening Participation

4. The College places a high priority on maintaining its admissions standards and attracting high calibre students from all backgrounds. In our outreach work, we seek to raise awareness of, and aspirations towards, higher education in order to increase the overall pool of candidates. We do not expect that our work will necessarily result in increased numbers of applicants to the College. Rather, our objective is to take a leading role in increasing awareness among young people of the importance and excitement of higher education, and of science in particular, and to offer practical help in these subjects. Our strategic aims in this area are therefore to:

   a. Pursue activities which raise aspirations, change perceptions and stimulate and support interest in science, engineering and medicine from primary through to A-level education.

   b. Enhance the College’s reputation among key audiences of capable young people from a wide range of backgrounds.

   c. Help to address the shortage of qualified science teachers in state schools.

1. Those aged under 21 on the 30 September of their year of entry to the College, as defined by HEFCE.
d. Continue to develop ways in which the College supports applicants/students with disabilities.

e. Retain and support the College’s students from under-represented groups (2) to enable them to succeed.

5. The delivery of these objectives is met through a diverse programme of outreach activities with a proven track-record. Overall, the College is now working with 33 London Boroughs, as well as UK regions (Huddersfield, Durham, Doncaster and Kent). Specific programmes are targeted at boroughs (e.g. Islington, Wandsworth, Westminster and Hounslow) which have areas with low rates of participation in HE. In the academic year 2003-04, over 50,000 pupils benefited from our outreach programme. Some specific examples of our activities are:

a. **Pimlico Connection Student Tutoring Scheme** in which undergraduate and postgraduate volunteers spend time in schools working with pupils. In 2003-04, 3,000 school pupils were involved and received tuition over a period of 17 weeks. The College founded this initiative in 1975 and it has been widely emulated across the UK and overseas.

b. **School Visits Programme** in which the Widening Participation Officer visits schools within, and around, London to offer information about higher education opportunities and to help with application forms. In 2003-04, 60 schools were visited with 64 repeat visits, involving around 10,000 pupils and 500 parents. Schools targeted are those which achieve an average of between 180 and 300 tariff points at A-level.

c. **INSPIRE (Innovative Scheme for Post-docs in Research and Education)** where post-doctoral researchers spend 50% of their contract in partner secondary schools teaching and studying towards a postgraduate teaching qualification. The remainder of their time is spent as a researcher. Ten schools in London and the South East are supported by the scheme at present.

d. **Summer Schools and Masterclasses.** A range of residential and non-residential programmes are available which, between them, serve all year groups from ages 6-12. Almost 1,000 pupils attended these activities in 2003-04.

e. **Demonstration Lectures, Workshops and Open Days** which benefited over 10,000 pupils in 2003-04.

f. **METRIC.** This project provides on-line assistance with mathematics to undergraduate and A-level maths students. Online tools and interactive resources have been made available to all schools in the London region, and departments in the College also use these materials to assist their first year undergraduates.

6. We also have a number of mechanisms in place to support students once at the College and help them succeed in their studies. We have an extensive range of welfare and pastoral support, as provided by, for example, College and Departmental Tutors, the College’s Disabilities Officer and the Students’ Union Welfare Advisor. As noted above, a version of our METRIC Project provides additional mathematics support to those undergraduates who require this. We also provide assistance to students who are experiencing financial difficulty through the Access to Learning Fund, the College’s Hardship

---

2. In the context of this Access Agreement ‘under-represented groups’ means groups that are currently under-represented in higher education at the national level.
Fund for overseas and European students and the Student Opportunities Fund, as detailed at Paragraph 14.

**Development of the Access Agreement.**

7. The College has given detailed consideration to the content and format of its Access Agreement. We recognise that our objective to maintain standards and quality is dependent on our ability to recruit and educate students of the highest calibre. Hence, we would not wish to see some of the brightest pupils from under-represented groups being deterred from entering, or staying within, higher education.

8. When developing our Access Agreement, we considered carefully the types of activities that the Agreement might cover. Our view was that the desire to encourage, and certainly not deter, access to our courses, would be most usefully effected by devoting a significant amount of the additional fee income to the Bursary Scheme detailed in this document. Some additional funding, of the order of £70,000 per annum, has been allocated to our outreach work and, in particular, to the appointment of a Director of Access. It is hoped that this appointment will take forward the existing outreach programme which, of course, remains embedded within the College's activities. The Bursary Scheme and our outreach programme provide a solid foundation to deliver our strategic objectives for widening access.

Further detail is provided within the sections below.

**FEE LIMITS**

9. The College proposes to charge the maximum fee allowed of £3,000 to all Home and EU students studying undergraduate courses from 2006 entry. The College intends to increase these fees on an annual basis in line with DfES recommendations.

**BURSARIES AND OTHER FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS**

10. The Bursary Scheme has been designed to ensure that financial circumstances do not deter potential students from applying to the College. It is envisaged that over 30% of our undergraduate students would benefit in the first year of the Scheme.

11. Through the Bursary Scheme, the College will offer cash awards for maintenance purposes, and, as such, only students assessed as 'Home' by both Imperial College and their Local Education Authority (or other relevant body) will be eligible to apply for bursaries. The College would expect to sign up to part of the model scheme proposed by the UUK/SCOP advisory group on bursary schemes, specifically the option to receive information about an applicant's eligibility for student support. However, as the College expects that the majority of our bursaries will be at non-standard rates, we plan to manage the assessment and award of our bursaries.

12. The College has committed to set aside at least 29% of the additional fee income (estimated at £744,000 in 2006-07) for its Bursary Scheme, with this proportion expected to rise in subsequent years. A minimum of 75% of these funds (i.e. 22% of the total additional fee income in 2006) will be awarded to eligible students on the basis of their LEA (or equivalent awarding body) assessment. The College guarantees that all students in receipt of the £2,700 Higher Education Maintenance Grant will receive a bursary of at least £300 a year (to increase annually in line with tuition fees). Students who receive a partial Higher Education Maintenance Grant will also be eligible for a bursary, the amount of which will be
determined by the level of government support they receive. The graduated scale for these awards will be established once the DfES publishes the thresholds for the Higher Education Maintenance Grant, but the following table provides some guidance concerning the amounts involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of HE Maintenance Grant</th>
<th>Amount of Bursary (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum HE Maintenance Grant</td>
<td>At least £2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid point</td>
<td>At least £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum HE Maintenance Grant</td>
<td>At least £200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The remaining 25% of the funds available to the Bursary Scheme (i.e. 7% of the total additional fee income in 2006) will be allocated for scholarships to reward exceptional performance at A-level or equivalent. These funds will be available to those students who have already received a bursary in accordance with Paragraph 12, and who have achieved the highest grade at A-level (currently 'A') or equivalent in at least 3 subjects. Students who are in receipt of the full £2,700 Higher Education Maintenance Grant, have the highest grade at A-level (or equivalent) in at least 3 subjects and who have firmly accepted a place by the UCAS deadline in May will receive the College’s maximum award (see Appendix 1). For 2006-07, this will consist of £4,000 per annum (to increase in line with inflation) for the duration of a student’s course, up to a maximum of 4 years. In subsequent years, the College will set the maximum award following the annual review of the Scheme. Students who receive a partial Higher Education Maintenance Grant and attain the highest grade at A-level (or equivalent) in at least three subjects will also be entitled to receive a scholarship in recognition of their exceptional A-level (or equivalent) performance.

14. As part of the College’s aim to widen access, over the past 2 years we have provided a number of new undergraduates with bursaries from the Student Opportunities Fund, financed through fundraising from alumni. These awards provide a maintenance grant for each year of study (up to 4 years), dependent upon satisfactory progress, and are made to candidates on the basis of proven widening participation criteria (financial and educational disadvantage). In total, the College has already committed over £100,000 to supporting undergraduates in this way and intends to continue with fundraising initiatives for this purpose.

PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS

Target Groups.

15. The College is committed to ensuring that information about fees and the support available to students is clear and accessible to the following target groups:

   a. Potential applicants to higher education
   b. Enquirers for study at the College
   c. Applicants for 2006 entry and beyond

---

3. These amounts do not include the scholarships for exceptional performance at A-level (or equivalent) detailed in Paragraph 13.
4. The College will define how non A-Level qualifications equate to the required A-level grades.
5. Students on courses of greater than 4 years’ duration will be eligible to apply for bursaries for the first 4 years of their course only. However, they may opt to spread these payments over the entire duration of their course.
d. Applicants for 2005 entry

Further detail of this provision is given below.

Potential Applicants to Higher Education

16. The College’s School Visits Programme forms one of our outreach activities and is described in Paragraph 5b. An important part of this work is to make school pupils aware of the general financial support available, should they enter higher education. The College intends to continue with this initiative, providing information about the College Bursary Scheme and support offered by other institutions, as well as giving advice on where to find further details.

Enquirers and Applicants for 2006 Entry and Beyond

17. All those enquiring about or applying for undergraduate entry from 2006 onward will be supplied with the following:

a. Written details of the likely fees for courses to include current fees and information about the expected rate of fee increases in future years for all courses.

b. Written details of the Bursary Scheme, detailing the amount of support that will be available from the College and the criteria for eligibility.

c. A breakdown of the likely costs associated with living expenses that students can expect to encounter during their course.

d. Directions to the College website where information will be posted, as it becomes available.

e. Contact details of the College Registry, which will deal with any questions related to fees and financial assistance.

18. Principally, the above information will be provided in the College Undergraduate Prospectus, which is available to potential students at the end of April for entry the following year (e.g. April 2005 for 2006 entry). Details will also be made available on the UCAS website and on the College website, where they will be updated as and when more information is available.

Applicants for 2005 Entry

19. In addition to informing applicants for 2005 entry of their fee liability and costs under the current arrangements, we will also notify them of the expected changes to the College fee structure and give details of the Bursary Scheme. This information will make clear that students entering the College in 2005 and those applying for deferred entry in 2006 will not be liable for the increased fee and neither will they be eligible for the new bursaries. However, from 2006 they will not need to pay fees up-front, but can do so after graduation. The details will also outline the existing financial support measures that will continue to be available to these students.

Current Students

20. The College will inform all current undergraduate students of the changes in the fee structure for students entering the College in 2006 and explain that these will not affect
students continuing on their current programme of study, with regard to their fee liability. As a result, they will be ineligible for assistance from the Bursary Scheme. However, from 2006 students will not need to pay fees up-front, but can do so after graduation. Again, the information will reiterate the financial support that will continue to be made available to these students. This information will be placed on the College website and will also be published in the College student newspaper.

OUTREACH WORK

21. Some of our additional fee income will be used to fund the appointment of a Director of Access. This will be a new post within the College, created to oversee and develop the College’s outreach work. The Director will provide coordination of, and strategic direction for, the College’s portfolio of interaction with schools. These include, but will not be limited to: voluntary and salaried participation of Imperial staff and students in local schools, widening participation activities, open days at College and development of events in individual schools. Novel techniques will also be considered for the independent assessment of the specific abilities and skills appropriate for applicants and potential students at the College.

22. The College currently has a network of more than 60 schools and the Director of Access will aim to increase this number. Work will take place with these schools at several levels with an aim to increase awareness of the opportunities within higher education and to assist school pupils with their applications. School visits will also be used to identify students from all backgrounds who have the potential to succeed at the College.

23. The extent of the College’s outreach work and the target groups are detailed in Paragraph 5. It is anticipated that the Director of Access will expand these over the period of the Access Agreement.

MILESTONES

24. The College’s milestones and objectives in implementing this Access Agreement are outlined below.

   a. The College will ensure that at least 29% of the additional income from the increased fees will be available to support eligible students in the form of bursaries.

   b. The College aims to raise awareness of the Bursary Scheme so that all those eligible to apply for bursaries receive the appropriate information in time to do so.

   c. The College will develop an efficient and effective system for the administration and award of bursaries and will ensure that this is targeted to those most in need. The College will regularly evaluate the system, make recommendations and implement any necessary changes.

   d. The College will appoint a Director of Access to oversee and develop the College’s outreach activities and to form a detailed strategy for our outreach work.

   e. Following the appointment of the Director of Access, the College intends to set further milestones in the area of outreach. These are likely to include:

   (1) Expansion of the Schools Visit Programme
   (2) Expansion of the project based activities programme
   (3) Work with a set number of new Aimhigher areas per year
As a consequence of its commitment to outreach work and the introduction of the Bursary Scheme, the College expects to increase the number and proportion of students from under-represented groups who apply here. For entry to the College in 2004-05, 13.2% of applicants were from the following socio-economic groups – lower supervisory and technical occupations, routine occupations and semi-routine occupations. It is intended that this figure should rise over the period of the Access Agreement.

Using the additional information on LEA assessments to be gained from the UUK/SCOP proposed administration scheme, the College will analyse on an annual basis how student numbers according to Higher Education Maintenance Grant are affected by the introduction of the new Bursary Scheme and the development of outreach work.

INSTITUTIONAL MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS

The everyday administration of the Access Agreement will be the responsibility of the Academic Registrar. The Academic Registrar will be able to direct any issues that arise to monthly meetings of the College’s Management Board and will also provide a report on the Access Agreement on an annual basis. The Management Board will be responsible for making decisions on all of our access measures and will monitor with the appropriate Senate sub-committees the College’s progress towards meeting the above milestones. It will also approve the Annual Monitoring Statement to HEFCE, which will include information on the College’s Access Agreement.

---

6. According to data provided by UCAS, based on the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification Analytic Classes. The data used does not include the group entitled 'Unknown'.
**Eligibility for Bursary Scheme**

1. **Is student in receipt of full £2,700 HE Maintenance Grant?**
   - **Yes**
     - Has the student firmly accepted an offer by the deadline?
       - **Yes**
         - **Yes**
           - Student will receive total award of £4,000
         - **No**
           - Student will receive a means tested Bursary of at least £2,700
       - **No**
         - Student is not entitled to a Bursary
   - **No**

2. **Is the student in partial receipt of a HE Maintenance Grant?**
   - **Yes**
     - Subject to thresholds set by DfES, the student will be entitled to a means tested Bursary
   - **No**
     - Student will receive a means tested Bursary of at least £2,700

3. **Does the student have 3 ‘A’ Grades at A-Level (or equivalent)?**
   - **Yes**
     - Student will receive a ‘top-up’ to the means tested Bursary
   - **No**
     - Student will receive a means tested Bursary of at least £200
GENERAL

1. The Finance Management Report (1) continues to be amended to make it a management tool. The first 3 pages are a conventional integrated I & E, balance sheet and sources and uses pack. From these, the major financial issues can be identified. Pages 4 & 5 set out the capital expenditure and related cash flows. From these can be seen the outright expenditure risks and the cash consequences and implications – important given their size in relation to the College’s financial position. Pages 6, 7, 8 and 9 analyse the overall cash flow position of the College, actual and prospective. Pages 10, 11 and 12 provide data on Faculty performance, with particular reference to research income. More work is being done on these pages.

2. On financial performance, the following are worthy of note:

   a. The research work in progress – i.e. unbilled research costs - is a source of concern. Page 8 shows how the amounts have risen absolutely and proportionately in recent months. The trend in the last 18 months is not good. It needs a straightforward recognition that the root of the problem is an inability to send out bills on time before this problem will be satisfactorily addressed. Being able to track the size of the problem is one thing; providing a usable management tool to drive the size of the problem down is another. This will not be readily available until Oracle Grants is more fully installed and being used.

   b. For the first time in 10 years, the over one year debtor position has now fallen below £3M, which is commendable; the fall in the size of the debtor book at the near end of the age profile is not, however, necessarily good news since it is probably a reflection of invoices not being sent out.

   c. Capital expenditure to date this year has been £36M; a further £52M is projected to be spent to 31 July 2005. Five projects are behind their spend schedule. I doubt if the £52M will be spent in the next 5 months. This will have positive consequences for cash; it may also have negative implications for costs. This is the subject of a review with Estates.

---

1 The Finance Management Report Booklet is not included with these Minutes
d. In the I & E, a number of positive variances - from a one-off VAT reclaim of £0.8M and a Full Economic Costing transitional grant of £2.8M, to a continuing benefit from student fees as noted in the last Report – have altered the full year outlook to a surplus of £1M. It is unlikely that there will be a continuance of this unbroken string of positive news; indeed, it may well be that the provision required for the ‘engineering facility’ will be markedly higher than that for the current year.

e. The £7.6M deficit against budget of research income is a concern, albeit that the forecasts from the Faculties show an improvement to the year end. A concerted effort is being made to ensure we are correctly classifying income as “research income”.

f. The Revised forecast for 2004/05 of £172.7M represents only a 2% growth over 2003/04 and as can be seen from the following table, is some £4M below the Cambridge University results for 2003/04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Research Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The budget process is now underway. A focus on targeted investment is a positive; so, too, is the news that the 2005/6 HEFCE grant, at £133M, is some 7.4% higher than 2004/5.

4. The appointment of a Director of Finance will shortly be announced formally.

5. A number of management issues are being considered, from an overhaul of the treasury function to the authorisation levels currently in force. On this latter point, it does seem as though these levels start very low, with small band widths, such that they almost certainly operate as a disincentive to the taking of responsibility and the streamlining of decision processing.
6. The Oracle Grants System has been successfully implemented, although a few issues remain outstanding and this may continue to impact our ability to claim reimbursements from our sponsors over the next couple of months. Preparations for the introduction of Full Economic Costing continue with significant progress being made on various workstreams.

M.P.K.
1. At its meeting on 23 February 2005 the Senate approved a recommendation from the Graduate School of Life Sciences and Medicine Management Committee for the establishment of a new advanced degree in Surgical Education.

2. The programme will bring together the disciplines of surgery and education in an innovative and rigorous manner and thus the Committee believed that it would be most appropriate to designate it as a Master of Education (MEd). The MEd is a qualification of the University of London not currently awarded by Imperial College.

3. The Council is invited to consider, and if it sees fit, approve the addition of the Master of Education (MEd) to the Awards of the University of London listed under paragraph 1.1 (B) of the Academic Regulations.

F.V.M
PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR
THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION TO HOLD AN ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

A Note by the Clerk and the President of the Imperial College Union

BACKGROUND

1. The Imperial College Union is required by its Constitution to hold an Annual General Meeting (AGM) once a year of all members of the Union able to attend and vote. The meeting must be held within the first five weeks of the Summer Term.

2. Changes to the Union’s Constitution made in 1998 mean that the Union Council has now superseded the AGM as the Union’s sovereign and governing body. Since then the AGM has therefore been a largely powerless, vestigial body with just two remaining purposes:
   a. To receive the annual reports of the Union and its Officers; and
   b. To elect various junior Officer positions for the following academic year.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

3. In recent years the Union has successfully implemented online electronic voting for elections held by cross-campus ballot. It is now preparing for elections to all Union Officer positions to be held this way. The turnout in the most recent sabbatical elections was around the 23% mark.

4. The increased size of the student body (12,618 registered this year) means that a General Meeting is an inappropriate and impractical method of governance. The quorum is only 200 yet the AGM has not been quorate for many years.

5. The Union is currently in the process of completing a governance review in which it appears there will be consensus to abolish the AGM with its remaining purposes to be dealt with as follows:
   a. Union Council meetings, which any student may attend as an observer with speaking rights, already provide ample opportunity to scrutinise Officers’ annual reports.
   b. Elections may in future be held by cross-campus ballots. This will be more efficient and will allow more students to take part in these elections.

6. In line with these recommendations, the Union is keen to review its junior Officer positions, and to elect them by online electronic cross-campus ballot this Summer Term. However, this would require the current Constitution and Election Regulations to be amended at two consecutive meetings of the Union’s Council, between 15 and 40 College days apart. The amended Constitution would also then have to be ratified by the College’s
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Council. Whilst appropriate changes to these documents are being prepared and will be brought to the Council in due course, this convoluted process is not practical if electronic elections are to be held this academic year.

7. In order to hold these cross-campus elections, the Union Executive has agreed unanimously to ask that the relevant section of the Union’s Constitution be suspended.

PROPOSAL

8. The Council is therefore asked to consider and, if sees fit, approve the suspension of the Union’s Constitution (Article 7.4) and Election Regulations (Regulation 2.E.25) pertaining to the Annual General Meeting. The relevant extracts are attached at Annex A.

K.A.M.
Mustafa Arif
CONSTITUTION:

“7.4. Annual General Meetings

1. The Annual General Meeting shall be held in the first five weeks of the Summer Term and shall
   a. Receive reports from the Officers of the Union,
   b. Elect such Officers of the Union and other officers as set in Regulations or policy, and
   c. Receive the Annual Report of the Union in accordance with the Education Act 1994.”

REGULATION 2 – ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA:

“E. Elections for non-sabbatical posts

25. Elections for all non-sabbatical Union Officers except the Faculty Union Presidents and Chairs of Club and Society Committees shall be by and from the Full Membership at the Annual General Meeting. Vacancies in these posts may be filled by election at the Council.”