The Forty-second Meeting of the Council was held in the Council Room, 170, Queen’s Gate at 10:30 a.m. on 8th July 2005, when there were present:

The Lord Kerr of Kinlochard (Chairman), Mr. G. Able, Dr. E. Buttle, Professor M. Duff, Sir Peter Gershon, Mr. B. Gidoomal, Dr. G.G. Gray, Professor J. King, Professor R.I. Kitney, Dr. M.P. Knight, Mr. J. Newsum, Mr. A.D. Roche, Dr. D.J. Wilbraham, the Rector and the President of the Imperial College Union, together with the Clerk to the Court and Council.

In attendance: The President elect of the Imperial College Union, Ms. S. Misbahuddin, and the Assistant Clerk to the Court and Council.

Apologies: Mr. D.P. Hearn, Professor S.K. Smith and the Deputy Rector.

WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed the Principal of the Faculty of Physical Sciences, Professor Mike Duff, to his first Meeting as a member of the Council. He also welcomed Ms. Sameena Misbahuddin, the Imperial College Union President elect, to her first Meeting.

CONGRATULATIONS

On behalf of the Council the Chairman congratulated Professor Peter Knight on his award of a Knighthood for services to optical physics in the Queen’s Birthday Honours List and Professor Gordon Conway on his appointment as Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George for services to international development, science and agriculture. The Chairman also congratulated Professor James Barber on his election as a Fellow of the Royal Society.

MINUTES

Council – 1st April 2005

1. The Minutes of the Forty-first Meeting of the Council, held on 1st April 2005, were taken as read, confirmed and signed.
MATTERS ARISING

Southside Project and the Section 106 Agreement (Minutes 2 – 3)

2. The Clerk informed members that the College’s planning application had been cleared by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, this being the last of the major planning hurdles. The application had now been returned to Westminster City Council for final consent to be issued. However, before this could be done a number of pre-commencement conditions had to be discharged and it was expected that this formal process might take about two months. The College would commence the demolition of the Southside building as soon as final approval was received; in the meantime, asbestos removal and soft stripping of the building’s interior had commenced. This was in line with the College’s overall Project plan, which was proceeding entirely according to schedule.

Imperial Innovations Ltd (Minute 4)

3. The Chief Finance Officer, Dr. Knight, reported that the private placement of shares in Imperial Innovations Ltd. had been concluded at the end of April. The placement had been very well received by the market. The placement had also had the intended effect on Innovations, which was now operating at a much higher level of activity than before.

Paddington Waterside (Minutes 5 - 6)

4. The Rector reported that the Government had decided not to proceed with the Paddington Waterside Project. Consequently, the planned expansion and concentration of medical services in West London would not now take place. Westminster City Council still had land at the site which it was keen to develop and which might yet be used to provide a new hospital to replace St. Mary’s.

5. The Rector reminded Governors that the College had only agreed to provide funds for the Project if it proceeded. Unlike the NHS, which had already spent over £20M on it, there were therefore no cost implications for the College from the Government’s decision not to proceed. Following this decision, he said, the Government had asked the Strategic Health Authority to review health provision in the area and to prepare a comprehensive health strategy for West London. This was now awaited.

RECTOR’S BUSINESS

Staff Matters (Paper A)

6. The Rector formally presented Paper A.

Rector’s Report

7. The Rector reminded Governors that the College had been founded on 8th July 1907 and that the College was therefore 98 years old on this very day. More pertinently, preparations were well under way for celebrating the College’s Centenary in two years’ time. The Chairman suggested that, once they were more firmly developed, the Council should consider the College’s plans for celebrating the Centenary and the role Governors should play in these. The Centenary represented a huge opportunity for the College and it would be important to ensure that this was grasped.
8. Moving on, the Rector said that a final pay offer of 3.4% had been put to the College's Trades' Unions on 5 July. He reminded Governors that this was the second year of independent pay negotiations for the College and he was pleased that Imperial had again been able to make an offer above that for the higher education sector as a whole where the final offer stood at 3%. He added the College intended to implement the award on the due date of 1st August. The Chairman said that the Imperial College Branch of the Association of University Teachers (AUT) had asked him to make clear to Governors that the AUT had yet to accept this final offer.

9. The Rector went on to report that there had been difficulties in reaching agreement with the Hammersmith Hospitals Trust (HHT) over the lease of the site for the proposed Centre for Brain and Musculoskeletal Repair at Charing Cross. The HHT had also objected to the College's planning application for the Centre. In addition, the Government's decision on Paddington Waterside and its call for a strategic review of healthcare in West London meant that the future of the Charing Cross Hospital itself was now in doubt. It therefore seemed likely that any new centres of excellence would be concentrated at the Hammersmith Hospital rather than at Charing Cross and in consequence the College had decided not to proceed with the Project.

Tanaka Business School

10. Moving on, the Rector said that Governors would have seen the recent reports about the arrest of Dr. Gary Tanaka in the United States. He noted that Dr. Tanaka had not yet been indicted, even though the initial deadline for indictment had now passed. The College’s policy for dealing with any enquiries on this issue was that any questions about the College's relationship with Dr Gary Tanaka should be referred to the Director of Communications. The Rector then said that the relationship between Imperial and Dr. Tanaka had led to some minor coverage in the Racing Post, the Evening Standard, the THES and the Sunday Times, but there had been no implication impugning the integrity of the College in any of this coverage. The Sunday Telegraph had, he said, run a piece on 26th June which had asked “How should universities react when their benefactors are accused of malpractice?” The journalist concerned had obtained quotes from the Lord Oxburgh and from Professor David Norburn. As both no longer had any connection with the College, Imperial had had no knowledge of or control over their statements.

11. Both Mr. Able and Dr. Buttle said that they too had been approached by the Press in relation to Dr. Tanaka's situation, but had both declined to comment. The Chairman said that if other Governors were approached, the sensible response would be to refer these enquiries to the College's Director of Communications, as College staff had been advised to do.

12. Mr. Gidoomal asked if the College had a policy on naming buildings and whether this should preclude any building being named after a living person. The Rector said that each proposal would have to be considered on its individual merits. However, he noted that the College was likely to consider naming a building after a person only in return for a very substantial donation and that donations of the requisite size were extremely rare and in reality would be declined only in exceptional circumstances. The Chairman agreed, but suggested that the Council should be informed of major donations such as this so that members were aware of any potential reputational risks involved. The Rector agreed, and remarked that, if an individual was subsequently shown to have behaved in a way that brought the College into disrepute, the Council had the power to remove their name from a building.
However, he re-emphasised that in this case Dr. Tanaka had not been found guilty or even indicted of any crime.

**Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation**

13. Turning to other matters, the Rector said that two research teams from Imperial had received grants totalling $28.8M (approximately £15M) from the Grand Challenges in Global Health Initiative, a programme of research sponsored by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Wellcome Trust and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. This was the third Gates Foundation related grant received by the College, which made the College the biggest recipient of funding from that Foundation outside the United States. The successful bids were to combat two of the world’s most serious diseases: tuberculosis and malaria. Professor Douglas Young of the Department of Infectious Diseases had received $20M (about £11M) to develop drugs for the treatment of latent tuberculosis, a condition affecting around one-third of the world population. Tuberculosis was responsible for up to 2 million deaths worldwide and the risk of progression from the latent to active disease was strongly increased in individuals who were co-infected with HIV. Dr Austin Bart of the Department of Biological Sciences had also received $8.8M (approximately £4.8M) to develop genetic strategies to block the spread of malaria by mosquitoes.

**Imperial Success at Henley**

14. The Rector concluded his report on a lighter note when he congratulated the Imperial women rowers, one of only four clubs to win more than one event at Henley’s Women’s Regatta on Sunday, 19 June. The double triumph had been pulled off in the Intermediate Coxed Fours and, in the Under-23 Lightweight Single, by Rachael Davies.

**Estates Staffing**

15. Mr. Newsum asked about the recent resignations in the Estates Division and any effect these might have on the College’s capital works programme. The Rector confirmed that two of the Assistant Directors of Estates, Mr. Andrew Rabeneck and Mr. John Walsh, had recently resigned. Mr. Rabeneck had been responsible for the maintenance of the College’s estate and the College was currently advertising for a successor. Mr. Walsh was in charge of the Projects Office and had managed this very well. This was clearly a vital position, given the number of major projects which the College had in progress, and the College was actively seeking a replacement. Mr. Walsh would be remaining in his position for a further three months and the College now had a professional Projects Office in place with a number of excellent project managers, which had not been the case five years ago. Consequently, the Rector did not believe that Mr. Walsh’s resignation should adversely affect the College’s building programme.

**Changes to Visa Regulations**

16. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Arif, thanked the Rector for taking a public stance against the Government’s proposed changes to the visa regime for foreign students. The Rector said that this issue did not affect the College as much as other universities as Imperial already provided considerable assistance to foreign applicants and most of those applying for visas were successful. However, he believed the principle behind the proposed changes was wrong and so had been happy to argue against them.
17. Introducing Paper B, the Rector reminded Governors that the Faculty of Life Sciences had consisted of three main departments, only one of which had been graded at 5* in the 2001 RAE, the other two receiving grade 4. Two years ago the HEFCE had removed research funding for 4-graded departments. This had exacerbated an already difficult financial position for the Faculty and in July 2004 the Management Board had agreed that the Faculty would have to address its increasing financial deficit as a matter of urgency. The Faculty had now been restructured into Divisions, with the Division of Biomedical Sciences moving into the Faculty from the Faculty of Medicine. It was hoped that the appointment of a new Principal would also be confirmed shortly.

18. Finalising the position of Environmental Sciences, both within the Faculty and across the College, had been more problematic. This was an important area for the College, with a very successful postgraduate MSc course which it wanted to support. However, environment had performed relatively poorly in the last RAE, so the research base needed to be improved and also co-ordinated with related activity in the other Faculties. The Management Board had therefore agreed to establish a Centre for Environmental Policy, which would support the MSc Course and liaise with other departments to develop excellent 5-rated research in Environmental Sciences.

19. Although the future of the Wye Campus was the subject of a separate review, the Rector said that there was one final issue for the Faculty to resolve, that of the Applied Business Management degree course at Wye. The Management Board had agreed that it was not appropriate for the College to continue to teach undergraduate students at Wye and it was therefore considering the possibility of transferring this course and the staff teaching it to the University of Kent. If agreement could be reached with the University, the existing students and those recruited onto the course this year would continue on the course for which they had registered and would receive an Imperial degree. Future students would, however, be recruited onto a University of Kent degree. If these conditions were not acceptable to the University of Kent, the College would have little option but to stop recruiting to the course. However, if the change could be agreed, it would allow the College to concentrate on developing excellent research at Wye.

20. The Chairman thanked the Rector for his summary and said that he believed the outcome of the Faculty’s restructuring review had been a set of eminently sensible proposals. With regard to the discussion with the University of Kent, he agreed that the College should maintain its robust stance. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Arif, asked the Rector to confirm that students currently registered on the course at Wye would get an Imperial degree and also asked if it was proposed to transfer any of the College’s MSc courses to Kent. The Rector confirmed that all students who had registered with or applied to Imperial would get an Imperial degree.

21. Professor Duff said it had been rumoured that the Department of Chemistry might be moved to Wye. The Rector replied that, although some chemical research might be conducted there, it would be ridiculous to move chemistry teaching away from South Kensington. Although he recognised that the Department badly needed new and updated facilities, it was clear to him that these should be at the South Kensington Campus.
22. Dr. Buttle then expressed her concern about the proposed title of the new Centre for Environmental Policy as she felt it did not adequately describe the work of the new Centre. She was also concerned that the Centre might have classification problems in the RAE. The Rector said that the title reflected that of the successful MSc programme and also the specialisms of its staff. One of the purposes of the Centre was to develop, encourage and co-ordinate research in environmental sciences across the College; the cross-faculty nature of its work was reflected in its status as a Centre rather than a Department. On the RAE issue, the Rector said that research would be submitted through academics’ home departments rather than through the Centre so he did not believe that there would be a problem with categorisation. Professor King agreed and noted that all of the Faculty Principals had agreed this solution and would work with the Centre to develop research in this area.

23. Sir Peter Gershon said that he, too, was concerned about the Centre’s proposed title and particularly its identification with ‘policy’, as this suggested its work was more concerned with social sciences rather than the ‘hard’ sciences. Professor King said that most of the existing grants which had been obtained by the staff in the Centre were in the policy field and that this was also the focus of the MSc programme. The Rector agreed, but said that as the Centre developed, it would have to move away from concentration on the policy area. Although its title was appropriate now, this might well change over time and could be revisited when necessary.

24. Bringing the discussion to a conclusion, the Chairman said that the resolution of these complex issues had been very well handled by the College and he commended the Deputy Rector, Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz, for the sensitive way in which he had brought these matters to a satisfactory conclusion.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

The Future of the University of London (Paper C)

25. The Rector introduced Paper C, saying that the University of London had been struggling to find an appropriate role for some time and now had little relevance to Imperial. The College paid an annual fee of some £800K to the University, but received very few benefits in return. These were limited to such items as student participation in sporting competitions and access to extra student accommodation in the inter-collegiate halls. Another consideration was the University’s property holdings and Imperial would want to ensure that it received its share of these assets. The Rector believed that none of these problems were insurmountable.

26. The question of the University’s future had recently been resurrected by the University’s new Vice-Chancellor who was seeking to redefine the University and its relationship with its Colleges. His vision was, however, at variance with the College’s needs and with those of the other large colleges - UCL, Kings and the LSE - and it was now time to consider whether the College should continue as part of the University or seek University status in its own right.

27. The Rector remarked that this could not be achieved quickly. If the College was to break with the University and recruit students to its own degrees, it would have to publish this in the next edition of its prospectus and the UCAS Guide. Even then, students applying to the College, rather than the University, would not actually be admitted until 2008 and it would be 2012 before the first of them graduated with an Imperial degree. The Chairman said that he agreed that Imperial should award its own degrees, recognising that to do so would entail leaving the University. The other
members of the Council concurred.

28. Professor Kitney suggested that the ideal time to launch the College’s new status would be at the Centenary in 2007. Dr. Wilbraham agreed that the College should make use of its reserve powers to award degrees. In his view, the only issue was one of timing. He suggested that it would be beneficial if Imperial could do this in tandem with UCL, Kings and the LSE. The Clerk informed Governors that, although these Colleges were following the Imperial route in seeking degree-awarding powers, Imperial was the only one of the University’s colleges to have been granted these powers to date. This meant that the other Colleges would not be able to work to the same timetable as Imperial for seceding from the University. The Chairman commented that a statement of intent from these Colleges released at the same time as Imperial announced its decision would have much the same effect. Mr. Able said that the sooner the College took this decision the better as it would only enhance its international reputation.

29. Mr. Newsum asked if breaking with the University would have an adverse impact on collaboration with other colleges. The Rector said that Imperial already collaborated extensively with the other Colleges, and with UCL in particular. These collaborations were arranged by the Colleges themselves and had nothing to do with the University. A decision to leave the University would, he said, have no material effect on the College’s academic work.

30. Mr. Arif said that the College should be confident enough to secede from the University regardless of the other Colleges’ intentions. Returning to the Rector’s initial comments, he said that he believed all of the issues related to student activities were solvable. However, he hoped that, if the College did award its own degrees, it would retain the Associateships and Diplomas of the Royal College of Science, Royal School of Mines and City & Guilds Association that were currently awarded to Imperial students on completion of their London University degree. These awards had an historic status that was valued by the students and it would be a shame if they were lost.

Amendments to the University of London Statutes (Paper D)

31. Introducing Paper D, the Clerk reminded Governors that, as a constituent College of the University, Imperial had a role to play in the formal approval of changes to the University’s Statutes, even though these had little or no relevance to the College. The changes now proposed related to the University’s disciplinary, dismissal and grievance procedures for academic staff and had already been approved by members by correspondence. The main purpose of this Paper was to record that the Council had passed the following resolution by correspondence in the period between 6 June 2005 and 21 June 2005:

That this Council, being the governing body of Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine, hereby consents to the making of new Statutes by the University of London as proposed by the Council and as set out in the document headed ‘Amendments to the University Statutes’.

GOVERNANCE

Compliance with the CUC’s Governance Code of Practice (Paper E)

32. The Clerk introduced Paper E and reminded Governors that the Committee of
University Chairmen (CUC) had issued a revised edition of its Guide for Governors in November 2004. This included a voluntary Code of Practice for Governing Bodies. However, the HEFCE had now said that it would employ a ‘lighter touch’ when reviewing those institutions which had signed up to the ‘voluntary’ Code. The Clerk said that there were only two elements of the Code with which the Council did not already comply, these being the adoption by the Council of a formal statement of its responsibilities and the production of a job description for governors. Although the CUC Guide included a model statement of governing bodies’ responsibilities, it was felt that, in a number of key areas, this blurred the distinction between governance and management and ascribed certain responsibilities to the Governing Body that properly belonged to the Rector. The model statement had therefore been amended and it was this revised statement that the Council was being asked to adopt. The issue of a job description for Governors would be taken forward by the Nominations Committee at its next meeting.

33. Mr. Able agreed that there should be a ‘person specification’ for Council Members. Dr. Buttle said that the other main recommendation from the Code was that the Governing Body should regularly review the institution’s performance. She thought that the HEFCE would probably concentrate on this area more than the others. The Clerk agreed, but said that the College was constantly reviewing its own performance and was also able to benchmark itself against other institutions through external reviews, such as the RAE and QAA audits.

34. The Chairman agreed that the model statement of responsibilities went too far in including managerial elements. However, he thought that the revised version had gone too far the other way. In particular, he thought the Council should monitor institutional performance in relation to its Human Resource strategy, policies and procedures. Sir Peter Gershon agreed and said that the model statement included a responsibility to ensure that the institution’s plans met “the interests of stakeholders”. This had been omitted from the amended statement. He believed that the Council had a wider corporate social responsibility that was not properly recognised if the reference to stakeholders was not included in some form. Mr. Newsum also suggested that the responsibility to act as trustees in respect of endowments, bequests or gifts had wider legal implications and should therefore not have been removed from the revised draft.

35. The Clerk noted that some of these points, such as members’ responsibilities as trustees, had been removed to avoid duplication with the Statutes where they were already set out.

36. The Chairman asked that the draft Statement of Primary Responsibilities be re-drafted in line with Governors’ comments. However, rather than delay approval of the Statement until the next Meeting, it was agreed that the revised statement should be considered and approved by Chairman’s action.

Harlington Trust (Paper F)

37. This Paper was withdrawn. It was envisaged that a revised version might be discussed at the Council’s next meeting.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMPERIAL COLLEGE AND THE SCIENCE MUSEUM WITH RESPECT TO THE LIBRARY (PAPER G)

38. The Chairman introduced Paper G and informed Governors that the Deputy Rector,
Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz, had asked him if he would discuss the matter with the Science Museum’s Chairman, Lord Waldegrave, and seek a resolution to this long-running dispute. The Chairman recognised that Lord Waldegrave and the Museum had received a considerable amount of correspondence over what was perceived externally as its plan to break up its collection. This had led the Museum to revise its plans and its priority now was to keep the collection together. Imperial’s priority, however, was that the collection should be removed from college space. The Chairman suggested that a possible way forward would be for the Museum to house the collection elsewhere, but with the College undertaking to provide public access to individual books and periodicals on 24 hours’ notice. The Museum would then be responsible for delivering the books to the College and returning them to its permanent store after use. If an agreement could be reached, the Chairman felt it would be important for both organisations to make a public statement confirming the joint arrangements.

39. Mr. Arif acknowledged that the demand for public access would actually be very limited. However, certain items in the collection were important for the Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine (CHoSTM) and he said that these particular items should be retained at South Kensington for its use. The Chairman said that it was not clear that this would be acceptable to the Museum as it would be seen externally as breaking up the collection. The Rector agreed and said that, as the College had been seeking a resolution to this dispute for over two years, a clean break solution was now the best option.

THE REGIONAL FUNDING OF UNIVERSITIES (PAPER H)

40. The Rector formally presented Paper H, which was received for information.

FINANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT (PAPER I)

41. The Chief Finance Officer, Dr. Knight, introduced Paper I and said that the College was now expecting to realise a surplus of £10M in the current year, mainly as a result of the sale of Innovations’ shares. Indeed, he said, depending on the accounting treatment of this sale, the surplus could be as much as £20M, although the figure of £10M more accurately reflected the real level of profit made by the College.

42. Moving on, Dr. Knight said that expenditure on capital projects had increased recently, although he still doubted that the full level of budgeted expenditure would be reached by the year-end. Although the College had recently driven unbilled research costs down very successfully, since this concerted exercise had ended, they had started to rise again. This suggested that the real problem was in ensuring that invoices were sent out in a timely manner. The Finance Division was taking steps to address this problem systematically. Turning to the College’s financial forecasts, Dr. Knight said that these were reviewed each month. In his view this was too often. He suggested that an in-depth review every 6 months would provide more useful information and would also represent a better use of resources. Finally, he noted that the Finance Division was trying to streamline a number of its processes, including the production of year-end accounts; it was planned that the Financial Statements would be signed off by the Management Board on 28th October. Although the Council itself would not formally approve the Statements until its Meeting on 9th December, he hoped that there should not be any need to revise the statements in the interim period.
43. Dr. Knight then introduced Paper J, saying that he also wanted to streamline the College’s budgeting process which he thought could be made tighter without losing any rigour. At present, the College’s planning processes paid too much attention to the minutiae of budgeting and not enough to strategic planning. He believed that senior staff should concentrate on planning, with the budget preparation being done by Finance staff once the plans had been agreed. Moving on to consider the proposed Budget, Dr. Knight noted that this was the second year in which the College had included a Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) to provide funds for new initiatives. However, he said, it was clear that investment decisions had long-term implications and should not be considered as isolated, single year projects. He believed that the SIF and the way it would be handled would assist the College in taking investment decisions which took account of the longer view.

44. Dr. Knight then considered the risk factors identified in the Paper and how these might affect the College’s ability to achieve its proposed Budget. The primary risk was the very small contingency built into the Budget. This meant that any shortfall in income – which was forecast to rise by 9% - or any increase in expenditure – which was forecast to rise by 8% - would affect the College’s bottom line. The main elements of the College’s income, Dr. Knight continued, were £147.9M from the HEFCE, which was secure; £65M from student fees; £193.8M in research grants; and £53.6M from donations and other income. The biggest potential risks were to overseas student fees, which were forecast to increase by 18% and research income. Dr. Knight said that overseas student recruitment did not appear to be a problem and 78% of the forecast research income had already been secured from successful bids for funding. Turning to consider other income, he said that the majority of this money was cost neutral (i.e. if the funding was not secured, there would be no related expenditure). Consequently, he did not believe that the income projections represented a significant risk to the College.

45. Dr. Knight then considered the College’s expenditure. The largest increases were in Research Services, Estates and ICT. However, in comparison with the College’s total expenditure, these increases were not excessive and were felt to be manageable. The other main risk was, he said, the introduction of Full Economic Costing (FEC) of research projects. If the College was unable to justify and so recoup its costs in this area, it could face a significant shortfall. In comparison to its peers, however, the College was well advanced in preparing for FEC implementation. Furthermore, the financial projections prudently assumed that FEC would initially have little or no impact on research funded by organisations other than the Research Councils.

46. Mr. Gidoomal asked if there was any risk that the HEFCE might seek to claw back any of its grant funding. Dr. Knight confirmed that the College’s block grant from the HEFCE was safe.

47. Dr. Gray noted that, even though the College had secured grants to cover most of the projected research income, it was just as important to ensure that this money was brought into the College on a timely basis. The level of unbilled research costs which had already been acknowledged as a concern by Dr. Knight suggested that this area remained problematic. Dr. Gray asked what action could be taken by the College to ensure that Departments claimed this money promptly. Sir Peter Gershon concurred with Dr. Gray’s remarks and also asked what measures the College was taking to reduce its utility costs, both through energy management and through the negotiation
of better prices. Dr. Buttle noted the continuing reliance on SRIF funding for capital projects and asked if these building works would assist in reducing the College’s long term maintenance liabilities. Finally, Dr. Wilbraham noted that the College did not intend to increase its overall student numbers and yet overseas student fees were due to rise by 18%. He asked if this meant that the College was planning to change its proportion of home and overseas students.

48. Responding to each of these points, Dr. Knight said that the College had secured £77M from SRIF 3 and that most of the projects to be funded from this particular round included a high proportion that would deal with long-term maintenance issues. With regard to energy consumption, he said that the Estates Division was introducing a new programme designed to reduce usage across the College, although it was unlikely that this would have an impact on next year’s budget. At the same time, he said, the College had a strong procurement section that worked hard to secure the best deals it could. Indeed, the College was considering leaving the London procurement consortium to join a new consortium with Oxford, Cambridge and UCL. As these universities had similar requirements to Imperial, it was thought that they would be able to obtain very competitive prices in specific specialist areas.

49. Responding to Dr. Wilbraham’s query, the Rector said that the intake of overseas students into the first year had increased significantly in each of the last few years. Even if the number of new students remained constant, there would be an inevitable accumulator effect as last year’s freshers moved into the next year. Overall, he said, overseas students made up about 25% of the student body. Dr. Knight agreed and noted that overseas student fees provided about £47M of the College’s income. This was about the same as the HEFCE teaching grant for the other 75% of the student population.

50. Turning to consider the working capital position, Dr. Knight said that this was not all due to unbilled research costs, as the collection of student fees and capital costs also contributed to the College’s cash position. As he had already noted, there was a team within the Finance Division that had been charged with addressing this issue. The intention was to develop a system that would identify any significant delays in invoicing or debt collection and then address these once they had been identified. He agreed that it would not be possible to reduce unbilled costs to zero, but the target was to reduce it to 40% of each quarter’s research volume. Mr. Newsum asked if a change to the College’s contracts with its research funders would help to achieve this. Dr. Knight said that the funding bodies had standard contracts with which the College had to comply. Although the Finance Division was seeking to address this as a priority, Dr. Knight pointed out that the College had made significant improvements in debt collection in recent years and its debtor book was much better than it had been five years ago.

51. Sir Peter Gershon noted that some of the College’s new IT systems were still causing problems and that these therefore presented a risk in achieving the proposed budget. He asked if the systemic problems with Oracle Grants would be overcome. Dr. Knight said that Oracle Grants was a very complex system and that, although the College had experienced some teething problems with it, these were much less than other users such as Oxford University. He could not give a categorical assurance that the problems would be overcome as the College was constantly seeking improvements to the system and periodically would have to install new releases. The Rector commented that the College had a very good relationship with Oracle and that they worked very closely with the College to overcome any problems and also to identify improvements. He also stressed that this was a much more complicated system than any used in business, and that the College was constantly seeking to
52. Returning to the issue of the budgeting process, Professor King agreed with Dr. Knight’s observations but said that this whole area was being reviewed and she expected that more attention would be paid to the planning element in future. Because Departments, which had been the focus of most planning and budgeting activity in the past, had limited financial support it was inevitable that Heads had concentrated on their budgets. The faculty structure would now provide more professional support, which should enable the Principals and their Heads to concentrate more on the planning side. Professor Kitney said that Departments prepared their plans carefully, only to find that their planning round meetings tended to be concerned primarily with budgeting issues, which was frustrating. He therefore welcomed the proposed changes to this process.

53. The Chairman remarked that public expenditure discussions in Whitehall were predicated on a three-year planning process. This recognised that it was not always possible to plan and implement a new initiative within a single year and the three-year timescale allowed for planning in Year One, with delivery in Years Two or Three. Such a process might be considered by the College. The Rector said that the biggest constraint on longer term planning was that the Government only provided funding on an annual basis. One of the reasons for the College to reduce its reliance on Government funding was to provide it with the freedom to plan over a longer period.

Resolved: That the College Budget for 2005-06, as set out in Paper J, be approved.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT (PAPER K)

54. Introducing Paper K, the Chairman said that the main issues for the Council to note were set out in Paragraph 8 of the Paper. In particular, he agreed with the proposal to negotiate an additional facility of £50M provided that the total borrowing would not exceed £100M without further consideration by the Council.

55. The Council endorsed the proposals contained in the Paper. Dr. Wilbraham suggested that the treasury rules of engagement being prepared by the Finance Division should be put before the Council once they had been finalised. However, if this would cause an undue delay in their introduction, they should be implemented by Finance as soon as they were available and presented to the Council for information as soon as was practicable thereafter. The Chief Finance Officer agreed to do this.

56. Sir Peter Gershon noted that he would be content for the College’s borrowings to increase if this was caused by additional capital expenditure, but would be rather less keen on any increase cause by increased unbilled research costs. However, as this would have to come back to the Council, the reasons for any such increased borrowing requirement could be explored at the appropriate time.

WYE COLLEGE FOUNDATION TRUST FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (PAPER L)

57. The Clerk presented Paper L and asked the Council to approve the Financial Statements of the Wye College Foundation Trust, for which the Council acted as Trustees.
Resolved:

(i) That the Wye College Foundation Trust Financial Statements for the year ended 31st July 2004, as set out in Paper L, be approved.

(ii) That responsibility for the preparation and approval of the Wye College Foundation Trust be delegated to the Wye College Foundation Trust Management Committee.

IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION FINANCIAL STATEMENTS 2003-04 (PAPER M)

58. Paper M was received for information.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION (PAPER N)

59. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Arif, presented Paper N, which was received by Governors for information.

ANNUAL REPORT ON HEALTH AND SAFETY (PAPER O)

60. The Clerk presented Paper O and noted that it had already been considered by the Audit Committee, which had made a number of detailed comments and recommendations that would be picked up by the new Health and Safety Management Committee in the next academic year.

61. Mr. Roche said that the Audit Committee had recognised that the College’s health and safety management structure was in a transitional phase at present, but that it would expect the Annual Report to include a more detailed review of health and safety performance in future years. He concurred with the other comments made by the Committee as set out in the Paper. He then reminded Governors that the former Health and Safety Audit Committee in its final report to the Council had highlighted that leadership by Heads of Department would be a key factor in improving the College’s performance. At present, he said, not all of the Heads demonstrated a real understanding of their responsibilities in this regard and he thought a key task for the Health and Safety Management Committee would be to inform and educate them in this respect.

ANNUAL REPORT BY THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE (PAPER P)

62. The Rector introduced Paper P, the second annual report from the College’s Equal Opportunities and Diversity Committee. The Report had already been considered by the Management Board, which had accepted the Committee’s recommendations.

63. Mr. Gidoomal welcomed the Report and said it was very encouraging to see the significant effort that the College was putting towards the equality and diversity agenda. The Council concurred and noted the major actions planned for 2005-06. In relation to this, the Chairman observed that the House of Lords and the Commons were proposing to establish a joint all-party committee which would consider how to encourage more women to participate in science.
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SENATE REPORT (PAPER Q)

64. Paper Q was received for information.

CLERK’S BUSINESS

Proposed Amendments to Academic Regulations (Paper R)

65. The Clerk introduced Paper R and said that the proposed amendments to the Academic Regulations and to the Regulations for Students had been recommended for approval by the Senate.

Resolved: That the amendments to the Academic Regulations and to the Regulations for Students, as set out in Paper R, be approved.

Proposed Amendments to the Imperial College Union’s Constitution (Paper S)

66. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Arif, introduced Paper S. The Union’s review of its Constitution, which he had reported on at an earlier meeting of the Council, had now been completed and a number of changes to the Constitution had been proposed. Although the changes to the Constitution had been approved by two consecutive Meetings of the Union Council, as required by the Constitution, the proposed changes to the Financial Regulations had not. The Union Council had therefore asked the Council to consider suspending this requirement to allow these revised Regulations to take effect in time for the next academic year.

Resolved: (i) That Article 20 of the Imperial College Union’s Constitution concerning the requirement for amendments to the Regulations to be approved at successive meetings of the Union Council be suspended with regard to the regulatory amendments contained in Paper S.

(ii) That the amendments to the Imperial College Union Constitution and Regulations, as set out in Paper S, be approved.

NEXT MEETING

67. The Clerk reminded the Council that its next Meeting was scheduled for 23rd September and that this would also be the Council’s Away Day. It was currently proposed that this would take place at the Silwood Park Campus and that there would therefore be opportunities for members also to visit the Reactor Centre, the CABI Building and the Technology Transfer Unit and to see some of the other research facilities at the Campus, such as the Ecotron. Members were asked to keep the entire day clear in their diaries.
ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman’s Action

68. The Clerk reminded Governors that there would be a few items requiring approval before the next Meeting of the Council, such as the Annual Operating Statement, which would have to be submitted to the HEFCE before the end of the month. In previous years this had been handled by the Vacation Powers Committee. However, as this had now been disbanded, these issues would be dealt with by Chairman’s action in line with the procedures set down in Regulation A11 - *Reserved Areas of Business and the Delegation of Powers of the Council*.

Honorary Degrees and Fellowships

69. The Chairman reminded Governors that one of the recommendations made by Dr. Buttle in her governance review was that two lay members of the Council should join the Management Board meeting at which it discussed recommendations for the award of Honorary Degrees and Fellowships. This Meeting would be taking place on Friday 21st October and the Chairman proposed that Dr. Buttle and Sir Peter Gershon should represent the Council at it. Dr. Buttle and Sir Peter Gershon agreed to check whether they would be able to attend the Meeting.

Valete

70. The Chairman noted that, as Mr. Arif’s period of office as President of the Imperial College Union was due to expire at the end of the month, this would be his last Meeting as a member of the Council. On behalf of Governors the Chairman thanked Mr. Arif for the considerable contribution he had made to the work of the Council during his two years as ICU President; he also expressed his personal thanks to Mr. Arif for much help and advice during his own early months in office.
PAPER A

STAFF MATTERS

A Note by the Rector

CHANGE IN NAME FOR DIVISION

The Division of Primary Care & Population Health Sciences has changed its name to the Division of Epidemiology, Public Health and Primary Care.

HONOURS

Professor Peter KNIGHT, FRS, Head of the Department of Physics has been awarded a Knighthood for services to optical physics in the Queen’s Birthday Honours List 2005.

Professor Gordon CONWAY, FRS, part-time Professor of International Development in the Division of Environmental Sciences, has been appointed a Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George for services to international development, science and agriculture in the Queen’s Birthday Honours List 2005.

FELLOW OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY

Professor James BARBER, Ernst Chain Professor of Biochemistry, in the Department of Biological Sciences has been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society.

PROFESSORS

Professor John Robert BESSANT, currently Professor of Innovation Management, School of Management, at Cranfield University, has been appointed to the Chair in Innovation Management in the Tanaka Business School with effect from 1 September 2005.

Professor Johannes Jacobus le Roux CILLIERS, currently Professor of Chemical Engineering at the School of Chemical Engineering and Analytical Science, at the University of Manchester, has been appointed to the Chair in Mineral Processing in the Department of Earth Science and Engineering with effect from 1 September 2005.

Dr Alessio CORTI, currently Reader in Algebraic Geometry, DPMMS, at the University of Cambridge, has been appointed to the Chair in Pure Mathematics in the Department of Mathematics with effect from 1 October 2005.

Professor Maria PETROU, FREng, currently Professor of Image Analysis in the School of Electronic Engineering, Information Technology and Mathematics at the University of Surrey, has been appointed to the Chair in Signal Processing in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering with effect from 1 September 2005.
VISITING PROFESSORS

Mr Duncan BOTTING, Head of Technology and Business Development in the Power Technologies at ABB (UK) Ltd., has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering from 23 May 2005 for a period of three years.

Professor Sir Michael BRADY, FRS, FREng, FIEE, FInstP, FBCS, BP Professor of Information Engineering at Oxford University, has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering from 7 June 2005 for a period of three years.

Dr Tom KEAN, Principal Consultant at Algotronix Ltd., has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering from 1 June 2005 for a period of three years.

Professor Peter NAGY, Herman Schneider Professor in the Department of Aerospace Engineering and Engineering Mechanics at the University of Cincinnati, has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering from 1 May 2005 for a period of four years.

Professor Winston Wen-Young WONG, Founder and Chairman of Grace THW Group and Chief Executive of the Grace Semi-Conductor Manufacturing Corporation of China, has been offered association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Institute of Biomedical Engineering from 1 April 2005 for a period of five years.
1. The Faculty of Life Sciences has been engaged in a major academic restructuring programme, as has been outlined to the Council and reported to the Management Board during this academic year.

2. The restructuring was precipitated by the precarious financial position of the Faculty and this has been made clear at all stages of the process. Following the approval by Management Board, the process has proceeded. In July 2004 the Management Board received proposals (MB 03-04/103) from the Deputy Rector (LB) and the Chief Co-ordinating Officer (JTG) to deal with the Faculty's untenable financial position; it agreed that:

   a. Wye should be recognised as a commitment to be funded by the College quite separately from the process of restoring the Faculty to viability.

   b. Leaving Wye aside, the financial requirement was that the Faculty should reduce its expenditure by some £1.6M per annum, which translated into the loss of about 30 academic posts, or some 15-20% of the Faculty’s academic staff, together with associated support staff.

   c. The Faculty should retain the vote funding already committed to it in the recent Planning Round for the years 2004/05 through 2007/08 in order to create the stability required to achieve self-sustainability through vote and overheads within 5 years.

   d. The Division of Biomedical Sciences should move across into the restructured Faculty of Life Sciences.

   e. The College recognises Environmental Sciences (in the broadest sense) as an area in which Imperial should be prominent (both in order to be attractive to recruiting students as well as responding to funding opportunities) and one which should span across all faculties.

   f. The College accepts that some units (e.g. around successful MSc courses) should exist as teaching only cost-centres, the justification for which will exist solely on the financial balance between vote/fees and costs.

   g. That in order to recover financial balance, some 30 or so academic posts would need to be lost with a commensurate number of support posts.

3. Since then a number of developments have been achieved:

   a. A new divisional structure for the Faculty has been defined for the natural science components (new Divisions of Biology, Molecular Biosciences, Cell & Molecular Biology will operate from 1st August 2005).

   b. Appropriate science components of the Department of Agricultural Sciences (DAS) have been restructured into these new Divisions.
c. The Division of Biomedical Sciences (BMS) from the Faculty of Medicine will join the above scientific divisions in the Faculty from 1st August 2005.

d. The comparative biology elements of DAS will move into BMS from 1st August 2005.

e. 11 staff have signed compromise agreements effective from 30th September 2005 and 3 more are at a late stage in negotiation; some have buy-back options (usually for around 20%, sometimes 40%) in order to deliver the teaching of the science based courses which are running out in DAS over the next 2 years.

f. New organisational structures, including Campus Deans and a Faculty Teaching Office (to support the organisation of teaching across the Faculty), have been implemented enabling significant achievements in terms of utilising buildings, concentrating resource and facilitating change.

g. A committee structure (academic and administrative) is now bedded down.

4. As reported to Management Board in December 2004, it became clear early on that a new model for the non-natural science elements of DAS and for the Department of Environmental Sciences & Technology (DEST) would take longer to achieve. Accordingly the restructuring process for the whole Faculty was split into two distinct parts, the natural science elements (referred to above and which have now been completed) and the remaining activities. The staff and Unions had a number of presentations and roadshows to explain this. It remains to deal with the other parts.

5. Since late last year a number of models for these remaining activities have been developed by Professor Waage in consultation with Professor Sir Gordon Conway. These have come forward in turn for consultation and have been shared with staff (and Unions), both within the Faculty and more widely throughout the College. A number of models have been proposed which can be evaluated against the guidelines set out by Management Board, namely:

   a. That the Applied Business Management (ABM) course, on its own, is not an activity the College would support.

   b. That some teaching elements (e.g. the MSc in DEST) would be supported if it were financially self-sustaining.

   c. That Imperial must in the medium term have a significant presence in Environmental Science.

6. As a result of the first round of consultations the concept of creating a new Division of Environmental Sciences was found to be unachievable, both with respect to these guidelines and also in financial and academic terms. Subsequently the concept of a Centre for Environmental Policy was developed, recognising that it could include staff teaching the MSc (some of whom had some research contribution) but drawing on other staff who would be embedded in faculties – this would be consistent with the Management Board’s view that environment should span all faculties.

7. However, the core problem with all structures which have been modelled is that, no matter how one reconfigures the current staff, there is not sufficient current research expertise to provide additional income to a unit which, alongside teaching income retained from the
MSc, will make the unit viable. This remains the core of the problem, and is no different now than when grades of 4 were attributed to these groups in the last RAE.

8. A consequence of this is that no model creates a unit which, on the one hand has sufficient staff to teach courses within it but on the other hand has sufficient core to be an adequate nucleus on which to build a financially sustainable 5* unit over the next 5-10 years.

9. The Management Board considered three proposed options and agreed to:

“the formation of a Centre for Environmental Policy, (which) represented the only acceptable way forward and should be pursued with as much support from the rest of the College as possible. In particular, while the Faculty of Life Sciences should lead on the recruitment of the Head of the new Centre, the other Faculty Principals should be involved, as appropriate, both in this and the development of a Council for the Environment based on the MIT model.” [MB 04-05/32]

**CURRENT POSITION**

10. A full consultation with the AUT and staff representatives was held on 15 June and a staff briefing document distributed (Annex A).

11. The Deputy Rector has held staff meetings at the South Kensington, Silwood Park and Wye Campuses on 15 and 16 June 2005 (Annex B).

12. Following the presentations, all members of academic staff in the Faculty, including each affected member of staff from the group previously identified as DEST, received a personal letter identifying their own position in the new structure and inviting them to meet to discuss options.

13. As indicated in the presentation (Annex B), preliminary discussions have been held with the University of Kent concerning the long-term future of the Applied Business Management Course based at the Wye Campus to ensure our ability to deliver this Course to the quality required. This is to ensure that we can honour our commitment to students who have been admitted to the Course as well as maintaining long-term opportunities to Faculty of Life Sciences staff delivering it. The results of these discussions will ultimately be considered by the Management Board and Senate and will be presented to the Council at a future meeting.

14. These actions bring to a close the re-structuring of academic staff in the Faculty of Life Sciences, but, as indicated in presentations to staff (Annex B), the Faculty is proceeding with the restructuring of support and technical staff, as previously agreed.

L.K.B.
1. Background

Since July 2004 the College has been consulting on proposals to restructure the Faculty of
Life Sciences in order to address the untenable financial position.

The Management Board set parameters for the Faculty of Life Sciences as follows:

- Wye should be recognised as a commitment to be funded by the College quite
  separately from the process of restoring the Faculty to viability.

- Leaving Wye aside, the financial requirement was that the Faculty should reduce its
  expenditure by some £1.6M per annum, which translated into the loss of about 30
  academic posts, or some 15-20% of the Faculty’s academic staff, together with
  associated support staff.

- The Faculty should retain the vote funding already committed to it in the recent
  Planning Round for the years 2004-05 through 2007-08 in order to create the stability
  required to achieve self-sustainability through vote and overheads within 5 years.

- The Division of Biomedical Sciences should move across into the restructured Faculty
  of Life Sciences.

- The College recognises Environmental Sciences (in the broadest sense) as an area in
  which Imperial should be prominent (both in order to be attractive to recruiting students
  as well as responding to funding opportunities) and one which should span across all
  faculties.

- The College accepts that some units (e.g. around successful MSc courses) should
  exist as teaching only cost-centres, the justification for which will exist solely on the
  financial balance between vote/fees and costs.

- That in order to recover financial balance, some 30 or so academic posts would need
to be lost with a commensurate number of support posts.

2. Progress to date

Structure for Faculty of Life Sciences

New organisational structures including Campus Deans and a faculty teaching office (to
support the organisation of teaching across the faculty) have been implemented enabling
significant achievements in terms of utilising buildings, concentrating resource and facilitating
change. A committee structure (academic and administrative) is now in place.

Campus Deans  
Silwood  Mike Hassell  
South Kensington  Maggie Dallman  
Wye  Mike Jeger
Natural Sciences

Consultation on proposed structures has been extensive and a number of models considered. The position on natural science components was clarified early on in the consultation process and a new divisional structure for the faculty has been defined for these components. The new Divisions of Biology, Molecular Biosciences, Cell & Molecular Biology will operate from 1st August 2005 and appropriate science components of the Department of Agricultural Sciences (DAS) have been restructured into these new divisions.

It has also been agreed that the Division of Biomedical Sciences (BMS) from the Faculty of Medicine will join the above scientific divisions in the Faculty from 1st August 2005 and that the comparative biology elements of DAS will move into BMS from the same date.

**Biology** led by Charles Godfray
- Plant & Microbial sciences
- Ecology and evolution
- Plant sciences
- Centre for Population Biology

**Molecular Biosciences** led by Paul Freemont
- Membrane structural biology
- Biomolecular structure & function
- Centre for Bioinformatics
- Centre for Structural Biology
- Glycobiology

**Cellular & Molecular Biology** led by Murray Selkirk
- Immunology & infection
- Molecular cell biology
- CMMI
- Biophysics

**Biomedical Sciences** led by John Couchman
- BMS
- Comparative Biology components of animal sciences

Environmental Sciences

Consultation on the non-natural science elements of DAS and for the Department of Environmental Sciences & Technology (DEST) has taken longer. The Management Board set guidelines for this area as follows:

- That the ABM course, on its own, is not an activity the College would support
- That some teaching elements (e.g. the MSc in DEST) would be supported if it were financially self-sustaining
- That Imperial must in the medium term have a significant presence in Environmental Science
Professor Waage, in consultation with Professor Conway, developed a number of models for consideration. These models were consulted upon widely. As a result of the first round of consultations the concept of creating a new division of Environmental Sciences was found to be unachievable both in financial and academic terms. There was a desire to continue with a Faculty / cross Faculty focus on specific environmental issues, for example energy and climate change, and acceptance that a broader perspective was important. Subsequently the concept of a Centre for Environmental Policy was developed, recognising that it could include staff teaching the MSc. Some of the MSc staff would contribute to the research but the Centre would also draw on other staff who would be embedded in faculties – this was consistent with the Management Board’s view that environment should span all faculties.

However the core problem with all structures that were modelled were that none created a unit with sufficient staff to teach courses and provide the basis on which to build a financially sustainable 5* unit over the next 5-10 years.

On 3rd June the Management Board considered the various options in detail and made the following decisions:

- ABM & Distance Learning Programme courses will continue
  - Discussions with University of Kent about long-term interaction with Imperial will be progressed (including ABM)
  - These have been positive:
    - Heads of terms by end of June 2005
    - Course will continue co-branded with University of Kent
    - Discussions with staff during the next week with the expectation of proceeding to an integration of the whole group into this programme for September 2005.
  - DLP remains with Imperial (in Centre for Environmental Policy) as a University of London activity (and as a separate cost centre) and a continued involvement in the ABM course.

- A Centre for Environmental Policy will be formed
  - To organise and deliver the MSc
  - Which has a non-laboratory based research component
  - Whose goal is to grow the research component into a 5* activity

**Financial impact for Centre for Environmental Policy**

The figures include research income generated by the staff retained, and recognise the substantial service teaching which will be credited to other faculties. Variants on scoring the research as RAE4 (its current score) or counting it as 5 are set out;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of students</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) (RAE 4)</td>
<td>(60K)</td>
<td>(219K)</td>
<td>(219K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) (RAE 5)</td>
<td>305K</td>
<td>177K</td>
<td>177K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on staff**

On Friday 17th June all academic staff in DEST, DBS and DAS will be contacted and informed of their individual position following the restructure. This will advise that either:
their position is moving to the Centre for Environmental Policy or to one of the new Divisions
- that their position is unchanged but subsequently their activity may move to the University of Kent
- that their position is at risk of redundancy.

What happens next?

All those remaining staff considered at risk of redundancy will be contacted by Human Resources and invited to an individual meeting to discuss the implications for them personally. This meeting will also discuss any voluntary severance package that may be available. The closing date by which to accept voluntary severance packages will be 1st August 2005.

In the event that voluntary severance agreements cannot be reached with those academic staff at risk of redundancy then Council will convene a redundancy committee under the College Statutes to review the requirement for compulsory redundancies.

The College regrets that it has taken many months to review and fully explore the various options for the new structure for Life Sciences. The College recognises that this has been an extremely difficult time for staff and that support should be provided to those staff remaining and those staff leaving as they prepare for the future.

The College has been in discussions with outplacement support, staff development, pension and financial planners and the facilities offered by Care First to put together a programme of support for staff within Life Sciences. Details of these events will be published within the next few days.

Who to contact?

For any questions on the new structure please contact:

Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz
l.borysiewicz@imperial.ac.uk

For any questions on redundancy matters please contact:

Louise Lindsay, Head of HR Operations,
l.lindsay@imperial.ac.uk
Financial performance (£K)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Deficits (£K)</th>
<th>Real Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>19,483</td>
<td>(700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>18,046</td>
<td>(900)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>17,437</td>
<td>(1,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>15,151</td>
<td>(3,627)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>16,007</td>
<td>(3,163)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>17,184</td>
<td>(2,347)</td>
<td><strong>£4.4M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This **after** additional support outside vote (SIF etc):

- (1,000)
- (1,900)
- (3,200)

Predicted carried forward balance of (£11.6M) at end 06/07

- DAS contributes between £1.5M and £2.0M p.a. to the above deficits
- The above figures include a recovery plan from DAS, based on student number increases.
July 04: Management Board set parameters for FoLS

- Wye recognised as a commitment funded by College quite separately from the process of restoring the Faculty to viability
- Leaving Wye aside, Faculty should reduce expenditure by some £1.6M per annum.
- FoLS should retain the vote funding committed to it in Planning Round for the years 2004-05 through 2007-08 to create stability and to achieve self-sustainability within 5 years.
- Division of Biomedical Sciences should move across into the restructured FoLS
- College recognises Environmental Sciences as an area in which Imperial should be prominent and spanning across all faculties
  - in order to be attractive to students
  - to respond to funding opportunities
- College accepts that some units (e.g. around successful MSc courses) should exist as teaching only cost-centres
- To recover financial balance, some 30 or so academic posts would need to be lost with a commensurate number of support posts

Progress up to Dec 2004

- New divisional structure defined for natural science components to operate from 1 August 2005.
- Appropriate science components of DAS restructured into these new Divisions.
- Division of Biomedical Sciences in Faculty of Medicine to join the Faculty from 1 August 2005
- Comparative biology elements of DAS move into BMS from 1 August 2005
- New organisational structures including Campus Deans and a Faculty Teaching Office
- A Committee structure (academic and administrative) bedded down.
Where we were in January

FoLS Division A: (n = 44)
- Plant & microbial sciences
- Ecology & evolution
- Plant Sciences
- Centre for Population Biology

FoLS Division B: (n = 17)
- Membrane structural biology
- Biomolecular structure & function
- Centre for Bioinformatics
- Centre for Structural Biology
- Glycobiology (?Centre)

FoLS Division C: (n = 30)
- Immunology & infection
- Molecular cell biology
- CMMI
- Biophysics

FoLS Division D: (n = 30)
- BMS

FoLS Division of Environmental Science (n=48)
- AEBM
- EPSRG, EPMG, RRAG

Comparative Biology (with CBS) with FoM

Key: DAS DBS BMS DEST

to include components of Animal sciences (6)

Natural Sciences restructured

Biology
- Plant & microbial sciences
- Ecology & evolution
- Plant Sciences
- Centre for Population Biology

Molecular Biosciences
- Membrane structural biology
- Biomolecular structure & function
- Centre for Bioinformatics
- Centre for Structural Biology
- Glycobiology

Cellular & Molecular Biology
- Immunology & infection
- Molecular cell biology
- CMMI
- Biophysics

Biomedical Sciences
- BMS
- Comparative Biology components of Animal sciences

FoLS Division of Environmental Science (n=48)
- AEBM
- EPSRG, EPMG, RRAG

Key: DAS DBS BMS DEST
Management Board guidelines on Environmental Sciences

- ABM is at risk of becoming an isolated educational activity and while commitment to students continues, its long-term (5yrs+) viability must be questioned
- Some teaching elements (e.g. MSc in DEST) supported if financially self-sustaining - but mission of research-lead education
- Imperial must have an increasing and visible presence in Environmental Sciences

Jan-April 2005: College-wide consideration of this model

- Disagreement with a proposed Division of Environmental Sciences – even within the Faculty of Life Sciences
- Desire to continue with a Faculty/cross-Faculty focus on specific environmental issues e.g. energy, climate change
- Recognition of strengths in Environment in all Faculties
- Acceptance that a broad perspective in environmental science is important
- A desire to re-focus the MSc
Additional input following visit to MIT

- Economics and Policy are important elements that are required for a wider acceptance of the science being pursued.
- These disciplines are best managed within their own peer-group and not embedded in the main science programme intellectually i.e. economics as a discipline collaborating with climate change as a discipline.
- Economics and policy can be successfully introduced into an ‘Imperial-like culture’

Proposed Model (based on Waage and Conway)
Why a Centre and not a Division?

- Centres are created with a defined role and purpose established between the responsible Faculty and the Centre Director.
- Faculty commits to ensure stability for a period to enable these shared goals to be achieved.
- No reduction in Centre representation at Faculty level.

Management Board decision on environmental sciences

- ABM & Distance Learning Programme courses will continue.
  - Discussions with University of Kent about long-term interaction with Imperial will be progressed (including ABM).
  - These have been positive:
    - Heads of terms by end of June 2005
    - Course will continue co-branded with University of Kent
    - Discussions with staff during the next week with the expectation of proceeding to an integration of the whole group into this programme for September 2005.
  - DLP remains with Imperial (in Centre for Environmental Policy) as a University of London activity (and as a separate cost centre) and a continued involvement in the ABM course.
Management Board decision on environmental sciences

- A Centre for Environmental Policy will be formed
  - To organise and deliver the MSc in Environmental Technology
  - Which has a non-laboratory based research component
  - Whose goal is to grow the research component into a 5* equivalent activity

Where we will be on 1 August 2005

Biology
- Plant & microbial sciences
- Ecology & evolution
- Plant Sciences
- Centre for Population Biology

Molecular Biosciences
- Membrane structural biology
- Biomolecular structure & function
- Centre for Bioinformatics
- Centre for Structural Biology
- Glycobiology

Cellular & Molecular Biology
- Immunology & infection
- Molecular cell biology
- CMMI
- Biophysics

Biomedical Sciences
- BMS
- Comparative Biology components of Animal sciences

Centre for Environmental Policy

Activities which FoLS will not support
- Laboratory sciences in Centre for Environmental Policy

Key: DAS  DBS  BMS  DEST
What happens next?

- All staff will receive details of their place in the new divisions
- Centre for Environmental Policy will house the MSc and international development unit with DLP. 15 academic staff will be moved into the Centre to take responsibility for providing these courses.
  - These staff will be responsible for developing the Centre and the research into a 5* activity
- Staff at risk of redundancy will be invited to an individual meeting to discuss the implications for them personally and to discuss any voluntary severance package that may be available.
  - Closing date by which to accept voluntary severance packages will be 1 August 2005
- Performance management process introduced throughout the Faculty

Support for staff during restructuring

- College organising outplacement support, staff development, pension and financial planners
- Practical advice offered by Care First in a programme of support for staff within Life Sciences
- Will come to each campus on a range of dates
- You will be advised as to these facilities and events and we’ll look to use the FoLS Intranet
New leaders in Faculty of Life Sciences

- Biology - Charles Godfray
- Molecular Biosciences - Paul Freemont
- Cellular and Molecular Biology - Murray Selkirk
- Biomedical Sciences – John Couchman
- Centre for Environmental Policy – leader TBA

- Campus Deans appointed for each of the Faculty’s campuses:
  - Silwood campus - Professor Mike Hassell
  - South Kensington campus - Professor Maggie Dallman
  - Wye campus – Professor Mike Jeger

The future of the Faculty of Life Sciences

- This major restructuring underpins future developments within the Faculty
- The financial commitment from College will allow investment in key strategic areas
- Vic Seddon, Faculty Operating Officer, in place. He will implement the new administrative structures
- New Principal interviews already at an advanced stage
- Meetings with PG students who may be affected and have particular anxieties, at GSLSM and DAS poster days in early July
Who to contact?

- For questions on the new structure please contact Leszek Borysiewicz
  – l.borysiewicz@imperial.ac.uk
- For questions on redundancy matters please contact Louise Lindsay, HR
  – l.lindsay@imperial.ac.uk
- Support information on FoLS Intranet
- These slides on Intranet on Thursday PM

Thank You

Now, your questions
1. Periodically, the University of London reviews itself, the last such examination being ten years ago. The current Vice-Chancellor (Sir Graeme Davies) recently started the process again and issued a consultation document on 'The Future for the Federal University' [link](http://www.lon.ac.uk/About_Us/Vice-Chancellor/consult.asp).

2. The central University performs two functions. The largest is the supply of services to some of the constituent Colleges, e.g. IT, HR and finance, the nationally important Senate House Library, intercollegiate halls of residence, etc. These services cost about £30M p.a. to deliver. The central University’s academic function is almost entirely vestigial. Apart from the small School of Advanced Studies, no real academic responsibility remains for the Colleges’ teaching and research.

3. The Vice-Chancellor’s consultation document is predicated on the University continuing to exist in much its current form and seeks views on how the University “can be strengthened to the benefit of the colleges and their students”. Some other HE institutions in London might like to join the federation and the consultation also asked for views about expansion. Apart from this central consultation, a number of related specific reviews are also being undertaken – of administrative services, student services and the external (distance learning) programme.

4. The Provost of University College issued his own discussion document simultaneously with the Vice-Chancellor’s [link](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/feature/newsitem.shtml?londonfuture). This Paper asked far more radical questions than the Vice-Chancellor and questioned whether the University had any role in the future. It proposed that the University be restructured or dissolved, with the opportunity for some of the smaller Colleges to come together in merged clusters centred on the four large Colleges (UCL, Imperial, QM and Kings) in geographic quadrants of London.

5. Imperial’s response to the Vice-Chancellor is attached at Annex A. The consultation is now closed. Almost all of the responses criticised the central University for its anachronistic governance, inefficiency, and cost, though only UCL and ourselves suggested that dissolution would be a suitable solution. At LSE there was “little enthusiasm for the University” though it stopped short of recommending dissolution, mainly because of the effort required in apportioning assets. Most other Colleges valued the brand name of the University and recommended a fundamental review of its centrally provided services and governance.

6. It therefore seems unlikely that dissolution will be supported. We need to decide on how to proceed given the continued existence and cost of the current federation, even if a radical restructuring of its governance were agreed.

7. We have our own degree awarding powers but, up to now, have not invoked them. Recent changes to the Ordinances of the University of London appear to allow Colleges to award their own degrees, subject to approval by Heads of Colleges’ Committee and the University’s Council, yet remain within the federation. Legal advice is being taken to confirm whether it is as simple as it appears. One option, clearly, would be to begin the process leading to the award of our own degrees to our students.

8. An internal consultation could be begun and Senate asked to advise the Council at its December meeting. Because of the need to announce any change, if agreed, in the prospectus, the first cohort of students that could be awarded Imperial degrees would be those who entered in October 2007.
THE FUTURE FOR THE FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

VICE-CHANCELLOR’S CONSULTATION OF FEBRUARY 2005

Response from Imperial College London

Imperial College has for long been disinterested in the federal university of London. Since the early 1950s, it has enjoyed a direct relationship with the government’s funding agency and has not had to rely on the central university for any of its financial support. This, together with its relative geographic distance from Senate House, has led to disengagement with the university except for a few student related areas.

The strength of the College is such that it does not derive any academic or reputational benefit from its membership of the university. The College is self-governing and self-reliant and the central university plays no part in its decisions. The College makes no reference to the university in most of its publications, notepaper or web sites. The university adds nothing to the College’s academic brand; indeed the reverse is likely to be true – the university brand is strengthened by the reputation of its leading colleges.

The College collaborates with a very large number of institutions including, of course, other colleges of the university. Indeed, the largest number of research collaborations is with UCL. Several teaching links exist with institutions in London, both with members of the University and those which are not (such as the Royal College of Music and Royal College of Art). Joint degrees are offered with these bodies, so the convenience of a single university degree is not necessary for successful teaching collaboration. The single common factor about all of these collaborations, both teaching and research, is that none of them was mediated by the central university. It is instructive to note that in all of the College’s recent mergers the central university was simply informed of progress rather than involved in any of the deliberations. Indeed, it would be difficult to conceive how the centre would be able to facilitate collaboration within the federal structure.

The College therefore concurs with the Provost of UCL’s analysis that the university has no continuing value in its current form. The university has the edifice and bureaucracy of a normal university but its deliberations have, rightly, little of no impact on this College. Imperial contributes about £K800 a year as a membership fee but receives very little in return. The College has its own degree awarding powers (as yet unused) and it might be thought strange that an institution which many consider to be in the top three in the UK and the top 10-20 in the world, does not award its own degrees.

The College believes that small adjustments to the university’s structure, governance or efficiency are unlikely to address the fundamental issue of its academic irrelevance to most of the constituent colleges. A new order needs to recognise this rather than rely on the illusion of unity offered by the current arrangements and ‘University’ name. This College would, therefore, support a radical re-structuring or dissolution, subject to various safeguards which would need to be negotiated. Any reconfiguration that might follow, for those colleges which wished to pursue such an option, would provide meaningful academic synergies within single management structures.

IMPERIAL COLLEGE
8 April 2005
PAPER D

AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON’S STATUTES
REVISED MODEL STATUTE

A Note by the Clerk

INTRODUCTION

1. Governors are reminded that in early June they were asked to give their consent in writing to proposed amendments to the University of London’s Statutes. The purpose of this Paper is to advise Governors of the outcome of the request to pass a Resolution by correspondence and also to ensure that their decision is formally recorded in the Council’s Minutes.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY’S STATUTES

2. In common with the other Chartered Universities, the College’s disciplinary, dismissal and grievance procedures for academic staff are based on the so called ‘Model Statutes’. It has long been recognised that these procedures are unnecessarily complex and cumbersome, and a working group chaired by the former Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, Professor Graham Zellick, was therefore established to prepare new procedures to promote the speedy and effective resolution of employment conflicts and facilitate the better management of staff and organisational change. In 2003 the Working Group produced a set of revised Model Statutes for institutions to consider, but the introduction of these new procedures is not a straightforward matter and it was therefore left up to individual universities to decide whether or not to adopt them.

3. One of the key points of the revised Statutes is that they provide for the detail of procedures to be developed by ordinance or regulation, thus offering an inherent flexibility which allows procedures to be tailored to each institution. However, it is vital that the procedures balance procedural efficiency with respect for employment rights. In particular, the Employment Act 2002 has introduced new statutory dismissal, disciplinary and grievance procedures and it is essential that regulations comply with these new rules to avoid claims for automatic unfair dismissal and increased compensation in employment tribunals. Before proposing any changes to the College’s own disciplinary procedures (which are contained in Appendix 1 to the College’s own Statutes) the HR Division is taking legal advice on the applicability of the revised Model to the College’s own position, as well as on the requirements for additional regulations and processes.

4. Although the College is still considering when and how to adopt any changes for itself, the University of London has decided to introduce revised Statutes in line with the model prepared by the Working Group.

5. The formal position is that the University Council, in March 2005, passed the first of two resolutions required by the University of London Act 1994 enabling it to effect these amendments. The University Council planned to pass the second resolution at its meeting on 29 June 2005. In order for it to do so, the Act required it to have obtained the consent of at least two-thirds in number of the constituent college governing bodies. As some of these governing bodies - including our own - were not due to meet again until after 29 June 2005, this requirement would have been impossible to meet unless their consent was obtained by
correspondence. Governors were therefore asked by letter to give their formal consent to
the University's proposals ahead of the University Council Meeting.

6. The case for the amendments, the outcome of consultations and the amendments
themselves are set out in the Report headed ‘Amendments to the University Statutes’, a
copy of which was circulated to members. For the avoidance of doubt, it should be stressed
that the proposed changes are applicable to the University’s Statutes only and will have no
effect on the College’s own Statutes or on its disciplinary procedures.

CONFIRMATION OF RESOLUTION

7. A majority of Council members responded in the affirmative to the proposed
resolution by the closing date of 21 June. The resolution was therefore deemed to have
been passed. In order to record this decision in the Minutes, which are the formal record of
the Council’s business, this Paper confirms that the Council of the Imperial College of
Science, Technology and Medicine passed the following resolution by correspondence in the
period between 6 June 2005 and 21 June 2005:

That this Council, being the governing body of Imperial College of Science,
Technology and Medicine, hereby consents to the making of new Statutes by
the University of London as proposed by the Council and as set out in the
document headed ‘Amendments to the University Statutes’.

K.A.M.
A Note by the Clerk

1. As members will be aware, in November last year the Committee of University Chairmen (CUC) published a revised and updated edition of their Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK (1). This incorporated much material (for instance, on risk management, governing body reviews of effectiveness and performance, the Audit Code of Practice, equal opportunities legislation, the quality assurance of teaching and learning, examples of good governance practice in UK universities, and so on) which, while not new in itself, had appeared since the previous edition of the Guide was published in 2001.

2. In his Foreword to the Guide the Chairman of CUC expressed the view that, if the higher education sector adopted the advances in good governance advocated by it, “we anticipate that Government, as one of the funders of the sector, will acknowledge that a lighter touch of regulation is now both appropriate and timely”.

3. Governors will recall that the first part of the Guide contains a “Governance Code of Practice” covering the role of higher education institutions’ (HEIs) governing bodies, their structures and processes and the regular effectiveness and performance reviews which it is recommended that they should carry out. This is a development of the code recommended by the Lambert Review and its text is at Annex A. From this it will be seen that the Code “is voluntary ……[However], Institutions should state that they have had regard to [it], and where an institution’s practices are not consistent with particular provisions of this Code an explanation shall be published in the corporate governance statement of the annual audited financial statements”.

4. HEFCE have subsequently stated (2) that:

"In HEFCE 2005/06, we proposed a new approach to the [Annual Monitoring Statement (AMS)]: that for those HEIs that adopt the CUC Governance code of practice (or intend to do so in the next 12 months) we would no longer require a report against individual activities and targets. We recognise that the code is voluntary and is intended to reflect good practice in a sector which comprises a large number of very diverse institutions. …… Institutions should inform us in the AMS template whether or not they have adopted the CUC Code. The new lighter touch AMS will apply to institutions that have subscribed (in full or in part) to the code. We will seek further information from those institutions that have not adopted the code (and are not planning to do so within the next 12 months) on a case by case basis.”

5. Although some of its requirements are open to a degree of interpretation, a review of the CUC Code indicates that the Council meets its requirements in all but the following two respects:

1. HEFCE 2004/40 and HEFCE 2004/40a

a. **Statement of Primary Responsibilities (Paragraphs 4 and 5).** The Council has not yet adopted a Statement of Primary Responsibilities. A 'model' example of such a Statement is provided in the *Guide* \(^{(3)}\) and the text is attached at Annex B. This, however, appears to be in some respects unduly prescriptive and in others to reserve to the governing body responsibilities which should properly be delegated to management. A revised version has therefore been drafted and is at Annex C for the Council's consideration.

b. **Nominations Committee (Paragraph 11).** The Nominations Committee has not, as yet, produced written descriptions of the role and the capabilities desirable in a new member of the Council. However, this omission can be readily rectified.

6. The AMS template issued by HEFCE requires the College to answer two specific questions related to the Code:

   a. "**Q36.** Have you adopted (or are you planning to adopt in the next 12 months) the CUC governance code of practice (HEFCE 2005/20, para 16)?

      (1) No, (2) Yes, in part or (3) Yes, in full."

   b. "**Q37.** If you wish to comment on the adoption of the CUC governance code of practice, please do so below."

7. The Management Board considered the HEFCE requirement at its meeting on 24 June 2005 and recommends that:

   a. The College’s response to Question 36 in the AMS template should be "(3) Yes, in full".

   b. The Council should:

      (1) Adopt the revised Statement of Primary Responsibilities at Annex C, or such variation of this as it sees fit.

      (2) Require the Nominations Committee to comply with the requirement for a written description of the role and the capabilities desirable in a new member of the Council

**DECISION REQUIRED**

8. The Council is invited to consider and, if it sees fit, agree the Management Board’s recommendations at Paragraph 7 above.

K.A.M.

---

**EXTRACT FROM THE CUC GUIDE FOR MEMBERS OF HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNING BODIES IN THE UK**

**Part I  Governance Code of Practice**

**Role of the Governing Body**

This Code is voluntary and is intended to reflect good practice in a sector which comprises a large number of very diverse institutions. Institutions should state that they have had regard to the Code, and where an institution’s practices are not consistent with particular provisions of this Code an explanation shall be published in the corporate governance statement of the annual audited financial statements.

1. Every higher education institution shall be headed by an effective governing body, which is unambiguously and collectively responsible for overseeing the institution’s activities, determining its future direction and fostering an environment in which the institutional mission is achieved and the potential of all learners is maximised. The governing body shall ensure compliance with the statutes, ordinances and provisions regulating the institution and its framework of governance and, subject to these, it shall take all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern to the institution.

2. Individual members and governing bodies themselves should at all times conduct themselves in accordance with accepted standards of behaviour in public life which embrace selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership.

3. The governing body shall meet sufficiently regularly, and normally not less than four times a year, in order to discharge its duties effectively. Members of the governing body shall attend regularly and actively participate.

4. The institution’s governing body shall adopt a Statement of Primary Responsibilities which should include provisions relating to:
   - approving the mission and strategic vision of the institution, long-term business plans, key performance indicators (KPIs) and annual budgets, and ensuring that these meet the interests of stakeholders
   - appointing the head of the institution as chief executive of the institution and putting in place suitable arrangements for monitoring his/her performance
   - ensuring the establishment and monitoring of systems of control and accountability, including financial and operational controls and risk assessment, clear procedures for handling internal grievances and for managing conflicts of interest
monitoring institutional performance against plans and approved KPIs, which
should be, where possible and appropriate, benchmarked against other institutions.

5. This Statement shall be published widely, including on the internet and in the annual
report, along with identification of key individuals (that is, chair, deputy chair, head of
the institution, and chairs of key committees) and a broad summary of the
responsibilities that the governing body delegates to management or those which are
derived directly from the instruments of governance.

6. All members should exercise their responsibilities in the interests of the institution as a
whole rather than as a representative of any constituency. The institution shall
maintain and publicly disclose a register of interests of members of the governing
body.

7. The chair shall be responsible for the leadership of the governing body, and be
ultimately responsible for its effectiveness. The chair shall ensure the institution is well
connected with its stakeholders.

8. The head of the institution shall be responsible for advice on strategic direction and for
the management of the institution, and shall be the accounting officer in respect of the
use of Funding Council funds. The head of the institution shall be accountable to the
governing body which shall make clear, and regularly review, the authority delegated
to him/her as chief executive, having regard also to that conferred directly by the
instruments of governance.

9. There should be a balance of skills and experience among members sufficient to
enable the governing body to meet its primary responsibilities and to ensure
stakeholder confidence. A governing body of no more than 25 members represents a
benchmark of good practice.

10. The governing body shall have a majority of independent members, defined as both
external and independent of the institution.

11. Appointments shall be managed by a nominations committee, normally chaired by the
chair of the governing body. To ensure rigorous and transparent procedures, the
nominations committee shall prepare written descriptions of the role and the
capabilities desirable in a new member, based on a full evaluation of the balance of
skills and experience of the governing body. When vacancies arise they should be
widely publicised both within and outside the institution. When selecting a new chair, a
full job specification should be produced, including an assessment of the time
commitment expected, recognising the need for availability at unexpected times.

12. The chair shall ensure that new members receive a full induction on joining the
governing body, that opportunities for further development for all members of the
governing body are provided regularly in accordance with their individual needs, and
that appropriate financial provision is made for support.

13. The secretary to the governing body shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with all procedures and ensuring that papers are supplied in a timely manner with information in a form and of a quality appropriate to enable the governing body to discharge its duties. All members shall have access to the advice and services of the secretary to the governing body, and the appointment and removal of the secretary shall be a decision of the governing body as a whole.

14. The proceedings of the governing body shall be conducted in as open a manner as possible, and information and papers restricted only when the wider interest of the institution or the public interest demands, including the observance of contractual obligations.

Effectiveness and Performance Reviews

15. The governing body shall keep its effectiveness under regular review. Not less than every five years it shall undertake a formal and rigorous evaluation of its own effectiveness, and that of its committees, and ensure that a parallel review is undertaken of the senate/academic board and its committees. Effectiveness shall be measured both against the Statement of Primary Responsibilities and compliance with this Code. The governing body shall revise its structure or processes accordingly.

16. In reviewing its performance, the governing body shall reflect on the performance of the institution as a whole in meeting long-term strategic objectives and short-term KPIs. Where possible, the governing body shall benchmark institutional performance against the KPIs of other comparable institutions.

17. The results of effectiveness reviews, as well as of the institution’s annual performance against KPIs, shall be published widely, including on the internet and in its annual report.
Model Statement of Primary Responsibilities

The principal responsibilities of the governing body should be set out in its Statement of Primary Responsibilities, which must be consistent with the institution’s constitution. Whilst there may be some variations because of different constitutional provisions, the principal responsibilities are likely to be as follows.

1. To approve the mission and strategic vision of the institution, long-term academic and business plans and key performance indicators, and to ensure that these meet the interests of stakeholders.

2. To delegate authority to the head of the institution, as chief executive, for the academic, corporate, financial, estate and personnel management of the institution. And to establish and keep under regular review the policies, procedures and limits within such management functions as shall be undertaken by and under the authority of the head of the institution.

3. To ensure the establishment and monitoring of systems of control and accountability, including financial and operational controls and risk assessment, and procedures for handling internal grievances and for managing conflicts of interest.

4. To ensure processes are in place to monitor and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the institution against the plans and approved key performance indicators, which should be, where possible and appropriate, benchmarked against other comparable institutions.

5. To establish processes to monitor and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the governing body itself.

6. To conduct its business in accordance with best practice in higher education corporate governance and with the principles of public life drawn up by the Committee on Standards in Public Life.

7. To safeguard the good name and values of the institution.

8. To appoint the head of the institution as chief executive, and to put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring his/her performance.

9. To appoint a secretary to the governing body and to ensure that, if the person appointed has managerial responsibilities in the institution, there is an appropriate separation in the lines of accountability.

10. To be the employing authority for all staff in the institution and to be responsible for establishing a human resources strategy.

11. To be the principal financial and business authority of the institution, to ensure that proper books of account are kept, to approve the annual budget and financial statements, and to have overall responsibility for the university’s assets, property and estate.
12. To be the institution’s legal authority and, as such, to ensure that systems are in place for meeting all the institution’s legal obligations, including those arising from contracts and other legal commitments made in the institution’s name.

13. To make such provision as it thinks fit for the general welfare of students, in consultation with the senate or academic board.

14. To act as trustee for any property, legacy, endowment, bequest or gift in support of the work and welfare of the institution.

15. To ensure that the institution’s constitution is followed at all times and that appropriate advice is available to enable this to happen.
STATEMENT OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

The principal responsibilities of the Council are:

1. To approve the mission and strategic objectives and key performance indicators of the College.

2. To appoint the Rector as chief executive, and to put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring his/her performance.

3. To delegate authority to the Rector, as chief executive, for the academic, corporate, financial, estate and personnel management of the College.

4. To ensure the establishment and monitoring of systems of control and accountability, including financial and operational controls, risk assessment and procedures for managing conflicts of interest.

5. To ensure processes are in place to monitor and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the College against the plans and key performance indicators.

6. To establish processes to monitor and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the Council itself.

7. To conduct its business in accordance with best practice in higher education corporate governance and with the principles of public life drawn up by the Committee on Standards in Public Life.

8. To safeguard the good name and values of Imperial.

9. To appoint a Clerk to the Council and to ensure that, given that the person appointed has managerial responsibilities in the College, there is an appropriate separation in the lines of accountability.

10. To be the principal financial and business authority of the College, to ensure that proper books of account are kept, to approve the annual budget and financial statements, and to have overall responsibility for the College’s assets, property and estate.

11. To be the College’s legal authority and, as such, to ensure that systems are in place for meeting all its legal obligations, including those arising from contracts and other legal commitments made in its name.
PAPER F

THE HARLINGTON TRUST

A Note by the Clerk

This Paper was withdrawn
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON AND THE SCIENCE MUSEUM WITH RESPECT TO THE LIBRARY

A Note by the Deputy Rector

BACKGROUND

1. The Science Museum Library occupies around 25% (ca. 3000m²) of the physical space in the Library Building at South Kensington under a 50-year lease dating from 24 June 1992. A peppercorn rent obtains until 2017, after which time a full rent would apply. The lease provides for the levying of an appropriate service charge.

2. Historically, a reduced service charge of ca. £70K per annum has been levied by agreement of the Rector at that time. Recent assessments have identified that this is a significant undercharge and the Science Museum Library were notified in mid-2003 that the College intended to apply a full, appropriate service charge prospectively from 1 August 2003. Imperial invoiced the Science Museum in October 2003 for the increased service charge of ca. £270K per annum. Recognising the financial problems faced by the Science Museum Library, the invoice was subsequently withdrawn to allow negotiations to proceed over the future use of College space by the Library and define ways in which its collection might be housed in the future. During this time, the Science Museum Library continued to pay the reduced service charge.

3. Negotiations during 2003, 2004 and early 2005 failed to reach any conclusion, although an option to divide the collection between the College, the Science Museum Library and the British Library was explored collaboratively. In the end, the Science Museum’s Trustees decided that they could not sanction the splitting of their collection and that they have an obligation to retain it intact and easily accessible to the public.

4. In the light of the failure to find alternative ways of housing the Science Museum Library’s collection, the College resubmitted its invoice for service charges, backdated to 1 August 2003 and requested payment within 30 days of a total balance of £397K to cover costs to the end of February 2005. The Science Museum Library responded by relinquishing office space within the building to a total area of ca. 300m² but has not, to date, paid the requested levy. In fact, they indicated (5 May 2005) that they wished to review the sums requested and negotiate a way forward. They have also questioned whether we have absolute rights to decide what to do with the physical space, although it would appear that they now acknowledge that we do have such rights. Our legal advisors have also confirmed that we have a strong position on this point.

5. At recent meetings with representatives of the Science Museum, it has become apparent that the two parties are adopting different perspectives and indeed have potentially diverging missions. The Science Museum Library stress that they wish to keep their physical collection of books intact, if at all possible, and ensure ready access for the public. Imperial has a vision which entails use of library buildings to provide enhanced study space from which information can be accessed, increasingly in digitised format.

6. Imperial also has an aggressive programme of infrastructure development which entails the consolidation of certain key academic functions which are currently poorly housed or fragmented across the South Kensington Campus. These plans will involve the top floors...
of the Library Building. The College is also now formulating plans for refurbishing the rest of the Library to create the kind of space needed for a 21st Century learning resources centre. The strategies and outline plans have been approved by the Operations Committee in recent months. A lack of resolution of the outstanding issues with the Science Museum Library is already impeding progress on implementation to a significant extent.

7. We are aware that the Science Museum Library has recently been granted additional financial support from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport and has some space available within its own buildings – at least sufficient to house the rare book collection. Imperial has offered assistance with the provision of alternative storage accommodation at the Wye Campus. Imperial has also supplied the Science Museum Library with its Strategy for Library Development and outline plans for use of the building to aid in their understanding of why we are anxious to resolve the outstanding matters and move on rapidly.

THE ISSUES

8. Two problems thus remain to be resolved; equitable payment of the service charge for the Library Building at South Kensington and the continued use of the physical space as currently configured. We have concentrated on the latter of these issues as regaining control of the space in the Library Building is of paramount importance to Imperial so that it can move ahead with its infrastructure development plans. We have not, however, changed our position on the outstanding debt. A recent letter from the Deputy Rector to Mr Jon Tucker of the Science Museum has been attached at Annex A. Council members will see that this letter is deliberately positioned to bring this very long impasse to resolution.

9. Council members are asked to note the current state of negotiations and to recognise that there is a potential for adverse publicity if lack of agreement leads to firm unilateral action by the College.

L.K.B.
Imperial College London

17 June 2005

Without Prejudice
Mr Jon Tucker
Science Museum
Exhibition Road
London SW7 2DD

Dear Jon

Following our recent meeting, I thought I would outline my understanding of our discussions and how I see the next steps. I believe you have come to the point where you wish to minimise future costs but also retain access to your valuable collection although you accept this may not necessarily be retained intact in physical terms.

Our position is that we are desperately keen to provide as much space as we can for student study and learning in the Library Building. We also need to consolidate our Humanities programme and that too will make calls on refurbished and reconfigured space in that building.

Here are our proposals:

1) Timescale
   - By 31 July 2005, we must have reached a mutually acceptable way forward, which is endorsed by your Trustees or their Chairman. Failure to do so will inevitably trigger a more formal process by us to recover the outstanding service charge and obtain vacant possession of space in the building.
   - By end of 2005, we must be in a position to start radical reconfiguration of the interior of the building which will inevitably require prior release of significant floor space.

2) Accommodation for SML books
   - The first option for consideration is that you remove your entire collection to facilities of your own.
   - The second option is that you leave some material, of relevance to our academic mission, at South Kensington although the decision on what that might be must be mutual and take into account our needs for substantial release of space. As an indication, we could offer around 600 sq. m. for such purposes.
   - We also considered the possibility of decanting any volumes on long-term loan to IC to alternative IC sites. This still has some cost implications and we both need to consider this.

No doubt SML will consider our proposals but we anticipate a very early response so that the necessary engagement of your Trustees can occur within the stated timeframe.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz
Deputy Rector

Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine
1. At its last meeting, the Council asked to discuss the implications for the College of the Government’s increasing emphasis on the regional component of funding and economic development. Obviously, for an international institution such as ourselves (and a small number of similar universities) such a policy potentially would be in conflict with our mission. At its most extreme, should core funding ever be allocated on a regional basis, then academic standards would eventually decline as competition reduced. HEFCE (and probably most HEIs) appreciate this and neither HEFCE nor the (last) Government in general have any plans to introduce regional funding for their core teaching and research grants.

2. HEFCE, though, is coming under pressure to introduce a regional element in some of its funding. They are responding to this in the allocation of additional funded student places, intended to implement government policy of increasing student numbers to 50% of the eligible population by about the end of the decade. These additional funded places have been allocated to regions by a geographically biased formula rather than simply pro-rata to the existing distribution or as a result of bids from individual institutions. Some areas of England have relatively low provision of higher education and HEFCE are keen to rectify this. Although young students are classically mobile, evidence shows that those from poorer socio-economic groups are less so and it is at these groups that widening participation policies are aimed. London has the highest participation rate in the country (already above 50%) and has no shortage of HEIs (41) so the capital will not see much growth in HEFCE funded student places (apart perhaps from the Thames Gateway area). This will not adversely affect the College as we intend to keep our undergraduate student population stable.

3. The recent debate about vulnerable subjects of strategic importance (instigated by the closure of the modestly rated Chemistry Department at Exeter University) often focussed on the implications for regional economies. We are not convinced that the closure of such a department has any implications for regional employers or wealth creation. Nevertheless, HEFCE can and do assist in the regional re-location of provision (in the Exeter case, funded places were awarded to Bristol and Bath).

4. Like HEFCE, the Research Councils aim to award the majority of their funding on strictly quality criteria based on peer-review. Increasingly, though, their special programmes have a regional component, even if not overt. (For example, EPRSC have just announced five grants of £3-4M each to strengthen research in strategically important subjects. Two have been awarded to Scottish universities, two to Midland ones and one to a Welsh university. Although we do not know exactly which departments in these universities are involved, it looks as if only one scored a 5* in the 2001 RAE, the others being rated 5 with one 4).

5. London may fare badly in regional policies and national funding competitions if only because of its existing comprehensive coverage. Almost every conceivable subject is taught and researched and the rest of the country often perceives the capital as being privileged and over-resourced. A consequence of increasing awareness of regional sensitivities is possibly seen in the composition of various advisory panels. Even panels which recommend national funding (such as the RAE panels) will often have the ‘statutory’ number of Scots and Welsh members, plus many from the North of England. Although London has about the
same population as Scotland and Wales combined, teaches 16% of the UK’s students with its universities generating 22% of the sector's income, it won't be represented on these panels as of right. Indeed, it should not be, but the inconsistency of selecting part of a panel on geographic as well as merit criteria is not acknowledged. Of course, such conflicts are inherent in our whole political and governance system from Parliament downwards. In many cases it is, of course, possible to combine geographic considerations with finding the best people for the job and the benefit gained from buy-in from the whole sector is then worthwhile.

6. Although the NHS is a both a national and local organisation, the vast majority of its services are provided locally. This influences much of its strategy. The NHS’ support of research and development in teaching hospitals is based mainly on historical precedent. The majority of the funds are spent in London much to the annoyance of the rest of the country. Of the national R&D funds, the largest award is to the Hammersmith Hospitals NHS Trust (£55M) which is closely linked to the College. Other hospitals in our group also receive substantial allocations (Royal Brompton, £28M; St Mary’s £8M; North West London £7M; Chelsea and Westminster £3M). The total coming to ‘Imperial’ hospitals is some 20% of the national budget. These funds are coming under considerable threat and although the spend can be justified in terms of supporting first class clinical research undertaken by our staff, it is likely that grant will leak away to other parts of the country on the basis of ‘fair play’ and local provision. The financial effect on the Trusts will be very severe and in some cases destabilising.

7. The overt regional funding bodies are the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) of which the London Development Agency (LDA) is the main agency for the College. The RDAs have growing importance to universities. RDAs’ relationships with their local universities vary greatly across the country. Most RDAs have one or more local vice-chancellors on their board (the LDA has the VC of London Metropolitan University). The northern RDAs spend considerable sums supporting their universities through funding research and knowledge transfer or contributing matching funds for bids to other sponsors. It is, of course, very difficult to compete with the latter if the support is significant in size. All RDAs funds come from central government. It is surely not the intentional policy of government for RDAs to use national funding to compete with each other for other national funds. Of the RDAs, the LDA and SEEDA (South East Development Agency) spend comparatively little on Higher Education. Of the Russell Group universities, RDA awards for 2003 and 2004 varied from £39M (Manchester, mainly to support the Manchester/UMIST merger) to £0 (Oxford, Southampton and LSE) with most northern institutions receiving about £10M. The College has had £3.7M awarded from the LDA mostly to assist in the development of our bio-incubator facilities (£3M) and in support of our Higher Education Investment Fund (HEIF) award from HEFCE (£350K). RDAs will probably play an increasingly important role in knowledge transfer both directly and in advising HEFCE and OST on allocations from the HEIF.

8. Collaboration is often the companion of regionalisation. It is fashionable to expect institutions to collaborate and this can be an explicit or implicit condition of funding. This College, like many others, has hundreds if not thousands of different academic collaborations across the world. The vast majority are the result of personal contact by academics based on shared research interests. A top-down approach to collaboration can also work but only if genuine research or teaching needs are being addressed. Collaboration at institutional level with neighbouring institutions, in order to support a view that the region will be made stronger because of it, has much less merit. Although funding bodies protest that collaboration for its own sake is not their policy, the results of funding awards often belie this. Large and strong institutions which may not need to collaborate with
neighbours to deliver a funder’s requirements are therefore forced to limit their own bids in order to partner artificially with another organisation.

9. Sometimes, regional issues become conflated with ‘golden triangle’ ones. Our suspicion increasingly is that to be successful in some national programmes ‘golden triangle’ institutions will need non-golden triangle partners in other parts of the country. It is, of course, very difficult to obtain any evidence to support (or refute) this.

10. The regional dimension of funding and policy is unlikely to diminish. The College is aware of the politics and will do what it can, with others, to promote its international dimension as well as maintaining appropriate regional links.

R.F.E.
1. On the specifics of the last two months’ results:

   a. The main feature of the results is the Imperial Innovations fundraising and the sale of some College shares. The reported figures, given the current state of discussions with our auditors, are based on the inclusion of the £10M realised profit, although the auditors may well insist that we include, on consolidation of Innovations’ results, the full £20M realised from the fundraising.

   b. On cash, the £10M “Innovations” receipt has clearly had a significant impact on the cash position, which showed a £9.4M inflow in the two months. A negative impact in this regard, however, is the accelerated spend on the College’s capital projects. On page 4, the estimated future expenditure for the remainder of the year is set at £20M, of which £6M is for the College’s own account. The borrowing forecast on page 6 has been updated in the light of 2005/06 budget submissions and the SRIF T03 project position. In this context, it is worth noting the College’s funding requirement, after the £77M HEFCE grant, may not be £7.7M (i.e. 10%), but c. £50M given total project costs as opposed to just build costs (see separate Treasury Paper).

   c. On working capital, it is positive to report the improvement in both unbilled research costs, (down £4.6M), and the reduction of £7.8M in unapplied receipts. On the former, the number of invoices sent out was two and a half times last year’s average. The corollary of this success is a net increase in the research debtor book of c. £4M over the last two months. It is important that this working capital improvement is maintained.

   d. Regarding the forecast for the year end, the year to date research volume increases continue to be below the level required to meet the year forecast. Average income in June and July needs to be nearly £17M a month, compared to a year to date monthly average of £13.7M. Notwithstanding this and a deficit in Estates, principally relating to the cleaning contract issue, the forecast is for a breakeven result some £6.6M better than budget. This breakdown result reflects the inclusion of an increased provision for the Reactor decommissioning of £3.7M, which more than explains the £2.3M adverse change from the last forecast given to Council.

2. Turning to more general issues:

   a. The College Budget has now been prepared and is the subject of a separate paper.

   b. The cash projection (page 6) has not been updated to reflect the Treasury Paper which is also being presented to Council. But it is a matter of importance that the College has only one cash projection and this will be corrected. The forecast net debt position at 31/07/05 is (£45M), although it should be noted that this is regarded as somewhat pessimistic.

   c. A meeting was held with the College auditors about how to make the audit process more efficient still; and it was proposed that the audit be completed by no later than the end of October.

---

1 The Finance Management Report Booklet is not included with these Minutes
1. The Budget Report for 2005/06 is enclosed with these papers. This sets out the details of the Budget as agreed by the College’s Management Board at its Meeting on 24th June 2005.

2. Set out below is an analysis of the key issues underlying the Budget, together with a review of the main risks.

KEY ISSUES

3. Four general observations on the budget process are worth making at the outset:

   a. A great deal of hard work at faculty and departmental level and in the Centre takes place over a 4-5 month period. Streamlining this process may well lead to an equally well prepared budget.

   b. There seemed to be confusion between planning and budgeting. The detail involved in the latter may well have led to not enough time and thought being devoted to planning for future years.

   c. The focus on the year ahead does not lead to enough attention being given to the impact on future years of decisions taken now. Investment analysis, in particular, has had a short term perspective – or a loosely defined long-term one.

   d. The relationships between capital and revenue and between profit and cash are not as well understood as would be desirable.

4. A more detailed review of the budget process is being prepared for the Management Board to ensure that in a post-FEC world a sharper focus is brought to bear on the different dynamics of planning and budgeting. Part of this review will be the establishment by 1st August 2005 of KPIs as management tools to monitor performance. These KPIs will form part of the reporting pack to be given to Council and the Management Board for 2005-06.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE (PAGE 5)

5. Total income of the College is £490M. £460M is in the core activity and £30M in businesses and subsidiaries (see Annexes D and E). This is 9% higher than the forecast outturn for 2004/05.

6. Within this total, the HEFCE grant, making up a third, is 8% up on 2004/05 forecast; the teaching element is reduced, but the research element is greater by 15%.

---

1 The College Budget is not included in these Minutes
7. Overseas student fees are 18.4% higher than 2004/05 forecast. At £47M, this figure is only marginally less than HEFCE’s teaching grant. Overseas students make up 27% of the taught student population.

8. Of the total income, some £200M is distributable at College discretion.

9. The “vote” from the Centre to the Faculties makes up £88M i.e. 20% of the total. Research work generated by the Faculties totals £187M, or 40% of the total.

10. The Support Services budget, detailed on page 17, totals a net £80M, which is a 9% increase over 2004/05. Of this increase, the greater part is non-discretionary, after a decision to budget for increased salaries across the Board by 3.5%. The largest individual increase is in Estates, where health and safety, rates and utility cost increases have impacted heavily. The discretionary cost rises - 4% - were largely in two specific areas:

   a. Research Services, where there is a clearly recognised need to improve the quality of resource. This is not reflected in the figures on page 17 because of the allocation of costs to Faculties; and

   b. ICT, where a decision was taken to improve delivery across the College and to bring in-house costs that had been borne in consultancy charges. ICT is now a Department of some 200 staff with a total cost base of £14.5M.

11. The large percentage increase (21%) in the £35M of “Unallocated Costs” at the Centre (page 18) is not a reflection of out of control expenditure; it is made up principally of a rise in the depreciation charge to £26M, reflecting the College’s capital expenditure programme.

12. Sums budgeted under the Strategic Investment Fund initiative (see Annex B) and which impact the 2005/06 Income and Expenditure total £13.3M. However, it should be noted that the aggregate sum to be invested under this initiative will be much larger than £13.3M; already £17.6M has been agreed, with a £9M cash impact and a £5M capital impact in 2005/06. The Strategic Investment Initiative is a welcome and important step in two respects – it increases the awareness of the need for longer-term investment planning and it represents the precursor of the way the College will need to make investment decisions in a post-FEC world, to meet College defined objectives not merely to spend monies granted by external bodies.

13. There is now a line in the Budget for the Foundation. At present, this is a “virtual” Foundation and will remain so until tax and legal issues have been bottomed. But it is important that the Foundation has a perceived existence, to enable it to be the focal point for the build up of freely disposable capital. Initially, the Foundation’s assets will comprise the College’s 71% holding in Innovations and a number of property assets in Prince’s Gardens; the quicker other non-core assets are released to the Foundation, the more commercial will be their exploitation and the faster the build-up of freely disposable capital. The Foundation has a business plan which shows it moving into profit in year 3.

14. The net position of the Income and Expenditure statement is a very small surplus of £1.6M, on a turnover of £490M. There is only a very small contingency built into this budget. It will require a tight control over costs to deliver this.
THE BALANCE SHEET (PAGE 6)

15. The size of the balance sheet is projected to continue growing substantially – over the last 2 years, it will have grown by c. 20% to £530M by 31st July 2006. This reflects the external funding of the College’s capital expenditure programme. The balance sheet has, nevertheless, a relatively robust look about it.

16. The Council should note two contrasting details:

a. The Foundation line has an asset of £10.5M. This reflects the Innovations share sale receipts. There is no account taken of the continuing 71% holding in Innovations, which has an externally validated value of a further £70M; but

b. The negative net current asset figure of £45.4M at 31 July 2006 is a direct reflection of the cash outflow set out in the integrated Sources and Uses Statement on page 7. The separate Treasury Paper presented in the Council papers sets out debt proposals which, if implemented, would reduce the net current assets deficit and increase long term loans.

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS (PAGE 7)

17. The College is budgeting to deliver £15M of cash inflow from operations. The need to control WIP and working capital in general is highlighted by the relative size of the budgeted working capital movement - £6.3M. Of greater significance, however, is the fact that the College is budgeting to spend £42M from its own resources on capital projects (see page 8). In the long-term, or even medium-term, this is unsustainable. Again, reference to the separate Treasury Paper and the growing borrowing requirement is very relevant.

18. The Capital Expenditure analysis on page 8 gives another slant on this same point: £120M of budgeted total capital spend in 2005/06 alone. As ever, the need to control, discipline and force value for money is high.

19. The Capital Expenditure budget for 2005/06 is made up essentially of five elements:

a. Building projects funded wholly by the College – the Sports Centre and Southside dominate this category.

b. SRIF 2 projects, where the College’s contribution is relatively small (£4M).

c. SRIF 3 projects, where the programme will hardly be under way in 2005/06, but where, it should be noted, the aggregate College expenditure element is currently estimated at c. £50M.

d. ICT projects, some of which are in SRIF 2 and 3, some of which are fully College funded. It is too easy to forget that Capital Expenditure is not only building expenditure. In the budget process, attention was focused very much on getting the message home that project and cost control in non-building works was extremely important; cost overruns on ICT projects are notoriously frequent and difficult to control.

e. The capital element of strategic investment initiatives total £5M in 2005/06. This sum will get larger in future years.
20. In the light of the budgeted movement in the cash position, the need to control, discipline and force value for money is very high.

THE RISK ANALYSIS

21. The weakness in the Budget is that there is a very small contingency included to meet the risks to satisfactory performance. Given the speed at which the College is growing as a financial operation – volume of research income, fee income, cost increases, capital expenditure – the operating surplus of £1.6M does not represent a particularly robust defence against unforeseeable events, even if it does include a £4.5M contingency element, £1M in Support Services and £3.5M in the Faculties.

22. Within the Faculties, the introduction of FEC; the ongoing DCS programme under which more authority is being devolved from the Centre to the Faculties; the pressures of the forthcoming RAE; and the completion of the introduction of major new systems (Infoed, Oracle Grants) and their impact across the College all represent potentially disruptive elements in a year when income is set to grow by 9% and expenditure by 8%. Add to these operational risks, the risk of capital expenditure overruns and the threat to the cash position of the College is clear. The Treasury Paper addresses the need to take pre-emptive steps to provide a cash underpinning; it also highlights the need for the College to address in a concrete and specific way the drive for the upsides that exist and must be turned into reality.

23. That said, the outturn in recent years and the budget process give evidence to the judgement that controls, checks and balances are in place to obtain satisfactory delivery of the budgeted net financial position.

24. The Council is invited, and if it see fit, to approve the College Budget for 2005/06.
PAPER K

TREASURY MANAGEMENT

A Paper by the Chief Finance Officer

INTRODUCTION

1. Historically, policy setting for Treasury Management has been established and reviewed by the Investment Committee of the Council. Following the recent review of Council Committees this no longer applies and therefore it lies with the Management Board, with the responsibility for delivering against the agreed strategy delegated from the Board to the Chief Finance Officer.

2. This Paper sets out the current approach to Treasury Management; highlights the main strategic issues facing the College in this area and details proposals on future Treasury Management; the draw down of the £23M European Investment Bank (EIB) facility; and the establishment of a further debt facility of up to £50M.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT – THE CURRENT POSITION

3. At 31 May 2005 the College held the following net debt position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (£M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and short term cash deposits</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt – Loan Notes</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash / (debt)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(24.1)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. By the year end net debt is forecast to be (£45M).

5. The College’s current Treasury operations fall into the following four areas:
   a. **Cash Management.** Finance aim to get the best returns available within the framework established under the current cash investment policy, which requires deposits to be placed in AA and above credit rated banks and funds. In addition, we follow a prudent policy of maintaining maximum liquidity where surplus cash is primarily invested either on an overnight or two day basis. The ability to make significant longer term deposits is limited by the availability of sufficiently detailed cash flow forecasting.

   b. **Debt Management**

      (1) In 2002 the Council of the College established an upper borrowing limit of £100M in order to provide for the capital investment strategy and the optimisation of non-core asset values. Currently we have a £50M loan fully drawn down and three further borrowing facilities in place:

         (a) £50M private placement loan notes were issued by the College in 2003 through the Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS). The notes have a maturity date of 2033 at a fixed interest rate of 5.39% over the thirty years with a bullet repayment at the end of the term.
(b) A £23.2M facility from the EIB, which is directly linked to the College's Scientific Research Investment Fund (SRIF2) programme. The College has not yet drawn down against this facility and any drawings must be made by 2 September 2005 in minimum tranches of £10M. Drawings can be at either floating rates of interest (which is currently running below LIBOR) or fixed. The loan period will be 15 years, with repayments commencing in Year 3.

(c) The College also has access to a £5M daily overdraft facility with our bankers, RBS. The facility provides a short term liquidity buffer. Interest is charged at 100 points over base rate and the facility lasts for a 12 month period and is rolled over in November each year.

Thus the College has existing facilities of £78M. The EIB have indicated that they would be prepared to provide a further facility of up to £50M in relation to the Southside Project, and the College has received positive indications from RBS that the existing facility established through them could be increased.

c. **Foreign Exchange (FX) Management.**

(1) At present we do not identify or actively manage any of our foreign currency exposures. The College receives research grants and other income of around £20M in both US dollars and euros and makes approximately £10M of payments in both currencies. This gives a net £10M inflow position which is not actively managed. We do not hold large amounts of US dollars or euro currency to meet future payment requirements, but sell surplus currency into sterling when received and buy foreign currency when we need to make payments. This almost certainly is not an efficient solution. Further, we have US dollar and euro payables and receivable balances on the balance sheet which are again not managed. Instead, they are only re-valued to reflect the exchange rates at the year end. This treatment can lead to big movements in the sterling value of these balances.

(2) With the lack of active management of our FX exposures, we are hiding an area of risk that can lead to unexpected charges or credits in the I&E account, as happened with US dollars at the 2004 year end, when a charge of £0.8M hit the I&E account.

d. **Interest Rate Exposure Management.** Addressing the risks arising from possible changes in interest rates is also not actively managed at present. The £50M loan is drawn at a fixed interest rate of 5.39% for its 30 year life, whilst our cash held on deposit is at variable rates and so is subject to changes in the base rate of interest. In the 2003/04 financial year our net interest charge was £2.1M. As we increase our debt by taking on further loans we will be increasing our exposure to interest rate movements.

**PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE**

6. As the College grows in size and complexity, we have the opportunity and need to strengthen our Treasury management procedures for a number of specific reasons:
a. Changes in university funding. Under Full Economic Costing (FEC), the College will receive greater research funding up front and be expected to manage this additional cash to finance future investment.

b. The development of the Foundation and spin out technologies and companies under the Innovations umbrella should drive new and additional sources of cash, as it has already done with the completed placement of shares in Innovations.

c. We are already sitting on a large cash/net debt position that we are not managing as effectively as we could to minimise our net interest cost.

d. The need to address our underlying foreign currency exposures and reduce the unforeseen impact of large exchange rate swings is growing.

e. With the size of the capital expenditure programme set to continue at significant levels, and more importantly with no short term reduction in the College net contribution (i.e. Southside £54M, SRIF3 shortfall of £40-50M) we need to recognise the potential need for further funding.

7. There are two specific areas in which we are therefore now making proposals:

a. **Enhanced Treasury Management.** Given the need to strengthen the College’s Treasury Management procedures it is proposed that the Chief Finance Officer establish a more significant treasury operation, but one that is appropriate for the College’s size and sophistication. This is likely to have an impact on the current organisation of the Finance Division as it will introduce new activities that are not performed today:

   (1) Improved short and medium cash forecasting including forecasting euro and US dollar cash flows and the identification of all US dollar and euro exposures.

   (2) Foreign Exchange exposure management.

   (3) Enhanced cash management to enable greater sophistication in our cash investment strategy and thus drive a lower net interest charge. This will encompass the overall net debt portfolio, to ensure that the exposure to movements in interest rates is appropriately handled. To enable the Finance Division to hedge exposures, an umbrella legal document called an ISDA (International Swaps and Derivatives Association) Master Agreement, needs to be put in place.

   (4) Appropriate Treasury processes, including suitable review and reporting controls.

   (5) It is important that the new Treasury operations are undertaken in accordance with correct governance and so specific Treasury rules will be published that provide the detailed framework within which any activities will be taken.

b. **Funding Requirements/ Balance Sheet Management.**

   (1) Based upon the 2005/06 Planning Round our future net debt position and hence funding requirements are projected to be:
Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net debt requirement</td>
<td>(£89M)</td>
<td>(£109M)</td>
<td>(£125M)</td>
<td>(£126M)</td>
<td>(£120M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt drawdown</td>
<td>£50M</td>
<td>£50M</td>
<td>£50M</td>
<td>£50M</td>
<td>£50M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New funding requirement</td>
<td>£39M</td>
<td>£59M</td>
<td>£75M</td>
<td>£76M</td>
<td>£70M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The cash projections start with the latest forecast 2004/05 year end net debt position of (£45M). This reflects the timing of our student fee collection, assumes that we see a large increase in capital expenditure in the last 2 months of the year and that the Foundation deposits £8M of the money received from the Innovations placement in non-cash investments. The detailed cash projections are contained in Annex A.

(3) The main assumptions in the cash flow projections are:

(a) The College will run a balanced budget position over the 5 years on its current operations before interest, with any cost savings or increased fees spent by departments.

(b) There will be additional fee income generated through top up fees, although this will be partially offset by a corresponding but smaller increase in bursaries for less well off students.

(c) FEC will start in 2005/06 on an 80% recovery basis, with the first grants under this basis received in April 2006, and reaching steady state by 2008/09. It is assumed that charities will continue with their existing policy of not making any overhead contribution. There is also £5.7M of transitional FEC income received in 2005/06.

(d) The Foundation will generate growing net income over the 5 year period reaching £1M in 2009/10. This is in line with the latest business plan produced by the Foundation.

(e) There is no significant change in the working capital position.

(f) Capital expenditure projections (see Annex B) are in line with the latest planning round submissions and include £35M of College funded SRIF3 expenditure, £5M p.a. for Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) expenditure and exclude any funds for the development of Linstead and Northside. College-funded capital expenditure thus peaks at £49M in 2005/06 and falls to £15M by 2009/10.

(g) We receive no further contributions from Dr Tanaka.

(4) There are a number of potential upside opportunities that have not been included in the cash projections:

(a) No income raised for the Centenary Appeal is included.

(b) No additional cash raised from IPR realisations or from additional sales of shares in Innovations have been included.
(c) No additional cash generated from other new sources of finance have been included.

(d) No other asset sales have been included.

(e) No allowance has been made for a SRIF4 or 5.

(f) No curtailment of Capex has been assumed from existing requests.

(g) Cash retained from FEC income is greater than projected.

(5) There are however a number of significant risks in these projections:

(a) Research volumes decrease due to FEC and we are unable to sustain overhead recovery at the current levels.

(b) We are unable to maintain the current levels of overseas students.

(c) The cash flow implications of top up fees are not yet known but there may be adverse implications.

(d) We do not reduce the level of our capital expenditure in the out years but that it continues at around £25M p.a.

(e) Projects overrun, the costs of which have to be borne by the College.

(6) Of course, it is highly unlikely that all of the downsides will occur and likely that some of the upsides will happen. But a prudent approach is to weigh up the risks to the core projections and factor in some upside allowance and plan to manage the resultant downside outturn. This downside projection is estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In £M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net debt requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) From Table B it will be seen that the College will need to increase its existing debt facilities of £78M to meet the net debt requirement estimated in 2005/06 at £89M. It will also be seen that in future years, there is the prospect that the net funding requirement will rise to c. £160M. Four conclusions could be drawn from this:

(a) The College needs to generate very specific plans to raise non-debt funds in 2007/08 and beyond;

(b) The College needs to re-examine some of its spending plans;
(c) The College will need to draw down its existing debt facilities to meet the funding requirement in 2005/06;

(d) The College, with its currently healthy financial standing, should put in place increased debt facilities as an insurance against the downside projection becoming reality, in an amount of a further £50M.

(8) Specifically, therefore, it is recommended that the College draws down on a floating rate basis the £23M EIB facility and commences negotiations to put in place a facility for a further £50M, on terms which provide an appropriate cost and maturity profile to meet the debt policy guidelines of the College. Precise details of this facility will be put forward for approval and it will be clear that no drawings will be made which will take the College's total indebtedness over £100M without Council sanction.

8. In the light of the above, the Council is asked to note that:-

a. Specific functions responsible for the management of all Treasury issues are being set up within Finance, including integrating cash management, interest rate management and FX management.

b. Detailed Treasury reporting and governance arrangements are being established.

c. The Finance Division is preparing Treasury rules of engagement that will include cash investment and a specific risk management proposal that will cover management of interest rate and FX exposure.

d. An ISDA Master Agreement with the College’s bankers will be set up so that the College will be able to commence operations once Treasury rules are agreed.

e. The full £23M of the EIB facility will be drawn down.

f. An additional facility of £50M will be negotiated. This facility will be drawn down as needed, but it is recognised that before drawings can exceed £100M, further Council approval will be required.

M.P.K.
### CASH PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus before Interest Charge</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>(4,163)</td>
<td>(5,945)</td>
<td>(6,563)</td>
<td>(6,817)</td>
<td>(6,589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating deficit</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(5,782)</td>
<td>(6,400)</td>
<td>(6,817)</td>
<td>(6,589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add back</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (College)</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>7,418</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>6,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Income/ Spend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top up fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>8,481</td>
<td>8,481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursaries and Director of Access</td>
<td>(814)</td>
<td>(1,741)</td>
<td>(2,714)</td>
<td>(2,714)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>5,767</td>
<td>5,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Economic Costing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Income</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>10,667</td>
<td>18,667</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to fund direct cost gap to Faculties (assumed spent)</td>
<td>(778)</td>
<td>(3,285)</td>
<td>(5,571)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td>7,525</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(581)</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash inflow from operating activities</strong></td>
<td>14,975</td>
<td>12,573</td>
<td>18,473</td>
<td>23,198</td>
<td>23,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement in Debtor/Creditors</td>
<td>(6,280)</td>
<td>(616)</td>
<td>(616)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactor Decommissioning</td>
<td>(613)</td>
<td>(834)</td>
<td>(1,471)</td>
<td>(1,389)</td>
<td>(1,389)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash outflow from working capital</strong></td>
<td>(9,892)</td>
<td>(1,450)</td>
<td>(2,087)</td>
<td>(1,337)</td>
<td>(1,337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital expenditure (Annex B)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College funded capital expenditure</td>
<td>(42,738)</td>
<td>(22,310)</td>
<td>(23,780)</td>
<td>(15,171)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared equity</td>
<td>(1,200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIF Capital</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash outflow from capital</strong></td>
<td>(48,938)</td>
<td>(27,310)</td>
<td>(28,780)</td>
<td>(20,171)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash inflow/outflow</strong></td>
<td>(43,855)</td>
<td>(16,187)</td>
<td>(12,394)</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>7,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net borrowings at start of period</td>
<td>(45,390)</td>
<td>(89,245)</td>
<td>(105,432)</td>
<td>(117,826)</td>
<td>(116,137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net borrowings at end of period</td>
<td>(89,245)</td>
<td>(105,432)</td>
<td>(117,826)</td>
<td>(116,137)</td>
<td>(108,978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum requirement in year</td>
<td>(89,246)</td>
<td>(108,568)</td>
<td>(125,188)</td>
<td>(125,812)</td>
<td>(120,062)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAPITAL EXPENDITURE CASH PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved/committed projects</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall &amp; Flats</td>
<td>6,595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 Sherfield</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering Labs</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Networks</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam &amp; Water Infrastructure</td>
<td>598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption Cooling Strategy</td>
<td>740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers Building VAT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Danes Full Scheme</td>
<td>27,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Molecular Science</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Physics</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Mathematical Sciences Institute</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Upgrade of E-Science Infrastructure</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Magnetic Resonance Equipment, Hammersmith Campus</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Biochemistry Building Completion</td>
<td>7,941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Cross Faculty Centre for NMR</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Institute of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Materials and Earth Sciences Engineering</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF 2 - Estates Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Hall</td>
<td>21,983</td>
<td>21,768</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddinton Basin</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Incubator Project</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital SIF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital project expenditure</strong></td>
<td>82,933</td>
<td>21,960</td>
<td>3,692</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Income</td>
<td>40,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net College Funded</strong></td>
<td>42,588</td>
<td>21,960</td>
<td>3,692</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRIF 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Biosciences Equipment</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHLI Guy Scadding Building Laboratories</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research Facilities Commonwealth Building</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing Cross Centre for Brain and Musculoskeletal Repair</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences Instrumentation Facilities</td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSM &amp; Bessemer</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Road Building</td>
<td>8,179</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Controls</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Facilities - Estate Infrastructure</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Facilities - Building Infrastructure</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Building Infrastructure</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Funded SRIF 3</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>19,988</td>
<td>14,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42,738</td>
<td>22,310</td>
<td>23,680</td>
<td>15,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Note by the Clerk

INTRODUCTION

1. The Wye College Foundation Trust was set up by Wye College in 1983 and is responsible for “the advancement of education in agriculture, horticulture, related sciences and economics and the proper care and development of the countryside, the undertaking of research into these matters and the dissemination of the results thereof”. Its Trustees were the members of the Wye College Board of Governors.

2. When Wye College and Imperial College merged in August 2000, the responsibilities of the Trustees for the Wye College Foundation Trust devolved upon the Imperial College Council. At the time of the merger, it was agreed that the management of the Trust should be delegated to a management sub-committee representing the former trustees and chaired by the Provost of the Wye Campus. However, formal approval of the accounts is at present the responsibility of the Council.

3. The Financial Statements for the Wye College Foundation Trust for the year ended 31st July 2004 and the Management Letter from the external auditors are attached at Annex A. (1)

4. The Council is invited to consider and, if it sees fit, to approve the Financial Statements for the Wye College Foundation Trust and also to delegate responsibility for the future approval of these Financial Statements to the Trust’s Management Committee.

K.A.M.

---

(1) The Wye College Foundation Trust Statements are not included with these Minutes
INTRODUCTION

1. The Union is required to present its annual audited accounts to the College Council, after they have been approved by both the Union Council and the College Audit Committee.

DELAYS

2. The accounts have taken longer to produce than is usual. This has been influenced, in part, by staffing changes. It also in part, reflects historical problems the Union has had with resourcing.

3. The Union agreed a number of remedial steps with the College. All of these have been followed up and actioned. This included funding from the College (previously refused) towards ICT-provided support for Union IT activities. The first major project is the installation of new accounting software (SAP Business One) for 1 August 2005. The new system is intended to alleviate much of the pressure on the Union staff as it will automate most of the financial reporting process. In addition the College has agreed to fund an additional reporting accountant post in the Union.

4. The Union's Honorary Senior Treasurer has agreed to take a more active role until management issues are fully bedded down.

SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

5. The Union’s finances are healthy and the auditors have issued an unqualified opinion on the financial statements. Concern is expressed regarding the level of free reserves, which is not sufficiently high to maintain and develop the assets on the Union’s balance sheet. The Council may wish to note this in light of the challenges faced by the Union in its plans to redevelop its premises in Beit.

6. The Union's auditors, Baker Tilly, raised a number of issues in their management letter, primarily related to accountancy resource. Baker Tilly are content with the Union's agreed management action plan – most of which was already being implemented.

RENEWAL OF APPOINTMENT OF AUDITORS

7. In light of the exceptional circumstances this year and the introduction of new accounting software the Union Executive has agreed to exceptionally renew Baker Tilly’s contract for a seventh year (2005/2006). The original one-year extension to the five year contract was reported to Council last year to oversee the transition to a new finance system, but the lack of ICT support to the Union delayed this project.

---

1 The Imperial College Union Financial Statements are not included with these Minutes
INTRODUCTION

1. The President of the Imperial College Union is required to report to the Council each session on the Union’s activities.

2. The Union’s annual report to members is normally attached as an appendix. Unfortunately, with many other matters to contend with, it was decided not to allocate either the administrative or legislative time for the Union Council to request, receive, compile and issue an annual report. Accordingly there is no annual report to members for the 97th session of the Imperial College Union.

GOVERNORS’ RESPONSIBILITIES

3. It is perhaps appropriate to remind Governors of their responsibilities, with respect to the Students’ Union which are defined in the 1994 Education Act Part II, Section 22.

ELECTIONS AND PARTICIPATION

4. The Union has launched a successful drive to increase participation.

5. The elections to the Union’s governing Council and other committees achieved a turnout of over 1,000 students. This was achieved through the introduction of a cross-campus ballot using electronic voting. In previous years these elections had been decided by no more than around 50 students who had bothered to turn up into a room.

6. The use of electronic voting increased turnout in the sabbatical elections to 23% which is the highest in many years. The absolute turnout (over 2800 students voting) represents the largest turnout in any democratic exercise ever held by the Union. There were some outstanding complaints by students aggrieved that the President, as Returning Officer, had emailed them, en masse, a few hours before the close of voting to remind them to cast their vote. Nevertheless this breach, by the President, of the College’s IT regulations increased turnout by at least 1200 votes in two hours at the end of a five day voting period.

7. Turnout in the summer term elections was a little disappointing. Just over 650 students voted in the online ballot for junior officer positions and the new post of Deputy President (Graduate Students). This can largely be put down to the lacklustre nature of candidates’ campaigning as well as the time of year (two weeks before the end of the undergraduate term). Nevertheless turnout was considerably up on last year’s Annual General Meeting turnout of around 40.
POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

8. This has been a relatively quiet year for the Union with many internal matters to concentrate on after the climax of the higher education funding debates last year. Nevertheless there have been a number of lower-profile campaigns.

9. The Union has set policy to campaign for the release of Babar Ahmed, a former student and member of staff in the ICT Division. Mr Ahmed is facing extradition to the United States on allegations of “conspiring to support terrorism”. Mr Ahmed is the first British subject to face extradition under the Extradition Act 2003. Under its provisions British subjects may be extradited to the United States in a one-way ‘fast-track’ without trial or even production of prima facie evidence. Mr Ahmed was previously arrested in the UK, on suspicion of supporting terrorism, in 2003 and later released without charge after the case was dropped by the Crown Prosecution Service. To date the Union has co-ordinated a letter-writing campaign to politicians and staff/student presence at demonstrations, as well as raised awareness of the civil liberties issues involved in the case.

10. The Union is supporting the Make Poverty History Campaign and is sending a delegation to the Campaign’s conference in Edinburgh to coincide with the G8 summit at Gleneagles. The motion to Union Council proposing the policy was seconded by over 250 Union members.

11. The Union made a submission to the Rees Commission on higher education funding in Wales and continues to support officers who are domiciled in the Principality in lobbying their elected representatives in the Welsh Assembly.

12. Imperial College Union remains active in the Aldwych Group (students’ unions of the Russell Group) and in the University of London Union. The Union remains outside of the National Union of Students (NUS), a policy last set by referendum in 2002, and long may it continue.

REPRESENTATION

13. The Union continues to be concerned about the lack of student representation on the College’s decision-making organs, in particular the new Strategic Education Committee. We find, increasingly, that the Senate Committees our representatives attend are merely rubber-stamping and tinkering with decisions after the key decisions have been made. There is still some genuine opportunity to influence policy at Senate (for example, recent discussion on the Bologna process) but it is often slow to achieve results.

14. Within the Faculties we remain concerned that the Engineering Faculty is the only faculty where there is not a student representative on the Faculty’s Teaching Committee.

15. The Union organised the student submission to the Quality Assurance Agency for the institutional audit of Imperial College. Student views were gathered through focus groups of academic reps as well as an all-student online survey, run in conjunction with the Union’s Strategic Review. The Union was commended by the QAA and the College for the quality of its submission which proved to be a great drain on the Union’s administrative resources.
STUDENT ACTIVITIES

16. The Union’s clubs and societies are as strong as ever. As usual, there have been a few new clubs formed and a few old ones have been dissolved or classified as ‘dormant’.

17. Participation in Imperial College Union clubs and societies remains higher than at any other university. Again, our membership rates are two to three times the average that we encounter through our peers in the University of London and the Russell Group.

18. The table below gives a summary of participation statistics. Of the club memberships reported, 6042 are unique students. The clubs are managed by over 1,000 elected club officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Committee</th>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Entertainments Board</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Clubs Committee</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Guilds College Union</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College School of Medicine Students’ Union</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Students’ Committee</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silwood Park Union</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Clubs Committee</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Clubs Committee</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal School of Mines Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye Union Society</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>244</strong></td>
<td><strong>8946</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. The Union has, this year, established a Bicyclists Users’ Group, outside of the clubs and societies structure. The Group already has just under 1000 members and successfully organised an auction of bikes left unclaimed in the College’s bike store. The Group initially looked at issues affecting cyclists and cycle-racking in the College but is now turning its attention to local road safety issues following the recent deaths of two College members, in close succession, on the Cromwell Road.

20. Community Action Group have continued to organise their projects with additional resource this year provided by the Imperial Volunteer Centre. In particular the weekly ‘soup-run’ for the homeless continues to operate out of Weeks’ Hall and the committee is organising a conference to share its expertise with other university groups.

EXTERNAL AFFILIATIONS AND CHARITABLE DONATIONS

21. ICU Clubs and Societies as well as Rag have raised several thousand pounds in various charities throughout the year. In addition many clubs and societies were involved in the fundraising appeal to help victims of the Boxing Day Asian Tsunami.
22. A breakdown of charitable donations and external affiliations will be tabled at the meeting. However, Governors may wish to note that the Union continues to have difficulty in finding the administrative resource to meet this Education Act 1994 obligation. It is hoped that a new finance system to be implemented on 1 August 2005 will alleviate these pressures.

DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

23. The Union embarked on a strategic review in October. The process involved the widest consultative exercise of student and other stakeholder opinion that the Union has ever carried out. Around 3000 students took part in various surveys, questionnaires and focus groups. 13 senior staff of the College were interviewed by external facilitators.

24. The Strategic Review concluded in February with the adoption by Union Council of a four year strategic plan, which is circulated separately to Governors.

25. One issue that will need resolving is the nature and level of funding the Union receives from the College and what the College expects in return. Through stakeholder interviews and the Planning Round we have received contradictory messages. On the one hand we are told that the Union should not be running businesses. On the other hand we are told to diversify our income streams to meet our funding needs.

26. This muddled sense of direction is untenable for long-term, or even short-term, financial planning. The result is that for the next session (2005/06) the Union is being asked to absorb increased costs (made up of College services for which we are recharged) of over £150,000 without a commensurate increase in our subvention. Since the increased charges represent 15% of our total subvention, and some 40% of our student activities budget (where these charges arise) this is not an inconsiderable headache.

STAFFING MATTERS

27. July 2004 saw the arrival of a new Permanent Secretary, to replace the former Union Manager who retired in August 2005. The change in job title was to reflect the intended change in the nature of the post from a very operational manager to someone whose focus was to support the Union’s Officers in the wider achievement of their aims and strategic objectives.

28. Unfortunately the Union’s experiences with staffing matters have been rather difficult this year and the Permanent Secretary resigned at the end of May. The College Human Resources Division has been very supportive and helpful throughout this time and are now assisting in the process of recruiting a permanent successor and also in finding an interim replacement.

29. Questions have been raised about the Union’s staffing relationships and a review of the Union’ staff-student protocol (an annexe to the Memorandum of Understanding with the College) was instigated. I do not believe that any major change is necessary.

30. The Permanent Secretary, prior to departure, had suggested emulating some other students’ unions (primarily those of the former polytechnics) where students’ union staff are line-managed directly by the parent university. In my experience of dealing with staff and officers of such unions it is apparent that university managers are in no position to line manage such staff as they do not have any awareness of day to day operations (except in
cases where the students’ union has little autonomy and the officers have no real responsibility).

31. The only sensible solution is to strengthen the support available to Union Officers in managing their staff. To that end the Human Resources Division is providing more training and coaching for my successor. The contract of the new Permanent Secretary will include a formal role for both the Director of Human Resources and the Honorary Senior Treasurer in supporting the ICU President in line managing them. Discussions are taking place with the College Secretary to update the staff student protocol to reflect this.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

32. The Union’s staffing difficulties, contributed in no small measure, to the Union’s inability to produce audited accounts for the financial year ending 31 July 2004 on time. A more detailed commentary is included in the cover paper for that item of the agenda of this meeting. Nevertheless the Council would wish to note that remedial action has been agreed and followed-up on with both the College and the Union’s auditors and that the Union’s auditors believe the accounts to be true and fair, without qualification.

PROJECTS

33. The Union is grateful that the seven-year wait for the new Sports Centre will soon be at an end. We are equally pleased that after more than a decade the Southside Redevelopment Project is finally going ahead.

34. Internally the Union is now looking at redeveloping its premises in Beit Quadrangle. They are looking increasingly worn and whilst the Main Building may be one of the oldest purpose-built students’ union buildings in the country, it is becoming increasingly unfit for purpose. The cost of overhauling Beit will likely be of the order of several million pounds and the Union will need to work carefully with the College in constructing a fundraising plan. It is hoped that this can be tied in with our plans to celebrate our Centenary, which is the same time as the College’s.

CLOSING REMARKS

35. I would like to place on record my thanks to the Rector and other members of this Council who have been incredibly supportive over my two years in office. I wish my successor, Sameena Misbahuddin, the very best of luck.

Mustafa Arif
ANNUAL REPORT ON HEALTH AND SAFETY

A Note by the Clerk

INTRODUCTION

1. The Annual Report on Health and Safety is attached at Annex A. It was presented to the Management Board at its meeting on 3rd June and to the Audit Committee at its meeting on 16th June.

2. The Audit Committee, which is now charged with receiving annual reports from the Rector on Risk Management and the management of Health and Safety within the College, was concerned that the Report presented was in a similar format to previous years' reports and did not reflect proposed changes to the College’s health and safety management structures following the Council’s decision to disband the Health and Safety Audit Committee. Although the Committee recognised that the College was in a transitional phase, it felt that, while the Report detailed the work of the Health and Safety Council in the previous year, it did not address any more fundamental issues concerning long term trends in health and safety performance or differing perceptions and management expectations between the College’s Departments and Faculties. The Committee noted that the Health and Safety Audit Committee had previously raised concerns about the change of health and safety culture required in some Departments, as well as the need to continue to integrate the Faculty of Medicine into the College’s policies and procedures. Finally, while the Committee welcomed the presentation of accident statistics in terms of frequency rates, it suggested that the College should also be measuring historical frequency rates for reportable accidents, as well as seeking to establish external benchmarks against which its own performance could be measured.

3. For the future, the Audit Committee suggested that the College needed to determine how best to present regular reports to the Council on health and safety issues, including the provision of advice on legislative changes and whether these presented compliance risks for the College. It was also suggested that the new Health and Safety Management Committee should consider instituting a programme of senior management training in health and safety together with a systematic auditing process covering all of the College’s Departments and Divisions. The Committee agreed that these issues would have to be driven by the new Committee, but suggested that the College should consider commissioning an annual external audit of health and safety management and performance. Such a report would enable the Audit Committee to assure the Council that the College had appropriate systems in place and that these were being followed.

4. As the attached Report has been formally presented to the Management Board by the Health and Safety Council, it has been decided not to amend the Report itself, but to respond to the Audit Committee’s observations in this covering Paper.

HEALTH AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

5. Members will recall that one of the recommendations of the Council’s review of governance was that most of its Committees, including the Health and Safety Audit Committee, should be disbanded. The Council’s discussion of these recommendations included a consideration of the responsibilities currently undertaken by the Health and Safety Audit Committee. Members agreed that the Council’s role was not to try to manage health
and safety itself, but rather to ensure that the College was fulfilling its legal obligations in this regard. It was felt that this responsibility for oversight could be satisfied if the Audit Committee were to scrutinise the Health and Safety Council’s annual report on safety in the College. This would be done within the context of the Audit Committee’s general responsibility for monitoring the College’s risk management policy and procedures and its terms of reference were subsequently amended to include this additional responsibility. The Health and Safety Audit Committee’s other responsibilities were passed to the Rector and the Management Board.

6. Following on from the governance review, the Management Board commissioned a review of all the College’s management committees. Part of this Review included a consideration of all of the responsibilities passed to the Rector by the Council to determine whether any or all of these should be remitted to existing management committees. In the case of health and safety it was felt that, although responsibility could in theory be assumed by the Operations Committee, the importance to the College of ensuring strong management of health and safety meant that this responsibility should instead be delegated to a body whose prime focus this was.

7. The only existing candidate was the Health and Safety Council. However, its main role is not to manage health and safety, but to meet the requirement of the Safety Committees and Safety Representatives Regulations 1977 for the College to have a forum for consultation between management and the trades’ unions on matters pertaining to health and safety. The Review Steering Committee learnt that those involved on the management side felt that it did not provide a suitable place for the development of health and safety policy and, although it received annual reports on health and safety from departments/divisions, it had no health and safety audit function. There was therefore already a perceived need for a health and safety management committee which the disbandment of the Council’s Health and Safety Audit Committee had considerably strengthened.

8. Accordingly, the Steering Committee recommended that a Health and Safety Management Committee should be established, that it should have the same Chairman as the Health and Safety Council, which should report to it, and that, given the importance of health and safety, the Committee itself should report to the Operations Committee. Furthermore, in order that the College might continue to benefit from the external advice and experience that had been a key feature of the Health and Safety Audit Committee, it was proposed that the new Health and Safety Management Committee should include up to three external members. These recommendations were accepted by the Management Board at its meeting on 22nd April 2005 and will be implemented in time for the beginning of the next academic year. A copy of the approved terms of reference for the Health and Safety Management Committee is attached at Annex B, together with structure diagrams for the College’s safety committees. In order to ensure continuity, the previous lay members of the Health and Safety Audit Committee will be invited to join the Health and Safety Management Committee.

DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE AND AUDITING

9. One of the most important functions of the Health and Safety Audit Committee was to conduct visits to departments to explore their approach to managing health and safety and to test their understanding of their responsibilities in the context of the College’s policies and procedures. One of the main values of these visits was that they signalled to departments the importance attached to health and safety by the Council. They also allowed the Committee to see the extent to which health and safety was embedded within each Department as an integral part of its own management practices. When these visits were first introduced, departmental performance in this area was variable. However, the last few
visits conducted by the Committee demonstrated clear improvements in the understanding of health and safety.

10. The Committee itself could not visit all departments and had therefore to be selective about which to test in this way. The programme of visits was therefore seen as an adjunct to a full auditing programme which was properly the responsibility of the College’s executive. The College’s Safety Department introduced an auditing programme covering all of the College’s Departments and Divisions in 2000. This was, however, temporarily placed in abeyance following the resignation of the Assistant Safety Director (Audits & Medicine) in 2002.

11. The Safety Department has now appointed a new Assistant Safety Director with specific responsibility for audit. That person’s first priority will be to review the previous auditing process to see if any improvements can be made and then to re-institute a systematic programme of safety audits. These will be reported to the new Health and Safety Management Committee. It is also currently proposed that the Committee will conduct visits to selected Departments to follow up on issues raised in the audit reports.

ACCIDENT STATISTICS

12. As is noted in the Annual Report, there has been an apparent increase in reportable injuries. This is, in part, due to a very strict interpretation of what constitutes a reportable injury. In most cases, only major injuries or those resulting in an employee being absent from work for more than three days are reportable. However, accidents involving members of the public which result in them attending hospital are also reportable. As students are not employees of the College, they have been considered to be “members of the public” for the purposes of accident reporting. This means that a number of incidents that would not otherwise be reportable are included in these figures. The College now believes that this interpretation is too strict, is inconsistent with the spirit of the legislation and is distorting the accident statistics. In future, therefore, incidents involving students will be assessed according to the same criteria as used for staff. This will result in more meaningful statistics for reportable injuries.

BENCHMARKING

13. Each year the College contributes to a Higher Education Injury, Disease & Dangerous Occurrence Statistics Report together with 111 other HE Institutions. Although the statistics from all the contributing HEIs are collated and published, because the information is anonymised, it is impossible to determine how the College’s close comparators are performing. For example, the 2004 Report shows that the College’s frequency rate for staff reportable injuries (i.e. the number of reportable injuries per 1000 members of staff) was 2.99. This was the 56th highest rate from 112 institutions, the lowest being 0 and the highest 9.55. However, as the individual institutions are not identified, it is impossible to say whether this is better or worse than other institutions with a significant science and medicine base. The College’s Safety Director has recently been discussing this issue with colleagues at Cambridge to see if would be possible to establish more meaningful benchmarks with a smaller number of more closely related institutions.

FUTURE REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

14. As noted above, the Audit Committee also made a number of suggestions for actions to be taken by the new Health and Safety Management Committee. It is proposed that these
should be discussed by the Committee at its first meeting in the new academic year and its decisions reported back to the Audit Committee at its next meeting in November 2005.

K.A.M.
ANNUAL REPORT ON HEALTH AND SAFETY
A Note by the Chairman of the Health and Safety Council

1. Since its last Report, the Health and Safety Council has met four times and has discussed a wide range of issues brought to its notice by the College Officers with responsibility for Safety, Occupational Health and the Fire Service and the Trades’ Union representatives. At its July meetings it reviewed the annual safety reports from the College’s departments, divisions and campuses.

AUDIT OF THE COLLEGE POLICY ON THE CONTROL OF ANIMAL ALLERGY.

2. In June 2004 the Health and Safety Council reviewed a paper detailing the audit of the College Policy on the Control of Animal Allergy conducted by the Director of Occupational Health and the key recommendations that it had generated. The Report noted that the organisation and management of animal houses was key to the control of laboratory animal allergy and that the most significant source of allergens was in animal housing and husbandry areas. CBS staff also have a central role in the training of researchers using the facilities and in advising on the set-up of designated laboratories. During the period covered by the Review the Faculty of Medicine had also conducted a separate review of the Management of CBS (which had recently become part of the Faculty), but this lay outside the scope of the Audit.

3. The Report, which was also considered by the governing body’s Health and Safety Audit Committee, highlighted several key areas:

   a. **Operation of Animal Houses.** The Audit highlighted some uneven stocking problems at one Campus and suggested that these might be remedied by re-location to under-utilised space.

   b. **Use of Individually Ventilated Cages (IVCs).** The introduction of these IVCs was not progressing as quickly as had been anticipated as some users were reluctant to change to the new system.

   c. **Ventilation Systems.** The Health and Safety Audit Committee had recognised the necessity to develop and operate auditable maintenance schedules for all CBS facilities.

   d. **Designated Laboratories.** The Audit found that some practices for the transfer of animals did not adequately control exposure to aeroallergens and suggested that these should be proscribed. However, it was also felt that, for some short-duration procedures with few animals, the Code of Practice on the Control of Animal Allergy was overly prescriptive, particularly as the College was moving away from the use of designated laboratories. The Health and Safety Council noted that only three new laboratories had been set up since the last audit.
e. **Personal Protective Equipment.** The Audit recommended that, in future, CBS staff check at induction that all new users had been instructed in the use of facemasks. The Occupational Health Manager would be informed in instances where this had not been carried out.

f. **Health Surveillance and Allergy Investigation.** After a surveillance exercise the Occupational Health Service undertook to check its lists against CBS and security access lists. When a case of allergy was identified the Occupational Health Service recommended that, in addition to a review of personal work practices, control procedures in the facility used by the person should also be reviewed to see if any changes in the work environment or controls were required to prevent sensitisation in other users.

4. The Health and Safety Council noted the Report’s recommendations but agreed it was for the CBS Steering Committee to take these forward. The Report was therefore referred to that Committee for consideration and action.

**SAFETY ISSUES**

5. **Latex Glove Policy.** At its meeting in February 2005 the Health and Safety Council received a revised version of the College’s Latex Glove Policy. The main change to the Policy was to only allow the use of latex gloves where there was a clear advantage over other types of gloves. In such cases the reason for their selection should be included on the Risk Assessment and appropriate information would have to be given to staff. The Health and Safety Council approved the revised document.

6. **Backup Generator used at the Charing Cross Hospital.** Also in February, the Health and Safety Council received a report from the Safety Department into the ongoing problems with the backup generator used at the Charing Cross Hospital. The College had investigated a number of options for addressing the problem but a permanent solution, such as a larger chimney for the generator, was required. Members were advised that the NHS Trust was, at that time, unable to fund a more permanent solution despite the College’s offer of assistance through partial funding for the project. The Health and Safety Council agreed to endorse a letter from the Director of Estates to the Trust urging them to address the issue.

7. **Stress.** A Report on Stress was considered by the Health and Safety Council in February, which highlighted the current indicators of stress in College along with measures to deal with them. The Report suggested four priorities for tackling the issues:

   a. Improve mechanisms for identifying sources and areas of stress.
   b. Improve uptake of management training.
   c. Develop new ways of delivering stress resilience training.
   d. The Management Board should consider adopting a stress prevention strategy.

8. **Asbestos Management Plan.**

   a. The Health and Safety Council approved a new draft of the College’s Asbestos Management Plan in October 2004. The introduction of new Statutory Regulations had required that the College’s existing Policy be updated. Although the
College's Policy and Procedures already complied with most aspects of the new Regulations, four changes were still required. These were:

1. The provision of more detailed information in the College's Policy.
2. A change in some of the responsibilities for individual staff members.
3. The introduction of three types of asbestos survey.
4. The Asbestos Register should identify a risk factor for each occurrence.

b. The new Asbestos Management Plan was subsequently approved by the College Operations Committee and has now been published on the College website.

9. **Fire Inspections.** The Committee received a report from the Chief Fire Officer and was pleased to note that in the last year there had been no loss of property or lives, or injury due to fire. During 2004 the College recorded 578 fire alarm activations. Most of these occurred in Student Residences; 359 (238 evacuations), with non-residences accounting for the other 219 (146 evacuations). These figures include 79 alarm activations that can be attributed to work being carried out by contractors. All the fire incidents were of a minor nature, mostly due to the precautions in place and very few led to the fire brigade being called. The total number of calls to the fire brigade (35) was quite high but none were due to serious incidents and most could be attributed to the use of auto-dialler systems.

**ANNUAL REPORTS FROM DEPARTMENTAL AND CAMPUS HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEES**

10. Every Department and Division and each Campus is required to present an Annual Safety Report to the Health and Safety Council. This year, all of the reports expected were received, with no Departments failing to present a Report to the Health and Safety Council.

11. As part of its review of reporting arrangements in the previous year, the Health and Safety Council had agreed that, for 2003-04, a new structure would be introduced whereby all the Annual Reports would be considered at an additional fourth meeting held in July 2004. Heads of Department or a senior academic from that Department would be expected to attend this meeting and present their Department’s Report.

12. The Meeting lasted all day and was divided into four separate sessions grouped approximately along Faculty lines. This enabled common issues to be addressed more easily and facilitated the sharing of best practice between Departments with similar concerns. Each session was well attended with most Heads of Department/Division or Campus Deans attending the relevant session.

13. In reviewing the new process, the Health and Safety Council agreed that the new format gave a chance for better consideration of the issues arising from the reports and also helped to focus discussion on the key issues. A document summarising the actions arising from the meeting was circulated shortly afterwards and has been reviewed and updated for each of the subsequent meetings of the Health and Safety Council.

14. Overall the Health and Safety Council decided that the revised procedure for the consideration of the Annual Reports had worked very well and it has decided to repeat the procedure in future years. Some further refinements have also been made to the Annual Report pro-forma to take account of the comments made during last year’s meeting.
ACCIDENTS AND DANGEROUS OCCURRENCES

15. In the Safety Performance, Accidents and Dangerous Occurrences Committee (SPADOM), the Council has had, since its inception, a sub-committee that has examined the accident and dangerous occurrence reports and made recommendations to the Safety Director on ways that these occurrences might be minimised. Attached to this Report at Appendix 1 is the statistical analysis of the reports for the year compared with those of previous years.

16. Although there are fluctuations between the various categories, overall this year there has been an increase of almost 10% in the total number of accidents. Last year, the increase was just 4.6% (although the increase the year before that was 23%). The accident rate, which is a truer reflection of the relative number of accidents in the College, has also increased, albeit by just over 4%. An analysis of the type of accidents reported suggested that this increase in part reflects improved reporting from departments rather than an increase in actual accidents as these reports now include a number of, what might be considered, relatively trivial accidents being reported.

17. The most serious accidents are those that are formally reportable to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). These include major injuries, injuries resulting in absence from work for more than three days and injuries to ‘members of the public’ (for reporting purposes, students are considered to be ‘members of the public’ as well as other visitors to the College’s campuses). In 2003-04 there were 34 reportable injuries, an increase of 75% compared to 2001-02, when they were 20 reportable injuries. This is clearly a concern, although the accidents reported to the HSE included 5 incidents involving visitors (i.e. not members of staff or students) and 3 that were reported to the HSE by contractors. Details of all the reportable injuries for 2002-03 are attached at Appendix 2.

HSE INSPECTIONS

18. During the course of the year, the Health and Safety Council received reports on several incidents that had been reported to the HSE. The major visit during the year was the HSE inspection of the College’s CBS facilities.

19. The HSE inspection of the College’s CBS facilities took place in July 2004. The HSE Inspectors were impressed with the College’s work and did not issue any improvement notices. However, they expressed some concerns over the facilities at the Hammersmith Campus and sought assurances that the new facility planned for the Campus would be designed and operated so as to ensure the effective containment of allergenic material.

20. The HSE inspectors also insisted that, in future, the College undertake full face-fit testing for masks. The Occupational Health Service has obtained the necessary equipment for doing so. Although highly time-consuming – testing takes between 20-30 minutes on average for each person tested – the programme is well advanced with c. 90% of staff and students working with animals already tested. The Occupational Health Service anticipates completing the programme by early July 2005, four months ahead of schedule. The failure rate with disposable masks has been lower than expected; c. 10% of those tested. These individuals are being equipped with re-useable half-face masks or are being advised to use a powered helmet-type respirator. These have a higher capital cost than disposable masks and require a maintenance record to be kept to comply with Health & Safety Regulations.

Professor M. Hassell (Chairman).
ACCIDENT REPORTS

1. During the year 2003-04 (1 August 2003 to 31 July 2004) 413 accidents were reported to the Safety Department. This represents an increase of 10% when compared to 2002-03. Of these, 34 were reportable to the HSE, a 70% increase on 2002-03, when there were 20 reportable accidents.

TYPES OF ACCIDENT

2. Accidents have been categorised using the same classifications employed by the Health and Safety Executive under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995 (RIDDOR). The results for the last ten years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact with moving machinery or material being machined</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit by moving, including flying or falling, object</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck by moving vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit something fixed or stationary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured whilst handling, lifting or carrying</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip, trip or fall on same level</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall from a height</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapped by something collapsing or overturning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning or asphyxiation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to, or contact with, a harmful substance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to fire</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to an explosion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with electricity or an electrical discharge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured by an animal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kind of accident (including sporting)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accidents</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCIDENT RATE**

3. Although it is important to consider the numbers and types of accidents, a more instructive yearly comparator is the accident rate; this is the number of accidents per 1000 people at risk (staff and students). This shows that the accident rate has also been increasing in recent years with an increase of over 4% this year.

4. The accident rate for the last five years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate per 1000</th>
<th>1999/2000</th>
<th>2000/01</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff and students</td>
<td>15155</td>
<td>16288</td>
<td>16252</td>
<td>16812</td>
<td>17800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Rate per 1000</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAPHS**

5. Three graphs are attached:

a. Total numbers of accidents for each year from 1991 to 2004 as well as the most significant categories of accidents for these years.

b. Total number of accidents for 2004 analysed by category.

Accident Reports 1991 - 2004

Accident Statistics 2003-04
Accident Rate per 1000 at Risk

Year


Accident Rate

19.86 17.68 21.90 22.19 23.20
REPORTABLE ACCIDENT SUMMARIES
1 August 2003 to 31 July 2004

Hit by Moving, Flying or Falling Object (1 incident)

04/131R Visitor, SAF Building – 30 March – while following a colleague through a door, individual’s eye was hit by a swing door’s knob. Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.

Hit Something Fixed or Stationary (4 incidents)

03/310R Security Officer (Charing Cross) - 4 September – whilst unloading desks into storage area, hit top of head on doorframe, felt dizzy and became unconscious. Over-three-day absence.

03/335R Academic, Biological Sciences - 30 September – trapped finger in door, fainted, hit head on floor and became unconscious. Major Injury.

03/359R Clerical Related, Catering (Southside Bar) - 22 October – walked into metal beam in tunnels when returning keys to Security. Knocked unconscious. Major Injury.

03/422R Undergraduate, Wilson House – 30 November – whilst walking through a swipe door, smashed forehead against a glass panel and sustained deep cut on the eyebrow. Accident to “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.

Injured While Handling, Lifting or Carrying (4 incidents)

03/292R Clerical, PSDU, (Hammersmith) - 11 August – whilst pushing a trolley, a click was heard which left the person in pain in between arm and shoulder. Over-three-day absence.

04/019R Postgraduate, Chemistry – 15 January – whilst using a test tube brush that was too big, measuring cylinder broke causing cut to forefinger and thumb. Visit to hospital confirmed that there was a tendon damage requiring plastic surgery. Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.

04/043R Clerical, Central Library – 26 January – strained tendon and muscles from continuous lifting and stretching. Over-three-day absence.

04/217R Employee, Sports & Leisure (Wye) – 23 June - felt pain in his back while lifting a chlorine container (stopped lifting immediately). Over-three-day absence
**Slipped, Tripped or Fall on the Same Level** (14 incidents)

03/305R Member of The Public, Wilson House - 16 August – tripped over metal humps on drive way and fell, suffered injuries to face. **Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.**

03/313R Postgraduate, Agricultural Sciences (Wye campus) - 8 September – whilst walking down stairs, slipped, lost control and fractured arm. **Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.**

03/314R Cleaner, Residences (Evelyn Gardens) - 29 August – slipped on wet steps and fell on back. Suffered swelling and bruising. **Over-three-day absence.**

03/315R Security Officer, Wye Campus - 9 September – caught toe of shoe in metal ramp and fell forward sustaining injury to knee which later needed surgery. **Major Injury (requiring admittance to hospital for more than 24 hours).**

03/329R Nursery Nurse, Early Years Education Centre - 1 October – fell awkwardly over a toddler whilst carrying a baby, landed on elbow and twisted back. **Over-three-day absence.**

03/366R Cleaner, Room 304, Blackett Laboratory – 14 August – slipped on a small patch of washing up liquid. Suffered sprain in muscles. Later investigation revealed that two ribs had been broken. **Over-three-day absence.**

03/393R Visitor, Nursery Garden – 10 November – whilst running in the playground, tripped and fell over bumping into a toy scooter. **Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.**

03/396R Technician, Biomedical Sciences – 31 October – whilst walking down stairs foot jarred and suffered knee pain and swelling. **Over-three-day absence.**

03/399R Postgraduate, Student Union – 12 November – student was knocked into by another person, fell over hitting edge of a table and sustained cut above eyebrow, remained unconscious for 10-20 seconds. **Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.**

04/017R Clerical, Biological Sciences (Silwood Park) – 12 January – Slipped on wet grass and hurt legs, shoulders and hip. **Over-three-day absence.**

04/104R Visitor, Union Concert Hall stage (rear area), Beit Quad – 11 March – An eight year old child was at a play rehearsal and was running back stage. As the rear area was not lit and there was a cable trailing across the floor, the child tripped and cut his forehead on a brick pier. **Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.**

04/146R Cleaner, Early Years Education Centre – 19 April – slipped down steps and hurt ankle. **Over-three-day absence.**

04/149R Fire Officer, Fire Services – 22 April – moved forward on chair, the chair leg snapped throwing the individual to the floor. Incident exacerbated back pain from a pre-existing problem. **Over-three-day absence.**
04/227R Plumber, Estates (St Mary’s) – 15 June – slipped whilst walking down stairs and hit valve handle sustaining cracked ribs. **Over-three-day absence.**

**Fall from a height (4 incidents)**

03/395R Undergraduate, Biological Sciences – 7 November – injured knee whilst jumping off stage. **Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.**

03/449R Visitor, South Kensington – 12 December – person climbing over Prince Consort Road gates, fell and became impaled on lower spike and hurt his leg. **Accident to a “member of the public” which required them to be taken to hospital for treatment.**

04/001R Contractor, Porn Dunwoody – 5 January – working inside lift car. slipped and fell off a ladder onto a machinery item and sustained back injury. **Reported to HSE by contractor.**

04/207R Shift Engineer, Estates – 6 June – while isolating a leak, slipped from steps mounted on top of a table (the steps were held by a colleague) injuring arms, head and leg. **Over-three-day absence.**

**Trapped by something collapsed or overturning (3 incidents)**

03/294R Contractor, Tanaka Building site -13 August – whilst working on top of scaffold, the scaffold toppled over causing injury to shoulder. **Reported to HSE by contractor.**

03/294aR Contractor, Tanaka Building site -13 August – whilst working on top of scaffold, the scaffold toppled over causing injury to chest. **Reported to HSE by contractor.**

04/138R Technician, ICT - 2 April - climbed onto a workbench (which appeared to be fixed). Worktop collapsed on top of the individual along with the filing cabinet, potted plant and some research papers leaving the person in severe pain and agony. Individual sprained wrist bruised lower back and also aggravated an existing arm injury (major surgery had taken place 6 months prior to the incident). As a result of this accident, arm movement is further restricted thus delaying recovery. **Over-three-day absence.**

**Other/miscellaneous accident (2 incidents)**

03/342R Undergraduate, Residences (Swanley Hall, Wye) – 10 October - whilst walking across Swanley Hall, fainted and was unconscious for 2 minutes. **Major Injury.**

04/132R Technician, Civil Engineering – 8 March – individual sprained his ankle whilst standing in lab. This is continuation of damage caused by an accident suffered by the individual when he twisted his ankle on a pallet in the concrete laboratory. **Over-three-day absence.**
HEALTH AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. To develop and monitor the implementation of the College’s Health and Safety Policy and the associated procedures and codes of practice.

2. To keep under review the College’s compliance with health and safety legislation.

3. To monitor trends in accidents and dangerous occurrences and to consider their implications for the College against national benchmarks.

4. To ensure that the recommendations of inspections and audits carried out by the Safety Department, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and other regulatory authorities are implemented.

5. To receive regular reports from the Safety Director and the Director of Occupational Health.

6. To receive annual safety reports from the College’s Departments, Divisions and Campuses.

7. To review its own terms of reference and constitution and those of its subordinate committees annually.

CONSTITUTION

Chairman, to be appointed by the Rector

Membership
One member from each of the Faculties, appointed by the Faculty Principal in consultation with the Chairman
The College Secretary, ex officio
The Director of Estates, ex officio
The Director of Human Resources, ex officio

Co-opted Members
Up to four lay members of the Court with experience of health and safety management, co-opted by the Committee

In attendance:
The Safety Director
The Director of Occupational Health

Other advisors, such as the Chief Fire Officer, may be invited to attend on an ad hoc basis.

Secretary:
The Assistant to the Head of Central Secretariat
REPORTING

8. The Health and Safety Management Committee reports to the Operations Committee and shall provide it and the Council with an annual report on the College’s health and safety performance.

9. The Committee has the following sub-committees:
   
a. The Health and Safety Consultative Committee, which has been constituted in accordance with the Safety Committees and Safety Representatives Regulations 1977, for the purpose of consultation on matters pertaining to health and safety, between management and union representatives.

b. Nuclear Safety Sub-Committee, which is intended to meet the requirements of Site Licence Condition 13(2) (LC13(2)) for the Consort Research Reactor. The Sub-Committee considers and advises the College on all matters which may affect safety on or off the licensed site.

MEETINGS

10. The Committee shall meet not less than three times a year.

QUORUM

11. The quorum shall be the Chairman and three other members.
Former Health and Safety Committee Structure

- Council
  - Audit
  - Health & Safety Audit
  - Management Board
  - Operations
    - Nuclear Safety
    - Health & Safety Council
    - Exploration Bard

Proposed Health and Safety Committee Structure

- Council
  - Audit
  - Management Board
  - Operations
    - Health and Safety Management
    - Nuclear Safety
    - Health & Safety Consultative
INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this second Annual Report is to:
   - Highlight the major activities that have been undertaken over the past year;
   - Provide a progress report on the plans for action that were approved by the Management Board and Council in January and February 2004 respectively;
   - Assess whether Imperial is viewed as a good place to join and work.

2. The Equal Opportunities and Diversity Committee (EO&DC) wishes to pay tribute to Professor Frank Leppington, the previous Chair of the Committee, who retired in September 2004. Subsequently, the Rector appointed Professor David Begg (Principal of the Tanaka Business School) as his successor.

SUMMARY

3. A College-wide survey, “Imperial - A Good Place to Work?” was undertaken in 2002. Taking this question as the main theme, improvements have been made. Policies are in place, managers and staff are attending training on equality and diversity on a wide range of issues that affect staff and students, consultative groups have been established, regular monitoring is undertaken, the College has close links with local community groups and publicity and communications have improved. These improvements have, necessarily, been at the macro level and we are assessing the impact of these changes ‘on the ground’. In accordance with any organisational development programme, however, it will take a further year in order for us to show, in detail, how the College is reaping the benefits of effective equality and diversity management, and for us to measure the extent to which the changes are having a marked effect on the day-to-day lives of staff and students.

ACTIONS – OVERVIEW

4. It is important for the College to have representative groups working on equality and diversity issues under the EO&DC’s umbrella. Annex A shows the range of equality and diversity groups that now exist. The groups are broadly, either management-led, with a remit to ensure effective policy development and progress on action plans, or staff/student led, where members inform College policy and help to provide feedback on the positive or negative impact of policies and procedures. All directly, or indirectly, impact upon staff and students.
5. Annex B provides a summary table of the progress on the major plans for action that were approved by the Management Board and Council last year.

**ACTIONS – SPECIFIC**

**BUILDING STAFF DEVELOPMENT, LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY**

6. In order to achieve the College’s strategic goal to attract, develop and retain staff, and to instil a positive and inclusive culture, our management and leadership training initiatives have been developed further. An individual manager’s responsibility for equity, and the benefits/ business case for diversity, have been incorporated into new management development programmes for staff at all levels.

7. In the 2003/04 academic year, 1175 training events on management and leadership were held. 28% of attendees were academic or research staff. Given that this Job Family accounts for 49% of total staff, and even allowing for the fact that some academic and research staff will have attended external activities, the figures show that participation rates could be increased. Female staff make up 42.4% of the total staff number and it is encouraging that they were well represented on management and leadership programmes by taking 55.4% of places.

8. The College recognises the importance of good practice in recruitment and selection, and the impact such practice has upon the achievement of equal opportunity and diversity. The policy that all interview panels should comprise fully trained staff or, at least a trained Chair, has continued to be implemented. Course attendance rates in the first year of the policy (2002/03) were high at 521 and dropped to 207 in 2003/04. While some reduction in attendance is inevitable as the most regular recruiters are trained, it is clear from our monitoring of interview panel membership (and comparing these data with attendance at College training), that more specific targeting is required. For example, although academic staff recruit regularly, only 28% of participants were academics compared with 51% in the previous year. Further work also needs to be done to ensure that our interview panels are more diverse.

9. Encouragingly, the percentage of disabled staff and staff from Black and Minority Ethnic groups (BME) who attended the full range of courses reflected the College’s staff profile.

10. Equality and diversity continue to be given great weight in the College’s induction programme. The Director of HR now introduces courses, taking the opportunity to emphasise the College’s strategic objectives for equality and diversity. Roadshows, held over the Summer to brief staff on the College’s anti-discrimination policies, supplemented these regular events. Following the 2003/04 pioneering Diversity Workshops in the Undergraduate Medicine Office and Residences, Local Action Plans have been introduced. Residences has established a Diversity Committee and action has been taken to improve communication for both staff and students, and work is progressing on translating key documents into the most regularly used languages. The Performance Review and Development Plan (PRDP) documentation for operations staff has been translated into Portuguese (the second most commonly spoken language in some departments) and a Portuguese speaker in HR joined the trainer to ensure full understanding.

11. The pool of specialist trainers and facilitators has been widened so that we have more experts skilled at providing relevant information and generating debate. Both formal evaluation and anecdotal feedback indicate that staff find the development activities useful
and the trainers are well-regarded. Word of mouth publicity has led to requests to provide equalities training – “arm-twisting” has reduced.

12. From its inception, the PRDP has included questions relating to the individual manager’s responsibility for equality and diversity. Reviews of the completed paperwork, however, show that these questions are often left blank. Equality and diversity are already covered in the training sessions provided for Reviewers and Appraisees, but it is clear that greater emphasis is required to ensure that managers understand their responsibilities. HR may have to court unpopularity by returning incomplete forms.

13. The CRE’s most recent investigation into the Metropolitan Police (March 2005) provides a useful prompt to consider whether the situation described exists in the College. Improvements were noted, as was the willingness to change at the top. What the CRE’s Report identifies, however, is that the thawing only goes so far and that middle managers are the “ice in the heart” of the service. Clearly, the College needs to ensure that its managers are properly supported and fully trained to ensure that we do not resemble the current picture that has been painted of the police. The Report’s recommendations also provide food for thought as we assess our own equality and diversity progress record and action plans.

RACE

14. The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 is a challenging piece of legislation because of its extensive requirements. The College’s “Promoting Race Equality Policy” is accompanied by five Codes of Practice and detailed Action Plans to facilitate comprehensive implementation. During the year, staff have been made aware of the College’s policy at induction and at the Policy Roadshows (Paragraph 10 above).

15. Following consultation with BME staff on whether an advisory group, specific to their needs and interests, would be a useful additional resource, the Rector wrote to staff in December 2004 to invite participation. Two meetings have been held to date and the group has chosen to call itself “Imperial As One”. While a consultant has been retained to facilitate the meetings, the College is concerned to ensure that the resultant recommendations are not top-down and consultant-designed as, paradoxically, this could increase any sense of alienation that staff might feel. It is imperative that those who are most likely to be affected by, or perceive the existence of, racism are consulted regularly so that they can help to inform College policy and help to identify gaps between policy and day-to-day practice.

16. A Race Equality Review Group has also been established and reports to the EO&DC. While the EO&DC retains overarching responsibility for race equality, it is considered that a group, with the specific remit to progress, monitor and assess the impact of the College’s Promoting Race Equality Policy, Codes and Action Plans, will undertake this task more effectively. Membership is drawn from key areas of College with both a staff and student remit; core members include those with lead responsibilities for the Policy and Codes. The Race Equality Review Group will also have very close links with “Imperial As One” to ensure that the Review Group fulfils its roles and responsibilities.

17. The partnerships and relationships that the College has with local communities are very important. The work of the Imperial Volunteer Centre (IVC) is a successful example of corporate social responsibility. In addition, it provides the College with the opportunity to promote itself to parents and potential students as an international, multi-cultural university which, in turn, helps to challenge a stereotyped view of the “Imperial student”.

18. The latest volunteer profile (236 people) shows that: 59% were female; over 50% were not White British; 5.5% were staff; 59.5% were undergraduates; 21% were PhD students; 2% were alumni or family members (12% were undisclosed).

19. There are many volunteer projects and some support our objective to promote race equality and good race relations directly. Examples include: Refugee Council (mentoring those waiting for school placements), After School Homework Project (assisting children from ethnic minorities), AHEAD (improving access to health services for African communities), St Clements & St James Into University (the majority of children are from an ethnic minority). Evaluation reports show that the projects are well received by those communities with whom IVC works.

CODES OF PRACTICE – GOVERNANCE AND PURCHASING AND CONTRACT COMPLIANCE

20. In line with the Code of Practice on Governance, a questionnaire on ethnic origin was circulated to all 160+ members of the Court and Council in 2004. Unfortunately, very few returns have been received to date and the questionnaire will now be re-circulated to members to obtain a fuller response.

21. The same questionnaire is now included with the induction pack sent to all new Governors and members of the Court together with the College’s Equal Opportunities Policy, its Race Equality Policy and the Governance Code of Practice. The return rate from new members has been much better than from existing members.

22. In accordance with the Code, all calls for nominations for appointment to the Court and Council now make explicit reference to the Code of Practice and make it clear that the College expressly welcomes the appointment of members from ethnic minorities.

23. During 2004-05, the Acting Chairman conducted a major review of governance, the result of which was a significant reduction in the size of the Council from 32 to 19 members. When considering how to reduce the membership from its current size, the Nominations Committee considered a number of options and took careful account of the College’s Code of Practice. In the end, it was determined that the fairest way to determine the new membership would be to operate the first in, first out principle so that the most recently appointed members were those appointed to the new Council. In fact most of those members had been appointed since the introduction of, and therefore in accordance with, the Code of Practice on Governance.

24. Finally, in 2004, the Management Board commissioned a review of all of the College’s management committees. This Review reported to the Management Board in April 2005. As this review was likely to make wide-ranging recommendations about the remit and membership of the College committees, no report has been made on the constitution and memberships of the current committees. The recommendations on the future membership of the Management Committees are in line with the Code of Practice.

25. Action on the Code of Practice on Procurement and Contract Compliance has been taken in 2003/04 to ensure that major purchasing contracts are open to all businesses. This will be extended to lower value purchases during 2005/06 (subject to changes in technology). The College was represented on the group which has developed a tool kit for ensuring that purchasing activities contribute to the promotion of race equality. It was launched in December 2004 and will be embodied into the Code during 2005. A national supplier database is also being established which will incorporate a race equality audit
process. Each individual institution will not, therefore, need to check for compliance with pre-qualification procedures and national standards.

26. The Estates Division uses pre-qualification questionnaires for companies that are interested in having a “Framework Agreement” with the College for capital projects. Failure by the company to provide an effective response to the equality questions results in application failure. All of the current Framework partners, therefore, have been judged to meet equality standards.

RESPECT FOR OTHERS

27. Following the introduction of the Harassment and Bullying Policy and the Harassment Support Contact (HSC) network at the beginning of 2004, work over the past year has concentrated on publicising the policy and network. Three review meetings have been held with the HSCs and it is clear that further publicity and training is required to ensure that all staff are aware of the network and the confidential nature of the support that is given. Fifteen members of staff used the service during its first year. HR also met with other staff who wanted to discuss harassment and bullying but who chose not to be referred. The network also has close links with the College’s Counselling Service, “Care First”, to ensure that staff are aware of all the confidential support networks that are available.

28. The training programme on harassment and bullying was launched in January 2005 with a briefing session for the Deputy Rector, Faculty Principals and Pro-Rectors. Further dates have been set for senior managers, Heads of Department/Division and staff throughout 2005.

29. The Equality Challenge Unit’s leaflet on the legislation relating to sexual orientation and religious belief has been distributed widely. Information on these rights and responsibilities has been incorporated into induction and recruitment and selection training. An in-house legal briefing for HR staff has also been held to provide up-to-date advice on good practice.

DISABILITY

30. HR’s Equality and Diversity specialist and the College’s Disabilities Officer work both independently and together to provide a comprehensive service for staff and students.

31. The major focus of activity has been to implement the College’s Disability Policy via the programme of Disability Equality Training. This has been combined with general awareness briefing sessions for support staff and academics to ensure that they are aware of their obligations and duties to students. To date, 200 participants have attended (all staff levels; 66% female/34% male; 25% BME). They have gained up-to-date knowledge of the law and have been briefed on the College’s policy. Staff are also asked to consider how their new knowledge can have positive effects on service provision in their local area and how they might work towards “accessibility for all” rather than “dealing with” those who have disabilities, i.e. a best practice rather than compliance approach. The sessions have been extremely well received and a rolling programme is scheduled for 2005/06.

32. HEFCE funding to improve provision for disabled students continues until December 2005. To date, in addition to part funding the training referred to above, other projects have been supported, including web accessibility, and a lecture on Dyslexia and Dyspraxia. The lecture was so successful that it prompted the decision to have an annual equalities event in
addition to the well-established Athena Lecture. In May 2005, the lecture is to be on Race and Disability and will be introduced by the Rector.

33. As part of its plan to embed good practice, the College’s Disabilities Officer coordinates the newly-established network of local Disabilities Officers drawn from both academic and support departments/divisions. They have been provided with guidance to help them fulfil the role so that they are fully aware of the College’s proactive and welcoming approach. The Disabilities Officers are also members of the Disability Equality Sub-Committee.

34. The number of students who have told the College that they have a disability is increasing (174 in 2002/03 to 202 in 2004/05), although there is a percentage who choose not to give this information. This is apparent from the number of students who seek advice from the Disabilities Officer who are not on record. Interestingly, within the relatively short period October-December 2004, the Disabilities Officer had 165 meetings with students who were seeking general advice and/or financial support. (35 meetings with staff were also held during the same period). While a large number of queries from students related to dyslexia, guidance was needed for the full range of disabilities.

35. The College meets four of the five criteria in relation to the Two Ticks disability symbol which can be used on recruitment advertising and other literature - the fifth requires employers to guarantee an interview to disabled applicants who meet the minimum criteria. We aspire to meet the fifth criterion but accept that a wider understanding and acceptance of employing disabled people may need to be established before we can apply.

36. The College’s web team has continued with its programme (begun in 2003) to move all websites (approx. 300 in total) to a set of fully accessible templates. Imperial, therefore, became compliant with SENDA/DDA requirements in advance of the legislation. Accessibility relates to those with visual impairment, but also to those who are unable to use a mouse. The aim is to make all web provision conform to at least Web Accessibility Initiative “Double A” (priority 2) guidelines.

GENDER

37. In order to implement the Schneider-Ross recommendations in relation to gender, action has continued to be directed at female academics and research staff. The Academic Opportunities Committee (AOC) analysed the main findings of the 2003 ASSET (Athena Survey of Science, Engineering and Technology) Survey and requested further work in May 2004 to benchmark us with other Russell Group universities. 224 academics from Imperial completed the survey (155 male/69 female). The Report revealed higher levels of ambition and frustration compared to Russell Group norms. 25% of our female respondents had aspirations to be Head of Department compared with 18% of female academics from the other Russell Group members; the percentage of Imperial female academics who thought they were not receiving equity of treatment across a whole range of factors was higher than that for other Russell Group members – a view not shared by Imperial’s male respondents. The analysis also showed that all male interview panels are more prevalent at Imperial. This survey prompted the AOC at its October 2004 meeting to commission a report to assess the impact of activities that have been undertaken to date and to prioritise future action. The Report will be published in Summer 2005.

38. The AOC regularly monitors data in relation to pay, promotions, appointments, contract type, etc. At its June 2004 meeting, data was presented to show how the objective to increase the number of female academic and research staff by 10% in the three years
from 2002 was progressing. The data showed that, while there were more females being appointed to research and academic posts, the numbers of those in post remained largely static. This indicated a turnover rate that would make the objective hard to fulfil and it was agreed that further analysis on the reasons for leaving were needed, specifically to identify if the reasons were negative, or (more positively) whether our staff are prime targets for being recruited elsewhere.

39. Exit questionnaires have been in place since 2001, but the assessment of turnover figures described above led to the decision that all female academic and research staff leavers would be invited to a confidential interview undertaken by either the E&D Specialist or the Deputy Director HR. Initial findings (from the relatively small number of interviews at that date) were presented at the October 2004 meeting and they will be used to assess the impact of our policies overall and to set targets as required. Findings included: the importance to female staff of managerial support and guidance in order to gain promotion and additional pay; the staff interviewed who were on fixed-term contracts felt less valued; and that there was a perception of inconsistent experiences in departments/divisions. Improvements included: the availability of more staff development opportunities; more visible commitment by the College to equal opportunities policies; and clearer pay progression. (Personal invitations to an exit interview have also been extended to BME staff).

40. The number of female students continues to rise. At 31 December 2004, the total number of female full-time students was 37%, an increase of 4.6% on the previous year.

41. While not specifically aimed at women, the appointment in September 2004 of a Staff Development Adviser, with dedicated responsibility for career development of research staff, will have a positive impact upon female research staff. A Research Staff Working Group (for both male and female staff) has been established with the aim of communicating more effectively with researchers and generating and sharing ideas. 36% of research staff are female. 21% of research staff are from an ethnic minority group (the figure may be larger as 10% of research staff have not disclosed their ethnic origin).

42. A Research Fellow in the Faculty of Engineering is part-funded by Schlumberger to look at the barriers that may exist to prevent girls studying engineering and women becoming engineers, and her report will provide the College with valuable information. Other projects that she is involved with include negotiating with sponsors to fund 20 scholarships for female undergraduates starting in September 2005 and the New Vision Project for undergraduate teaching in the Faculty. This latter Project analyses what changes might be made to the curriculum and its delivery so that it is responsive to a more diverse range of students; this may, in turn, increase the number of students entering engineering as a career.

43. Dr Sue Ion from BNFL gave the 5th annual Athena Lecture. Her main topic was on nuclear power as a sustainable energy resource and she also reflected upon her experiences and successes as a senior female manager within industry.

FLEXIBLE WORKING/FAMILY FRIENDLY POLICIES

44. The Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) has asked the College to work with it to develop a model EOC Flexible Working Policy. The College will introduce its policy during 2005, but in order to learn from experience, and to measure the impact of the policy over time, a survey of current practice was conducted in December 2004. 41 responses from managers were received. Varied arrangements are in place across the College but only half have been formalised in writing. While 88% of respondents were in favour of flexible
working, it is clear that the policy will need careful introduction and managerial support. The aim must be to balance requests with continuing operational effectiveness. HR staff have already been trained on how flexible working is best implemented so that they are better equipped to advise and support managers.

45. The College is considering plans to double the number of childcare places at a newly-located Early Years Education Centre (subject to planning permission). Every effort is also made to ensure that EYEC parents benefit from the financial incentives available under current legislation. Additionally, a salary sacrifice Childcare Voucher scheme to subsidise the costs of childcare was introduced during 2004 and provides significant savings for parents.

AGE

46. Legislation has been delayed but the College has given initial consideration to the impact of changes to the retirement age and possible changes it might make to documentation, e.g. the application form, but work will start in earnest during 2005.

LEARNING AND TEACHING

47. One of the Centre for Educational Development’s (CED) roles is to provide academic, research, and learning support staff with opportunities to develop their teaching-related skills. During 2004, two of the core workshops (compulsory for non-clinical lecturers) have been re-designed to give greater emphasis to equality and diversity. “Becoming a Personal Tutor” equips staff to respond effectively to students from diverse cultures and backgrounds and raises awareness of equality policies. The workshop on “Designing for Learning” requires participants to address the specific question “How does your practice and planning ensure that the curriculum, teaching, learning activities and assessment promote equality and are not discriminatory?” CED also offers training specifically for post-doctoral staff including “Starting Teaching” and “Assisting with Supervision”.

48. Equality and diversity training has also been held for panel members who hear appeals from students who have been deemed to fail. Panel members do not serve unless they have been trained.

49. The Widening Participation Strategy aims to raise the educational aspirations of those who are under-represented in HE. The outreach programme is diverse and the areas in which we work have high BME populations. In 2003/04, over 50,000 pupils in total were involved with the programme with a large proportion coming from BME communities. The College’s Access Agreement was submitted to the Office for Fair Access in January 2005. Included in the Agreement are details of the Bursary Scheme for those from less affluent backgrounds. Awards will be monitored as part of student-related data assessment (see Paragraph 58 below).

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

50. Senior level support has been much in evidence. General communications activity has also moved into a higher gear to raise awareness of equality and diversity issues. Efforts have been made to make certain that the equalities and diversity groups that link to the EO&DC (Annex A) have a multiple purpose. They recommend action, policy change and
help the College to set the equality and diversity agenda while also providing extremely important consultative and communication functions.

51. The range of promotional material has increased significantly. Mouse mats, pens and posters all publicise the College’s key value of “respect for others” and also give the web address for easy access to College policies. A full-colour brochure with photographs and contact details of the HSCs has been produced and the “Imperial College Pledge to Academic Women” has been redesigned as a full-colour postcard.

52. Close working with colleagues in the Communications Division has led to significantly more and improved publicity in the College’s newspaper “Reporter”. Articles and reports on events have included the launch of “Imperial As One”, the Athena Lecture and that on Dyslexia and Dyspraxia, an interview with the Deputy Rector on the importance of the College’s Harassment and Bullying Policy and associated training, and interviews with two of the HSCs.

53. While the majority of work has been internally focused, it is important that staff in HR with the most significant day-to-day responsibility for equality and diversity (the Equality & Diversity Specialist and the Deputy Director HR) are members of HE and national networks. The E&D Specialist is also an external member of the equalities committees of the Royal College of Art and the Institute of Physics.

54. Cultural events are planned for 2005, with regular activities taking place as part of the official launch of the new diversity groups.

**DATA COLLECTION AND MONITORING**

55. Accurate data and subsequent monitoring are vital to ensure that the College meets its equality and diversity objectives and that it complies with the law. A second personal data collection “push” for staff was undertaken in 2004 which resulted in an improvement in our knowledge of the overall staff profile. At November 2003, the ethnic origin of 86.4% of staff was known and this increased to 92.1% at November 2004. The aim is to improve this figure further during 2005. The number of staff with a declared disability remains very small at 1.2%, but it is hoped that wider knowledge of the Disability Policy and the training programme will contribute to higher declaration.

56. A minimum of 19 staff-related data sets (e.g. data on who applies and gets appointed, who gets promoted, etc.) are produced and are analysed regularly by HR and all major College committees. For example, a review of last year’s turnover data shows higher than average figures for BME staff. Research is to be undertaken to identify if this could be a reflection of the representation of BME staff in the lower grades (which generally have a higher turnover), or whether there are other reasons. Analysis of Leavers’ Questionnaires and the exit interviews referred to in Paragraph 39 above will also help the analysis. The number of staff who leave before completing 6 months’ service, and leave between 7-23 months, also increased in 2003/04. Further work is to be undertaken to assess the College’s record at recruiting to support posts at a rate that matches the ethnic composition of London’s potential workforce. (The market for academic and research staff is national and international).

57. A major exercise was carried out with colleagues from the IDEA League to compare the period 1998/99 to 2002/03 e.g.: overall female student numbers; female PhD students and PhD graduates; the numbers of female academic staff and whether in open-ended or fixed-term posts. Female representation on decision-making bodies and general career
development activities were also surveyed. Whilst there is no room for complacency, it is encouraging that the College is attracting a higher proportion of female staff and students.

58. A minimum of 11 student-related data sets are collected. Collection has been sustained over the year and return rates have improved. For those who have disclosed their ethnic origin, 38.8% are non-white. The largest ethnic groups are Indian and Chinese - 12.3% and 8.1% respectively. Analysis focuses upon comparing applications with offers and considering which groups are failing or leaving courses early. As an example, the percentage of students from a BME background who appeal against being failed, and their appeal success rate, has remained largely constant since 2001. More in-depth analysis will be conducted in 2005/06 when a member of Registry staff will be given specific responsibility to coordinate and analyse student-related figures.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

59. Impact assessment is the thorough and systematic analysis of a policy or practice to determine whether there is potential for, or is, differential impact on a particular group. This applies to all of the College’s major functions. The improvement in data collection in relation to ethnic origin has enabled us to assess the statistical impact of policies and procedures with a greater degree of accuracy than before. We still, however, need to mainstream impact assessment in policy formation and meet all of HEFCE’s good practice requirements. In the coming year we must also commit more resource to in-depth assessment of the statistics so that we are better able to assess trends year on year.

60. The setting up of our staff consultative groups will enable us to gain valuable information from those who are most likely to experience the effects of discriminatory institutional practice/discriminatory behaviour. The groups will also be provided with relevant statistics so that they can give us feedback. In addition, the follow-up to the 2002 College-wide survey will furnish us with valuable information on how staff view the impact of equality and diversity policies and procedures generally.

MAJOR ACTIONS PLANNED FOR 2005/06

61. The major focus will be to:

- Continue policy development and support for students;
- Continue the training/briefing programmes and build management and leadership capability;
- Review the Harassment and Bullying Policy; improve publicity for the policy and HSC network; continue the training programme for managers and staff;
- Produce a Workforce Composition report with targets;
- Survey disabled staff to identify if there have been positive changes since 2002 when the Schneider-Ross report recommendations were made; survey/focus groups of disabled students, and staff with responsibility for student matters, to identify the level of awareness in relation to support for disabled students (part of the HEFCE-funded project);
Follow-up on the 2002 College-wide survey in conjunction with the Communications Division;

Implement the recommendations from the Progress Review report commissioned by the AOC;

Work in conjunction with the EOC and implement the Flexible Working/Work Life Balance Policy;

Establish a working group to prepare for the legislation on age;

Undertake a second equal pay audit (which will be more comprehensive because of improved data);

Establish an Equality and Diversity Award;

Assess whether we should begin to monitor sexual orientation and establish groups to identify good practice guidance and initiatives;

Build upon the work undertaken to date with staff and student consultative groups;

Improve Impact Assessment implementation;

Publish and communicate a document that identifies practical actions that can be taken by managers at local level.

**AMBITIONS**

62. Longer-term, the EO&DC wishes to see: increasing leadership and public commitment from those senior staff with managerial responsibility; greater recognition of the achievements and contribution of a wider range of staff than presently exists – working for a prestigious organisation is very positive but elite organisations can be less successful at being inclusive; increasing understanding of the benefits of equality and diversity to Imperial, both as an employer and as a teaching and research institution; and increasing communication with, and greater participation by, a wider range of staff and students.

**DECISIONS**

63. The Council is asked to:

   a. Consider the findings of this Report.

   b. Assess the impact of actions taken to date.

   c. If thought fit, approve the major actions planned for 2005/06.
# MAJOR ACTION PLANS IN THE FIRST ANNUAL REPORT 2004-2005 – SUMMARY OF PROGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SER</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
<th>REFERENCES in 2005-06 REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Improve Data Collection</td>
<td>Return rates regarding declaration of ethnic origin have improved for both staff and students e.g. ethnic origin declaration has increased from 86.4% to 92.1% for staff. Improvements still to be made.</td>
<td>See Paragraph 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Impact Assessment of College Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>Increased, and more accurate, data has enabled better statistical analysis of the impact of policies and procedures. More in-depth analysis required in order to identify if changes to practice are required.</td>
<td>See Paragraphs 56-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Implementation of Promoting Race Equality, Disability and Harassment and Bullying Policies</td>
<td>Roadshows held to brief staff on the College’s anti-discrimination and promoting equality policies; Disability Equality Training – 200 participants; the Harassment Support Contacts network publicised and training sessions held on the policy for the most senior staff; expanded session on equality and diversity at Induction. Equality and diversity training will continue through-out 2005/2006.</td>
<td>See Paragraphs: 14-26 Promoting Race Equality 27-29 Harassment &amp; Bullying 30-36 Disability 10 Induction/Roadshows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Build Management and Learning and Teaching Capability</td>
<td>1175 training days on management and leadership were held; an individual manager’s responsibility for equality and diversity has been incorporated into management training for all levels of staff; the questions relating to equality and diversity on the PRDP are often ignored and more work is required to increase managers’ understanding of their role and contribution; the training of interview panel members has continued (207 participants attended last year’s courses) but more specific targeting is required; compulsory core learning and teaching workshops for non-clinical academic staff have been redesigned and now have greater emphasis on equality and diversity.</td>
<td>See Paragraphs 6-9; 12; 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td>REFERENCES in 2005-06 REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Communications and Publicity</td>
<td>Close working with local community and BME populations via Widening Participation and Volunteer activities; top-level support is much in evidence; the range of promotional material has increased; publicity has increased, as has the number of equality and diversity – related events.</td>
<td>See Paragraphs 17-19; 50-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Achieve Active Participation by Staff and Students</td>
<td>The number of groups that provide input into policy development and feedback on the impact of policies and procedures has increased; the number of staff attending training/briefing sessions on a wide range of equality and diversity issues is encouraging.</td>
<td>See Paragraphs 4; 28; 31; 60 and Annex A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Family-Friendly and Work-Life Balance Policy</td>
<td>Survey of current practice undertaken; working in partnership with the Equal Opportunities Commission to develop a model policy; plans in train to double the number of childcare places.</td>
<td>See Paragraphs 44 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Develop Local Equality and Diversity Action Plans</td>
<td>Developed in two areas of College – Residences and Undergraduate Medicine Office.</td>
<td>See Paragraph 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation and Religious Belief Legislation</td>
<td>Incorporated into policies and staff briefed via training and written information.</td>
<td>See Paragraph 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Implications of Age Legislation 2006</td>
<td>Initial consideration given to retirement age and application forms but serious work will take place during 2005.</td>
<td>See Paragraph 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAPER Q

MINUTES OF THE SENATE

A Note by the Rector

1. The Minutes of the meetings of the Senate held on 23 February 2005, 11 May 2005 and 22 June 2005 are attached. The following points are drawn to the attention of the Council for information.

2. **Minute 760 – Imperial College Union Written Submission to QAA.** The Senate received the written submission to the QAA produced by the Imperial College Union on behalf of the student body as part of the institutional audit process. The overall view of the students was that the College provided an excellent standard of education which generally met students' expectations. Some areas had, however, been identified for improvement; significantly, shortcomings in the personal tutoring system and the communication of student views above departmental level. The Senate noted that the Quality and Academic Review Committee would consider the submission in detail. In parallel the Senate requested the College Deans to address the issue of personal tutoring and its application across the College.

3. **Minute 761 – Review of Research Training.** The Senate noted the satisfactory review of research training in the Department of Physics conducted by the Quality and Academic Review Committee.

4. **Minute 765 – Master of Education.** The Senate approved a recommendation from the Graduate School of Life Sciences and Medicine that a new Master of Education (MEd) in Surgical Education be established from October 2005. The MEd is a qualification of the University of London not currently awarded by the College.

5. **Minute 766 – Faculty Teaching Committees and ‘Studies’ Committees.** The Senate noted that the Academic Registrar had convened a review of the terms of reference and membership of the Faculty Teaching Committees and the ‘Studies’ Committees. The Review had concluded that although there was some overlap of membership the two sets of committee served different purposes and should therefore remain separate. Better linkage between the Committees should be achieved through wider publication and distribution of the minutes.

6. **Minutes 767 and 779 – Access Agreement.** The Senate received for information the College’s Access Agreement which had been submitted to and subsequently approved by the Office for Fair Access.

7. **Minute 768 – Office of the Independent Adjudicator.** The Senate approved changes to the **Procedure for the Consideration of Representations Concerning Decisions of the Board of Examiners**, and the **Procedures for dealing with appeals by research students to the Transfer Appeal Committee against a decision by their Department or Division not to transfer their registration from MPhil to PhD** consequent upon the establishment of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator to hear student complaints once all the internal appeal and complaints procedures have been exhausted.

---

1 Copies of the Senate Minutes are not included with these Minutes
8. **Minutes 782, 801 and 802 – Reviews of Undergraduate Teaching** The Senate approved reports from the Quality and Academic Review Committee on undergraduate teaching in the Departments of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanical Engineering. The Senate was pleased to note that the assessors, all of whom were external to the College, had commented positively on the teaching in all the departments reviewed.

9. **Minute 788 – Powers of the Senate.** The Senate approved the recommendation of the Academic Registrar to disestablish its Chairman’s Action Committee with immediate effect, as the need for its existence had been removed following amendment of the Statutes.

10. **Minute 800 – QAA Institutional Audit.** The Senate was pleased to note the very satisfactory outcome of the QAA Institutional Audit, in which the College had received a judgement of broad confidence in the soundness of its current and likely future management of the quality of its academic programmes and the academic standards of its awards.

11. **Minute 803 – Implications for Imperial College of the Bologna Process following the Bergen Summit.** The Senate confirmed its support for the strategy adopted by the task force set up by the Strategic Education Committee to ensure that Imperial’s degrees satisfy the spirit and the letter of the Bologna mandate.

R.B.S.
1. At its meetings on 11 May 2005 and 22 June 2005 the Senate considered a number of proposals for amendments to the Academic Regulations and to the Regulations for Students. The Senate agreed to support the proposals, and the Council is therefore invited to consider and, if it sees fit, approve the amendments to the Regulations detailed below. The Minutes of the relevant meetings of the Senate are reported separately to the Council.

**ACADEMIC REGULATIONS**

2. **Paragraph 1.2** (Senate Minute 810 refers) The Senate approved the participation of the College in the new Doctor of Medicine (Research) degree (MD(Res)) of the University of London and the College requirements for students proceeding to the award of the new degree. It is proposed that Paragraph 1.2 of the Academic Regulations should accordingly be amended so as to include the MD(Res) as an award of the University of London available to students of the College.

3. **Paragraph 5.6** (Senate Minute 783 refers)
   a. Paragraph 5.6 of the Academic Regulations currently states that:

   “No student who is registered as an External Student of the University of London may be registered concurrently as a Student of the College.”

   b. The Senate has supported a proposal from the Quality and Academic Review Committee so as to permit students to hold the status of Internal and External Student concurrently. It is accordingly recommended that paragraph 5.6 of the Academic Regulations be amended to read as follows:

   “A student who is registered as an External Student of the University of London may be registered concurrently as a Student of the College where such registration is supported by the appropriate College committee.”

4. **Annex B - Student Withdrawals and Appeals – Procedure for Dealing with Cases of Unsatisfactory Academic Progress** (Senate Minute 814 refers)
   a. The Senate has supported proposals from the Quality and Academic Review Committee to clarify the student withdrawal and appeals procedure so as to make explicit the grounds upon which appeals may be based and to make the holding of an Appeal Committee conditional upon the appellant presenting reasonable grounds for their appeal. In so doing, the procedure will come into line with the *Procedures for the Consideration of Representations Against the Decisions of Boards of Examiners*, under which an Appeal Committee only takes place once the case has been reviewed and a hearing then judged necessary. The aim of the changes is to reduce the number of appeals which have no possibility of succeeding, thereby freeing resources to effect a faster resolution of cases where there are significant grounds for appeal.
b. A change to the required contents of Departmental written statements to Appeal Committees is also proposed. The current requirement for the Department to detail “any remedial measures taken … to improve the student’s performance” can give rise to difficulties in interpretation. It is not always evident that a student needed remedial attention until after their examination results are known, but under the current phrasing an appellant may be able to claim that the Department has failed to provide them with a proper level of support if such measures were never offered. It is therefore recommended that the caveat “(where appropriate)” be inserted into the procedure.

c. The current Student Withdrawal and Appeals procedure is attached to this paper as Annex A. The proposed revisions would affect section 4 only of the procedure and a revised version of this section is attached as Annex B.

REGULATIONS FOR STUDENTS (Senate Minute 816 refers)

5. Regulation 7 states as follows:

“Undergraduates must inform their Senior Tutor and postgraduates their Postgraduate Tutor if they are absent from the College for more than one week during term. If the absence is due to illness a medical certificate must be produced. If an examination is missed on account of illness a medical certificate must be produced immediately.”

6. It has become apparent that this Regulation is not being observed uniformly across the College, with practice varying from one day to two weeks for notification of absence and from one to six days for a doctor’s certificate. While many Departments and Divisions prefer earlier notification of absence, the requirement for a medical certificate before seven days imposes a financial burden upon the student as a charge is made for a certificate for an illness lasting for less than a week. College employees are only required to produce a certificate if they have been absent for seven days or more and it would appear to be discriminatory to introduce a different, and more expensive, procedure for students.

7. In view of the value of Departments and Divisions being notified as soon as possible of a student’s absence it is recommended that Regulation 7 is amended as follows:

“Undergraduates must inform their Senior Tutor and postgraduates their Postgraduate Tutor if they are absent from the College for more than three days during term. If the absence is due to illness a medical certificate must be produced after seven days. If an examination is missed on account of illness a medical certificate must be produced immediately.”

K.A.M.
**ACADEMIC REGULATIONS**

*Student Withdrawals and Appeals - Procedure for dealing with cases of unsatisfactory academic progress*

1. **General**

   1.1. Academic Regulations require that a student admitted to any course of study must attend to the satisfaction of the Head of Department. The College reserves the right to require any student whose academic progress is unsatisfactory or who fails in an examination to withdraw from the College. Withdrawal decisions may be taken at any time during the session.

   1.2. The right to require a student to withdraw from the College on academic grounds is vested in the Senate and is delegated by the Senate to the Departments, subject to the appeal procedure referred to in paragraph 4 below.

2. **Withdrawal procedure in respect of undergraduate students**

   2.1. When an undergraduate student's academic progress is considered so unsatisfactory as to be likely to lead to a withdrawal decision during the session, the Department must clearly warn the student of this possibility in good time (i.e. a minimum of six weeks’ notice must be given), both orally and in writing. In giving such warnings the position in respect of course work and its significance in assessment should always be made clear.

   2.2. If the student's academic progress continues to be unsatisfactory beyond the warning period and if, following discussions with the student, it is the view of the Department that there are no or insufficient extenuating circumstances, a decision that the student be required to withdraw may be made by the Head of Department (1) and shall be reported to the Academic Registrar for formal communication to the student.

   2.3. In the case of failure in an examination, the Head of Department will decide (in the light of the results declared by the Examiners, the student's academic performance on the course, and the existence of any extenuating circumstances) whether the student shall be required to withdraw from the College. The decision will be reported to the Academic Registrar for formal communication to the student.

3. **Withdrawal procedure in respect of postgraduate students**

   3.1. When a postgraduate student's academic progress is considered by a department to be so unsatisfactory as to be likely to lead to a withdrawal decision, the Department must clearly warn the student of this possibility in good time (i.e. a minimum of four weeks’ notice for an advanced course student and six weeks’ notice for a research

---

1. The term 'Head of Department' is deemed to include the Principal of the School of Medicine, who may designate as he/she thinks fit the Head of Undergraduate Medicine, the Vice-Principal for Postgraduate Medicine or the Head of Division to act on his/her behalf.
student must be given), both orally and in writing. A copy of the warning letter must be sent to the Departmental Postgraduate Tutor and/or Head of Department and to the Academic Registrar. Where appropriate the student should be informed that voluntary withdrawal is advisable.

3.2. The warning letter should indicate measurable ways and the timescale in which the student’s academic progress should be expected to improve.

3.3. If the student’s academic progress, beyond the warning period, continues to be so unsatisfactory as to justify a withdrawal decision, the Department must notify the student of this fact in writing. If the student does not withdraw voluntarily, he/she will be required to appear before an ad hoc Assessment Committee.

3.4. Departmental ad hoc Assessment Committees will be established as necessary by the Head of Department and should wherever possible include a member of the academic staff of another department. The student will have the right to nominate a member of the academic staff of his/her own department to serve on the Committee. The Assessment Committee will hear both the student and his/her supervisor or course organiser, and will invite the student to refer to extenuating or other circumstances which, in the student’s view, have affected his/her academic performance. The Committee will produce a written report on the student’s academic performance and on any extenuating circumstances put forward.

3.5. The Head of Department, in the light of the Assessment Committee’s report and such subsequent discussion with the student as he/she may deem appropriate, will decide whether or not the student shall be required to withdraw from the College. If the student is to be required to withdraw, the decision will be reported to the Academic Registrar for formal communication to the student. The Assessment Committee’s report will also be submitted to the Academic Registrar.

3.6. In the case of failure in a postgraduate advanced course examination, consideration by an ad hoc Assessment Committee will not be required. The Head of Department will decide (in the light of the results declared by the Examiners, the student’s academic performance on the course, and the existence of any extenuating circumstances) whether the student shall be required to withdraw from the College. The decision will be reported to the Academic Registrar for formal communication to the student.

4. **Appeal procedure in respect of all students**

4.1. All students required to withdraw have the right of appeal through the Academic Registrar to an Appeal Committee of the Senate. The right of appeal relates only to the withdrawal decision and not to the results of any examination or academic assessment on which the decision may be based.

4.2. Students required to withdraw are given written notice, by the Academic Registrar, of their right to appeal. In respect of withdrawals during term-time as regards undergraduates and anytime in the session as regards postgraduates, any appeal must be lodged within two weeks; in respect of withdrawals following examination failure by undergraduates, any appeal must be made within four weeks. The appeal must be made in writing by the student giving details of any extenuating circumstances.
4.3. The Department is then asked to consider the appeal, and, if acceptable, to cancel its previous withdrawal decision. If the Department is not prepared to cancel its decision the matter is referred to an Appeal Committee.

4.4. An Appeal Committee shall consist of three members of the academic staff drawn by the Academic Registrar from a panel established by the Senate for the purpose. The Appeal Committee will not include a member of staff from the appellant’s department.

4.5. The student will be invited to attend the Appeal Committee and the Department will be invited to send a representative to the hearing. Students may, if they wish, be accompanied by a ‘friend’ who is a member of Imperial College (either a fellow student, or a personal tutor, warden or other member of the academic staff); the friend may speak 3 in support of the student if the latter so desires. In keeping with the Human Rights Act (1998), students may, if they wish, request that the hearing be held in public.

4.6. Written statements will be required from the Department as follows:

(1) In respect of withdrawal arising from unsatisfactory academic progress during the session:

   (a) A statement indicating in general terms the reasons which led the Department to require withdrawal;

   (b) For an undergraduate, a statement giving details of any progress tests undertaken so far in the session, the student’s results and course work marks and their relationship to those of the class as a whole, together with the previous academic record within the College; for a postgraduate, the report by the Assessment Committee.

(2) In respect of withdrawal resulting from examination failure:

   (a) A statement indicating in general terms the reasons which led the Department not to accede to the student’s request to repeat the year, including an account of any remedial measures taken by the Department to improve the student’s performance;

   (b) A statement giving details of the student’s examination and course work marks, the relevant pass marks, and the relationship of the performance to the class average, together with the previous academic record within the College. These statements will be sent to the student at least one week before the hearing.

4.7. The conduct of the Appeal Committee will be standardised as far as possible. Both the student and the departmental representative (if attending) will be before the Committee at the same time; the Chairman will explain that the academic details and information, provided under 4.6 (1) (b) and (2) (b) above, are taken by the Committee as given and that it is only empowered to hear extenuating circumstances which might lead to a conclusion that the withdrawal decision was unreasonable. The student will be invited to present his/her case; following which the representative will then make a statement of the departmental view, with the student permitted to put questions. Finally, the student will be invited to make any further comments he/she wishes; after which the student and ‘friend’ (if present) and departmental representative will withdraw, before the Appeal Committee considers the matter.
4.8. The Appeal Committee, in reaching a conclusion on a student appeal, may attach specific conditions to the continuance by the student of the course of study.

4.9. The Clerk to the Appeal Committee will write to the appellant within ten working days of the hearing taking place, informing him/her of the Committee's decision, and providing reasons for the judgement reached in relation to submissions made at the hearing.

4.10. The responsibility for hearing and deciding upon appeals is vested in the Senate and is delegated by the Senate to the Appeal Committee, whose decisions are final.

4.11. A formal report on all withdrawal decisions is made to the Senate. In keeping with the Human Rights Act (1998), should the student choose, the Committee's decision and reasoned judgement will be published.

4.12. Once a student has completed the College's internal appeals or complaints procedures, the College will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures Letter. If the student is still dissatisfied, the student may direct their complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator within three months of the date on which the Completion of Procedures Letter was issued. Information on the complaints covered by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and the review procedures is available at: http://www.oiahe.org.uk/docs/OIA_New_Rules.pdf.

**Procedure for dealing with cases of unsatisfactory academic progress**

**Withdrawal resulting from examination failure - Conduct of Appeal Committee**

(1) Both the student and the Departmental representative (if attending) will be before the Committee at the same time.

(2) The panel and the student will be provided with a statement giving details of the student's examination and coursework marks, the relevant pass marks, and the relationship of his/her performance to the class average, together with the previous academic record within the College. The Chairman will explain that these academic details and information are taken by the Committee as given and that the Appeal Committee is only empowered to hear extenuating circumstances which might lead to a conclusion that the withdrawal decision was unreasonable.

(3) The Chairman will then invite the student to present his/her case.

(4) The Departmental representative is then invited to put questions.

(5) Members of the panel may address questions to the student.

(6) The Departmental representative will then make a statement of the departmental view.

(7) The student is then invited to put questions.

(8) Members of the Panel may address questions to the Departmental representative.

(9) The student is then invited to make any further comments he/ she wishes.

(10) The student (and his/ her ‘friend’ if present) and the Departmental representative are then asked to withdraw.
ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

Student withdrawals and appeals – Procedure for dealing with cases of unsatisfactory academic progress

Proposed revised section 4 - July 2005

4.1. All students required to withdraw have the right of appeal through the Academic Registrar to an Appeal Committee of the Senate. The right of appeal relates only to the withdrawal decision and not to the results of any examination or academic assessment on which the decision may be based.

4.2. Students required to withdraw are given written notice, by the Academic Registrar, of their right of appeal. In respect of withdrawals during term-time as regards undergraduates and anytime in the session as regards postgraduates, any appeal must be lodged within two weeks; in respect of withdrawals following examination failure by undergraduates, any appeal must be made within four weeks. Any appeal must be made in writing and sent to the Academic Registrar and shall state the grounds on which the appeal is being made and provide evidence to support it.

4.3. The College will consider appeals (i) where there is new evidence of extenuating circumstances which the student had been unable for valid reasons to disclose before the Head of Department made his/her decision; (ii) where there is evidence that the Head of Department had acted unreasonably in requiring the student to withdraw; and (iii) where there is evidence that the Student Withdrawals and Appeals procedure has not been correctly followed.

4.4. The Department is then asked to consider the appeal, and, if acceptable, to cancel its previous withdrawal decision. If the Department is not prepared to cancel its decision the matter may be referred to an Appeal Committee, at the discretion of the Academic Registrar, if sufficient evidence remains providing grounds for appeal as stated in para 4.3 above.

4.5. Any request for an Appeal Committee to be convened must be made in writing and lodged with the Academic Registrar within 14 days of the notification to the student of the decision of the Department not to cancel its withdrawal decision.

4.6. If the Academic Registrar determines that sufficient evidence remains to allow an appeal, the Academic Registrar shall arrange for an Appeals Panel to be established. The Appeal Committee shall consist of three members of the academic staff drawn by the Academic Registrar from a panel established by the Senate for that purpose. The Appeal Committee will not include a member of staff from the appellant's Department.

4.7. The student will be invited to attend the Appeal Committee and the Department will be invited to send a representative to the hearing. Students may, if they wish, be accompanied by a 'friend' who is a member of Imperial College (either a fellow student, or a personal tutor, warden or other member of the academic staff); the friend may speak in support of the student if the latter so desires. In keeping with the
Human Rights Act (1998), students may, if they wish, request that the hearing be held in public.

4.8 Written statements will be required from the Department as follows:

(1) In respect of withdrawal arising from unsatisfactory academic progress during the session:

(a) A statement indicating in general terms the reasons which led the Department to require withdrawal;

(b) For an undergraduate or taught postgraduate student, details of any academic record within the College, a statement giving details of any progress tests undertaken so far in the session, the student’s results and coursework marks, and their relationship to those of the class as whole; and for a postgraduate student, the report by the Assessment Committee.

(2) In respect of withdrawal resulting from examination failure:

(a) A statement indicating in general terms the reasons which led the Department not to accede to the student’s request to repeat the year;

(b) A statement giving details of the student’s academic record within the College, the student’s examination and coursework results, the relationship of the performance to the class average, and (where appropriate) an account of any remedial measures taken by the Department to improve the student’s performance;

These statements will be sent to the student at least one week before the hearing.

4.9. The conduct of the Appeal Committee will be standardised as far as possible. Both the student and the departmental representative (if attending) will be before the Committee at the same time; the Chairman will explain that the academic details and information, provided under 4.8 (1) (b) and (2) (b) above, are taken by the Committee as given and that it is only empowered to hear extenuating circumstances which might lead to a conclusion that the withdrawal decision was unreasonable. The student will be invited to present his/her case; following which the representative will then make a statement of the departmental view, with the student permitted to put questions. Finally, the student will be invited to make any further comments he/she wishes; after which the student and ‘friend’ if present) and departmental representative will withdraw, before the Appeal Committee considers the matter.

4.10. The Appeal Committee, in reaching a conclusion on a student appeal, may attach specific conditions to the continuance by the student of the course of study.

4.11. The Clerk to the Appeal Committee will write to the appellant within ten working days of the hearing taking place, informing him/her of the Committee’s decision, and providing reasons for the judgement reached in relation to submissions made at the hearing.

4.12. The responsibility for hearing and deciding upon appeals is vested in the Senate and is delegated by the Senate to the Appeal Committee, whose decisions are final.
4.13. A formal report on all withdrawal decisions is made to the Senate. In keeping with the Human Rights Act (1998), should the student choose, the Committee’s decision and reasoned judgement will be published.

4.14. Once a student has completed the College’s internal appeals or complaints procedures, the College will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures Letter. If the student is still dissatisfied, the student may direct their complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator within three months of the date on which the Completion of Procedures Letter was issued. Information on the complaints covered by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and the review procedures is available at: http://www.oiahe.org.uk/docs/OIA_New_Rules.pdf.
AMENDMENTS TO THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION’S CONSTITUTION

A Note by the President

INTRODUCTION

1. The Council agreed at its last meeting to suspend Article 7.4 of the Imperial College Union Constitution and Regulation 2.E.25 of its Election and Referenda Regulations concerning the requirement to hold an Annual General Meeting. This was done to allow the Union to hold a cross-campus electronic ballot for its junior officer posts. The decision was made in the knowledge that the ICU was engaged in a wider governance review, the results of which would be brought back as more concrete proposals.

2. The review of the Constitution has now been completed and the purpose of this Paper is to seek Council approval for the proposed changes to the Union’s Constitution and Regulations.

THE CONSTITUTION

3. The principal change is a proposed re-draft to Article 7 (General Meetings) to take account of the fact that the Annual General Meeting is no longer held. The opportunity has also been taken to revise the quorum to a more sensible, and scalable level and to change references to the Union Manager to the Permanent Secretary throughout.

FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

4. As a result of delays with the completion of the financial audit for the year ended 31 July 2004, the Union was requested by the College’s Internal Audit function to review its Financial Regulations. The changes have been drafted to achieve the following desired consequences:

   a. A clear process by which the ICU Executive should produce a budget for the ICU Council to endorse before the end of each summer term.

   b. A framework for monitoring of budgets on a regular basis by the ICU Executive.

   c. New and replacement permanent staff contracts must receive financial sign-off by the Honorary Senior Treasurer. (At present the President can sign any contract for new staff with no financial sign-off).

   d. Non-trading operational managers are able to approve expenditure within their budgets, just as trading managers are.

   e. The Executive Committee must agree to expenditure above £100,000 and the ICU Council must agree to expenditure above £1M (at present the Deputy President (Finance & Services) has unlimited financial authority).
f. The Honorary Senior Treasurers may appoint nominees (normally other Honorary Senior Treasurers) to act as signatories in their place. (This formalises current practice).

g. The President should nominate internal (to the Union) backup signatories. At present the Honorary Senior Treasurers act as a backup which doesn’t seem right.

h. The financial authority limits for clubs/ societies, managers, and officers are increased to take account of inflation since they were last set.

OTHER REGULATIONS

5. There are wide-ranging changes to the other regulations. These aim to:

a. Establish a new sabbatical post of Deputy President (Graduate Students), which is strongly supported by the College and the funding for which is part-sponsored by the Graduate Schools. An election has successfully been held to fill this position in the 2005/06 session, in anticipation of likely approval.

b. Establish a Graduate Students’ Association, under the leadership of the new Deputy President to provide a framework for representation of, and social activity among, graduate students of the College.

c. Establish suitable provision in the election regulations for non-sabbatical Union Officers now that there is no AGM for them to be elected by.

d. Streamline the Union’s bureaucracy through a sweeping consolidation of its committee structure.

e. Reforming the composition and legitimacy of the Executive Committee. In particular, giving electoral legitimacy to the Chair of the Overseas Students’ Committee in their role as a representative of international students to the Union and College at large.

f. Perform routine ‘housekeeping’, for example correction of past drafting errors and amending of job titles.

APPROVAL PROCESS

6. The process for amending the ICU Constitution and Regulations is set out in Article 20 of the ICU Constitution:

“20. Amendment

1. This Constitution may be amended by resolution of the [Union] Council, passed by a two-thirds majority at two successive meetings, not less than fifteen and not more than forty College days apart, with the approval of the Imperial College Council.

2. The Regulations may be amended by resolution of the [Union] Council, passed by two successive meetings, not less than fifteen and not more than forty College days apart, with the second resolution passed by a two-
thirds majority, with the approval of the Imperial College Council or its nominee."

7. The proposed changes to the Constitution have been approved by two successive meetings of Union Council in the prescribed manner. Proposed changes to the Financial Regulations have also been approved in the prescribed manner.

8. The proposed changes to the other regulations did not receive their (simple majority) first reading as the Union Council became quorate after a session approaching 9 hours in length. Nevertheless the Union Council did approve the changes by a two-thirds majority at a second meeting. There being insufficient term-time left to approve the change in the normal way the Union Council agreed that the President should seek approval from the College Council to suspend this requirement and ratify the proposed regulatory amendments.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

9. Attached at Annex A is a set of extracts from the Union’s Constitution and Regulations setting out the proposed amendments. The Council is invited to consider and, if it sees fit, approve these.

Mustafa Arif
7. **General Meetings**

1. General Meetings are held to ensure the accountability of the Union to its members.
2. All Full Members of the Union may participate and vote all aspects of business at General Meeting. The quorum shall be 200 Full Members.
3. The standing orders and procedures for the calling and conduct of General Meetings shall be set in Regulations.

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

5. **Emergency General Meetings**

   4. A General Meeting shall be called by
      1. The President
      2. The Council Chair upon receipt of a request by
   
   6. An Emergency General Meeting may be called by
      1. The President,
      2a. The Executive Committee, or the Council
      3. The Council, or
      4. b. The Council Chair upon receipt of a petition signed by at least 100 Full Members of the Union requesting an Emergency General Meeting, the meeting to be held within five College days of receiving such a petition.

   53. An Emergency General Meeting shall discuss a specific item of business only, and may
      a. Review and refer back policy or operational policy made by the Council or Executive Committee respectively,
      b. Hold the Sabbatical Officers and Felix Editor to account, and
      c. Act on behalf of the Annual General Meeting if its business was not completed.

“10. **The Executive Committee**

4. The Executive Committee shall
   a. Advance the aims and objects of the Union,
   b. Implement the Union policy,
   c. Set operational policy in line with Union policy,
   d. Oversee the day-to-day running of the Union and the co-ordination of its activities,
   e. Establish policy on staffing issues and oversee staffing matters,
   f. Establish policy on health and safety issues and oversee health and safety matters,
   fg. Deal with disciplinary matters in accordance with policy,
   gh. Establish principles for the fair allocation of the financial resources available to the Union,
Monitor financial performance against budget, and
Receive the audited annual accounts of the Union, and report their
findings to the Council.”

“17. Discipline
1. Misconduct in the Union is dealt with in the following ways depending on
the individual concerned:
   1. Misconduct or negligence by Officers of the Union and others
   holding elected office in any part of the Union may be dealt with by
   the Council or its committees under Regulations; this may include
   censure or dismissal.
   2. Misconduct by students of a non-academic nature shall be dealt
   with by the Union under Union policy approved by the Imperial
   College Council, which forms part of the College Code of Discipline
   for students.
   3. Misconduct by Associate, Reciprocal or Life Members shall be dealt
   by the Executive Committee under Union policy.
   4. Misconduct by Union staff shall be dealt with by the President and
   Permanent Secretary Union Manager through the line management
   structure.”

REGULATION ONE - OFFICERS OF THE UNION

“A. Officers of the Union

1. The Officers of the Union shall be:
   1. President,
   2. Deputy President (Finance & Services),
   3. Deputy President (Clubs & Societies),
   4. Deputy President (Education & Welfare),
   5. Deputy President (Finance & Services)
   6. Deputy President (Graduate Students)
   7. Council Chair,
   8. President of the Imperial College Faculty of Life Sciences Students’ Union,
   9. President of the Imperial College Faculty of Life Sciences Students’ Union,
   10. President of the Imperial College Faculty of Medicine Students’ Union,
   11. President of the Imperial College Faculty of Physical Sciences Students’ Union,
   ...
   1617. Silwood Park Union Chair,”

20. Deputy President (Graduate Students)

The Deputy President (Graduate Students) shall:
(i) Uphold the policy and further the aims and objects of the Union.
(ii) Take on Presidential duties as appropriate,
(iii) Be responsible for the effective representation of graduate students both
to the College and within the Union itself,
(iv) Be responsible for the effective co-ordination of the Union’s services to,
and activities, for graduate students,
(v) Champion the cause of graduate students’ involvement in all relevant
areas of Union and College activity,
(vi) Liaise with Union and College staff as appropriate
(vii) Attend the relevant Union Committees,
(viii) Represent the Union on external committees as appropriate,
(ix) Report to Union Committees as appropriate, and
(x) Negotiate other duties with the President.”

“The Chairs of the Clubs and Societies Committees

The Chairs of the Arts and Entertainments Board, Athletic Clubs Committee, Graduate Students’ Association, Overseas Students Committee, Media Group, Overseas Students Committee, Recreational Clubs Committee, Royal School of Mines Committee, Silwood Park Committee, Union, Social Clubs Committee, and the President of the Wye Union Society, in addition to any responsibilities laid down by their respective committee, shall:

REGULATION TWO - ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA

“D Sabbatical elections

19. The Sabbatical Officers and Felix Editor shall be elected by a College-wide secret ballot in which all Full Members are entitled to stand and vote for these positions, with the exception of the position of Deputy President (Graduate Students) who is elected from amongst those Full Members who are graduate students by the Full Membership.”

“E Elections for non-sabbatical posts

25. Elections for all non-sabbatical Union Officers except for officers of the Faculty Union Presidents and Chairs of the 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. Through a College-wide secret ballot held no earlier than the sabbatical elections.

26. Elections for Faculty Union Presidents shall be by secret ballot in the relevant departments, by and from all full members of the respective Faculty Union. Other Faculty Union posts shall be elected at a meeting or by departments-wide secret ballot as may be prescribed.

27. The Chair of the Overseas Students’ Committee shall be elected through a College-wide secret ballot by and from those Full Members registered as having residency status other than ‘home’.

28. Elections for Chairs and other officers of the Club and Society Committees shall be by the committee and from the Full Membership.

29. Elections for club and society officers shall be at a general meeting of the club or society by and from all full members of the club or society.

30. Elections for ordinary members on the Council, Trading, Services, and Retail Committees shall be by College-wide secret ballot at the first meeting of the Council of the academic year, by and from the Full Membership.

31. The ordinary members of the Executive Committee shall be elected by and from the Council with restrictions as detailed in Regulation 3 Part B. The elections for ordinary members of the Executive Committee shall begin after the results are declared for elections for Ordinary Members of the Council. Nominees on the Executive Committee shall be determined by meetings of the same year’s membership of the relevant Committees. Nominations to other Committees shall also be made by the same year’s offices and committee members but only after the Executive Committee’s membership is confirmed and it has made its own appointments.
32. The Union’s delegates for the University of London Union’s Council will be the President and those Deputy Presidents whom Council request to go. The remaining delegates shall be elected by College-wide secret ballot at the first Council of start of the year by and from the Full membership.

REGULATION THREE - COMPOSITION OF UNION COMMITTEES

“A. The Council

Sabbatical Officers

ii President,
iii Deputy President (Finance & Services),
iv Deputy President (Clubs & Societies),
v Deputy President (Education & Welfare),
v. Deputy President (Finance & Services),
vi Deputy President (Graduate Students),”

Permanent Observers

xxxv The Union Manager, Permanent Secretary,
xxxvii The Honorary Senior Treasurer”

“The Executive Committee

2. The Executive Committee shall consist of:

1. the Sabbatical Officers,
2. the Presidents of the Faculty Unions,
3. The Chair of the Overseas Students Committee,
4. two members nominated by the Student Activities Committee,
5. one member nominated by the Academic Affairs Committee, and
6. one member nominated by the Welfare Committee.
3. Six Ordinary Members.

3. Two of the six Ordinary Members shall come from the following Two categories respectively:

1. Chairs of Clubs and Society Committees, which are: the Chairs of the Arts
   & Entertainments Board, Athletics Clubs Committee, Overseas Students
   Committee, Media Group, Recreational Clubs Committee, Royal School of
   Mines Committee, Silwood Park, Social Clubs Committee, and the
   President of the Wye Union Society,
2. Academic representatives, which are: the Faculty Education
   Representatives and the Faculty Research Representatives.

4. Remaining Ordinary Members may be drawn from the full membership of the Council.

53. The Executive Committee shall be chaired by the Council Chair, or the President
    in his or her absence or their nominee.

4. The Honorary Senior Treasurer and Permanent Secretary shall attend as
   permanent observers.

5. Appropriate staff members determined by the President, as advised by the
   Permanent Secretary shall have permanent observer status and shall present
   reports detailing activities within their areas of responsibility.

6. The Executive Committee’s powers and responsibilities are set out in section 10 of
   the Constitution, and include the approval of operational policy.”
“The Trading and Services Committees

12. Each committee shall invite the Permanent Secretary, Finance Manager, Marketing Manager, and Union Honorary Senior Treasurer or their nominees as permanent observers.”

“Trading Committee

14. Responsibility for monitoring the performance of the Union’s bar, catering, retail and entertainment provision and gaming and vending machines shall be delegated to the Trading Committee.

15. The Trading Committee shall approve commercial policy on the operation, marketing and integration of the Union’s bar, catering, retail and entertainment provision and gaming and vending machines, provided it does not conflict with Union or operational policy.

16. The Trading Committee shall consist of:
   1. The Sabbatical Officers,
   2. A representative from each Faculty Union, and
   3. Four ordinary members elected by Council from the Full Membership of the Union nominated by the Executive Committee.”

“Services Committee

20. The Services Committee shall consist of:
   1. The Sabbatical Officers,
   2. Two members nominated by the Executive Committee,
   3. Two members nominated by the Student Activities Committee,
   4. One member nominated by the Welfare Committee, and
   5. One member nominated by the Academic Affairs Committee
   2. A representative from each Faculty Union, and
   3. Four ordinary members elected by Council from the Full Membership of the Union.”

“Retail Committee

22. Responsibility for monitoring the performance of the Union Shop and Newsagent shall be delegated to the Retail Committee.

23. The Retail Committee shall approve commercial policy on the operation of the Union Shop and Newsagent, providing it does not conflict with Union or operational policy.

24. The Retail Committee shall consist of:
   1. The Sabbatical Officers,
   2. A representative from each Faculty Union, and
   3. Four ordinary members elected by Council from the Full Membership of the Union.

25. Appropriate staff members determined by the President, as advised by the Union Manager, shall have permanent observer status and shall present reports detailing activities within their areas of responsibility.”

“The Student Activities Committee

28. The Student Activities Committee shall consider and set student activities policy on the management, governance and finances of clubs, societies, Rag, Community Action Group and the central activities of Faculty Union and Club and Society Committees provided it does not conflict with Union or operational policy, make recommendations on policy relating to clubs and societies before approval by the Executive Committee or Council. It may exercise any policy powers delegated to it.

“Membership

31. The Student Activities Committee shall consist of:
   1. The Sabbatical Officers,
2. A representative appointed by each Faculty Union,
3. A representative appointed by the Overseas Students’ Committee,
4. A representative appointed by the Silwood Park Union,
5. A representative appointed by the Wye Union Society,
6. The Chairs of the other Clubs and Societies Committees,
7. The Community Action Group Chair, and
8. The Rag Chair.

2. the Chairs or Presidents and Honorary Junior Treasurers of the
1. Faculty Unions,
2. Clubs and Societies Committees,

32. The Student Activities Committee shall be chaired by the Council Chair, or the
Deputy President (Clubs and Societies) in his or her absence or their nominee.

33. The Chairs or Presidents and Honorary Junior Treasurers shall exercise one vote
between them.

34. The Union Manager and other appropriate staff members

determined by the President, as advised by the Union Manager,
shall have permanent observer status.

35. The Deputy President (Clubs and Societies) shall be responsible for compiling and
circulating the papers and setting the agenda. The Deputy President (Finance and
Services) shall be responsible for administering all aspects of the committee
relating to finance and allocation of funding.”

“The Clubs and Societies Committees

38. The Clubs and Societies Committees shall be the:
1. Arts & Entertainments Board,
2. Athletics Clubs Committee,
3. Graduate Students’ Association
Overseas Students Committee,
4. Media Group,
5. Overseas Students Committee
6. Recreational Clubs Committee,
7. Royal School of Mines Committee,
8. Silwood Park Union,
9. Social Clubs Committee, and the
10. Wye Union Society.”

“Representation

41. In addition the Graduate Students’ Association, Silwood Park Committee,
Wye Union Society and Overseas Students Committee shall consider welfare and
academic affairs issues relating to graduate students, students at those
respective campuses, or overseas students respectively, as well as local issues or
the promotion of international culture as appropriate.”

“The President’s Committees

46. The President’s Committees shall be the:
1. Academic Affairs Committee,
2. Accommodation Committee,
3. Colours Committee,
4. Community Action Group,
5. Health and Safety Committee,
6. House Committee,
7. Research Students Group,
85. Rag Committee, and the
9. Student Development Committee, and the
10. Welfare Committee.”

“Accommodation Committee

53. It shall consist of:
   1. The Sabbatical Officers,
   2. A representative appointed by the Overseas Students Committee,
   3. A representative appointed by the Postgraduate Group Graduate Students’ Association,
   4. One representative from each Hall of Residence in the College.”

“Community Action Group

62. The officers of the committee (except the Chair) shall be elected at, and by an
Annual General Meeting of the committee, to be held before–after the Union’s
Annual General Meeting election of the Chair. Vacancies may be filled at another
meeting.”

“Health and Safety Committee

66. The Health and Safety Committee shall consider and monitor Health and Safety
issues in the Union, and shall advise on the appropriateness and adequacy of
current Health and Safety policies and practises.
67. It shall consist of:
   1. The Sabbatical Officers,
   2. A representative appointed by each Faculty Union, and
   3. A representative appointed by each Club and Society Committee, except
      Silwood Park and Wye Union Society.
68. The Union Manager and not less than three other appropriate staff members
determined by the President, as advised by the Union Manager, shall have
permanent observer status.
69. It shall be chaired by the Deputy President (Clubs and Societies) and shall have a
quorum of six voting members.
70. It shall meet at least once per term. An emergency meeting may be called by a
Sabbatical Officer or three members or permanent observers.

House Committee

71. The House Committee shall consider the management, maintenance and usage of
the Union Building, and management and usage of other areas in the College
which are the management responsibility of the Union under the terms of the
Memorandum of Understanding; it shall be allocated a budget for these purposes.
72. The House Committee shall consider Health and Safety issues in relation to its
areas of responsibility. The House Committee shall not consider those aspects of
the trading and retail facilities of the Union that fall under the Trading and Retail
Committees.
73. The House Committee shall consist of:
   1. The Sabbatical Officers, and
   2. Four ordinary members elected by the Council from the Full Membership.
74. Appropriate staff members determined by the President, as advised by the Union
Manager, shall have permanent observer status.
75. It shall be chaired by the Deputy President (Finance and Services) and shall have
a quorum of five voting members.
76. It shall meet at least twice per term. An emergency meeting may be called by a
Sabbatical Officer or three members.
77. The Deputy President (Finance and Services) shall report its business to the
Executive Committee and then the Council for approval.
Research Students Group

78. The Research Students Group shall consider the welfare, academic, involvement and other issues related specifically to postgraduate students, whether on taught or research degrees.

79. It shall consist of:
1. The Sabbatical Officers;
2. Faculty Union Research Representatives;
3. Such additional members as the committee may co-opt.

80. It shall be chaired by the President, with a quorum of five voting members.

81. It shall meet at least once per term. An emergency meeting may be called by a Sabbatical Officer or four members.

“Rag Committee
86. The officers of the committee (except the Chair) shall be elected at, and by an Annual General Meeting of the committee, to be held after the Union’s Annual General Meeting election of the Chair. Vacancies may be filled at another meeting.”

“Student Development Committee
90. The Student Development Committee shall consider the acquirement by Imperial College students of non-academic skills, the training necessary to acquire skills, and the provision of support to monitor skills development.

91. The Student Development Committee shall co-ordinate the provision of training and skills development in the context of student involvement in Union activity, both in clubs and societies, and welfare and academic representation.

92. It shall consist of:
1. The Sabbatical Officers,
2. A representative appointed by each Faculty Union, and
3. Four ordinary members elected by the Council from the Full Membership.

93. Appropriate staff members determined by the President, as advised by the Union Manager, shall have permanent observer status.

94. It shall be chaired by the Deputy President (Clubs and Societies), or the Deputy President (Education and Welfare) in his or her absence, and have a quorum of six voting members.

95. It shall meet at least twice per term. An emergency meeting may be called by a Sabbatical Officer or six members.”

“Welfare Committee
97. It shall consist of:
1. The Sabbatical Officers,
2. The Equal Opportunities Officer,
3. Welfare Campaigns Officer,
4. Faculty Union Welfare Officers,
5. A representative appointed by the Overseas Students Committee, and
6. A representative appointed by the Research Students Group Graduate Students’ Association.”

REGULATION FOUR - STANDING ORDERS FOR ALL UNION MEETINGS

“Automatic resignation of members
35. If a person resigning under the previous section holds ordinary membership of a committee (rather than a post qualifying them to sit on it) then their position is deemed vacant and an election held.”
REGULATION 5 - DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE

“C Censure and No Confidence Motions
9. The policy-making bodies of the Faculty Unions, Club and Society Committees, Silwood Park, Wye, Rag, Community Action Group, clubs and societies may censure or dismiss their officers and representatives (including those that are Officers of the Union). These committees’, clubs’ or societies’ standing orders shall not contradict but may further restrict or prohibit censure or dismissal.”

“REGULATION SIX - UNION FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

This regulation governs all financial matters relating to the Union. Although these Regulations contain no specific sanctions for non-compliance, deliberate, negligent or repeated disregard of their provisions may result in disciplinary action being taken against the person concerned, under the terms of their employment contract with the Union, or, in the case of students, under the Union Disciplinary Procedure. Where appropriate, criminal proceedings may also be considered.

The President is ultimately responsible for the finances of the Union. The responsibility for the day to day administration of the finances of the Union is delegated by the President to the Deputy President (Finance and Services). Responsibilities allocated to the Permanent Secretary in this regulation may be delegated to suitable members of staff with the approval of the President. The Union annual accounts shall be approved by the Council and College Audit Committee prior to report to the College Council.

1 Use of Union Funds
The Union subvention from College, monies raised by trading outlets and any other funds generated by Union-wide initiatives may not be used for:
  a. loans, grants or subsidies to individual students,
  b. donations or payments to persons and bodies outside the Union except for subscriptions to national or regional student bodies approved by Council or payment for supplies and services rendered. In particular, no part of such funds shall be used to support or further the aims or activities of any body, group or campaign of a political nature, nor be paid to any voluntary body or any other educational institution or any group of persons at any educational institution,
  c. the benefit of individuals in any way that would not be equally available to the membership as a whole,
  d. donations to charitable causes, except where the Union authorises fund-raising events and donates the proceeds to charitable causes, provided that the object of the fund-raising is made clear to the donors, or
  e. ultra vires payments as defined by the Attorney General.

2. Budgets
   a. The Executive Committee shall propose a consolidated income and expenditure budget, and a capital expenditure budget, for each financial year not later than the end of the summer term in the previous year.
   b. The proposed budgets shall be approved by the Honorary Senior Treasurer, after ratification by the Council.
   c. The approved budgets (or individual items within them) may be varied only with the authorisation of the President for amounts up to £10,000 and the Executive Committee for all amounts in excess of this. The President may delegate authority to vire to appropriate Officers or Committees, save that no Officer may exercise such authority in excess of the limits of authority defined in part of this regulation.
d. The Executive Committee shall monitor the performance of the Union against budget during the financial year and may review the budgets in line with forecasts.

23. Budget Holders’ Responsibility
It is the responsibility of every budget holder to ensure that expenditure committed from his/her budget complies with the Union financial procedures. Budget Holders must also ensure that the handling of income complies with the Union financial procedures.

34. Bank Accounts and Investments
a. Neither the Union nor any constituent part of the Union nor any individual acting on behalf of such a part may operate a separate bank account other than that authorised in advance by the Welfare Officer. Such accounts must be operated in accordance with Executive Committee operational policy.

b. All Captains/Chairs/Presidents shall notify Executive Committee, at the first meeting of the year, of all bank accounts held and the names of cheque signatories.

c. All cheque signatories other than Honorary Senior Treasurers shall be agreed in advance by the Deputy President (Finance and Services).

b. The Executive Committee shall be authorised to invest any surplus funds or reserves after taking reasonable professional advice.

5. Payment Authority
a. All payments (cheques and other paper/electronic financial instruments) must be signed or otherwise authorised by the relevant Honorary Senior Treasurer. For the Club and Society Committees (CSCs) of the Union and the Faculty Unions, each Honorary Senior Treasurer shall act as the sole cheque signatory for expenditure up to £750, and shall be joint cheque signatories with the President for all expenditure above £750.

b. All other cheques shall be signed by the President and one of the three designated Union cheque signatories. Payments for amounts in excess of £1,000 shall be counter-signed by the President.

c. In the absence of the relevant Honorary Senior Treasurer, one of three nominees from the other Honorary Senior Treasurers may sign on his/her behalf.

d. In the absence of the President, the Union Manager or one other of the three designated Union cheque signatories or nominees may sign on his/her behalf.

e. The Executive Committee shall approve the nominee signatories on the recommendation of the Honorary Senior Treasurer and President respectively.
The Deputy President (Finance and Services), or in his/ her absence one of the other Deputy Presidents shall authorise all other expenditure.

The Executive Committee shall authorise all expenditure over £100,000 up to £1,000,000.

The Council, on the recommendation of the Executive, shall authorise all other expenditure.

In the absence of the Deputy President (Finance and Services), the Deputy President (Clubs and Societies) may give authorisation on his/her behalf, subject to subsequent notification to the Deputy President (Finance and Services) in writing. Such authorisations must be carried out in accordance with Executive Committee policy.

In the absence of both the Deputy President (Finance and Services) and the Deputy President (Clubs and Societies), the Deputy President (Education and Welfare) may give authorisation on his/her behalf, subject to subsequent notification to the Deputy President (Finance and Services) in writing. Such authorisations must be carried out in accordance with Executive Committee policy.

Orders of goods or services shall only be placed using an Imperial College Union order form or in accordance with a duly authorised contract.

Loans to staff must not be made without the written permission of the Union Manager. Arrangements for repayment of such loans must be put in place before the funds are advanced.

Only the President jointly with the Union Manager shall sign a contract which commits the Union to any obligation that extends beyond the current financial year. Such contracts shall only be signed with the prior written authorisation of the relevant budget holder. Such authorisations shall be made within the limits set out in part 5-6 of this appendix regulation.

Appointment of staff (except those employed on a ‘casual’ or ‘zero-hours’ contract basis) and any variance to their contracts shall be authorised by the Honorary Senior Treasurer.

The limits of authority as defined in part 5-6 of this appendix regulation shall be applied to the total of all expenditures relating to events organised on behalf of the Union.

Prior authorisation shall be given in writing as set out in Executive Committee operational policy.

The prior written approval of the Union Manager shall be sought for events where the total of all expenditure exceeds £1,500/2,000.

No constituent part of the Union may hold cash without the prior written authorisation of the Deputy President (Finance and Services).

Other than trading outlets for legitimate operational purposes (as determined by the Executive Committee) no constituent part of the Union may hold cash without the prior written authorisation of the Deputy President (Finance and Services).

Cash takings shall be deposited with the Union’s bankers within three working days of receipt and no expenditure may be incurred from cash receipts.

Members and employees may carry or hold cash or other valuables with due regard to the limits set from time to time by the Union’s insurers.
11.12. Borrowing
The Union shall not borrow any external funds without the prior written authorisation of the Union Honorary Senior Treasurer.

11.13. Guarantees and indemnities
The Union shall not give any guarantees or indemnities without the prior written authorisation of the Union Honorary Senior Treasurer.

11.14. Supplies on credit
Goods and services shall not be issued on credit without prior approval from the Deputy President (Finance and Services) in accordance with approval procedures and credit limits set by operational policy.

11.15. Inventories and Asset Management
a. The Union shall maintain a full inventory of all its assets valued (individually or in aggregate) in excess of £200.
   b. It is the responsibility of all Union Officers and Club or Society Chairs and managers to ensure that they maintain a register of such items and inform the Permanent Secretary when such items are purchased or disposed of.
   c. A full inventory of items of value, as defined by Executive Committee, is kept by that Club/Society/Union Committee/Faculty Union, and shall be given to the President. The inventory shall be updated at the beginning of each academic session, and the President shall be informed when new or replacement equipment is purchased.

11.16. Disposal of Union Assets
   c. Equipment valued in excess of £200 belonging to the Union or any constituent part thereof, shall not be sold, re-allocated or otherwise disposed of without the prior written authorisation of the relevant budget holder, and the President and a Deputy President. Authorisation shall only be granted after consultation with the Union Manager/Permanent Secretary by the President or Deputy President (Finance and Services).

11.17. Union Honorary Senior Treasurer
The appointment of the Union Honorary Senior Treasurer shall be determined by Council on the advice of the Deputy President (Finance and Services) Executive Committee and approved by the Rector or his/her nominee and s/he shall:
   a. approve and monitor the expenditure of the Union budget on behalf of the Governing Body/College Council,
   b. act as cheque signatory/payment authority for the main Union bank account and be empowered to sign cheques in the absence of the other Honorary Senior Treasurers in their absence,
   c. ensure, on behalf of the College, that the Union Financial regulations are observed,
   d. be an permanent observer of the Council, Executive Committee, and the Trading, and Services and Retail Committees, and
   e. ensure that all books and financial records pertaining to the Union are submitted to the Clerk to the College Council within 45 days of the end of the financial year, and
   f. be responsible for ensuring that any anomaly or discrepancy in the financial management of the Union is reported to the Deputy President (Finance and Services). If no satisfactory outcome results, the matter shall be reported to the President and, if appropriate, to the College Internal Audit section and the Rector.

11.17. Committee and Faculty Union Honorary Senior Treasurers
The appointment of an Honorary Senior Treasurer shall be determined by the Council on the advice of the relevant Faculty Union/Committee President/Chair and s/he shall:
   a. act as cheque signatory/payment authority to the relevant bank account,
b. oversee all expenditure and bring any possible anomalies or discrepancies in the financial management of that Faculty Union /Committee to the attention of the relevant President/Chair and the Union Honorary Senior Treasurer, and
c. ensure that all books and financial records pertaining to the relevant account are submitted to the Permanent Secretary within 15 days of the end of the financial year.”