MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS
at the
Twentieth Meeting of the
COUNCIL
of the
IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE

The Twentieth Meeting of the Council was held in the Solar Room, 170 Queen's Gate, South Kensington Campus, Imperial College London, at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, 11th February 2011, when there were present:

The Lord Kerr of Kinlochard (Chairman), Professor D.K.H. Begg, Mrs. P. Couttie, Professor M.J. Dallman, Mr. A. Kendall, Ms. J.R. Lomax, the Baroness Manningham-Buller, Professor Sir Anthony Newman Taylor, Mr. J. Newsum, Mr. S. Newton, Ms. K. Owen, Professor S.M. Richardson, the Lord Tugendhat and the Rector and the Clerk to the Court and Council.

Apologies: Professor Dame Julia Higgins, Professor J. Kramer and Professor J. Magee.

In attendance: The Director of Finance and Acting Chief Financial Officer, the Director of Communications and Development (for Minutes 37 - 42 only) and the Assistant Clerk to the Court and Council.

WELCOME

On behalf of the Council, the Chairman welcomed Professor Sir Anthony Newman Taylor, the new Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, to his first Meeting as a member of the Council. The Chairman also welcomed Mr. Andrew Murphy, the Director of Finance and Acting Chief Financial Officer, who was attending his first Meeting of the Council in his capacity as Acting Chief Financial Officer.

MINUTES

Council – 3rd November 2010 and 26th November 2010

1. The Minutes of the eighteenth Meeting of the Council, held on Wednesday, 3rd November 2010, and of the nineteenth Meeting of the Council, held on Friday, 26th November 2010 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS

2. Before presenting Paper A, the Chairman said that discussion at the previous evening's dinner had demonstrated the high degree of regard for, and confidence in, the Rector, Professor Sir Keith O'Nions. The Council was very pleased with the way in which the College's strategy had been developed and was now being implemented and he expressed the Council's thanks to the Rector for all that had been achieved in his first year in office.

3. The Chairman then reminded members that they had also discussed the oral reports given
at each meeting by the Faculty Principals. These had been a welcome innovation when the practice was first introduced and had ensured that the Council was able to get a better understanding of the College's academic concerns. However, there was a general consensus that this mechanism for introducing academic matters into the Council's business was no longer required. Instead, it had been suggested that the Principals should present more detailed reports to the Council when they had substantive matters to discuss, with the proviso that each Principal would present at least one such detailed report to the Council each year to ensure that the Council was kept up to date on each faculty's academic strategy.

4. Council members had also considered the format of papers and discussions at Council meetings. While it was recognised that on certain issues the Council would want to see a clear recommendation coming from the College's management team, members had expressed a desire for more papers in future to contain options for consideration by the Council, even if this meant some issues would have to be revisited at successive Council Meetings. Finally, the Chairman said members had discussed the extent to which the College was effective at setting long-range strategy, as opposed to reacting to immediate opportunities as they arose. No conclusions had been reached, but there was a general feeling that the College was very good at local optimisation, but that this very success might make it less good at taking a longer range view on certain strategic issues. He suggested that Council members give more thought to this apparent dichotomy.

5. Mr. Newton said that a related issue that had been raised in discussion was the time available for long-range strategic thinking. It was clear to him that consideration of the key issues that would distinguish the College's strategy in the mid to long term required time and resources; both of which were in relatively short supply. He suggested that as well as considering how to improve long-term strategic thinking, Council members should also consider how this type of strategic review could best be supported and encouraged.

Report on the Membership of the Council (Paper A)

6. The Chairman then presented Paper A and reported on his discussions with candidates for appointment as members of the Council. Two of the candidates the Council had agreed could be approached had indicated that they were not at present taking on any more Board appointments. However, both had confirmed their strong support for Imperial and had not ruled out serving on the Council in future should their current circumstances change. The Chairman was hopeful that, if they were approached again when their immediate concerns had been resolved, they would be able to respond more positively to the College's invitation. The Chairman was pleased to report that the third candidate, Mr. Iain Conn, had agreed to join the Council. Mr. Conn was Chief Executive, Refining and Marketing for BP and a member of the BP board of directors and executive management team. He was also an alumnus of the College and Chair of the Business School's External Advisory Board. Although he was keen to support the College and join the Council, Mr. Conn had indicated that his other commitments meant he might not be able to attend every Council Meeting. He had asked the Chairman to check that the Council was comfortable with this before confirming his appointment. Mr. Conn had also confirmed his intention to continue on the Business School's Advisory Board, something that was welcomed by the Chairman. The Council welcomed the news that Mr. Conn would be joining.

Resolved:

That Mr Iain Conn's appointment as an external member of the Council with immediate effect be approved.

7. As there were still a number of vacancies for external members of the Council, the
Chairman then presented three further recommendations from the Nominations Committee. As before, the Chairman sought the Council's permission to approach these candidates to gauge whether they would be interested in joining the Council before asking the Council to formally approve their appointments.

8. Ms. Lomax asked if the proposed candidates would be interviewed by the Nominations Committee. Ms. Owen suggested that a full-blown interview might not be appropriate, given that the College was approaching the candidates rather than vice versa. However, she agreed that the Council's decision on whether or not to appoint should be based on more than just the candidates' CVs. She suggested an alternative approach in which the candidates would have an informal meeting with members of the Nominations Committee. This would enable the candidates to make an informed decision on whether they wanted to join the Council while also allowing the Chairman and other members of the Nominations Committee to determine whether their candidatures were as strong as their CVs suggested. The Chairman agreed and noted that all three had been proposed by members of the Council. He suggested that the members who had put their names forward should make contact with them and invite them to meet with the Rector and the Chairman and/or Deputy Chairman to discuss their possible appointment to the Council. Members agreed this way forward.

**Report on Membership of the College Fund Board (Paper B)**

9. The Chairman presented Paper B and said that the resignation of Dr. Martin Knight as Chief Operating Officer had left a vacancy on the College Fund Board. This had given the opportunity to the Fund Board's Chairman, Mr. Newton, and him to consider the structure and balance of the Fund Board. As a result, it was now proposed to extend the membership to include another member of the Council as well as appointing Professor Begg as a permanent member of the Board (Professor Begg had previously attended Fund Board meetings as an advisor). Both the Chairman and Mr. Newton believed the proposed extension of the Board's membership was appropriate given the Fund's increasing importance to the College. The Chairman was also grateful to Mr. Newsum, who had agreed to serve on the Fund Board.

10. Mr. Newton said that the Fund Board had met the previous day and he had asked the other members for their views on these proposals. They supported the extension of the Board's membership and welcomed the suggestion that Mr. Newsum be appointed from the Council; his expertise in property matters would be a particular asset to the Board.

Resolved:

(i) That the amendments to Ordinance F1, as set out in Paper B, be approved.

(ii) That the appointment of Mr. Jeremy Newsum, Professor Stephen Richardson and Professor David Begg as members of the College Fund Board be approved.

**Search for a New Chairman**

11. The Chairman of the Search Committee, Lord Tugendhat, reported that good progress was being made in the search for a new Chairman. He had written to all members of the Court and Council and to various external bodies inviting suggestions and nominations. The College staff had also been invited to submit nominations to the Search Committee. An advertisement had also been placed in the Economist and a number of enquiries had been received. The Search Committee had more meetings scheduled and expected to put together a shortlist of candidates for interview shortly. Lord Tugendhat was hopeful that the Search Committee would be able to present a recommendation for appointment at the
RECTOR'S BUSINESS

Staff Matters (Paper C)

12. Paper C was received for information.

Rector's Report

13. Opening his report, the Rector said that the College had been giving serious consideration to how to replace Dr. Martin Knight since his departure at the end of December and he had discussed possible options with various Council members, including the Chairman, Mr. Newsum and Ms. Owen. He reminded members that Dr. Knight had filled two distinct roles within the College; as the Chief Financial Officer he had been responsible for the College's financial strategy, while as Chief Operating Officer he had led the support service operations. He felt it was unlikely that the College would find a candidate who could fulfil the requirements of both posts and it had been decided that the most pressing vacancy was for a Chief Financial Officer. A job description had been agreed and recruitment consultants would be appointed to assist the College in identifying the best possible field. The Rector hoped that a new Chief Financial Officer would be in post by the end of the year. Once the Chief Financial Officer had been appointed, the College would then look for a new Chief Operating Officer. In the interim, the support services were reporting to the Deputy Rector.

14. Moving on, the Rector reported that the College was currently recruiting staff to a number of new Imperial College Lectureships. It was hoped that these posts would attract young lecturers with outstanding ability and potential. The main aim of these appointments was to extend and consolidate the College's existing research interests. The successful candidates would be expected to develop innovative research ideas within their fields as well as having a commitment to providing the highest quality of teaching to students. Over 700 applications had been received already and indications were that the posts were attracting an outstandingly strong field of candidates. Pleasingly, about 25% of the applications received were internal to the College. Not only was this a demonstration of Imperial's investment in its future, it was also providing clear career development opportunities for the College's RAs and other junior staff.

15. The Rector then advised members of Imperial's involvement in the Government's plans for the 2012 Olympic park after the Games. The 'Tech City East' initiative had been launched by the Prime Minister in November 2010 and aimed to build on an existing cluster of technology companies in east London to create a world-leading technology centre. It was being strongly supported by the Government and included major global companies such as CISCO, Intel and Google. The Government was also keen to involve London's best universities in the project and to that end was in discussion with Imperial and with UCL.

16. Finally, the Rector reported on developments in West London at the Woodlands site and the Hammersmith Campus. The Deputy Rector had been leading a working group to consider the academic and other requirements for the use of the rest of the Woodlands site as well as the other opportunities for the College in the immediate vicinity and in particular at the Hammersmith Hospital campus. The Rector suggested that this was an extremely important strategic decision for the College and the purchase of the Woodlands site could turn out to be an important turning point in the College's history; as important in its way as the purchase of the land at South Kensington by the 1851 Commission had been. He then reminded members that the land had been purchased by the College Fund and that it had taken the lead in developing the first portion of the site for postgraduate accommodation.
This development had been very successful with planning consent achieved in under a year. Indeed, so good were the relations with the local authority that the College was now being pressed by the authority to confirm its plans for the development of the rest of the site. This was a highly unusual position and the College Fund Board had urged the College to respond positively to maintain its good relations with the planners and to keep the momentum going. However, given its strategic importance for the College, he suggested that the College Fund could not take this forward on its own and neither could the College’s Management Board. Instead, he suggested that the development of Woodlands and Hammersmith, or Imperial West as it had been dubbed, should be taken forward by a joint group encompassing the College's academic needs and requirements; the College Fund's understanding of the investment opportunities and its expertise in property development; and the Council's understanding of the strategic opportunities this presented. Because of the need to maintain momentum with the local authority, which had been emphasised by the Fund Board, he suggested that the joint group should be set up as soon as possible to coordinate these developments and report back to the Management Board, the College Fund Board and the Council in time for the Council's next Meeting in May.

17. The Chairman agreed that Imperial West represented a real opportunity for the College; indeed, he said it was possible that more land in the area would become available to the College because of its demonstrable success in developing the first phase of the Woodlands site. He also cautioned on the necessity to avoid stasis while the College developed its plans for the rest of the site. However, he also felt it would be important to avoid being forced into making piecemeal decisions just to maintain momentum. Ensuring an overall strategy that made the best possible use of Imperial West was just as important.

18. Mr. Newton reported that the other members of the College Fund Board had indicated that the degree of support and encouragement the College was receiving from the local authority was highly unusual. Obtaining planning consent for big projects such as this was usually extremely difficult in London and often very time consuming. As the local authority was currently so supportive, he suggested that the College should seize this opportunity if it could. Any undue delay could mean that the College either did not get its plans approved, or had to wait much longer to do so. He also said that, as a result of its success in developing the first phase of Woodlands, the College was now seen as a leading player in the area. If it was successful in providing a coordinated development for the rest of its site as well as at the Hammersmith Hospital, this could provide the catalyst for several other developments in the area. It was likely that other organisations and property developers would thereby benefit from the College's success. He suggested that the College would also have to ensure that it had a fair share of the benefits from the resultant regeneration of the whole area. He believed this was a significant opportunity for the College and that, if managed correctly, it could also provide a substantial source of wealth generation for the College in the future.

19. Ms. Lomax said that this suggested a much grander vision for Woodlands and also for Hammersmith than had previously been presented to the Council. The Rector said that, although the College had recognised that Woodlands represented a substantial opportunity for it when it had purchased the site, the full extent of these opportunities was only now becoming apparent. He said that he intended to bring a much fuller report to the Council at its next Meeting in May, including some concrete proposals for the next phase of the Woodlands project. However, he suggested that, if possible, the joint steering group he had proposed should be established in advance of the next meeting so that it could start to structure the proposals for consideration by the Council.

20. The Chairman recognised that there was a degree of urgency in finalising proposals for the next phase of the Woodlands development and he agreed that the Rector's suggestion of a joint working party to ensure that the priorities of the Management Board, the College Fund Board and the Council were aligned was a sensible one. He suggested that Imperial West should be the major subject for debate at the Council's next meeting in May. At that
meeting, the Council would want to see a report on the College's plans for the next phase of the Woodlands development as well as an outline critical path for decisions to be made. He also asked the Rector to prepare a more detailed proposal for the joint working group, including its constitution and structure. He suggested that this could be circulated to Council members for endorsement out of committee, if it was felt important for this group to commence its work before the next meeting and perhaps inform the development plans to be presented at that meeting.

**Oral Report by the Principal of the Imperial College Business School**

21. Professor Begg reported that the Business School had launched two new Masters programmes just before Christmas in Strategic Marketing and Innovation and Entrepreneurship. One month after launch they were already attracting as much as 90% of the number of applications of the School’s other established programmes. This was an extremely encouraging start and he was sure that both programmes would go on to be very successful. He also reported that the School was in discussion with Microsoft on a proposal related to digital developments.

**Oral Report by the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine**

22. Professor Sir Anthony Newman Taylor reported that agreement had now been reached with the Kennedy Trustees and the University of Oxford for the TUPE transfer of the Kennedy Institute to Oxford. The transfer would take effect on 1 August, although the Institute would not be relocating to Oxford until 2013. While this would create some logistical difficulties, Sir Anthony said he felt there would be fewer problems than had originally been feared. The Faculty's own rheumatology research programmes would now be relocated in new facilities at the Hammersmith Hospital campus.

**HOME/EU UNDERGRADUATE TUITION FEES FOR 2012 ENTRY (PAPER D)**

23. Introducing Paper D, the Chairman summarised the discussion around the issue of student tuition fees at the previous evening's meeting and Council dinner. Members had accepted that Imperial College had to maintain the standard of education it provided and should also ensure that it could maintain the quality of its students. To this end, it had been suggested that the College should try to break even – that is to not make a loss on the teaching of home undergraduate students. If it was to do so, it would have to charge the maximum allowable fee of £9,000. However, because of the need to maintain the quality of students, it had also been agreed that the imposition of quotas or any suggestion that the College should lower its entry standards for particular groups of students would be unacceptable. For this reason, it had been suggested that it would be preferable for the College to charge the lower fee of £6,000 rather than accept onerous access conditions if these would compromise the College's entry standards. The Chairman said that one reason why he believed the College should aim to break even was that there was no indication of whether the fee cap would be index linked, or even if it would be allowed to rise in future years. He was concerned that, if fee levels did not rise in line with inflation, the losses made on teaching would increase over time. If the College at least broke even when these new fees were introduced, such losses would be kept to a manageable level in future years. Although it had been suggested that this should be the College's aim, the Chairman said he recognised that the Office of Fair Access (OFFA) would probably require universities to invest a significant portion of the additional fee income over £6,000 in improving access and providing fee waivers and bursaries. This might make it impossible for the College to achieve the break-even point; however, this at least provided the College with a starting point for its negotiations with OFFA.
24. Ms. Lomax agreed that the College must maintain its entry standards, but she suggested that it might need to provide substantial funds to support access provisions in order to do so; her concern being that a failure to provide this level of support could result in the imposition of quotas or the suggestion that the College should drop its entry requirements to improve access.

25. Mr. Newton said he believed that living costs were a much greater barrier to students than the level of fees. It was therefore more important for the College to offer poorer students support for their immediate living costs through bursaries and scholarships, rather than through fee waivers. He too was concerned that there was a risk that the current concentration on access provisions could result in a demand that the College lower its standards. This should be resisted as any drop in standards would have a serious effect on the College's ability to attract the best and brightest students.

26. The Chairman cautioned against trying to set too many parameters for the College's access agreement at this stage; there were still too many variables for any final decision to be made at this stage. In particular he said, the level of the HEFCE grant was not yet known. This would be crucial in determining how much money the College would have to replace through students fees and hence, how much it could devote to access and outreach. Consequently, the Chairman suggested that, for the time being, the Council should only confirm the College's commitment to excellence and determine that Imperial should aim to charge the higher fee of £9,000 per annum provided an acceptable agreement on access could be reached with OFFA. Beyond this, he said that it should be for the Management Board to prepare the access agreement within the parameters set by the Council once the HEFCE grant had been announced and OFFA had published its guidance on access agreements. Having said that, he acknowledged that outreach would have to form a major part of any future access agreement, together with a mixture of other measures including the provision of more bursaries and fee waivers.

27. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Kendall, said that the majority of Imperial's home students came from the South East. This was because it was largely students from the South East who could afford to live in London; students from other parts of the country found the hefty increase in living costs particularly challenging. Consequently, the Union believed that the best way to improve access at Imperial was to provide support for students' living costs which would enable them to study in London.

28. Although he accepted that it would be for the Management Board to determine the best mix of measures to be included in the access agreement, Mr. Newton said he hoped that financial support for poorer students by way of bursaries would be a major part of the College's overall package. He had, he said, been very impressed with the arguments presented by the Imperial College Union. It was clear from the President's comments that the Union believed that support which would enable students to meet their living costs was much more important than any fee waivers. Although the Government favoured fee waivers as these would reduce the overall costs of the loan system, the College had to have regard to what would be most beneficial for its students as well as what would prove most attractive to prospective students. The Chairman agreed and asked the Rector and the Management Board to bear in mind the points made by the Union when determining the overall package to be presented to OFFA.

29. Ms. Lomax said it was apparent that the Government, and hence OFFA, would expect universities to agree targets to improve access to higher education. Even if universities set these targets themselves, they would be expected to meet them and she asked what the College could do to move closer to the Government's widening access agenda without reducing standards. Professor Begg said that the situation was actually worse than this suggested. The national debate around tuition fees had centred on the increase in fees and the impact this would have on poorer students and had ignored the fact that they would
not have to pay these fees upfront. There was a real risk that the rhetoric surrounding this debate would act as a greater deterrent to poorer students than the fees themselves. It was therefore possible that access would actually decline, at least in the short term.

30. The Chairman acknowledged the Council’s interest in the College’s access agreement with OFFA, but noted that this would have to be provided to OFFA by mid-April, before the next Council meeting. He suggested that, once the College had determined the overall package to be submitted to OFFA, it should also be circulated to the Council for information. The Rector noted that guidance on what was required in the access agreement was only now starting to be published by BIS, while HEFCE had still to confirm the level of universities’ grants in 2012. OFFA’s own guidance was not expected until early March. The College would therefore have very little time in which to prepare a fully considered proposal for OFFA. However, he agreed that the College’s proposal should be circulated to members of the Council before it was submitted to OFFA.

31. Bringing the discussion to a close, the Chairman noted that the press was already speculating on which universities would seek to charge the higher fee of £9,000 and had published documents suggesting Cambridge and Oxford were likely to do so. In the light of the Council’s confirmation that Imperial should aim to charge £9,000 he said that he saw no point in concealment and that he proposed to inform the members of the Court at its meeting that afternoon that, in order to maintain the excellence of the education Imperial provided to students it was the College’s intention, subject to agreement by the Office for Fair Access, to set fees at £9,000 for Home and EU students for 2012 entry. Although it was not possible to confirm the financial support that would be made available for students at this stage, he suggested that the message to the outside world must be that, for those who could manage Imperial’s courses, the College would work to ensure they could manage its costs. Once the Court had been informed of the Council’s decision, it would effectively be in the public domain. He therefore suggested that the College should also make arrangements to make a public statement confirming the Council’s position.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT (PAPER E)

32. The Acting Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Andrew Murphy, presented Paper E and said that the College’s financial position was very healthy. Total Income for the first five months was 5% higher than last year and £2.6m ahead of budget, while research income was up 6% on the previous year following a particularly strong performance in November. As well as attracting more income, the College’s costs were also better than budget, with the result that the College’s operating surplus now stood at £32m, some £10m better than budget. The College would shortly be conducting its 6-month review of its finances after which these forecasts would be reconfigured.

33. Mr. Murphy then reminded members that, at the last Meeting of the Council, it had been agreed that, because of the uncertainties around the fees and grants position, the financial forecast submitted to HEFCE in December should include forecasts only for the current year. Consequently, the financial forecasts for the next three years would now have to be submitted to HEFCE in April. These revised forecasts would take account of the HEFCE grant settlement, which was due to be published in March. However, as the submission date was before the next scheduled Council meeting, it would not be possible for the Council itself to approve the figures before they were submitted to HEFCE. Mr. Murphy therefore asked the Council to delegate authority to the Rector and the Chairman to approve the financial forecasts on its behalf.

Resolved:

That authority to approve the financial forecasts for the years 2011-12 to 2013-14 for submission to the Higher Education Funding Council be delegated to the Chairman and the
Rector, acting on the advice of the Acting Chief Financial Officer.

COLLEGE FUND BOARD REPORT (PAPER F)

34. The Chairman of the College Fund Board presented Paper F and highlighted the successful conclusion of the Imperial Innovations rights issue. He reminded members that, although the success of Innovations and the high value of its shares were positives, the latter combined with the relative illiquidity of these shares and the disproportionate size of the holding within the College Fund total assets had meant that it actually represented a considerable risk to the Fund. The rights issue had not only strengthened Innovations, it also meant that it was now a much more stable asset within the College Fund. As well as providing these substantial benefits, the Fund had also gained £6m in cash for the disposal of the College’s rights.

35. Turning to the Fund’s substantial property portfolio, Mr. Newton said that the Fund’s decision to invest in this area was now reaping positive benefits. He reminded members that most of these properties had transferred to the fund in a relatively poor state and some had been liabilities for the College. Following a period of investment and refurbishment, they were now providing real returns and had turned from potential liabilities into income-generating assets. This was a real achievement and a credit to the Fund’s property managers and to the advice given on property issues by the Fund Board’s members, and in particular the Hon. Robert Rayne. In relation to this, Mr. Newton noted that the Fund had the opportunity to develop 5a Montrose Court, a 3 bedroom bungalow in the garden square to the rear of Prince’s Gardens. In order to do so it would be necessary to swap the land containing the bungalow with an adjacent parcel of land of the same size. The College’s Management Board had agreed to designate this parcel of land as a non-core asset for transfer to the College Fund, and Mr. Newton asked the Council to formally approve this transfer.

Resolved:

(i) That the parcel of land set out Annex B of Paper F is a non-core asset and may therefore be transferred to the College

(ii) That authority to enter into any documentation necessary to complete the land swap, as set out in Paper F, be delegated to the Chief Executive Officer of the College Fund.

36. Closing his report, Mr. Newton drew members attention to the update on the Wye Campus, which was appended to Paper F. This confirmed the actions being taken to market the campus and Withersdane Hall and also the management actions being taken in relation to the other properties at Wye. The Chairman welcomed this report and in particular the news that relations between Imperial and the village residents in Wye had improved dramatically over the last 12 months.

PROPOSAL FOR THE REFORM OF THE IMPERIAL COURT (PAPER G)

37. Presenting Paper G the Clerk, Dr. Eastwood, reminded members that the original governance review had recommended that the Court should be given responsibility for the appointment of the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman, acting on the recommendation of the Council. This proposal had been accepted by the Council and included in the proposed revisions to the Statutes which had been approved by Special Resolution at its Meeting in September. Since then, the Central Secretariat had been in discussion with the Privy Council over these proposed revisions. While most were acceptable to the Privy Council, this particular change was not. The Privy Council had objected on the grounds that the
Council should be the ultimate decision making body in the College and it was felt that this effective veto for the Court would be counter to this principle and thus not in line with best practice in governance. The Central Secretariat had put the College’s case as strongly as it could, but to no avail. The Clerk then reminded members that the resolution passed at the September meeting had included a clause providing for additional changes to be made to the Statutes if required by the Privy Council, provided these were acceptable to, and agreed by, the University. If the Council decided to agree to the removal of this proposed extension of the Court’s remit, then the Privy Council could progress with the other proposed changes to the Statutes without the need for the Council to reconsider the Statutes and pass a further resolution. The Council agreed that the change required by the Privy Council was acceptable and that there was no need for the Statute changes to be re-resolved.

38. Moving on, the Clerk noted that the Council had asked the College to give further consideration to the proposed Science Festival in the light of the various comments and suggestions made at the last Meeting, particularly in relation to timing. This had now been done and it had been agreed that there would be insufficient time to reconstitute the Court and arrange a Science Festival to be hosted by the newly constituted Court in July. Therefore, it was now proposed to reconstitute the Court this year and then to hold the first Festival of Science in 2012. Members agreed that this timescale was more realistic and would ensure a more professional Festival could be held.

39. Finally, the Clerk said that, although the Court’s views would be sought at the meeting following the Council, the power to make and amend Ordinances was reserved to the Council. He acknowledged that it would be preferable to approve the changes to the Ordinance after the discussion with the Court. However, this would have the effect of delaying the dissolution and reconstitution of the Court until after the Council's next Meeting in May. It was therefore proposed that the Council approve the proposed amendments to the Ordinance now, with any minor amendments suggested by Court to be accepted by the Chairman on behalf of Council. Before he asked the Council to consider the amendments, the Clerk reminded members that the Goldsmiths’ Company had had a long relationship with the College and had made a number of generous donations to the College since its creation; most recently it had commissioned and paid for the College Mace. He suggested that, given this long and close association, the Goldsmiths' Company should be reinstated as one of the appointing bodies to the Court. The Council concurred with this suggestion.

Resolved:

That, subject to the reinstatement of the Goldsmiths’ Company as an appointing body, the amendments to Ordinance A7, the Powers, Functions, Membership and Meetings of the Court, as set out in Paper G, be approved, subject to such changes as may hereafter be suggested by the Court and which are agreed by the Chairman on behalf of the Council.

40. The Director of Communications and Development, Mr. Tom Miller, then reported on the latest proposals for the Science Festival to be hosted by the Court. He said that further research had revealed that no other university currently held a public event similar to that now being proposed for the Court. The nearest comparators were the Founders Day event held at the University of Bath, the two-week festival of science hosted by Cambridge and the Bristol University Festival of Contemporary Science, which was aimed at school teachers. The Court-hosted Science Festival would therefore be unique to Imperial. Mr. Miller then said that further discussions had also been held with the College departments. It was clear from this that it would be feasible to hold this event and that there was a degree of enthusiasm from the academic departments. As the Clerk had already indicated, some concerns had been raised about the original timing because of the proximity to examinations and it was now proposed to hold the Festival in May, shortly after the postgraduate graduation ceremony. To assist in the arrangements for the Festival, it was
proposed that a Festival Committee, including key members of the Court, would be established in the autumn.

41. The Chairman thanked Mr. Miller for his report. The proposals for the Court and its involvement in the Science Festival represented a real opportunity for the College to improve its engagement with its stakeholders. Ms. Couttie agreed and said that she was very much in favour of the proposal. She believed that the local authority would also be interested in these proposals and would welcome the opportunity to work with Imperial and with the museums to promote a wider festival of science across South Kensington.

DEVELOPMENT BOARD

42. Mr. Miller then provided the Board with a progress report on the College’s development activities and the establishment of the new Development Board and Scholarship Campaigns Board. The membership of these boards was now close to being finalised and he was pleased to say that the College had been successful in attracting several distinguished fund-raisers and philanthropists to join both boards.

CLINICAL CANCER SERVICES (PAPER H)

43. Professor Sir Anthony Newman Taylor presented Paper H. He advised the Council that the proposed restructuring of cancer services in the Imperial College NHS Trust would have a knock-on effect on the College as a number of staff in the Faculty of Medicine were funded either wholly or in part by the Trust. As a consequence of these proposals five clinical academic members of staff had been written to by the Trust and informed that they were directly affected by these proposals. Because of the possible withdrawal of NHS funding for these staff members, they were now at risk of redundancy. Professor Newman Taylor confirmed that the restructuring had been necessitated by a reduction in patient numbers, and hence funding from the Strategic Health Authority. The Faculty was trying to find alternative funding for these staff members, but it had to be recognised that if this alternative funding could not be found, the posts would be redundant. As with the College’s own restructurings, voluntary severance terms would be pursued, but if these could not be agreed, dismissal by reason of redundancy would, regrettably, have to be considered. Before asking the Council to pass the resolution required under Ordinance D11, Professor Newman Taylor advised members that the College’s related NHS Trusts were all coming under financial pressure and might have to consider further restructurings of their other services in the coming months. It was therefore possible that more College staff would be affected by these NHS restructurings. If that was the case, it was likely that similar proposals would have to come forward to the Council.

Resolved:

That, if any staff members affected by the proposed restructuring set out in Paper H do not agree to voluntary severance terms, in accordance with the procedures set out in Ordinance D11, the Dismissal of Members of Staff by Reasons of Redundancy, authority will be delegated to the Rector, or to another person authorised by the Rector, to implement the selection process and subsequent proposed redundancy if the Rector or his nominee considered this appropriate following the comments and counter-proposals gathered during the consultation period.

IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION ANNUAL REPORT (PAPER I)

44. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Kendall, presented the Union’s Annual Report. The Report, which included the Union’s audited Financial Statements for the year
ended 31 July 2010, had been ready in November; however, it had been decided to defer consideration to this Meeting because of the extensive agenda for the previous meeting. Mr. Kendall drew members’ attention in particular to the completion of the refurbishment of the Union’s Beit building, which now offered much improved facilities for all students. He was also pleased to say that the numbers of students involved in the Union’s 300 clubs and societies had risen again with club memberships at an all time record of 14,500. Although official statistics were not readily available, the Union believed that it could boast the largest participation rates of any Student Activities programme at a UK University.

45. The Chairman thanked Mr. Kendall and commended the Union, both for its activities throughout the year and for the production of an excellent end of year report.

HARLINGTON GRANTS FUND (PAPER J)

46. Paper J was received for information.

MAJOR PROJECTS (PAPER K)

47. Paper K was received for information

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

48. There was none.

NEXT MEETING

49. The Clerk reminded members that the Council’s next Meeting would be held on Friday, 13 May 2011, with a dinner on the preceding evening.
CANDIDATES FOR EXTERNAL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

Paper from the Nominations Committee

1. At its meeting on 26 November 2010, the Council approved the recommendations of the Nominations Committee that Mr Iain Conn and two other candidates be approached and asked whether they might agree to join the Council as external members. To date, Iain Conn has agreed subject to an understanding that he might not be able to attend more than 3 of the 5 meetings of the Council and would need to have a light committee load. He indicated that he would wish to remain chairman of the Business School Advisory Board.

2. A minimum of two new appointments of external members are needed to fill vacancies (and a possible six appointments could be made to reach the maximum size of Council).

3. The Nominations Committee at its meeting on 27 January 2011 considered a list of possible candidates and recommends a further three candidates listed in the annex who might be approached by the Chairman to ascertain whether they might consider joining the Council.

4. Short biographies of each are provided in the annex. (1)

1. The Annex has been omitted from these minutes as details of the candidates to be approached are confidential at this stage.
1. The Nominations Committee, at a meeting on 27 January, reviewed the composition of the College Fund Board in the light of recent senior changes to the executive. It thought that there was a strong case for another external member of Council to join the Board and that the Board might be re-balanced.

2. The current composition is that the Chairman is an external member of Council but that the other two external members are independents, not Council members, invited to join the Board because of their specific financial or commercial expertise. The rector, Chief Operating Officer and the CEO of the Fund make up the executive part of the Board.

3. The Nominations Committee, after consultation with the Chairman of the Fund Board, recommend to Council that the composition of the Board be changed to:

   Chair (an external member of Council)
   up to two other external members of Council
   up to two executive members of Council
   Rector *ex-officio*
   Two independent members (not being members of Council or staff of College)
   Chief Executive Officer of the Fund (appointed by the remainder of the Board)
   With the proviso that there should be a minimum of two external members of Council (including the Chair) and that there should be a majority of external members. The Board should also have the power to co-opt other external members.

4. All members of the Board would need to be approved by Council. The Ordinance needed to give effect to this change is attached at Annex A.

5. If the Council agree to this re-constitution then the Nominations Committee propose that Jeremy Newsum, Stephen Richardson and David Begg be appointed to the Board (to join Stewart Newton (chair), the Hon. Robbie Rayne, Nick Moakes, the Rector and John Anderson (CEO)).
1. Pursuant to Clause 5(f) of the Royal Charter, the University, subject to the Charter and Statutes, has the power to invest any monies in the hands of the University and available for investment in accordance with the relevant law and the Statutes.

2. Furthermore, pursuant to Statue 3, subject to the Charter and Statutes the Council shall exercise all the powers of the University and may delegate any of its functions, powers and duties to committees appointed by it, its officers, other entities or individuals and such committees, entities or individuals may further delegate unless the Council has provided to the contrary.

3. In Ordinance F2, the Council has approved a process for the identification of assets and monies that are available for investment ("Non-Core Assets") and for their transfer to the College Fund.

4. Pursuant to Statute 3 and subject to this Ordinance F1, the Council hereby delegates authority to the College Fund Board to:

a. Manage the Non-Core Assets that have been transferred to the College Fund as it sees fit, including placing monies on deposit with any bank or licensed deposit taker or by investing in such stocks, funds, shares, securities and other investments (including land and any tenure or any interest therein) of whatsoever nature and wheresoever and whether involving liability or not, as the College Fund Board shall, in its absolute discretion, think fit.

b. Appoint (and in a like manner revoke or vary the terms of such appointment) any person or persons including a company or firm to act as investment advisers or investment managers and to permit any monies, investments or other property belonging to or in the hands of the University to be registered or held in the name of any nominee or nominees within the United Kingdom on behalf of the University without being liable for any loss occasioned thereby in each case subject to such conditions and upon such terms (including the payment of remuneration) as shall from time to time be agreed in writing between the College Fund Board and such person or persons as aforesaid.

c. Establish sub-committees and advisory committees and to receive reports from such of these committees as it sees fit;

d. Further delegate its authority to individuals, organisations or committees as it sees fit.
TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COLLEGE FUND BOARD

5. **Investment and Distribution.**
   
a. To manage the Non-Core Assets within the terms of the investment policy as determined by the College Fund Board and approved by Council from time to time (the “Investment Policy”);

b. Subject to Paragraph 5.a. above, to manage the Non-Core Assets in a manner that is appropriate to achieve the investment and distribution objective determined by the College Fund Board and approved by the Council from time to time (the “Investment Objective”);

c. To make a regular distribution from the Non-Core Assets to the College in line with the Investment Objective;

6. **Unit Structure.** To establish, operate and maintain a unit structure within the College Fund;

7. **Monitoring and Reporting.**
   
a. To monitor the performance of the College Fund and to provide a report on its activities (including a financial report and a list of all the newly identified Non-Core Assets) to each meeting of the Council;

b. To review the Investment Objective set by the Council and to make recommendations for variations to the Council as required but at least once every three years;

c. To submit an annual report to the Council on its activities for the year;

d. To submit a College Fund three year plan (including a Strategic Plan) and budget to the Council at the same meeting at which the University’s three year plan and budget are submitted by the Rector.

e. To support the consolidation of the College Fund’s three year plan and budget into the University’s three year plan for submission to the Council by the Rector.

8. **Other.**
   
a. To review the assets of the College on a regular basis in order to identify additional assets that could potentially be designated as Non-Core Assets;

b. To appoint a Chief Executive Officer to undertake such duties as are necessary to ensure the efficient management of the Non-Core Assets;

**CONSTITUTION**
9. **The Members of the College Fund Board shall be appointed by the Council.** The Council shall ensure that the College Fund Board has at all times a majority of external members who are not persons holding honorary status in the University as defined by Ordinance, or students of the University, or employees of the University.

10. **Members.**

   a. A Chairman to be appointed by the Council. The Chairman of the College Fund Board shall be an external member of the Council.

   b. **Up to two** external members to be appointed by the Council, who are not members of the Council or persons holding honorary status in the University as defined by Ordinance, or students of the University, or employees of the University and who shall have recent and relevant expertise and experience to assist the Board in fulfilling its obligations to the Council.

   c. **Up to two other external members of the Council, appointed by the Council.**

   d. **Up to two senior staff or ex-officio staff members of the Council other than the Rector, appointed by the Council.**

   e. The Rector of the College **ex officio**;

   d. The Chief Operating Officer of the College **ex officio**;

   e. The Chief Executive Officer of the Fund to be appointed by the other members of the College Fund Board.

   g. **The College Fund Board shall have the power to co-opt additional external members, if it sees fit.**

11. **In Attendance.** The College Fund Board shall have the power to invite such others persons to attend its meetings as it sees fit from time to time.

12. **Secretary.** The Secretary of the College Fund Board shall be appointed by the Clerk to the Court and Council.

**MEETINGS**

13. The Board shall meet quarterly and may meet more often as it sees fit.

**QUORUM**

14. The quorum for the College Fund Board shall be the Chairman, one external member **of the Council**, either the Rector or the Chief Operating Officer, one senior staff or ex-officio staff member, and the Chief Executive Officer. Paragraph 9 of Ordinance A10 shall not apply to the College Fund Board.
STANDING ORDERS

44/15. Except where otherwise stated in this Ordinance, the Declaration of Members’ Interests (Ordinance A5) and the Standing Orders for the Council, the Court and the Senate and for Committees of the Council and the Senate (Ordinance A10) shall apply to the College Fund Board.

Approved by the Council: 13 July 2007
A Note by the Rector

PRO RECTOR (HEALTH)

Professor Stephen SMITH FMedSci, currently Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, has been appointed to the post of Pro Rector (Health), with effect from 1 December 2010, in addition to his existing role as Chief Executive of Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust.

PRINCIPAL OF THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Professor Sir Anthony Newman TAYLOR FMedSci, currently Deputy Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, has been appointed to the post of Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 December 2010 for a period of two years initially.

PRINCIPAL OF THE FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

Professor Jeff MAGEE, currently Deputy Principal (Research) of the Faculty of Engineering and Head of the Department of Computing, has been appointed to the post of Principal of the Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 January 2011.

DEPUTY PRINCIPAL OF THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Professor Jenny HIGHAM, currently Director of Education of the Faculty of Medicine, has been appointed to the post of Deputy Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 December 2010.

DIRECTOR OF MARKETING

Ms Laura Marie BARKER, previously Director and Vice President Marketing for the National Grid, has been appointed to the post of Director of Marketing, in the Enterprise Division, with effect from 6 December 2010.

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTING

Professor Susan EISENBAICH, currently Professor of Computing and Dean of Learning and Teaching, has accepted an appointment as Head of Department of Computing, with effect from 1 January 2011 for a period of five years.
FACULTY OPERATING OFFICER – ENGINEERING

Mr Richard MARTIN, previously Chief Operating Officer of the UCL School of Energy and Resources, Australia, has accepted an appointment as Faculty Operating Officer, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 17 January 2011.

ACTING CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

Mr Andrew MURPHY, currently Director of Finance, has accepted an appointment as Acting Chief Financial Officer, with effect from 1 January 2011.

CHANGES TO THE RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISIONS

Professor Stephen RICHARDSON, currently Deputy Rector, will assume responsibility for the following Support Services Divisions, with effect from 1 January 2011:

- Capital Projects and Planning (formerly Building Projects)
- Commercial Services
- Facilities and Property Management
- Human Resources
- ICT
- Reactor Centre

He will also assume responsibility for liaison with the College Fund and will retain his responsibility for the Research Office.

PROFESSORS

Professor Jeffrey W HAND, has been appointed to the short part-time contact as Principal Research Fellow in MR Safety, Institute of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 25 October 2010 for a period three months.

Professor Marco PAGANO, currently Professor of Economics, at the University of Naples Federico II, Italy, has accepted a part-time appointment as Professor of Finance, Imperial College Business School, with effect from 1 September 2011, on a one year rolling contract. He will also continue his role at the University of Naples Federico II, Italy, on a part-time basis.

Professor Masao TAKATA, formerly Professor of Molecular Physiology in Critical Care and Head of Section of the Anaesthetics, Pain Medicine and Intensive Care, Division of Surgery, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, has accepted the appointment of Magill Chair in Anaesthetics, Pain Medicine and Intensive Care, Division of Surgery, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 January 2011.

Professor John Oliver WARNER FMedSci, has been appointed to the post of Chair in Paediatrics and Head of Department of Paediatrics, in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 November 2010.

Professor Allan Hunter YOUNG, has been appointed to the post of Chair in Psychiatry, in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 December 2010.
READERS

Dr Lesley RUSHTON, previously Principal Research Fellow, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, has accepted the appointment of Reader in Occupational Epidemiology, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 September 2010.

VISITING PROFESSORS

Professor Michael Angus CRAWFORD, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 July 2010. (Not previously reported).

Professor Marinos C DALAKAS, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 November 2010.

Dr Wojciech FUNDAMERSKI, currently Leader of the EFDA-JET Task Force on Exhaust Physics and of the Plasma Exhaust Theory and Modelling Group at the Culham Centre for Fusion Energy, Eurotom/UKAE Fusion Association, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 October 2010 for a period of one year.

Professor Glenn GIBSON, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 19 December 2010.

Professor Kenneth (Ken) HAYNES, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 October 2010.

Professor Bruce Charles NEAL, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 September 2010.

Dr Karen Anne RITCHIE, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 8 November 2010.

Professor David William YORK, currently a Research Fellow in R&D Process Breakthrough at Procter and Gamble, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Chemical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 October 2010 for a period of three years.

Professor Liping ZHAO, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 July 2010. (Not previously reported).
RETIREMENTS

Professor Alan ATKINSON, Chair in Materials Chemistry, Department of Materials, Faculty of Engineering, retired from his full-time role on 31 October 2010. Following retirement, he will continue in his role on a part-time basis.

Professor John William COSGROVE, Professor of Structural Geology, Department of Earth Science and Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, retired from his full-time role on 31 October 2010. Following retirement, he will continue in his role on a part-time basis.

Professor Mohammad Ali GHATEI, Professor of Peptide Endocrinology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, retired on 31 December 2010.

Mr David GRAY, Faculty Operating Officer, Faculty of Engineering, retired in January 2011.

Mr Mohamed Hameed-Ullah (Hameed) KHAN, Head of Financial Management, Finance Division, Support Services, retired on 31 December 2010.

RESIGNATIONS

Dr Robert Eric BEADMORE, Reader in Applied Mathematics, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, resigned with effect from 31 December 2010, to take up an appointment at the University of Exeter.

Professor Marinos DALAKAS, Chair in Clinical Neuroscience, Neuromuscular Diseases, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, resigned with effect from 31 October 2010.

Dr Martin Peter KNIGHT, Chief Operating Officer, Support Services, resigned with effect from 31 December 2010. He has been offered continued association with the College as Chairman of Innovations plc.

Professor Marc LARUELLE, Chair in Biological Psychiatry, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, resigned with effect from 31 October 2010.

Professor William Robert Maurice PERRAUDIN, Chair in Finance, Imperial College Business School, resigned with effect from 31 December 2010.

Dr Neil VAREY, Director of Commercial Projects, Development and Corporate Affairs, resigned with effect from 31 July 2010.
PAPER D

HOME/EU UNDERGRADUATE TUITION FEES FOR 2012 ENTRY

Paper from the College Secretary

Paper D is commercially sensitive and confidential and has therefore been excluded from these published minutes
Paper E is commercially sensitive and confidential and has therefore been excluded from these published minutes.
PAPER F

REPORT FROM THE COLLEGE FUND BOARD

A Paper from the Chairman of the College Fund Board

YEAR TO DATE

1. At the consolidated level, the position of the College Fund at the end of the last calendar year was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>31 Jul 10</th>
<th>31 Dec 10</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unitised Scheme</strong>*</td>
<td>£73.7m</td>
<td>£84.5m</td>
<td>£10.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Circumstances:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Core Property</td>
<td>£124.3m</td>
<td>£125.5m</td>
<td>£1.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt</td>
<td>(£20.8m)</td>
<td>(£21.2m)</td>
<td>(£0.4m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands Loan</td>
<td>(£20.0m)</td>
<td>(£20.0m)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Property</strong></td>
<td>£83.5m</td>
<td>£84.3m</td>
<td>£0.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperial Innovations</strong></td>
<td>£141.0m</td>
<td>£162.1m</td>
<td>£21.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£298.2m</td>
<td>£330.9m</td>
<td>£32.7m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* After Distributions and Net Additions

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES PORTFOLIO

2. **Imperial Innovations** – Imperial Innovations announced to the Stock exchange on the 7th of December a fundraising worth £140m, after the terms of the rights issue were agreed on the evening of the 6th. The Rights Issue delivered the full £140m targeted by Innovations, and has been raised via a 2 for 3 Rights Issue at 3.50p. This has reduced the College Fund’s holding in Innovations to slightly over 30%. As well as the significant injection of capital that this deal provides to Innovations, Invesco also took the College’s Rights for 30p each, a move which delivered a £5.5m net cash return for the College Fund. As this event was completed in January this year, the numbers have not yet be incorporated into the returns noted above. This is a highly significant deal, which has generated a substantial amount of publicity and press attention. It is hoped that over the coming years this fundraising will benefit the three distinct parts that comprise Imperial – Innovations, core College itself, and the College Fund. It has been pleasing to note that the market has reacted positively to the news, with the share price holding up well and remaining above £4 even following the placement of the rump of unallocated Rights.

3. **Operational Property**

   a. **Wye Campus** – A full, high-level update on activities at the Wye Campus can be found at Annex A, in addition to updates on specific developments at the campus below in this paper. In summary, there are a number of schemes in development across the Fund’s portfolio in Wye, including with consultations on the planning status of the core College site proceeding in parallel to a number of specific developments at the peripheral
sites. A policy of increased cooperation on the ground has greatly improved Imperial’s relationship with the local residents.

b. **52 Princes Gate** – The Rights Issue transaction noted in relation to Innovations above has triggered a rent review on the commercial element of 52 Princes Gate. Innovations occupy the building on a 25 year FRI lease, currently paying £225k per annum. This will now be the subject of a review from agents acting for both Innovations and the Fund which will move the rent to market levels. An in principle agreement has also been reached with the ultimate Freeholder to obtain the Freehold interest of the property for £20,000. This required a commitment not to pursue the Freehold on relation to 53 Princes Gate – an approach that has received support from the Management Board.

4. **Development Properties** –

a. **Wye Residential** – Construction programmes were severely affected by the spell of cold weather prior to Christmas. The residential properties at Wye were where this was felt most acutely, with sites closed for 20 days due to operatives being unable to reach the site in heavy snow. The main contractor, Brennans, have been working hard to regain the time lost, and the Old Flying Horse was handed over before the spell of bad weather, but there has been a 6-week delay to Edward Partridge, which will now be handed over on the 31st of January. The most prominent of the developments, Coldharbour House, a high-profile building being converted into 5 flats, remains on programme and will be completed on the 16th of May. It should be noted that as the developments are being carried on under Guaranteed Maximum Price contracts, and as the delays are not attributable to client change, there will be no cost implications to the projects.

b. **Silwood Farmhouse** – The farmhouse has been awarded a ‘commendation’ by Windsor & Maidenhead Planning Authority for the design of the building, an endorsement of the project design and construction team, who attended an awards ceremony in Maidenhead on the 20th of January. The new access road to the property was handed over on the 24th of January, on time, despite the cold weather immediately prior to Christmas. As part of this project the property will be connected to a mains gains supply so that the Calor Gas tank (presently located in the garden) can be removed. This will take place in the coming weeks.

5. **Planning Schemes** – Progress continues in relation to the following projects:

a. **5a Montrose Court (Secret Garden Cottage)**

   (1) The Garden Square to the rear of Princes Gardens (the Secret Garden) was transferred into the College Fund as a non-core asset in 2006. The square is 9,305m², so it is similar in size to Prince Gardens. The square also contains in its south-western corner a 1960s 3-bedroom bungalow with a faded exterior and décor in chronic need of refurbishment or redevelopment. Notwithstanding this, there are two factors which mean the Fund cannot, at present, realise any commercial gain from the cottage:

   (2) The bungalow is, at present, categorised in planning terms as a Gardener’s cottage. To rent the Cottage commercially would place the Fund at risk of violating planning regulations and as such subject to an enforcement notice from Westminster Council.

   (3) As part of the square, the cottage is subject to the London Squares Preservation Act, which would preclude any development or refurbishment
designed to bring the cottage up to a standard which, firstly befits the College Fund’s residential portfolio and, secondly, would be desirable on the lettings market.

(4) A solution has been proposed for the second issue, which involves, in effect, ‘swapping out’ the cottage from the square and ‘swapping in’ an equivalent parcel of land. This will result in a square of the same size as before, but with the cottage removed from the onerous restrictions placed on it by the London Squares Preservation Act, it will be possible to seek a change of planning use for the building. This was approved in principle at the January meeting of Management Board, with a drawing outlining the proposal attached at Annex B.

(5) This will move the boundary of the square slightly to the south towards Weekes Hall, with a small sliver of land at the south of the square being ‘given’ to the square to substitute for the removal of the cottage plot. This area, which is 9 metres away from the existing boundary at its widest point, is presently overgrown with foliage and trees. This small triangle of land is not presently used by College for any core function – there are no essential services there that have been identified, and the parcel of land being ‘swapped in’ does not constitute any of the gardens for the halls of residence in Princes Gardens. Furthermore, the proposal has no impact on the current operation of the garden as a recreational amenity space.

(6) Westminster have indicated that they will support the proposal with the relatively minor conditions of posting a notice of our intention in the Estates Gazette and submitting a report to the Council Planning Officer. The outcome of this would be to create a distinct lettable entity on the site of the existing Cottage, with the Fund then free to pursue development plans for the site to maximise the residential value of the site. The first stage of this will be to seek to amend the planning status of the property, something which will be significantly easier without the heavy conditions placed on the site by the London Squares Preservation Act.

(7) Council is therefore asked to formally to declare the parcel of land indicated by the pink hatching (see Annex B) to be a non-core asset, delegating to the Chief Executive of the College Fund the authority to enter into any documentation necessary to complete the land swap.

b. Withersdane, Wye – The scheme to create c.200,000 square feet of residential care accommodation at the Withersdane site continues. Following Ashford Borough Council’s ruling that a further period of marketing of a minimum of 6 months must take place for them to be satisfied that there remains no latent educational demand for the site, a steering group has been convened to sign off the marketing material. Two meetings have taken place so far, with the scope of the marketing material having now been agreed at the second meeting on the 13th of January. The final marketing strategy will be presented and agreed at the next meeting on the 14th of March, after which the 6 months will commence. While it was hoped that the marketing period would commence before then, our property consultants have advised that it is essential that all parties involved in the steering group have input into the marketing process for it to be deemed comprehensive. Should no acceptable offer be received for the site, the existing proposals for a care village at Withersdane will be taken forward.

c. Fisher Hall, Evelyn Gardens – A formal planning application has been submitted for consideration by Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. This takes forward proposals formulated in collaboration with Wellcome Trust (the freeholders) to
obtain consent for a residential care facility at the Fisher Hall student residence in Evelyn Gardens. Objections have been received, however, from the Conservation Officer at RBKC, who has indicated that she is unwilling to support the proposals in their present state, objecting to modifications being made to the rear elevation and front entrance. This is a frustrating development, particularly given that previous indications had been that these alterations were not objectionable. The scheme retains significant political support, however, and a joint meeting between the Wellcome Trust, the College and RBKC has been convened, in conjunction with the design team, to overcome these obstacles with a view to going to Committee in April at the latest.

d. **Pembridge Annex** – A planning application for the revised scheme of 1 house and 13 residential apartments remains under consideration by RBKC. A soft strip of the site took place over the Christmas vacation period, while full demolition of the existing property will take place while the adjoining halls of residence are vacant over the Christmas vacation. The Valuation Office Agency have finally affirmed their advice to RBKC in relation to the costplan. This feedback is crucial as it confirmed that no affordable housing provision will be applied to the development, and without such a recommendation the Planning Officer at RBKC indicated he was unwilling to consider the proposal. The scheme will now reach committee comfortably in time for demolition to proceed at Easter, however, and ISG as main contractor remain closely involved to ensure a coordinated design.

e. **Woodlands Masterplan** – Negotiations on the final price to be paid by the Joint Venture company for the 150 year lease in relation to the Postgraduate Scheme are nearing completion, with a target land acquisition date of 28 February conditional only on the completion of the Judicial Review period in relation to planning. Council will recall that the entire site was acquired for £28m, with £20m being contributed by the College Fund. Pre-planning the site allocated for the Postgraduate Scheme was valued at £2.5m – the terms of the Joint Venture will deliver a cash return significantly in excess of this number, to reflect the planning permission granted and the structure of the planned development. Full details will be reported once the land transaction has moved from its current conditional status through to completion.

**UNITISED SCHEME**

6. **Property Developments**

a. **Winstanley Road** – Winstanley 2 – the development SPV – completed the purchase of the land upon which phase 2 of the scheme will be built on the 13th of January. This is a former children’s home adjoining the original site, and adds a further 114 postgraduate studios to the original 452 bed scheme. Phase 2 will become occupied a year after phase 1, with students moving in October 2012. Progress on site has slipped very slightly, again due to the bad weather just prior to Christmas, but remains comfortably on target for completion in time for the first phase to be occupied this October, assuming that there is not another sustained period of snow. A ‘sales module’ replica of the studio remains in place at the South Kensington campus, with the unit attracting considerable interest and playing an important role in the marketing of the scheme. The scheme has also attracted coverage in Felix, which recognises the role the scheme plays both as accommodation and as an investment.

b. **Woodlands Postgraduate Scheme** – The development of 606 Postgraduate studio apartments and nine three-bedroom Family Units for Imperial College key workers has progressed well following the granting of planning permission last October. ISG, who are also a College Framework contractor, won the main contract. This follows a highly
competitive tendering process, in which a number of high quality compliant bids were received. ISG have a strong track record of delivering complex projects on time and budget for College, however, and were able to put forward an impressive project team who have just completed a 1000 bed scheme in central London under the Nido brand. The scheme will be built out for £37.5m including contingency, with a 72 week programme. Demolition continues on site, as can be seen below. Banking terms have been agreed with Santander on the £57m development loan to fund the construction of the scheme, and a roll on £67m ten year Investment Loan for post completion.

7. **Asset Allocation** – The scheme has initiated a reallocation of funds from Alternative (Hedge Funds) to Global Equity over the last quarter, and continues to build its allocation to Property as the Winstanley and Woodlands Scheme’s develop. The final equity payment into the Woodlands Scheme of c. £7.5m will be transacted in February. At the strategic level, the portfolio has therefore moved marginally overweight on equities, and moved away from its defensive cash position. Alternatives remain significantly underweight and this is unlikely to change in the near future as the transparency and liquidity of the main markets remain attractive. The Scheme continues to hold a zero allocation to bonds and bond funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>31 Dec 10</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>YTD Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Equities</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property (incl. committed cash)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>nil</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Performance** – The tactical allocations within the portfolio have continued to deliver a positive return for the year to date, with both the Global Equities and Property positions providing returns significantly ahead of the absolute target of 3.8%. On a weighted benchmark
comparison, the Scheme also performed well as active management in Global Equities and the positive performance on the Postgraduate Development Schemes combined to influence performance. At the consolidated level, the year to date returns were therefore as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Months Performance (Total Return)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WYE CAMPUS UPDATE

A Report by the Chairman of the College Fund Board

Following the decision of Council on 12 February 2010, all remaining property interests at Wye were transferred to the College Fund as Non-Core Assets. These Assets breakdown into four main elements:

1. The Farm – c.750 Acres of land managed under a ten year Farm Business Tenancy with just over seven years left to run.
2. The peripheral estate – a number of small scale residential, student residential, commercial and agricultural properties outside of the main Village.
3. Withersdane – a substantial Victorian house with significant twentieth century additions located about half a mile outside of the main Village
4. The main educational and research buildings within the Village itself.

Wye Farm

There have been no significant events in relation to the farmland, which continues to be managed by three tenants and provides a regular rental income (c.£100k p.a.) back to the Fund.

Peripheral Estate

The Fund's case by case approach to upgrading the peripheral residential estate continues, with planning received or confirmed for 34 dwellings to date. 15 are now fully refurbished and let, with a further 9 due for completion within the first quarter of 2011. Of the remaining 10 units, 9 (the former Wolfson House Student Block and the ‘Pig Unit’) are due to be resubmitted to planning with enhanced schemes whilst the final dwelling (the ‘Sheep Unit’) has been submitted for tender to be developed out in the course of the year. The performance of the let properties has been pleasing in difficult economic conditions, generating an additional £100k p.a. in net income.

The Fund has also agreed terms with Natural England for the continued use of office accommodation at Coldharbour Farm – resulting in an increase in rent of £35k p.a. Terms have also been agreed with SOAS for the early surrender of their lease on Ian Carruthers and Bexley House – with a formal letter noting that the College placed no pressure on them to depart, but rather that they were unable to make a academic activity work on a sustainable basis within the Village. Work has commenced to promote an alternative residential use of the buildings that will be vacated at the end of July 2011.

Withersdane

The Fund’s application to establish a Residential Care Scheme at Withersdane has been placed on hold pending the implementation of the ‘Wye 3’ policy that emerged from the local Planning Authority.

Main Campus North and associated sites

The main educational and research buildings form the core of the Wye 3 issue: This policy (found within the Tenterden and Rural Sites Development Plan Document), was confirmed following a public enquiry last summer and seeks the continued use of the entire Wye campus (including Main Campus North, the old ‘ADAS buildings’ and Withersdane) for educational and related research and business uses. The inspector has ruled that an additional minimum 6 month period of marketing must take place in order for the Council to be satisfied that there is no latent educational demand for the site, with all or part of the site available for potential tenants.
Savills will commence this period of marketing with meetings being held with ABC and local residents to ensure that the marketing campaign is being conducted in line with the Inspector's wishes.

This will lead to one of two outcomes for the site:

1) A viable educational tenant user for the site, or parts thereof, is found or
2) No acceptable offer is received resulting in the need for a ‘masterplan’ for future potential uses.

The College continues to receive proposals, recommendations and unsolicited advice on the future of the campus from various sources. The response has not changed, noting that we continue to seek a sustainable future for all aspects of the estate, and that in line with the Wye 3 Policy established by Ashford Borough Council we will be embarking on a further period of marketing for those assets. Therefore all notices of interest should be directed to Savills as the College’s agent.

**Wye Operations**

Relations between Imperial and the village residents in Wye have improved dramatically over last 12 month. Although the College is ‘closed’ a remaining staff of 13 are based full-time at Wye – comprising 8 Security Officers, 2 Gardeners, 2 General Maintenance Staff and a Manager's Agent reporting directly to the Chief Executive of the College Fund, Carol Jovanovic.

The Fund manages the buildings and grounds of the campus on a ‘care and maintenance’ basis. The efforts of the staff on the ground at Wye have greatly improved relations at Wye, something which is evident from more recent Parish Council minutes. This involves a combination of daily engagement with the local village and an effort to deal with specific local issues as they arise, and a number of specific initiatives which have served to build good will towards Imperial:

- The Wye Sports Field is now leased to Wye Juniors Football Club on a peppercorn rent
- The Security Office on Main Campus North is used as a base (free of charge) for the local Police Officer and Community Warden.
- Police Sniffer Dog training is now carried out weekly in the Kempe Centre, in return for an increased police presence around campus
- Permission has been granted for ‘Kent Men of Trees’ society to plant more trees on College Land.
- The Lecture Theatre is offered to the community for use eg./ fitness classes, book clubs etc.
- The Village Green (owned by the College) is used for the local Farmer's Market under a formal licence agreement.
- The College is in the process of offering space for a locally run Wye Heritage Centre.

**Consolidated Financials**

At a consolidated level – the ongoing cost of operating the campus is budgeted at £671k – however, local cost reviews and amendments to operational practices have cut c. 25% from the
budget delivering a revised outturn forecast of £500k for the operations and care and maintenance. This is offset by existing and new tenancies across the site that are forecast to deliver c.£420k net – resulting in an approximated ongoing hold cost of £80k for the current year.
IMPERIAL COLLEGE: Proposed Land Swap.

Red Edging: Original Garden Sq
Solid Blue: Imperial Ownership
Green Hatch: Land surrendered from Square
Pink Hatch: Land given to Square
INTRODUCTION

1. The Council at its meeting in September 2010 debated and approved proposals for the reform of the role and composition of the Court, based on the Governance Review’s recommendations which it had previously accepted. Members of the Court were themselves asked to comment on the general proposals. Support was received from those who responded.

2. At its meeting in November 2010, Council supported a proposal to link a summer Science Festival to the main meeting of the Court, subject to a concern about the ability to organise an event for the coming summer. It asked that worked up proposals be brought to Council and presented to Court for comment at their annual meeting in February.

3. The reformed Court will be principally a stakeholder forum but the Governance Review recommended that the Court also be given a role in the governance of the College. It recommended, and the Council agreed, that the Court should have the power to approve the appointment of the Chair and Deputy Chair of Council. The College’s Statutes would need to be modified in order to confer such authority on the Court and the Privy Council would need to approve. The College has been in informal discussion with the Privy Council office about this proposal for a number of months. It is clear that they will not accept this proposal, citing the 1997 Dearing Report which recommended that Councils should be sovereign and that Courts should not enjoy a power of veto. A way forward might be to seek the views of the Court before making appointments to the Chair and Deputy Chair. Such a requirement would not require Privy Council approval.

4. Further thought has been given to the organisation of the Science Festival in the light of Council’s and others’ comments. Given the need to involve the new Court (which has still to be formed) and the difficulty of engaging departments during the examination season, it may be that the Festival would be better placed in early summer with the first Festival being organised for 2012. A specific proposal is given in paragraphs 8-9.

5. If this plan were to be accepted, then the annual ‘AGM style’ meeting of the Court would coincide with the Festival. The form of a second meeting of the Court each year has also been considered. The aim would be to generate sufficient interest to encourage attendance and engagement in the context of a Court that may have little business to transact. Of course, agendas do not need to be determined in advance, but one thought is that a second meeting could take place in the autumn and be used as a committee of Court to help shape the design of the following year’s Festival.

SCIENCE FESTIVAL

6. The centre-piece of the proposed Festival, the exhibition, would seek to draw on many existing resources, and to recycle successful examples of the College’s public engagement activities wherever possible. For example, over the last five years the College has averaged three exhibition stands per year at the Royal Society Summer Science Exhibition, the Graduate Schools every summer run poster competitions for all PhD students to present their work to a lay audience, and since 2007, the College has fielded four finalists
in the national science communication talent show ‘FameLab’. In addition, the College would make modest amounts of seed money available to develop new exhibits and content, which, after debuting at Imperial’s Festival, could become candidates for display at other venues and locations; thus the exhibition would serve as both a chance to reprise well-regarded existing exhibits or performances, and to cultivate new ones.

7. The rationale and proposal for the Festival were presented and debated at a Heads of Departments’ meeting in December. Broad and warm support was given, but concern was raised about the proposed timing and the time needed to mount an event this coming summer. Specific concerns centred on the clash with the examination season and the departmental resources and staff time required to support the event.

8. In revisiting the timing of the event in the College year, whichever date was chosen would throw up difficulties for some part of the College. As the purpose of the event is to give Court the greatest chance to show the College off to its guests in the best possible light, the ideal date might contain the following characteristics:
   a. The best chance of good weather: when daylight hours are long
   b. Take place when as many students as possible are at the College
   c. Make use of temporary event facilities e.g. Marquee

9. Given the concerns on timing and the limited time available for the coming season, the first Festival is proposed for May 2012, following the Postgraduate Degree Ceremony (which falls on Wednesday 9 May) i.e Friday-Saturday 11-12 May 2012.

10. A review of other Russell Group universities’ programmes for their Courts (or equivalents) has not revealed any events of comparable scope to Imperial’s proposed Festival, and based on desk research, no evidence has been found of Court-led events or celebrations being promoted or advertised publicly (many run ‘Town & Gown’ type events but these have a different focus). The University of Bath is an exception in that it has launched a Founders Day Programme which combines tours, refreshments and dining, a formal meeting and a special lecture given by a guest speaker (this year Sir Paul Nurse).

11. The proposed format of the event therefore currently stands as follows:

**Day 1 (Friday):**
   a. Formal business of the Court – AGM
   b. Luncheon for Court members
   c. Imperial exhibition opens – interactive exhibits, debates and lab tours across Campus
   d. Evening Imperial Awards dinner (or if held preceding evening, an Alumni/Fundraising dinner)

**Day 2 (Saturday):**
   a. Imperial exhibition continues – interactive exhibits, debates and lab tours across Campus
   b. Alumni focussed events including lectures
c. Family-friendly events

12. An important proposed component of the full Festival is a College-wide Alumni event to replace a poorly attended annual event in September. A new format Alumni Reunion is now being planned for June 2011 and may serve as a test run for some elements of the Festival.

13. The administration of the new Court would be based within the Communications and Development Division and include responsibilities for stakeholder and event management. The event committee, as proposed in paragraph 5 above, will bring together Court members, academic champions, student representation and staff with responsibility for facilities, catering, communications, alumni and development.

SUMMARY

14. Annex A provides a summary of the proposals for the reform of the Court. Annex B provides the draft amendments to Ordinance A7, the Powers, Functions, Membership and Meetings of the Court, required to give effect to these reforms. The Court itself does not have any power to block or delay its dissolution and reformation, this being a power reserved to the Council. Clearly, though, its views will be sought at the meeting following the Council. However, the Council alone has the power to make and amend Ordinances and this is a power that cannot be delegated. (1) While it would be preferable to approve the changes to the Ordinance after the discussion with the Court, this would mean that the changes could not be approved until the Council's next Meeting in May. Council is therefore asked to consider approving the amendments to the Ordinance now, with any minor amendments suggested by Court being accepted by the Chairman on behalf of Council.
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1. Statute 3(6) states that:

"The Council may delegate any of its functions, powers and duties (other than its power to make Ordinances) to committees appointed by it, its officers, other entities (comprising its own officers or members or otherwise) or individuals, and such committees, individuals or entities may further delegate unless the Council has provided to the contrary."
ANNEX A

PROPOSALS FOR A REFORMED CONSTITUTION OF THE COURT

Following Council’s acceptance of the Governance Review’s recommendations for the Court, its powers, functions and membership need to be revised formally in order to replace the present Court with a new one acting as a stakeholder body. It is expected that the Court would normally meet twice a year with its main meeting being devoted to promoting a Science Festival showcasing the work of the College.

New Ordinances will be required to effect these proposals and they are likely to be centred on the powers, functions and membership of the Court shown below.

POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT

1. The powers and functions of the Court shall be:

a. To receive annual reports on the workings of the University from the Rector and the Council;

b. To host an annual event demonstrating to a wide audience the academic work of the University

c. To discuss any matters relating to the University and convey its opinion thereon to the Council;

d. To provide an opinion to the Council on the Council’s nominations for Chair and Deputy Chair of Council and Court.

d. To approve amendments to the Charter on the recommendation of the Council, prior to submission to the Privy Council;

e. To make representations for the appointment of a Visitor, as provided for in the Charter.

MEMBERSHIP

2. **Category**

   Chairman: Chairman of Council

   a. Council (19-23)

   Members of Council *(ex-officio)* (19-23)

   b. Senior executive team (4)

   Members of staff who are members of the Management Board (other than the College Secretary if he or she is also Clerk to the Court and Council) who are not Council members *(ex-officio)* (4)
c. Staff (4)
   Senior Dean (ex-officio) (1)
   Directly elected staff (3)

d. Students (2)
   Two ICU Deputy Presidents nominated by the President of ICU (who qualifies under Category 1) (ex-officio) (2)

e. Alumni (4)
   Alumni as determined by the Development Board (4)

f. Friends (up to 10)
   As determined by the Development Board (up to 10)

g. Employers of our graduates (3)
   Senior staff of those employers, as determined by the Management Board, who recruit significant numbers of our graduates and post-graduates (3)

h. Schools (3)
   Head Teacher nominated by the Head Masters Conference (1)
   Head Teacher nominated by the Girls Schools Association (1)
   Head Teacher nominated by the Secondary Heads Association (1)

i. Research sponsors (15)
   One each nominated by the 15 largest sponsors of research in the College (exact definition of size to be determined by the Management Board) other than Imperial College Trust or Imperial College Healthcare NHS or Charitable Trust (15).

j. Associated NHS bodies (up to 4)
   Senior staff nominated by Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust (1)
   Senior staff nominated by Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust (1)
   Senior staff nominated by other NHS bodies associated with the College as determined by the Management Board (up to 2)

k. Neighbours and associates (14)
   Member nominated by Friends of Imperial College (1)
   Member nominated by Imperial College Trust (1)
   Member nominated by Imperial College Healthcare Charitable Trust (1)
Member nominated by Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851 (1)
Member nominated by City and Guilds of London Institute (1)
Member nominated by the Royal College of Art (1)
Member nominated by the Royal College of Music (1)
Member nominated by the Natural History Museum (1)
Member nominated by the Science Museum (1)
Member nominated by the Victoria and Albert Museum (1)
Member nominated by the Corporation of the Hall of Arts & Sciences (Royal Albert Hall) (1)

Member nominated by the City of Westminster (1)
Member nominated by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (1)
Member nominated by the Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (1)

I. Other research, education or other partners or associates (4)²

Senior staff nominated by research, education or funding partners as determined by the Management Board and not listed above (up to 2)
Members nominated by other organisations as determined by Council (up to 2)

Clerk to the Court: Clerk to the Court and Council

Total membership of up to 90

PERIOD OF OFFICE OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE COURT

3. Ex officio members shall be members of the Court for the period for which they hold the position designated; other members shall be appointed for a term of four years, and be eligible for re-appointment except that members shall not normally be appointed for more than two consecutive terms of four years.

4. Periods of office of appointed or elected members shall commence on 1 October, save that any member appointed or elected to fill a casual vacancy shall commence his period of office immediately, but that his appointment shall be deemed to have commenced on the following 1 October for the purposes of determining that member's eligibility for further appointment or election.

CESSATION OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE COURT

5. Ex officio members shall cease to be members on vacation of the relevant office.

6. Elected members shall cease to be members of the Court if they cease to be eligible in the categories in which they were elected.

7. Nominated members shall cease to be members of the Court if the nominating body withdraws support for its nominee.

8. Where a member of the Court becomes incapable by reason of mental disorder, the Court may resolve that such person's membership be terminated.

9. The Court may require any member against whom a bankruptcy order has been made, or

² Examples might be UKCMRI, NTU (Singapore)
who makes a voluntary arrangement or any form of composition with his creditors, or a similar or equivalent order or arrangement in any jurisdiction or who is convicted on indictment of a criminal offence, to resign from membership.

10. Any member of the Court may resign by sending notice of resignation in writing to the Clerk to the Court.

**MEETINGS OF THE COURT**

11. There shall be a meeting of the Court at least once a year at such day and hour as determined by the Council to discharge the powers and functions prescribed by Paragraph 1 of this Ordinance.

**QUORUM OF THE COURT**

12. The Court shall be deemed to be quorate when at least 30 members are present, in which appointed members shall form a majority.
POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT

1. The Court is the University’s Stakeholder Body. It provides a forum in which Imperial College’s strategies can be discussed with representatives of all its major stakeholders. It is intended to promote a better understanding of Imperial College and to ensure that its strategies take into account the interests, aspirations and concerns of its stakeholders. The powers and functions of the Court shall be:

a. To receive an annual report on the workings of the University from the Rector and the Council;

b. To receive the Annual Accounts and the comments of the Audit Committee thereon of the University;

c. To discuss any matters relating to the University and convey its opinion thereon to the Council;

d. To host an annual event to promote the academic work of the University;

e. To approve amendments to the Charter on the recommendation of the Council, prior to submission to the Privy Council;

ef. To make representations for the appointment of a Visitor, as provided for in the Charter.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COURT

2. The Court shall consist of the following persons:

a. The Chairman

The Chairman of the Council

b. The Members of the Council, ex officio

c. Ex officio Staff Members

The Rector
The Deputy Rector
Pro-Rectors
The Members of the Management Board who are not also members of the Council other than the College Secretary if this person has also been appointed as the Clerk to the Council, ex officio

The Senior Dean, ex officio

Deputy Principals
Vice-Principals
Provosts
President of the Imperial College Union
Presidents of the Old Students’ Associations

d. **Elected Staff Members**

3 Members of the academic staff (1 elected each by and from the Engineering, the Medical and the Science academic staff)

e. **Ex officio Student Members**

2 of the Deputy Presidents of the Imperial College Union appointed by the President of the Imperial College Union

f. **Alumni Members**

4 alumni members nominated by the Development Board

g. **External Members**

Up to 10 external members nominated by the Development Board

h. **Appointed-Nominated Members**

**Employers**
3 members nominated by those employers, as determined by the Management Board from time to time, who recruit significant numbers of the College’s graduates and post-graduates.

**Schools**
1 Head Teacher nominated by the Head Masters Conference
1 Head Teacher nominated by the Girls Schools Association
1 Head Teachers appointed by the Secondary Heads Association

**Research Sponsors**
15 members nominated by the largest sponsors of research in the College, other than the Imperial College Trust, the Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust or the Imperial College Healthcare Charitable Trust, as determined by the Management Board from time to time.

**Associated NHS Bodies**
1 member nominated by the Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust
1 member nominated by the Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust
Up to 2 members nominated by other NHS bodies associated with the College, as determined by the Management Board from time to time.

Other Stakeholders

1 Member nominated by the Friends of Imperial College
1 Member nominated by the Imperial College Trust
1 Member nominated by the Imperial College Healthcare Charitable Trust
1 Member nominated by the Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851
1 Member nominated by the City and Guilds of London Institute
1 Member nominated by the Royal College of Art
1 Member nominated by the Royal College of Music
1 Member nominated by the Science Museum
1 Member nominated by the Natural History Museum
1 Member nominated by the Victoria and Albert Museum
1 Member nominated by the Corporation of the Hall of Arts & Sciences (Royal Albert Hall)
1 Member nominated by the City of Westminster
1 Member nominated by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
1 Member nominated by the Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
Up to 2 Members nominated by research, education or funding partners not otherwise represented on the Court, as determined by the Management Board from time to time
2 Members nominated by other organisations as determined by the Council from time to time.
1 appointed by the Goldsmiths’ Company
1 appointed by the Clothworkers’ Company
13 appointed by the City and Guilds of London Institute, of whom 10 should be members of City Livery Companies other than the Goldsmiths’ Company and the Clothworkers’ Company
2 appointed by the Royal Commissioners for the Exhibition of 1851
2 appointed by the Royal Society
2 appointed by the Royal Academy of Engineering
1 appointed by the Royal Society of Chemistry
1 appointed by the Royal College of Physicians
1 appointed by the Royal College of Surgeons of England
1 appointed by the Royal College of Anaesthetists
1 appointed by the Royal College of General Practitioners
1 appointed by the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists
1 appointed by the Royal College of Ophthalmologists
1 appointed by the Royal College of Pathologists
1 appointed by the Royal College of Psychiatrists
1 appointed by the Royal College of Radiologists
1 appointed by the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health
1 appointed by the Royal Aeronautical Society
1 appointed by the Royal Statistical Society
1 appointed by the Royal Institution of Naval Architects
1 appointed by the Royal Agricultural Society of England
1 appointed by the Royal Horticultural Society
1 appointed by each of:
— the Institution of Chemical Engineers
— the Institution of Civil Engineers
— the Institution of Engineering & Technology
—— the Institution of Mechanical Engineers
—— the Institution of Mining Engineers
—— the Institute of Materials, Mineral and Mining
—— the Institute of Biology
—— the Institute of Management
—— the Institute of Physics
—— the Society of Chemical Industry
—— the Institute of Biology
—— the British Computer Society
—— the Royal Society for the History of Science

1 Head Teacher appointed by the Head Masters Conference
1 Head Teacher appointed by the Girls Schools Association
2 Head Teachers appointed by the Secondary Heads Association
1 each by the Local Authority in the areas in which the University has a main site location as determined by the Council
1 each appointed by the Governments of: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka
1 appointed by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs
8 appointed by the Imperial College Union
1 each appointed by the Royal College of Art, the Royal College of Music, the Trustees of the Science Museum, the Trustees of the Natural History Museum, the Trustees of the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Corporation of the Hall of Arts & Sciences
3 Members of the Commons House of Parliament for relevant parliamentary constituencies as determined by the Council.

e. **Elected Members**

24 Members of the academic staff (8 elected each by and from the Engineering, the Medical and the Science academic staff).

4 Members elected by and from the non-academic staff.

d. **Co-opted Members**

Up to 40 persons, not employees of the University, co-opted on the recommendation of the Council.

e. **Chairman and Deputy Chairman**

The Chairman and the Deputy Chairman shall be the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Council.

f. **Clerk to the Court**

The Clerk to the Court shall be the Clerk to the Council.
NOMINATION, APPOINTMENT AND ELECTION AND CO-OPTION OF MEMBERS OF THE COURT

3. For the purposes of this Ordinance, the following shall be the meaning of the terms used and procedures to be adopted for the appointment, election and co-option of members of the Court.

4. **Ex Officio Staff Members.** The definitions of offices used in this Ordinance shall be as set out in Ordinance D4.

5. **Appointed-Nominated Members**

   a. **Appointed-Nominated** members of the Court shall be those nominated by the Appointing-Nominating Bodies and whose appointment is approved by the Council. Nominees should normally be a senior member of the staff or of the governing body of the nominating body with an understanding of the College's relationship with that body.

   b. In the list of Appointing Bodies:

      (1) “One person each by the Local Authority in the areas in which the University has a main site location”, shall be interpreted as one representative from each of the Local Authorities in whose boroughs the South Kensington, St. Mary’s, Royal Brompton, Hammersmith, Charing Cross, Silwood Park and Wye Campuses are situate.

      (2) “Three members of the Commons House of Parliament for the relevant parliamentary constituencies”, shall be interpreted as three members from among those members of the Commons House of Parliament with constituencies in which the South Kensington, St. Mary’s, Royal Brompton, Hammersmith, Charing Cross, Silwood Park and Wye Campuses are situate.

      (3) “Eight appointed by the Imperial College Union” shall be eight persons nominated by the Imperial College Union Council in accordance with any such policy established for that purpose as determined by the Imperial College Union Constitution.

   eb. In the event of a vacancy occurring among members appointed on the nomination of one of the Appointing-Nominating Bodies, that body shall be invited by the Clerk to the Court to nominate another senior person for appointment to the Court. The nomination shall be drawn to the attention of the Court Council at its next ordinary meeting and, if it is acceptable to the Court Council, the appointment shall be confirmed.

   c. In the event of a vacancy occurring for a nominated member where the nominating body is determined from time to time by the Management Board or the Council, the Management Board or Council will review the current nominating bodies within that category and decide on the body to be invited to nominate a
member to fill the vacancy. The Clerk to the Court will then write to the nominating body and invite it to nominate a senior person for appointment to the Court. The nomination shall be drawn to the attention of the Council at its next ordinary meeting and, if it is acceptable to the Council, the appointment shall be confirmed.

65. Elected Members of Staff

a. Members of the Academic Staff

(1) Persons elected by the academic staff of the University from among their number to be members of the Court shall be members of, be elected by, and shall represent the interests of the Engineering, Science and Medical staff of the University.

(2) Engineering staff shall comprise those academic staff employed in the Faculty of Engineering, and the Business School.

(3) Science staff shall comprise those academic staff employed in the Faculty of Natural Sciences and the Department of Humanities.

(4) Medical staff shall comprise those academic staff employed in the Faculty of Medicine.

(5) In the event of any uncertainty or dispute, the Rector shall have the authority to determine to which category a member of staff shall be deemed to be associated for the purpose of these elections.

(6) Academic staff entitled to vote for representatives of their academic grouping to be members of the Court shall be those academic staff who are employees of the University with the status of Professors, Readers, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers but excluding Probationary Lecturers.

b. Members of the Non-Academic Staff. Persons elected by the non-academic staff of the University by and from among their number to be their representatives on the Court shall be employees of the University in the Professional Services, Technical Services and Operational Services Families and Research Assistants inclusive.

cb. Election of Staff Members

(1) No later than the end of the Spring Term in the session preceding that in which vacancies occur, the Clerk to the Court shall invite nominations for election to the Court by notice in writing to all members of the academic and non-academic staff in the relevant groups. Each person nominated for election to the Court from the engineering, science and medical groupings of the academic staff or from the non-academic staff shall be nominated by two members of the same staff grouping, and nominations must reach the Clerk to the Court in writing by the closing date given in the notice, which shall be not less than three weeks from the date of that notice. The person nominated must
confirm in writing by the closing date that he or she is prepared to stand for election.

(2) If only sufficient nominations are received to fill the vacant places on the Court, those nominated will be declared elected without a ballot.

(3) If insufficient nominations are received, those nominated will be declared elected without a ballot and the remaining place or places shall remain vacant for a further year, at which point the Clerk to the Court will invite nominations in accordance with Paragraph 65(e)(b)(1) of this Ordinance.

(4) If more nominations are received for any one group than there are vacancies, a ballot will be held for that group. The ballot notice shall include in each case only the candidate’s name and permanent appointment in the University (that is without civil honours, academic and professional qualifications or temporary University appointments), together with the names of the proposer and seconder. Included with the ballot notice will be a brief curriculum vitae in respect of each candidate. The ballot notice must state the closing date for the election, which shall be not less than three weeks from the date of that notice. The persons to be elected shall be determined by the operation of the single transferable vote system.

(5) As soon as possible after the closing date for the election, the Clerk to the Court shall inform the candidates, their proposers and seconders of the result which shall also be announced in a University Notice to be issued as soon as possible thereafter.

d. Casual Vacancies. In the event of a vacancy occurring amongst the elected staff members before the end of the elected period of a member of the academic or non-academic staff, the Clerk to the Court shall arrange for an election forthwith to fill that vacancy.

e. Co-Opted Members. Persons eligible to be co-opted on the recommendation of the Council to be members of the Court shall be persons possessing such expertise as may be required by the Court to enable it to carry out its functions, together with any person co-opted to a committee of the Council who is not already an appointed or elected member of the Court.

PERIOD OF OFFICE OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE COURT

76. Ex officio members shall be members of the Court for the period for which they hold the position designated; other members shall be appointed for a term of four years, and be eligible for re-appointment except that members shall not normally be appointed for more than two consecutive terms of four years.

78. Periods of office of appointed or elected members shall commence on 1 October, save that any member appointed or elected to fill a casual vacancy shall commence his period of office immediately, but that his appointment shall be deemed to have commenced on the
following 1 October for the purposes of determining that member’s eligibility for further appointment or election.

**CESSATION OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE COURT**

98. *Ex officio* members shall cease to be members on vacation of the relevant office.

910. Elected members shall cease to be members of the Court if they cease to be eligible in the categories in which they were elected.

10. Nominated members shall cease to be members of the Court if the Nominating Body withdraws its support for its nominee.

11. Where a member of the Court becomes incapable by reason of mental disorder, the Court may resolve that such person’s membership be terminated.

12. The Court may require any member against whom a bankruptcy order has been made, or who makes a voluntary arrangement or any form of composition with his creditors, or a similar or equivalent order or arrangement in any jurisdiction or who is convicted on indictment of a criminal offence, to resign from membership.

13. Any member of the Court may resign by sending notice of resignation in writing to the Clerk to the Court.

**MEETINGS OF THE COURT**

14. There shall be a meeting of the Court at least once a year at such day and hour as determined by the Council to discharge the powers and functions prescribed by Paragraph 1 of this Ordinance.

**QUORUM OF THE COURT**

15. The Court shall be deemed to be quorate when at least 50 members are present, in which appointed and co-opted-nominated members shall form a majority.

**TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS (2011)**

16. The Council shall determine the effective day on which the new membership provisions set out in the 2011 revisions to this Ordinance shall take effect.

17. Save for ex-officio members of the Court and for other members as provided for in paragraphs 19 and 20 below, the members of the Court immediately before the effective date shall cease to be the members of the Court on the effective date.

18. Notwithstanding anything in paragraphs 1 to 15 of this Ordinance, and save for the members as provided for in paragraphs 19 and 20 below, the first appointments and elections
of members of the Court shall be made so as to take effect on the effective day in accordance with procedures set out in this Ordinance

19. Those persons who immediately before the effective day were members of the Court nominated by the bodies mentioned in paragraph 20 of this Ordinance shall be deemed for the purposes of this Ordinance to have become members of the Court in accordance with this Ordinance on the effective day. Where there has been a reduction in the number of members appointed by the nominating body, the Clerk to the Court will write to the nominating body and invite it to which of its current appointees should become members of the Court on the effective day.

20. The bodies referred to in paragraph 19 above are:

- the Head Masters Conference
- the Girls Schools Association
- the Secondary Heads Association
- the Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851
- the City and Guilds of London Institute
- the Royal College of Art
- the Royal College of Music
- the Science Museum
- the Natural History Museum
- the Victoria and Albert Museum
- the Corporation of the Hall of Arts & Sciences (Royal Albert Hall)
- the City of Westminster
- the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
- the Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

21. Notwithstanding anything in paragraphs 1 to 15 of this Ordinance any person who immediately before the effective day was an appointed member of the Court and who becomes a member of the Court on that day shall be deemed for the purposes of this Ordinance to have begun his term of office as a member of the Court on 1st October immediately following the date on which he originally became a member of the Court.

Approved by the Council 23 March 2007
Effective from 8 July 2007
Revised by the Council 23 November 2007
PAPER H

CANCER SERVICES AT IMPERIAL COLLEGE HEALTHCARE NHS TRUST
RESTRUCTURING PROPOSAL

A Note by the Principal, Faculty of Medicine

AIM

1. The Council is asked to note the Consultation Paper attached at Annex A, which outlines a proposal to restructure Cancer Services by Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust. As a consequence of these proposals five clinical academic members of staff, funded either wholly or in part by the Trust, have been written to by the Trust and informed that they are directly affected by these proposals. Consequently these proposals may result in some of these staff being at risk of redundancy due to the withdrawal of funding. Any potential redundancies are covered by Ordinance D11 of the University’s Statutes – The Dismissal of Members of Staff by Reasons of Redundancy, a copy of which is attached at Annex B. As is made clear in Ordinance D11, before or during the consultation period, the Council must be provided with a copy of the consultation paper, details of the area affected and the reasons for the proposed reduction in academic staff.

BACKGROUND

2. Consultation with those members of staff in the Department of Surgery and Cancer within Faculty of Medicine commenced on 18 January 2011 with a meeting with both College and Trust staff directly affected by these proposals. UCU, the College trades' union representing academic staff, was sent a copy of the consultation document on the same day and a meeting with the trade union was held on 19 January 2011.

3. Should any clinical academic member of staff be directly affected by these proposals and their funding withdrawn by ICHT and therefore at risk of redundancy, it is proposed to offer voluntary severance terms in the first instance. If any clinical academic members of staff do not agree to the voluntary severance terms Council is asked to:

   a. Authorise the Rector or other person authorised by the Rector to implement the selection process and subsequent proposed redundancy if the Rector or his nominee considers this appropriate following the comments and counter-proposals gathered during the consultation period; or

   b. Defer its decision and review the position again following the completion of the consultation process, at which stage the Council may require a report on the preliminary consultation with staff and/or appropriate representatives and any comments received from them. The Council may then authorise the Rector or his nominee to implement the selection process and subsequent proposed redundancies if the Rector or his nominee considers this appropriate following the comments and counter proposals gathered during the consultation period.

Annexes:

A. Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust Consultation Paper
B. Ordinance D11 – The Dismissal of Members of Staff by Reasons of Redundancy
Proposed Resolution:

That, if any staff members affected by the proposed restructuring set out in Paper H do not agree to voluntary severance terms, in accordance with the procedures set out in Ordinance D11, the Dismissal of Members of Staff by Reasons of Redundancy, authority will be delegated to the Rector, or to another person authorised by the Rector, to implement the selection process and subsequent proposed redundancy if the Rector or his nominee considered this appropriate following the comments and counter-proposals gathered during the consultation period.
Annex A

Imperial College Healthcare
NHS Trust

SURGERY & CANCER CLINICAL PROGRAMME GROUP
DIRECTORATE OF CANCER

CONSULTATION TO REVIEW CONSULTANT PRODUCTIVITY WITHIN THE CANCER DIRECTORATE

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following Executive Team endorsement of the Development and Rationalisation of Cancer Services at Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust Business Case in December 2010, a number of organisational change activities are being proposed to improve quality of service, strengthen governance structures, increase productivity and recover the deficit.

The aim of this paper is to initiate formal consultation on the proposed organisational changes for the Oncology Consultant structure within the Cancer Directorate in accordance with the Trust’s Change Management Policy.

There is significant rationale for change including:
- A sharp decline in activity and income which is not expected to recover
- The need to recover an unsustainable financial position
- The need to improve productivity

There has been a significant decline in income and activity and due to the changing provider landscape there is no realistic prospect of recovering this at the current time. This does mean that there are some tumour sites that are over resourced and need to be reviewed.

It is proposed that we reduce the Oncology Consultant spend by 40 PA’s (4 WTE) in order to create a medical staffing structure based on the current demand for oncology services.

2. BACKGROUND

The Cancer Directorate has a budget of £28.1 million, which represents 42% of the CPGs total budget of £68.2 million. In 2009-10 the service over performed its income target by £1.1 million which partly offset an overspend on expenditure budgets of £1.4 million to leave a net adverse position for the year of £0.3 million. The full year budget for consultant staff within the Cancer Directorate is £3,104,958.

Since the merger in 2008, the Cancer Directorate medical staffing model has not changed. There are 28 consultants within the Cancer Directorate, 3 Palliative Care Consultant and 25 Oncology Consultants. It is headed up by the Chief of Service who manages 5 Lead Clinician posts. The Lead Clinicians have responsibility for one or two tumour groups as detailed in the organisational chart at Appendix 1.
Each Lead Clinician post, in collaboration with the Chief of Service, was designed to have management responsibilities for clinicians within those specialities (between 2 and 8 consultants), including resource management, training and education, governance and productivity. The majority of consultants practice in more than one speciality which can blur lines of responsibility and accountability. Some consultants also have research programmes and/or training responsibilities for the junior doctors.

3. CASE FOR CHANGE

There are a number of key factors that drive this change:

3.1 Activity

Cancer activity has decreased between 2009/10 and 2010/11 in the following areas:
- First out patients by 6%
- Day case activity by 46% off set by regular day attenders increasing by 29%
- Elective activity by 55%
- Non elective activity by 12%
- Radiotherapy by 6%

The cancer service has areas of low productivity and some areas are over resourced. Performance measures demonstrate areas of inefficiency in day case chemotherapy and non elective length of stay. The Trust has a high oncology bed base relative to peer organisations. These inefficiencies and loss of activity result in a significant financial loss and are a driver for the changes proposed in this paper.

3.2 Royal College Guidelines

In line with Royal College guidelines there are recommendations on the number of new patients with common cancers (including breast, urology and lung) that Consultants should see annually. Based on this figure, some assumptions have been made about the new patient numbers for the more complex cancers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Patients (annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head &amp; Neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynaecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Cancers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a reduction in activity there are Consultants who are seeing less than the recommended number of patients. Not only is this unsustainable from a cost effectiveness perspective, but additionally there is a risk of low volume practice leading to de-skilling.

3.3 Outpatient Clinic Capacity and Trends

In light of the financial pressures within the Directorate there has been some remodelling completed on the throughput and activity within cancer outpatient clinics.
Current activity reports show that we have a 1:8 ratio of new to follow up appointments. This is higher than the benchmarked peer recommended ratio of 1:6. If we were to reduce this ratio in line with peer benchmarking and how our clinic templates are designed, as well as better utilisation of capacity, this would allow for a reduction in the numbers of clinics by up to 17 per week.

3.4 Proposed Rationalisation of the Oncology Bed Base and Reduction in Length of Stay

To provide further context, these changes are also in line with the organisational change paper presented to the JNCP in January 2011. This paper proposes to rationalise the inpatient oncology beds at the Charing Cross site, resulting in the closure of the oncology ward at the Hammersmith Hospital.

The non elective length of stay is currently at an average of 8 days. With the proposed consolidation of the inpatient beds, the objective is to reduce this to an average of 6 days in line with best practice. This would again support the case for rationalising medical resources.

3.5 Consultant Productivity

It is evident that there has been a significant reduction in activity in 2010/11. Chart 1 shows activity by oncology consultant. In reviewing our activity figures it is clear that some oncology consultant productivity has decreased by as much as 41.5% over the last 12 months.

3.6 Income

Chart 2 shows the associated drop in income by the reduction in activity displayed in chart 1. The 41.5% reduction in activity for one consultant is reflected in a £262K reduction in income.
Charts 1 and 2 clearly detail the significant drop in activity and associated income within oncology. The charts have been anonymised but analysis reveals that the significant drop in activity sits largely within Breast and Urology tumour groups.

3.7 Finances

The decrease in activity in 2010-11 has materially altered the pattern of income and, for the year to October, the Cancer Directorate is underperforming its income target by £1.6m; the current year-end forecast is for a shortfall of £2.2million. This has not been offset by a reduction in pay expenditure meaning that the service is now looking at a substantial deficit for the year in excess of £3million.

The objective of this consultation document is to reduce the cost base in line with the reduction in activity to ensure a financially sustainable future for the service. Other actions are being taken to attempt to redress some of the others areas of pay and non pay expenditure.

3.8 Pan London Review of Cancer Services

An additional driver for change is the Review of Cancer Services across London led by Healthcare for London. Senior clinicians from the Trust participated in this work. Internal timelines for development and rationalisation of cancer services were intrinsically linked to the review, which was put on hold by the incoming coalition government. It is imperative to rationalise the service in light of the review, which is now reactivated.

4. PROPOSED CHANGE / STRUCTURE

In response to the points highlighted in section 3 the CPG needed to review the current oncology consultant structure and numbers. The overall objective was to ensure that we have a consultant structure that supports the needs of the patients and is based around demand for oncology services.

There were a number of factors considered in this review including activity by consultant and by tumour group, by understanding Royal College guidelines on new patient activity, by forecasting market share changes and reviewing our overall business plans.
4.1 Current Structure

Table 2 details the current oncology consultant structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speciality</th>
<th>Current WTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Oncologist</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Oncologist</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 below details a breakdown of the consultants who work within each tumour group. These are not WTE or PA’s but numbers of consultants who see patients within each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumour Group</th>
<th>Numbers of Consultants who see patients within tumour group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Cancers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast - clinical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast - medical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung - clinical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung - medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urology - clinical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urology - medical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Cancers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynaecology - clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynaecology - medical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain / CNS - clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain / CNS - medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper GI – clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal – clinical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal – medical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testicular – medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrinology – clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD – medical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematology - medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin – medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin - clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head &amp; Neck - clinical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear, Nose &amp; Throat - clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Proposed Reduction

It is proposed that we reduce our consultant body or funding for consultant posts by 4 WTE or 40 PA’s.

4.3 Key Benefits to ICHT and CPG 2

The development and rationalisation of cancer services will achieve the following benefits:

- **Financial planning** - the proposal contributes to the financial plan to achieve FT status through rationalisation as a result of productivity achievement.
- Enhanced patient outcomes – Consultants seeing more patients in line with the Royal College recommendations.

5. IMPACT UPON STAFF AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSAL

5.1 Capacity Assessment

In order to achieve the target of reducing the budget by 4 WTE (40 PA’s) we need to review areas that are over resourced and, where we could potentially remove a consultant post without destabilising the service.

5.2 Areas of Non Reduction

Table 3 (page 6) above shows the number of consultants who see patients within each tumour site. There are some cancers (both complex and common) that do not have more than 2 consultants who practice in these areas. These consultant posts were reviewed but it was considered inappropriate to include them in the selection as the service could not be maintained by reducing their numbers. These included:

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumour Group</th>
<th>Numbers of Consultants who see patients within tumour group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Cancers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung - clinical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung - medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Cancers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynaecology - clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain / CNS – clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain / CNS - medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper GI – clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal – clinical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testicular – medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrinology – clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD – medical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematology - medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin – medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Areas for Reduction

The review confirmed that in some areas we have multiple consultants and our activity is decreasing. Urology and Breast services have a highest numbers of consultants providing patient care and are the areas that have seen the biggest dip in income and activity during the last 12 months. Medical Oncology within Gynaecology is another area that has multiple consultants.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumour Group</th>
<th>Numbers of Consultants who see patients within tumour group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Cancers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast - clinical</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on this analysis it proposed that the CPG will reduce the funded establishment by one Breast Medical Oncologist post, one Urology Medical Oncologist, one Urology Clinical Oncologist post and one Gynaecology Medical Oncologist post.

### 5.4 Breast Consultant Post
To identify the post to be disestablished the CPG will review the income per clinical PA generated by each of the 5 consultants who provide medical oncology services within breast, increase/decrease in activity, the new patient activity by each, and the potential cost to the Trust of making these changes.

### 5.5 Urology Consultant Posts
To identify the post to be disestablished the CPG will review the income per clinical PA generated by each of the 6 urological oncologists, increase/decrease in activity, the new patient activity by each, and the potential cost to the Trust of making these changes.

### 5.6 Gynaecology Consultant Post
To identify the post to be disestablished the CPG will review the income per clinical PA generated by each of the 4 consultants who provides medical oncology services within gynaecology, increase/decrease in activity, the new patient activity by each, the potential cost to the Trust of making these changes.

### 5.7 Selection Criteria
The selection of these proposed posts from the identified tumour groups will be based on the following criteria:

- Royal College guidelines for new patient activity
- Activity and income over the last 12 months(taking into account changes to number of PA’s or job plan)
- Estimated cost in making these changes

5.8 These proposals might have a direct impact on the clinical academics within these tumour groups. The CPG will be linking in Imperial College to communicate all proposals in parallel to this consultation.

### 6. PROPOSED CHANGE PROCESS
After careful consideration, including financial analysis, it has been concluded that the least disruptive approach is to propose to disestablish specific posts rather than placing all consultant posts, within the Breast, Urology and Gynaecology tumour groups, ‘at risk’. The rationale for this is outlined in section 3 (page 3-5) and the selection criteria are outlined in section 5 (page 8).

With the reduction in activity and the financial pressures facing the CPG, consultant staff have been made aware of the need to reduce costs and increase productivity. Consultants were made aware that this might result in the disestablishment of posts in meetings held by Justin Vale, CPG Director.
The affected staff members will have informal discussions around the potential financial necessity to consider their posts with regards to redundancy and through this will be made aware of the selection criteria used that might result in their post becoming ‘at risk’.

All staff placed at risk will be supported by the CPG Skills Consultant, central medical staffing and redeployment teams and the external career transition consultants as appropriate.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The recurrent savings of reducing our pay budget by 40 PA’s is detailed in table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA’s</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. EQUALITY IMPACT FOR STAFF

Equality impact assessment has been completed for review by HR and TU reps only.

9. TIMETABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2011</td>
<td>Proposal document submitted to JNCP, LNC and BMA for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2011</td>
<td>Proposal document given to affected staff and staff side representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14/01/2011</td>
<td>Group meeting[s] with affected members of staff and representatives to discuss proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 17/01/2011</td>
<td>Consultation meetings with individual members of staff, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/2011</td>
<td>End of consultation document drawn up in line with responses to original paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Proposal document returns to JUP to end consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011*</td>
<td>Managers meet with affected staff and representatives to report on conclusions of consultation, including timetable for implementation of changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011*</td>
<td>Position of staff at risk confirmed together with the options available to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011**</td>
<td>Arrangements for implementation e.g. notice period agreed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Within 7 days following the JUP meeting in February 2011.
**Within 14 days following the JUP meeting in February 2011.

10. TRADE UNION REPRESENTATIVES

For a list of Trades Union Representatives and their contact details please go to the Source/Your Working Life/Unions.
Author of Paper: Justin Vale CPG Director

Date: ……December 2010………………………………………………

Cc Lorry Phelan, Chair of JUP, and, if known, relevant trade union lead[s] for affected staff.
ANNEX B

IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

ORDINANCE D11

THE DISMISSAL OF MEMBERS OF STAFF BY REASON OF REDUNDANCY

This Ordinance is made pursuant to Part II of the Appendix to the University’s Statutes

APPLICATION

1. The power to dismiss and the procedures set out in this Ordinance in accordance with Part II of the Appendix to the Statutes (herein after “the Appendix”) shall apply to all staff to whom the Appendix applies, provided that in its application to those staff defined in subsections (3) to (6) of section 204 of the Education Reform Act 1988 (staff appointed prior to, and not promoted after, 20 November 1987), the power to dismiss shall be subject to such limitations (if any) on the power to dismiss for redundancy as applied to the member of staff concerned prior to the introduction of the Appendix made by the University Commissioners in the exercise of their powers under Sections 203 and 204 of the Education Reform Act 1988.

2. This Ordinance shall not apply to the non-renewal of a limited term contract (within the meaning of Section 235 of the Employment Rights Act 1996), which shall be dealt with under Ordinance D13.

3. Where specifically indicated, this Ordinance shall be read in conjunction with the University’s Redundancy and Change Policy and Procedure (which does not have contractual status) as amended from time to time.

PRELIMINARY STAGE – CONSULTATION

4. Where any Faculty, Division or Department of the University is considering organisational change which may impact on staff, a consultation paper setting out the proposals should be prepared. Details of the information which should normally be included in the paper are set out in the Imperial College Redundancy and Change Policy and Procedure as amended from time to time.

5. There should be appropriate consultation with the staff concerned or, if and to the extent required by Section 188 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992, with appropriate representatives in relation to the consultation paper.

6. Each member of staff and/ or trade union being consulted will be provided with a copy of the consultation paper. Any member of staff affected by the proposals who is absent from work (for example, due to maternity, sickness or other leave) should be sent a copy of the consultation paper to their home address in order that they can participate in the consultation process.
7. Members of staff will be offered the opportunity of individual consultation meetings with the Faculty/ Divisional representative and/or the Human Resources representative. Staff can be accompanied at the consultation meetings by a trade union representative, another member of staff or, at the Head’s discretion, a friend or relative who is not a legal representative.

8. Where appropriate representatives are being consulted at the preliminary stage, they will be offered the opportunity to attend consultation meetings with the Faculty/ Divisional representative and/or the Human Resources representative.

9. As part of the consultation process, comments on the consultation paper and any alternative proposals will be sought from the appropriate representatives and individual members of staff. The Faculty, Division or Department will provide information that is necessary for staff and the appropriate representatives to make an informed contribution to the consultation process. The consultation will be carried out with a view to reaching agreement on the way forward. Only at the end of the consultation process and the preliminary stage will any formal recommendation be made as to how to proceed.

10. Before or during the consultation period, the Council should be provided with a copy of the consultation paper, details of the area affected and the reasons for the proposed reduction in academic staff. Following review of the consultation paper the Council may:

   a. Defer its decision and review the position again following the completion of the consultation process, at which stage the Council may require a report on the preliminary consultation with staff and/or appropriate representatives and any comments received from them. The Council may then authorise the Rector or his or her nominee to implement the selection process and subsequent proposed redundancies if the Rector or his or her nominee considers this appropriate following the comments and counter proposals gathered during the consultation period; or

   b. Authorise the Rector or other person authorised by the Rector to implement the selection process and subsequent proposed redundancies if the Rector or his or her nominee considers this appropriate following the comments and counter-proposals gathered during the consultation period.

**DECISION TO PROCEED**

11. At the end of the consultation period the Head of Faculty, Division or Department or other relevant person will review the comments and counter-proposals and, if required under Paragraph 10.a. above, will provide the Council with a report on the preliminary consultation with staff and/or appropriate representatives and any comments received from them.

12. If it is still anticipated that redundancies may be necessary, and the Council has given authorisation, the Director of Human Resources or his nominee should initiate formal redundancy procedures.
13. All staff at risk of redundancy and their appropriate representatives should be notified of any decision to proceed with the formal redundancy procedure.

14. Where a member of staff is at risk of redundancy he or she will receive details of the redundancy procedure and the timescale over which it will be implemented. This will normally include:

a. The selection criteria to be used to select members of staff for redundancy (where any post to be made redundant is not unique) and/or the selection arrangements where staff are to be considered for new posts in the reorganised Faculty, Division or Department;

b. Any arrangements for seeking alternative work for those subsequently selected for redundancy. Where a member of staff is provisionally selected for redundancy, the University will consider all redeployment opportunities and, wherever possible, offer alternative positions within the University where necessary, arrangements for a further consultation meeting with individual members of staff or appropriate representatives to discuss the selection criteria to be employed;

c. An invitation to take voluntary severance and the relevant timescale for applications, if applicable;

d. Any arrangements for avoiding compulsory redundancies referred to in the University’s standard Redundancy and Change Policy and Procedure;

e. Assistance to be given to staff at risk of redundancy, including career counselling and, if selected as redundant, reasonable time off to seek other employment or undertake training.

DISMISSAL MEETING AND NOTICE OF REDUNDANCY

15. If redeployment is not an option and all suggested alternatives to avoid compulsory redundancy are unsuccessful, the Head of Faculty, Division or Department (or a senior manager as his or her nominee) will invite the member of staff in writing to attend an employment review meeting. In inviting the member of staff to the meeting he or she will be informed why their employment is at risk and why they have been provisionally selected for redundancy. The purpose of the meeting is to give the member of staff the opportunity to put forward their views on the provisional selection for redundancy, including the way in which the selection criteria (if applicable) have been applied to them. At this meeting the member of staff can be accompanied by a colleague or a trade union representative, or, at the Head’s discretion, a friend or relative not of the legal profession. A member of the Human Resources Division will be present to facilitate the discussion if required.

16. After this meeting and normally within 10 working days the Head of Faculty, Division or Department (or his or her appointed nominee) will, acting on the authority of the Rector, write to the member of staff and confirm whether or not his or her employment is to terminate by reason of redundancy. If the decision has been taken to terminate the member of staff’s employment, the member of staff will be given any contractual notice of redundancy and confirmation of the leaving date and will be informed of the redundancy
payment (at a minimum that required by law) to be made. The member of staff will also be given the right of appeal against the decision to terminate his or her employment. The arrangements for an appeal hearing are in accordance with those prescribed in Paragraphs 19 - 20 of this Ordinance.

17. Where a decision is taken to dismiss member(s) of staff, a report will be submitted to the Council confirming this. Redundancy dismissals will also be reported annually with a breakdown consisting of the number of staff to be dismissed broken down by age, disability, gender, and race and, other relevant information as determined appropriate for equal opportunities monitoring purposes and statutory requirements.

18. As set out in Paragraph 14 above, assistance will be offered to staff declared redundant, which can include career counselling as well as reasonable time off to enable the person to seek other employment or to undertake training. Staff will remain on the redeployment register until the end of their employment.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

19. Appeals must be lodged within ten working days of the receipt of the formal notice of redundancy issued to the individual member of staff. Appeals will be based only against the selection of an individual for redundancy, rather than against the actual decision to restructure. Appeals against dismissal will be heard by a panel constituted in accordance with Paragraphs 21 to 25 of Ordinance D7.

20. The terms of reference for the appeal panel will be as follows:

   a. To review whether the selection for redundancy was adequately reviewed and substantiated; and

   b. To review whether the University’s procedures were correctly and fairly implemented.

21. The appeal will be conducted in accordance with the rules for hearings set out in Ordinance in Paragraphs 21 - 25 of Ordinance D7.

22. If the decision of the appeal panel is to uphold the decision to dismiss the employee, the Director of Human Resources or his or her nominee will report this decision to the Chairman of the Council as soon as is reasonably practicable and the Chairman of Council will notify the Council that this has occurred.

Approved by the Council 23 March 2007
Effective from 8 July 2007
PAPER I

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION

A Note by the President of the Imperial College Union

INTRODUCTION

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

2. In accordance with the Education Act 1994 the College’s Code of Practice with the Union includes the following requirement for the Union to publish an Annual Report:

   “39. The ICU shall publish an Annual Report for submission to the ICU Trustee Board and to the College Council at the meeting at which it presents its Annual Accounts. The Report is to contain:

   a. A statement that the ICU operates in a fair and democratic manner and that it has properly accounted for its finances.

   b. A report on the conduct and outcome of elections of ICU Officers, which must confirm that they have been fairly and properly conducted.

   c. A list of the external organisations to which it is currently affiliated and the details of any donations, subscriptions or similar fees paid to such organisations since its previous Annual Report.

   d. A note of any charitable collections made by the ICU.”

3. A copy of the Union’s Annual Report 2009-10 is enclosed with these Papers. (1)

A.K.

---

1. The Union’s Annual Report is not included with these published Minutes.
PAPER J

REPORT BY THE HARLINGTON GRANTS FUND COMMITTEE

A Note by the Chairman of the Harlington Grants Fund Committee

1. The Harlington Grants Fund provides grants to Imperial College students in relation to sporting, athletic and recreational activities. Applications are scrutinised by the Grants Committee, which consists of the Pro-Rector (Education) in the Chair, the current President of the Imperial College Union and a former President of the Imperial College Union. The Grants Fund Committee is required to report to the Council annually on the disbursements made from the Fund.

BACKGROUND

2. In 1936 Imperial's Students' Union wanted to buy some land in Harlington, North of Sipson Lane for use as a sports ground. The Students' Union, as an unincorporated association, could not itself purchase the land and therefore sought assistance from the College. The College purchased the land in its name, holding the land on a bare trust for the benefit of Imperial students. The Trustees of this bare trust are the College's Governing Body (the Council).

3. In the 1980s, the opportunity arose to raise funds by allowing the extraction of gravel from the site. It was decided at the time that part of the proceeds would be used to set up a Grants Fund, the income of which would be available for disbursement for the benefit of students of Imperial College in relation to sporting, athletic and recreational facilities. In 1989, the then Governing Body agreed that the Governing Body "will administer all existing and future sporting and athletic facilities for the benefit of students and that any income arising from the use or disposal of such facilities will be applied for the benefit of students". In 2005, the Council further resolved that:

   a. The sum held by the College to fund annual grants, the Harlington Grants Fund, "should be retained for that purpose and should be available for disbursement for the benefit of students of Imperial College in relation to sporting, athletic and recreational facilities";

   b. "Responsibility for the disbursement of the income from the Grants Fund should be delegated through the Rector to the Harlington Grants Fund Committee";

   c. "The Harlington Grants Fund Committee should be chaired by the Pro-Rector (Educational Quality) and include as members the incumbent Imperial College Union President and a former Imperial College Union President"; and

   d. "The Harlington Grants Fund Committee [will] be required to report annually through the Rector to the Council as the Harlington Trustees".

4. In line with these decisions, the Harlington Grants Fund Committee is responsible for dispensing annual grants within the financial limits set by the Council; that limit is currently set at £50,000 per year. However, in May 2003 the Grants Fund Committee agreed to limit expenditure to £30,000 per year for the foreseeable future.
5. The Grants Fund is held as long term investments within the Imperial College Fund Unitisation Scheme. The financial accounts for the year 2009/10 are shown below.

Julia Buckingham
Pro-Rector (Education)

ACCOUNTS FOR 2009/10


Harlington Gravel Trust Funds investments are held as long term investments within the Imperial College Fund Unitisation Scheme.

The long term investments comprise 9.7% Listed UK Equity, 45.8% Listed Global Equity, 10.3% Absolute Return Funds, 3.9% Absolute Equity Funds, 7.4% Property, and 22.9% cash.

It was intended that income from this perpetual endowment be used to fund student grants and small projects for the foreseeable future.

The balances as at 31st July 2010 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31/07/2010</th>
<th>31/07/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value of long term Investments</td>
<td>£2,037,757</td>
<td>£2,017,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated cash</td>
<td>£218,964</td>
<td>£617,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Harlington Gravel Trust Fund</td>
<td>£2,256,721</td>
<td>£2,635,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income & Expenditure for the Fund in last financial year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Investment Income</td>
<td>£16,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>£25,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Grants awarded/refunded</td>
<td>(2,662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure - Beit redevelopment</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for year</td>
<td>(455,675)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Movement on Fund from 31/07/09 to 31/07/10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Harlington Gravel Trust Fund as at 1 August 2009</td>
<td>£2,635,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments - realised gains for year</td>
<td>£123,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit for year (from above)</td>
<td>(455,675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2,303,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year on year movement in unrealised gains/(losses)</td>
<td>(46,556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Harlington Gravel Trust Fund as at 31 July 2010</td>
<td>£2,256,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEALTH, SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT

1. Statistics sent to WRAP (Waste Reduction Action Programme) show that on average our construction activities recycled 88% of the waste produced.

PROJECTS APPROVED AND UNDER CONSTRUCTION

SOUTH EAST QUADRANT 1ST PHASE (£76M)

2. **Mechanical Engineering Levels 0 & 1.** Handover of thermofluids teaching lab has been further delayed by bad weather at the end of last year and now scheduled to take place at the end of January. This does not affect occupation which has been scheduled for Easter. Final areas for which process exhaust facilities serve are still scheduled for completion in May. However there are some potential electrical infrastructure changes which may delay completion and challenge the budget. This is under review.

BLOCK ‘L’ (£74M)

3. Still on track for July completion by Bovis after resequencing. Cladding is progressing well currently on North face and atrium installation. West elevation is complete and east elevation is complete apart from spines. The fit out is progressing well with partitions, floors and some areas of ceilings installed on lower floors. One tower crane has now been removed.Extent of the fit out for user requirements is still to be defined as is the use of the basement.

INSTITUTE OF SHOCK PHYSICS (£0.8M)

4. Equipment finally arrived from the USA on Saturday 8th January and it was successfully installed and tested. Project is now complete.

HAMMERSMITH CBSH1 FACILITY (£10.5M)

5. Currently in decant period and in preparation for Stage 5 of the project which has a planned completion at the end of May.

PILOT PLANT (£8.9M)

6. Works are generally progressing well and are on programme and on budget. This is due for completion in September. Issues with foundations and piling that created some challenges were all resolved. Some minor issues with choice of walkway (flowforge) to be replaced by chequerplate are to be resolved.
ROBOTIC ASSISTED MICROSURGERY LABS (£1.03M)

7. Level 4 construction works were completed on programme and have been very well received. Level 5 works delayed by the department until week commencing 10th January. Some changes requested by the department will be self funded.

CHEMISTRY AND RCS1 ESSENTIAL AND PRIORITISED WORKS (£2M)

8. Works to trench the new HV cabling in Imperial College Road commenced on January 25th for 6 weeks, with a link also to SAFF.

CANCER IMAGING CENTRE (£0.95M)

9. Completed except some issues with adverse airflows affecting some fume cupboards which is being rectified.

PROJECTS IN PRE CONSTRUCTION

MPAC MATERIALS FOR ENERGY (£3.04M)

10. The design process is on programme to complete on the 31st January and the contractor has been appointed to commence works on the 21st February with a completion date of September.

COMMONWEALTH LEVEL 3

11. Design is complete for tender but is now on hold for prioritised FoM projects to take precedence.

COLLEGE FUND PROJECTS

PEMBRIDGE GARDENS (£3.7M)

12. The planning hearing was delayed and we await confirmation of which meeting it will be presented at. Consequently the demolition of the existing building has been deferred until Easter.

WYE CAMPUS PROJECTS – VARIOUS (£1.3M)

13. Old Flying Horse was completed on 5th January 2011 and Edward Partridge House is virtually complete.

14. Stage C design of Wolfson House completed and contractor is reviewing against cost ceiling set. Savilles will prepare the planning application.
WOODLANDS POST GRAD ACCOMMODATION

15. Demolition is progressing and a Main Contractor (ISG) has been awarded the contract to build the new accommodation commencing on the 28th February (at completion of Judicial Review) and will be complete for the October 2012 intake.

PLANNING AND THIRD PARTIES

16. Two meetings have been held at Wye with Ashford Borough Council and Parish representatives to agree a marketing campaign for a 6 month period for leasing the whole estate at full repairing and insurance lease for 10 years or more. The target is to commence this marketing in February 2011.