MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

at the

Fourteenth Meeting of the

COUNCIL

of the

IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE

The Fourteenth Meeting of the Council was held in the Solar Room, 170 Queen’s Gate, South Kensington Campus, at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, 12th February 2010, when there were present:

The Lord Kerr of Kinlochard (Chairman), Professor D.K.H. Begg, Mrs. P. Couttie, Professor M.J. Dallman, Sir Peter Gershon, Ms. C. Griffiths, Dr. M.P. Knight, Professor Sir Peter Knight, Professor J. Kramer, Ms. J.R. Lomax, Mr. J. Newsum, Mr. S. Newton, Ms. K. Owen, Professor S.M. Richardson, Professor S.K. Smith, the Lord Tugendhat, Baroness Wilcox, the Rector, the President of the Imperial College Union and the Clerk to the Court and Council.

Apologies: Professor Dame Julia Higgins and Baroness Manningham-Buller.

In attendance: The Assistant Clerk to the Court and Council and from Minutes 42 to 48 the Director of Property Management, the Chief Executive of the College Fund and the Director of Commercial Services.

MINUTES

Council – 9th November 2009 and 20th November 2009

1. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Brown, said that he had not attended the Special Council Meeting held on 9th November 2009 as the Meeting had been exclusively concerned with an item of Reserved Business, from which he was excluded by Statute. He asked that his exclusion from the Meeting for this reason be noted in the Minutes.

2. Subject to the incorporation of this clarification, the Minutes of the twelfth Meeting of the Council, held on Monday, 9th November 2009 were taken as read, confirmed and signed. The Minutes of the thirteenth Meeting of the Council, held on Friday, 20th November 2009 were similarly taken as read, confirmed and signed.

MATTERS ARISING

3. Update on the College’s Pension Provision (Minute 20 refers). The Chief Operating Officer, Dr. Knight, reminded members that the employers had been in discussion with trades’ union representatives to try and agree changes to the USS pension scheme. If the necessary changes were not agreed by the USS, there was a risk that the Pension Regulator would impose measures on the USS to reduce its pensions liability; these would almost certainly be worse for the College than the
proposals currently being discussed. Dr. Knight said that the unions had moved some way on several of the proposals, particularly those concerned with raising the retirement age and also sharing responsibility for the increased contributions between the employers and employees. However, they were still resistant to the introduction of a CARE (career average revalued earnings) scheme for new entrants. Dr. Knight was encouraged by the progress that had been made and said that the concession on contributions was a significant step for the unions. However, he cautioned that these changes would not be sufficient by themselves to deal with the potential pension liability, nor would they remove the risk of the Pensions Regulator having to step in. Negotiations were continuing and Dr. Knight agreed to keep the Council informed of developments in this area.

4. **Reactor Centre Options (Minute 33 refers).**

   a. The Rector reported that there was little or no support for the academic proposals for the Reactor Centre which had previously been reported, and that there was no prospect of receiving any funding for these proposals. In view of this, the College had decided to reopen discussions with the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) on the decommissioning options. The Chairman and he would be visiting the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the NDA to discuss the Reactor Centre. In doing so, they hoped to clarify the NDA’s views on designating the Reactor and the likely timescale for any subsequent decommissioning. The Rector said he believed that designation was unlikely to be in the College’s best interests as the NDA had previously indicated that the Reactor might not be decommissioned for a long time after designation, perhaps as much as twenty to thirty years. This would have a significant effect on the value of the Silwood Campus estate and could also hamper any future plans for the development of the Campus. Given the potential costs involved in decommissioning the Reactor, it was important for the College to fully understand the NDA’s views and policies before deciding whether to seek designation or to manage the decommissioning itself. The Chairman agreed, saying that he felt that the chances of the NDA acting as a *Deus ex Machina* for the College were very slim, but that the College had to explore all avenues before proceeding.

   b. The Deputy Rector (Research), Professor Sir Peter Knight, said that the research proposals had not been supported by the research councils or the Government, so the College had to now explore the other options for dealing with the Reactor Centre. Baroness Wilcox noted that Parliament was due to consider the nuclear issue in March, with a full debate in the Lords scheduled for 9th March. She suggested that it might be worth waiting until after this debate before reopening discussions with the NDA; it was possible that the debate could lead to a change in the NDAs future plans and approach to decommissioning. The Chairman thanked Baroness Wilcox for this helpful advice and asked the Rector to keep the Council informed of developments in this area.

**CHAIRMAN’S BUSINESS**

5. The Chairman opened his report by thanking the members of the Council for responding so speedily to the various emails about the proposed Governance Review which had been sent since the last Meeting. It was, he said, encouraging that so many governors had said that they would be prepared to sit on the review group if asked. The structure of the Group, with three external Council members,
three internal members and three members from outside the College was a good one. Although the three external members were all genuine outsiders and were truly independent, none of them were unfamiliar with the College. The rest of the membership was also well-balanced; any larger and the Group might too unwieldy. The Chairman then confirmed the Terms of Reference and Membership of the Group for the Record as follows.

“1. To review the constitutional structures in place for the governance, leadership and effective management of the College, and in particular:

a. The relationship (including delegated powers and oversight arrangements) between the Council and the College’s executive;

b. The roles and responsibilities of the Rector and other executive members of Council, in relation to the Council as a whole, to the senior management group, and to the wider university;

c. The role, composition and effectiveness of the Council and its committees, and frequency of meetings, and the role of the Chairman, other non-executive members of Council, and committee chairs;

d. The role and composition of the Court.

2. To do so taking into account the experience of those knowledgeable in these matters and the practice of other leading universities in the UK and elsewhere.

3. To report on progress at every meeting of Council, to receive and consider Council feedback as appropriate, and to deliver a final report, with recommendations, to Council by July 2010.

Membership

Sir Rob Margetts (Chairman)
Sir Cyril Chantler
Mr Iain Conn
Professor Dame Julia Higgins
Lord Kerr
Dr Martin Knight
Ms Rachel Lomax
Professor Sir Keith O’Nions
Professor Stephen Richardson
Dr Rodney Eastwood (Secretary)”

6. The Chairman said that Sir Rob Margetts was keen to progress the Review and its first meeting had already been arranged. The Group would be taking evidence from staff in the College as well as from those with experience of other governance structures elsewhere in the UK and abroad. The Chairman expected that the members of the Council would want to make their views known to the Review Group; indeed, he thought it was important that the Council did not express a collective view at this point, but that members each put their own individual views to the Group. Although the timescale for the review was to deliver a final report in July, Sir Rob Margetts was keen to complete the review before then, possibly even in time for the May Council meeting. There would in any case be a report in May.
7. Ms Griffiths reported that she had not received the Chairman’s emails on the Governance Review, although she acknowledged that this might have been caused by her workplace firewall blocking emails from the College. She asked if it would be possible for the emails to be sent to her again so that she could comment on the terms of reference. The Secretary undertook to resend the emails to Ms. Griffiths.

8. The Chairman then said that the Nominations Committee had considered the membership of the Council and had recommended that Mr. Jeremy Newsum, whose first term of office had now expired, should be re-appointed to the Council. The Council concurred.

Resolved: That the re-appointment of Mr. Jeremy Newsum for a second term of office, as recommended by the Nominations Committee, be approved.

9. Moving on, the Chairman was reported that Sir David Cooksey had decided to resign from the Council with effect from the end of January 2010. Sir David was, he said, reducing his portfolio of executive and non-executive responsibilities and had decided to concentrate on just three main activities. In July 2009, he had been appointed as the Chairman of UK Financial Investments, the body responsible for controlling the taxpayers’ stakes in the bailed-out banks. He was also continuing as the Chairman of London & Continental Railways, which was responsible for the high-speed Channel tunnel rail link from St Pancras, and was Chairman of the UK Centre for Medical Research and Innovation (UKCMRI), the proposed medical research centre located next to the British Library involving many of the major institutions involved in Biomedical research in the UK - the Medical Research Council, Cancer Research UK, the Wellcome Trust and UCL. These were all major bodies requiring significant input, and Sir David had decided to give up his position on the Council to devote his energies to these boards. Sir David had, he said, only been on the Council for six months, but the value of the contribution he had made in that time belied the relatively short time span he had spent as a member. The College was considering some involvement in UKCMRI so Sir David might still have some form of relationship with the College. The Chairman hoped that Sir David had formed a positive impression of Imperial during his time on the Council and that he would continue to take an interest in the College.

RECTOR’S BUSINESS

Staff Matters (Paper A)

10. Paper A was received for information.

Oral Report by the Rector

11. Opening his report the Rector reminded members that he had been in post for just six weeks, but said that they had been very enjoyable as staff in the College had been extremely supportive and helpful. Turning to the main business of his report, the Rector said he wanted to update the Council on progress with the development of the College Strategy, the background to which had been circulated in Paper B. The Management Board had had a number of discussions on the emerging strategy. There was a degree of consensus on the main themes and he was pleased to say that none of the issues considered had been contentious. He expected to be able to bring forward a more detailed discussion document at the next Council meeting, the main features of which would include:
a. Confirmation that the College was not going to put its energies into developing overseas campuses. There was no appetite for these in the College and without strong academic support he believed it would be difficult to deliver on this type of provision.

b. A concentration on the College’s core disciplines. In the current environment, the Rector said that many universities would be cutting back on activities and reducing staffing levels. This would provide an ideal opportunity for the College to invest in the future and recruit young researchers who would go on to become the stars of the future.

c. A concentration on improving the educational experience for students. The College recognised that the expectations of students, and indeed the Government, would only increase in the coming years, particularly if student fees were allowed to rise. The College had to anticipate this and ensure that the experience it provided for all its students was worthy of its standing and reputation.

12. The Rector then turned to the recently announced cuts in higher education. The Government had confirmed that HEFCE’s budget would be cut by £900M over the next three years. HEFCE had indicated that the first £300M cut next year would largely come from funding for teaching, with research funding being protected. Furthermore, HEFCE was also revising the way in which research funding was to be distributed. The Rector reminded members that research staff entered into the RAE had been graded as either 2*, 3* or 4*. Funding was then distributed according to a formula that weighted staff against these gradings in the ratio 1:3:7. For next year, the weighting for 4* staff had been increased to 9. Because of the high proportion of 4* staff at the College, this change in weightings should result in an additional £2M of research funding for the College. Similarly, capital allocations for teaching activity had been cut, but those for research had largely been protected. While this was a relatively positive outcome for the College, and was certainly better than had been expected, the Rector cautioned that HEFCE had not indicated how it intended to implement the further cuts of £600M required in the following two years. It was by no means certain that research would continue to be protected, while it was also likely that the next Government might well require further cuts to be made.

13. Closing his report, the Rector said that the Russell Group of universities, of which the College was a member, had recently released a number of press statements which had been poorly worded and would not have been supported by a number of the member universities in the form in which they were released. The Rector said he and his fellow vice-chancellors were engaging with the Russell Group to try and ensure that any future statements released by the organisation were more sensible and better reflected the views of the member universities.

14. Thanking the Rector for his report, the Chairman paid tribute to the progress he had made in his first month in office. There was, he said, a very positive atmosphere across the College with staff at all levels welcoming the start Sir Keith had made. Turning to the substance of the report, the Chairman welcomed the news that the HEFCE settlement was likely to be better for the College than originally feared. However, he too cautioned that the real cuts were likely to come after the general election and said the College still needed to plan prudently for the coming years.

15. Mr. Newsum asked if the Council would be given the opportunity to discuss the developing strategic plan before it was finalised. The Rector said that Paper B was
intended to give members a taste of how the Plan was developing, but it was certainly not his intention to preclude discussion. He confirmed that the Council would have an opportunity at its next Meeting to discuss and shape the Strategy in detail. The high-level issues noted in Paper B were, he felt relatively straightforward and uncontroversial; however, if the Council disagreed with any of these objectives, it was better to identify this at this stage, rather than when the Plan was closer to finalisation.

16. The Chairman said that the Council had recognised at its Away Day in September the need for a clearly articulated strategy, and had been disappointed that very little of the discussion at that time had appeared to be directed towards the creation of such a strategy. It was clear that the Rector was addressing this and would come forward with a more detailed draft strategy for discussion in May. The Council would then be asked to approve the finalised College Strategy at its following meeting in July.

17. Ms. Owen said that she was encouraged by the Paper and by the Rector’s explanatory comments. In particular she welcomed the suggestion that the College should not seek to develop overseas campuses; she was sure this was the right decision. Ms. Lomax noted that the statement of the Vision and Objectives was very similar to the currently approved Strategy and she asked the Rector how the developing strategy differed from what was already in place. The Rector said that the major change at the level presented in Paper B was to provide greater definition to the objectives related to Translation. However, he said he wouldn’t expect an institution’s vision and objectives to change greatly every five years; the real changes would be at the next level down which would be more affected by changes in focus (for example he suggested that the College needed to consider whether the focus for investments should be on new buildings and facilities or new staff). It was this level which would be presented at the Council’s next meeting, when there would be more for members to discuss and debate.

18. Turning to the HEFCE settlement, the Clerk, Dr. Eastwood, reminded members that the College’s research funding this year had been cushioned by a £3.5M safety net, required because of the minor reduction in the unit of resource after the last RAE. The safety net had been provided for one year only, so although the increase of £2M in research funding reported by the Rector was welcome news, the net effect would still be a £1.5M reduction in research funding for the College. The Clerk then advised the Council that HEFCE was also trying to increase its general powers over institutions, following the London Metropolitan University (LMU) debacle. He reminded members that LMU had been found to have falsified its student number returns over a number of years and had been forced to return £35M of overfunding, in addition to having its annual grant cut by £15M. Following lengthy discussions between HEFCE and LMU, its Vice-Chancellor had resigned and the members of its governing body had also agreed to stand down. However, as a result of this isolated governance failure, HEFCE was proposing a series of sweeping changes to the Financial Memorandum with institutions which included the right for it to require that a university should remove its accounting officer (i.e. its Vice-Chancellor or Chief Executive). Such a proposal struck at the very heart of institutional autonomy and was likely to be resisted vigorously by the sector. The Clerk said that, in his view, such a power was both unenforceable and unnecessary; unenforceable because HEFCE was not the CEO’s employer and therefore could neither dismiss him or her nor insist that a legally separate body should do so, and unnecessary because the only real sanction open to HEFCE was to withhold an institution’s grant, a sanction that was already open to it to use.
Oral Report by the Deputy Rector and Principal of the Faculty of Engineering

19. Opening his report the Deputy Rector, Professor Richardson, said that the annual planning round was about to start. As was usual, this would be taken in two parts; first the plans of the support services would be scrutinised, followed by a review of the Faculties’ and academic departments’ plans. Some changes to the process had been introduced this year, one of which was intended to ensure greater consistency between the plans produced by the support service and academic service divisions. This would enable the College to more easily compare the plans produced by the different divisions and thus make strategic choices about the services required to support the academic mission and the funds required to provide these services.

20. Moving on, he said that the Management Board had established an overarching Space Committee to look at space needs across the College. Its primary purpose was to produce a space masterplan for the College, with the exception of space used for residential accommodation. In doing so, the Committee would need to come up with a rational policy for allocating space while also making sure that the College could provide space for future activities.

21. Turning to developments in the Faculty of Engineering, he said the departments were, in the main doing well. However, he suggested that all College departments should aim to be in the top three departments in the Country in their discipline and not all the engineering departments had quite achieved that. The forthcoming planning round was an opportunity to focus on this aim and to explore with the departments what actions were required to move them into the top three.

Oral Report by the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine

22. Professor Smith said that the Faculty restructuring had now been completed. The exercise had resulted in a total of 102 redundancies, spread almost equally between academic and non-academic staff, achieving a saving of £5M from the Faculty’s annual budget. It had been a very painful process for all involved, but it had been well managed and would ultimately prove beneficial for the Faculty. The net result had been that the bottom 10% of the Faculty (i.e. those staff who were lowest rated in the RAE) had now left, which meant that medicine now had a higher proportion of research-excellent staff than many of its competitors. Indeed, the restructuring had in one fell swoop lifted the Faculty into the top three institutions for medical research in the country. Staff morale was also improving across the Faculty. Importantly, the Faculty now had the opportunity to recruit excellent new staff to enhance its profile in its strategically important areas.

23. Turning to the AHSC, Professor Smith said that the College was now starting to see the real benefits of its relationship with the Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust through the AHSC. In April 2009, the NHS had launched its new Best Research for Best Health strategy. Under this new system, NHS research would have to be used to support ‘outstanding individuals, working in world-class facilities, conducting leading-edge research focused on the needs of patients and the public’. The AHSC was ideally placed to take advantage of this new strategy, the immediate impact of which would be to provide an additional £10M per annum for medical research for the next five years. Under the previous system, these funds would have remained within the NHS, but the AHSC meant these funds could be used to support research within the College and the AHSC to the mutual benefit of the College and the Trust. This was, said Professor Smith, a welcome development and provided a clear
demonstration of the significant extra benefits to both organisations brought by the AHSC.

24. Moving on, Professor Smith then said that in the next five years that NHS was likely to change its structure, moving away from the current split-model to a more integrated healthcare system. The AHSC would be at the forefront of this move to greater integration. Indeed, the Trust had already agreed to assist the NHS in driving this strategy forward. The Trust had recently established two successful polyclinics on its sites, and Professor Smith hoped that these would be followed by several more. Significantly, these changes would allow NHS Trusts to employ GPs, something that was not previously permitted. This move would completely change what an Academic Health Science System (AHSS) could provide for the College, as it would allow an emphasis to be placed on prophylaxis, with Trusts being incentivised to keep patients out of hospitals. The proposals were clearly controversial and would take some time to implement, but the College would be in a strong position to take advantage of this change if and when it was implemented.

25. Closing his report, Professor Smith reminded members that the Trust had applied for Foundation Trust status. However, since doing so, the financial environment in the NHS had changed considerably and this was impacting on the review process for Foundation Trusts. As yet, Monitor, the body that regulated the foundation trusts, had been unable to clarify how the financial changes would impact on the application process and whether this would change the criteria used for assessing applications. The Trust was currently in consultation with the Department of Health to try and resolve this problem. Professor Smith confirmed that the Trust’s governance arrangements and its performance were not in question; the only issue that might delay the award of Foundation Trust status was this new financial issue. Ultimately though, he felt that the Department of Health would be embarrassed if the country’s largest NHS Trust withdrew its application for Foundation status on financial grounds. It was therefore in the Department’s interests to resolve this issue with Monitor and with the Trust.

26. The Chairman asked Professor Smith if the issues with Monitor would change the timetable for Foundation Trust status. Professor Smith said that resolving these financial issues would indeed delay the Trust’s application, although he hoped the delay would not be too great. The Trust was at the head of the list of applications being considered by Monitor, so if there was a significant delay in completing the Trust’s application, this would serve to delay the whole programme; something he thought the Department of Health would wish to avoid. Lord Tugendhat reminded members that one of the benefits of Foundation Trust status was that the Trust would gain a degree of financial independence from the NHS. It was possible that the straightened financial circumstances facing the NHS meant that this level of independence might be more circumscribed in the future. However, this was still preferable to the Trust’s current position as an NHS Trust. Dr. Knight agreed and said that the relative freedom provided by Foundation Trust status would allow the College and the Trust to more closely align their financial management systems.

27. Mr. Newton thanked Professor Smith for this report, which he said highlighted the importance of Trust developments for the College’s own strategy. He suggested that it would be useful for the Council to take extra time at its next meeting to consider other issues, such as the NHS agenda, and their impact on the College strategy for the next five years. This suggested to him that extending the meeting to the whole day, or even longer, would be beneficial. As the discussion of strategy was a central responsibility of the Council, he believed such an approach was both warranted and necessary.
28. Ms. Lomax noted that NHS strategy could be significantly affected by the outcome of the general election later in the year. She suggested that this type of discussion might be better reserved until after the election, when the Government’s approach to public expenditure would be clearer. Professor Smith noted that the Conservative’s approach at the moment appeared to favour allocating funding through the GPs. If this was the case, it underlined the importance of a change which would allow Trusts to employ their own GPs.

29. The Rector said that Mr. Newton’s suggestion was a good one and that the Council should devote extra time to its strategic discussions and the opportunities presented by the AHSC. He proposed that, at the very least, College strategy should be to position itself to be able to respond to and take advantage of the changes to come in the NHS.

30. Lord Tugendhat suggested that the NHS was likely to be a political battleground over the next few years. Both main parties were suggesting that NHS budgets might be ring-fenced. However, given the size and cost of the NHS, this looked to be very difficult; ring-fencing the NHS would require very significant cuts to be made in other areas of public expenditure and might not be feasible in the longer term. Cuts in funding could lead to hospital closures, which would be unpopular and would be resisted by local MPs. The Chairman said it was clear that, because of the AHSC, the NHS could have a major impact on the College’s own strategy and it was important for the Council to take this on board. Ms. Lomax said she would find it useful to have a briefing on the NHS Trust and the AHSC so that she could better appreciate its close relationship with the College. Lord Tugendhat suggested that the Council might appreciate a presentation on the NHS from the Trust’s senior management team: Professor Smith, Ms. Claire Perry, the Trust’s Managing Director and Mr. Tony Graff, AHSC Chief Financial Officer. The Chairman agreed that this might provide useful background for the discussion on strategy at the Council’s next Meeting.

Oral Report by the Principal of the Faculty of Natural Sciences

31. Professor Dallman said that the Faculty’s research performance was still very positive, with income ahead of budget. The number of grants being won by Faculty staff was also good with no signs of a decline in numbers, despite the recession. As with Engineering, she said that the planning round was an opportunity to evaluate the Faculty’s departments and think about the areas they needed to improve in order to be amongst the best in the country. This assessment could not happen in isolation as these were core scientific subjects and any decisions about how they should develop would also have an impact on the rest of the College. A case in point was applied mathematics within the Mathematics Department. Consideration of this section had to consider not only its role within the Department, but also the impact on the other Faculties and Departments, almost all of which had an interest in and made use of applied mathematics.

32. Moving on, she said a number of staff had been recognised with awards and honours, the highlight of which was the CBE for Professor Donal Bradley. Professor Bradley was one of the most highly cited physicists in the world and, as well as being a highly respected academic, showed a true entrepreneurial spirit, holding some 26 patents. He was also a former head of the Physics Department and currently Deputy Principal of the Faculty.
33. Turning to the Junior Research Fellowship Scheme, which was so important for the College, Professor Dallman said that the selection process for the scheme’s second cohort was now under way. She reminded members that the JRF scheme provided support for early stage career academics who it was hoped would be the future research superstars. The scheme provided them with a three year programme to develop their research and attracted applications from all over the world. If anything, she said the quality of applications for the second year of the scheme was even higher than the first year.

34. Professor Dallman then said she wished to inform Council of a new and exciting development for the Faculty. As the Chairman had already noted, the College was considering an involvement with the UK Centre for Medical Research and Innovation (UKCMRI). The Centre would be located behind the British Library near King’s Cross Station and was backed by the MRC, the Wellcome Trust and Cancer Research UK. UCL was also involved as one of the founding members of UKCMRI. Sir David Cooksey was Chair of the Steering Committee and the nobel laureate, Professor Sir Paul Nurse, was leading its academic strategy. The Centre was probably the most exciting development in biomedical research in Europe in recent years, and there was now an opportunity for the College to join the Centre as one of its founding members. Although centred on biomedical research, the Centre’s academic strategy fully recognised the benefits of multi-disciplinarity, so work there would include the other natural and physical sciences as well as engineering. Its approach was entirely consistent with the College’s own research agenda and, given the funding that would be distributed through the Centre, it would be beneficial for the College to be involved. The College had therefore been holding discussions with UKCMRI to join as a founding member. These discussions were still at a very early stage, and it would require the agreement of all the other members of UKCMRI before the College could become a partner in the Centre. Early indications were positive though, and Professor Dallman hoped that the College would eventually be able to join UKCMRI. She said that the price of doing so would be significant, with the College required to invest about £45M in the project. Because discussions were still at an early stage, and it was still not clear if the College would be able to join, she asked members to respect the confidentiality of this information, for the time being.

35. Ms. Lomax said this appeared to be a major development for the College and asked why the Council had not received a briefing paper on this issue. The Rector said that the UKCMRI Steering Committee had met only the day before and had indicated that an approach from the College would be welcomed. This was the first clear indication that an application to join might be successful. As it was for the other founding members to decide if the College could join, it would have been premature to brief the Council on this issue before this indication had been received. With this news though, the College could continue with its discussions and bring a more concrete proposal to the Council at the appropriate time. Professor Dallman confirmed that the MRC, Wellcome Trust and CRUK were all investing heavily in the Centre (having committed respectively £320M, £120M and £170M). UCL’s investment in the Centre was comparable to the level of investment being asked of the College. All of these institutions saw the Centre as the nucleus for future investment in the biological sciences in Europe. If the College was not engaged with the Centre, there was a risk that it would be seriously disadvantaged, losing both funding and staff to the Centre. The Chairman agreed that there were serious risks for Imperial in not being involved. He advised members that the College’s previous policy of non-engagement had only been reversed in January and that confidential discussions were still at a very early stage. Professor Dallman had drawn this issue to the Council’s attention as soon as was practical, and he suggested that a more detailed paper should be provided for the Council at its next Meeting.
36. Sir Peter Gershon said that until the Council understood the proposal more fully and was able to appreciate the full implications for the College, all it could do was note the development. The Chairman said the Council was not being asked to make a decision at this point; there was still much to be discussed with UKCMRI and there would have to be a full discussion at the Council before any financial decisions were made. The Rector said that the Management Board had only decided to pursue this opportunity in the previous month and there was still much to be done. The price of joining was now clear and the Management Board was examining the Centre’s academic mission. It was also clear that the risks of not joining were significant, while the potential opportunities presented by UKCMRI were considerable. However, this was far from a ‘done deal’ and it was still open to UKCMRI or any of its members to refuse the College entry. It was important, though, for Council members to be aware of this opportunity so that it could be considered as part of the debate on strategy to be conducted at the next Meeting.

Oral Report by the Principal of the Imperial College Business School

37. Professor Begg reported that the Business School’s restructuring was also complete and that it was now recruiting new staff. On the research side, the Business School was involved in both of the College’s successful Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KIC) bids for European funding. As such, it was the only Business School in Europe to be involved in two KIC projects. The School had also risen seven places to 32nd in the world in the latest Financial Times Global MBA rankings. In the same rankings, the School had been rated third in the world for entrepreneurship, sixth for economics and seventh for marketing, making it one of only two institutions in Europe to hold three top ten places for specialisations. This achievement crowned a continual rise up the rankings for the Business School since it first entered the top 90 in 2002.

38. As he had reported at the last Meeting, the School was also in discussion with Microsoft to be the centre of its global hub, providing access for a range of multinational companies to expertise in business, entrepreneurship, IT and engineering. Contract negotiations were at an advanced stage and he expected the deal to be finalised very shortly. Indeed, he said, Microsoft had already announced its partnership with the College publicly. In similar vein, he said the School was preparing a bid for funding on research into the digital economy in partnership with IBM. The bid involved the use of meta data to improve outcomes across a range of areas. The School had also secured a large contract with Finmeccanica to provide executive education. This last was a particularly important development for the School. The top business schools in the world all had lucrative executive education programmes; for example the London Business School made over £40M from executive education per annum. Although Imperial’s executive programme was still relatively small, this was a priority area for the School to develop over the next few years.

39. Ms. Griffiths thanked Professor Begg for his report and said she would welcome a more detailed briefing on the Business School’s activities at a future meeting to complement the suggested briefings on the NHS/ AHSC interface and other strategic developments.
Oral Report by the Senior Dean

40. Professor Kramer reported that the deans were currently engaged in the annual promotions and appointment rounds. The number of appointments being made this year was down on previous years, possibly as a result of the economic downturn and departmental concerns about their future income. Although this was manageable in the short term, Professor Kramer said the deans were concerned that a reduction in the number of new appointments could reduce the College's effectiveness; it was vital to the College's wellbeing that there was a reasonably steady influx of new academics and new ideas. He therefore welcomed the Rector's earlier statement that the College strategy would focus on investing in the future through the recruitment of young researchers.

41. Turning to the promotion round, Professor Kramer said this was going well. It had been agreed this year to streamline the promotion process and this had been managed without sacrificing the necessary rigour in reaching decisions. One of the benefits of the new process was that candidates would know if they had been successful much earlier than had previously been the case.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT (PAPER C)

40. Introducing Paper C, the Chief Operating Officer, Dr. Knight said the figures presented in it were for the year to December. However, the figures to the end of January, which he now had, were consistent with these. Income was slightly ahead of budget and also ahead of last year. Research income remained flat, although this too was better than had been anticipated in the budget. Notably, research income in the Faculty of Natural Sciences was showing a marked increase, both against budget and against the previous year. The College’s net cash position was also better than budgeted, mainly as a result of improvements in debt collection. Turning to the full-year forecast, Dr. Knight said that the College was on course to meet its projected surplus, but that by the end of the year he expected the net cash position would be negative. As he had noted on several previous occasions, for a not-for-profit organisation like the College, the cash position was actually much more important than the surplus it generated. Although the cash position would be negative, this was still in line with the budget and was not a concern. Indeed, the net cash position would be slightly better than budgeted.

41. The Chairman thanked Dr. Knight for his report and said that one of the risks of the College’s current positive position was that it could give a misleading impression that everything was fine and there was nothing to worry about. It was important that everyone recognised that the financial environment was still very difficult and was likely to remain so for quite some time. It was therefore imperative that the College continued to exercise a very tight control on its finances to ensure that it was able to manage the difficult times ahead. Dr. Knight agreed and said that he had been visiting a number of the College’s departments to discuss the College’s finances with them, the latest one being Physics. He was heartened by the sense of realism prevalent in all the departments he had visited. It was clear that staff understood the need for continuing tight control.

WOODLANDS MASTERPLAN

42. Before the Board considered the proposal to provide a rental guarantee for postgraduate accommodation at the recently acquired Woodlands site, the Chairman
said it would be useful for the Council to see how the masterplan for the use of the whole site was developing. This would, he said, provide an additional context for members when considering the postgraduate accommodation proposals. He had therefore asked Dr. Knight to arrange for the Council to be given an additional presentation on the Woodlands Masterplan.

43. The College’s Director of Property Management, Mr. Nigel Buck, then gave the Council a presentation on Woodlands as requested by the Chairman, a copy of which is attached at Annex A. Mr. Buck explained that the Masterplan was being prepared for submission to the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF) for outline planning approval in April 2010. This would include a proposal for detailed planning consent for the development of postgraduate accommodation, which would be the first element of the College’s plans for the site. The plans currently encompassed five distinct elements. The first phase, on the north side of the site, was for postgraduate accommodation to provide 600 bed spaces. Later phases included undergraduate student accommodation providing 660 bed spaces and associated student facilities; Imperial College offices for 500+ staff; academic space for up to 700 staff; commercial offices and the option to develop retail and hotel facilities. The plan was intended to optimise the commercial return to the College and create a vibrant campus for staff and students. The scale and mass of the various elements of the masterplan were designed so as to minimise the impact of the buildings on residential properties to the north of the site (hence this was the location chosen for the postgraduate accommodation). At present, the buildings on site provided 250,000 sq ft of floor space; the masterplan envisaged an increase to 1.3M sq ft. Although the masterplan had not been submitted to LBHF as yet, they were supportive of the College’s general plans to develop the site and indeed, saw these as a catalyst for encouraging further development of the other sites on the other side of the Westway. Concluding his presentation, Mr. Buck confirmed that the costs for the production of the Masterplan had been funded by the College Fund, which members were reminded had contributed most of the funds for the purchase of the site.

POSTGRADUATE SCHEMES (PAPER F)

44. The Council then received a presentation on the proposed postgraduate schemes from the Director of Commercial Services, Mr. Paddy Jackman, and the Chief Executive Officer of the College Fund, Mr. John Anderson, a copy of which is attached at Annex B.(1) In addition to the existing scheme at Winstanley Road, for which the Council had previously given a rental guarantee, it was now proposed to create an additional 135 postgraduate beds on an adjoining site at Winstanley Road as well as the new development at Woodlands. All of these developments would be undertaken by the College Fund as joint ventures with appropriate development partners; Berkley First at Winstanley Road and Voreda at Woodlands. This would allow the financing of these schemes to be off-balance sheet, but would require the College to provide the joint venture companies with appropriate rental guarantees. Following extensive research, the guarantees had been set at a level that would allow students to be charged a reasonable rent (below comparable market rates), while still allowing a reasonable return to the College and the joint development partner. The main risks to the College in doing so were that it might be unable to fill all the places in these halls, or that the market rate might drop to such an extent that students would have to be charged rents at less than the guarantee rate. The dearth of suitable accommodation for postgraduate students in London provided some

1. Information which is commercially sensitive has been redacted from the published presentation.
comfort against the first, while the lack of competition, particularly in west London, meant the latter scenario was unlikely.

45. At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Newton confirmed that the College Fund Board fully supported these developments. Mr. Newsum said that his advice on these schemes had been sought by the College Fund, as one of its members had a potential conflict of interest and had therefore been unable to proffer advice. The schemes were well founded and, he believed, would offer a good return to the College Fund and the developer. He would, he said, have preferred the proposals to have included a fifteen-year guarantee, rather than the twenty-five year guarantee with a fifteen-year break point which had been agreed with the development partner. However, this did not affect his support for the scheme.

46. Ms. Lomax said she supported the proposals, but was surprised at the level of rents expected of students, both in College accommodation and in the general market place. The President of the Imperial College Union, Mr. Brown, confirmed that many students were already paying rents at this level and above, which were within a range that was considered affordable for students. The Union’s main concern when dealing with proposals such as this was that the College should maintain a range of properties so that students also had the option of cheaper but less well appointed properties. To this end, he said he hoped that the College would keep the Clayponds residences available even after these new halls had been built, as Clayponds offered a lower cost alternative for those students who could not afford market rates. He also hoped the College would continue to provide advice for students seeking cheaper accommodation elsewhere. This was a valuable service that he would not wish to see discontinued. Dr. Knight reminded members that the College offered little or no accommodation for its postgraduate students, but still received in excess of 1600 applications for accommodation from these students each year. Even when all this new accommodation was available, this would still only provide bedspaces for 25% of the College’s postgraduate population. This accommodation would be particularly welcome for overseas students who found it difficult to find rooms when they came to the College. Professor Begg reminded members that the College was not restricted to Imperial students. If there was a risk that the College could not fill all these places with its own students, it could offer places to students at the other London universities and colleges, all of which had similar housing problems. Mr. Brown said that, although he wished the College to maintain a range of properties, the Union was fully supportive of all these schemes, which would provide much-needed housing for the College’s postgraduate population. Although still concerned by the rental costs, Ms. Lomax said she was comforted by the Union’s support for these schemes.

47. Bringing the discussion to a close, the Chairman said that there was a compelling argument for proceeding with all these schemes and especially that at Woodlands, given its close proximity to the Hammersmith Campus. He also endorsed the Union President’s comment that the College should continue to offer advice for students searching for cheaper accommodation elsewhere.

Resolved: (i) That the provision of a rental guarantee for the Winstanley Road 2 Development, as set out in Paper F and in the presentation made to the Council, be approved.

(ii) That the provision of a rental guarantee for the Woodlands Development, as set out in Paper F and in the presentation made to the Council, be approved.
(iii) That authority to enter into the rental guarantees referred to in paragraphs (i) and (ii) above and all and any documentation necessary to facilitate the equity investment in the joint venture companies which will carry out the Winstanley Road 2 Development and the Woodlands Development and the proposed development of postgraduate student accommodation at Woodlands and at the Winstanley Road 2 Development be delegated to the College Fund Board.

48. The Clerk advised members that the College's legal advisors had advised that, for technical reasons, the formal Rental Guarantee for the first Winstanley Road Development, which ran to over 80 pages, would also have to be formally approved by the Council. He confirmed that the relevant documents would be produced for this approval at the Council's next Meeting.

COLLEGE FUND (PAPER D)

49. The Chairman of the College Fund, Mr. Newton, introduced Paper D and said that the key point he wished to highlight was the growth in the value of the Fund's holdings in Imperial Innovations. This had continued to rise in January and was now worth £130M (about 45% of the total value of the Fund). Ordinarily to have this much invested in a single company would be considered too much in the context of the whole portfolio. However, Innovations was a special case and, until the Council decided otherwise, the College would maintain its majority shareholding. The Fund had also been successful in marketing its recently refurbished properties with most of the flats in 46 – 48 Prince's Gardens having been let already. As a result, the Fund would be bringing in £2.9m in rents this year. The Fund Board had also been using Asset Risk Consultants (ARC) to analyse the Fund's risks and rates of return. He reminded members that the Unitised Scheme, which was highly liquid, was run on a low-risk investment basis in order to balance it with the rest of the portfolio, which was relatively illiquid. ARC’s analysis showed that the returns achieved by the Fund were at least equivalent to the level of returns in the general equity market and outperformed many other schemes, despite those schemes having much higher risk levels. The Fund’s risk to return ratio was therefore much better than that in the general market. Concluding his report, Mr. Newton suggested that the Council consider the position of the College Fund when discussing College Strategy at its next meeting; use of the monies generated by the Fund would be a key factor in the College’s ability to meet its strategic objectives in the coming years.

50. Returning to the previous discussion, Mr. Brown reported that one of the Fund's luxury flats in Prince's Gardens had been let to three students, so it was clear that affordability was not an issue for some of the College's students. More seriously, he noted that the College Fund was in discussions with the Wellcome Trust (the freeholders) on the future of the Fisher Hall student residence, including a proposal to convert this into a ‘care hotel’. Fisher Hall was the College’s cheapest student hall and was popular for this reason. He said that this underlined the diversity of the student population and the need for the College to offer a wide range of properties to suit all needs and budgets. Dr. Knight agreed, but said that, while it was appropriate for the College Fund to offer private and postgraduate accommodation, he did not believe it should consider developing undergraduate halls of residence. These were key to the achievement of the College’s academic mission and should be run by the College.
51. The Chairman thanked Mr. Newton for his report and said that the Council had once again to congratulate him and the other members of the College Fund Board for the sterling performance of the Fund. That it consistently exceeded expectations was a tribute to the wise advice of all the Board’s members.

MAJOR BUILDING PROJECTS REPORT (PAPER E)

52. Paper E was received for information.

SEQ PROJECT (PAPER G)

53. Before Paper G was discussed, Mrs. Couttie noted that, as a Councillor and Cabinet Member for Housing for Westminster City Council, she had a potential conflict of interest. Consequently, she would play no part in the discussion of this item.

54. Introducing Paper G, Dr. Knight said that Westminster had initially been supportive of the College’s plans for the SEQ project and particularly for its proposals to replace the Mechanical Engineering Building and hence provide a consistent and high quality aspect onto Exhibition Road. However, this mood changed after the Summer and, when the College’s plans had eventually been submitted, Westminster had rejected the planning application, requiring that the College reduce the height of the building and also move it back from Exhibition Road. The College had reviewed Westminster’s new requirements and had decided that these were incompatible with its academic needs; to reduce the size of the building to the extent required by the Council would mean that the College would not be able to satisfy the academic justification for the building; the co-location of all the engineering departments. The College was therefore faced with three options:

a. Redesigning the scheme in line with Westminster’s requirements. As already noted, this would be expensive and would not meet the College’s needs. This was therefore unacceptable.

b. To enter into further discussion with Westminster about a possible compromise solution. This too would be expensive and it was far from clear that the College would be able to reconcile its academic requirements with Westminster’s objections.

c. To withdraw the application.

55. Dr. Knight reminded members that one of the original purposes of the SEQ scheme was to release space on the South Kensington Campus for other academic purposes. Since the scheme had originally been proposed, the College had purchased the Woodlands site where the attitude of the local authority was much more congenial. It was highly likely that the objective of releasing academic space at South Kensington could be achieved through developments at Woodlands. The pressing need for the SEQ project to be completed was therefore somewhat less than it had been. Finally, Dr. Knight noted that external funding was still required for the final phases of the SEQ and the financial environment was now much more difficult than when the College had originated the project. Taking all these factors into account the College had decided to withdraw the application completely. Dr. Knight then said he thought Westminster’s decision to reject the College’s proposals was a mistake, particularly given its own desire to improve Exhibition Road: The replacement of the Mechanical Engineering Building would have been a major
improvement.

56. Sir Peter Gershon said that, even though the College had decided to withdraw the application, at some point, the existing building would have to be refurbished or replaced. The Deputy Rector, Professor Richardson agreed and said the impact of this decision on the College's academic mission was also regrettable. Civil Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Aeronautics were excellent departments that needed to be co-located in a high quality engineering facility. He believed that they could still be co-located once the current refurbishments of the Skempton and Mechanical Engineering Buildings were completed. This would satisfy the medium term academic needs, but at some point in the future, the College would have to address its aspect onto Exhibition Road.

57. Sir Peter Gershon asked if it would be possible to move engineering to the Woodlands Campus. Dr. Knight said this wasn't an option; it was not proposed to provide workshops or labs at Woodlands, but provision would be made for other academic activities. This would free up other space at South Kensington, which could be used for engineering.

58. Mr. Newton congratulated the Management Board on its decision making. Given the amount of time and energy invested in the SEQ project, it would have been easy to continue to try and develop the project despite the damaging constraints placed on the College by the local authority. However, the Board had taken the right decision to look at other more practical solutions. The Chairman said he had been surprised by Westminster's decision to reject the College's application, but agreed that now was not the time to go ahead with the SEQ project.

OFFICE OF ALUMNI AND DEVELOPMENT (PAPER J)

59. The Rector presented Paper J and said that this paper had been prompted by a discussion he had had with the Chairman. Both he and the Chairman were concerned that the College's development activities were not sufficiently aligned with College priorities or with the Council. The paper set out the current activities and also provided an analysis of some of the Office's problems. The real point was that the College appeared not to be making the best use of the resources it had available. The first step in addressing this would be to get clarity about the College's priorities for fundraising and also improve the connections between the Council and the Development Advisory Board. The Chairman endorsed the Rector's view and said that the Office was very good at working with the College's alumni, but was perhaps less well placed to manage the development agenda.

60. Lord Tugendhat agreed that a closer relationship between the Development Advisory Board (DAB) and the Council was essential and he suggested that the Chairman of the DAB should also be a member of the Council. He then said that in the USA, it was expected that board members would make a personal commitment to donate to an institution. He suggested that the members of the Council and of the DAB should also consider making a similar personal contribution. For the members of the DAB, it was particularly important that they each made a significant contribution as their requests that others donate to the College would lack credibility if they had not done so themselves. He suggested that they might each be expected to give between £10K and £15K. He recognised that it was different for members of the Council as making such a donation would not originally have been part of the expectation placed on them. Nonetheless, he believed that they too should make a contribution to lead by example. He refrained from proposing an amount as this would depend in each
member’s circumstances, but suggested that an appropriate figure should be agreed and then phased in over the next few years.

The Chairman said the College also needed a mechanism for determining its priorities. There was sometimes confusion when an organisation received simultaneous approaches from different parts of the College for different projects. He agreed that the Development Office could not set these priorities – they had to be decided by the Management Board. He also agreed with the suggestion that the Chairman of the DAB should be on the Council and that Council members should each make a personal contribution to the College’s fundraising efforts. These points needed further consideration and he suggested that the Council return to this discussion at its next meeting, when it could consider some more concrete options.

**WYE CAMPUS (PAPER H)**

Introducing Paper H the Chairman said that he had been persuaded that the Wye Campus North should be transferred to the College Fund without any restrictions. However, the paper also included a proposal to transfer various other items for possible disposal and he sought an assurance that nothing of importance to the history of Wye College, or to the local community, would be disposed of. The Clerk said that the College Treasures Policy separated items and artefacts into ‘core’ and ‘non-core’. Core items were defined as those which had a direct relationship with the academic work of the College and/ or had a significant historical connection with the College. Any item with an historical connection to Wye would fall under this definition and would therefore be retained by the College. The items being transferred to the Fund had no significant connection to the College, largely being pieces of furniture or unconnected artworks. He also confirmed that any disposal of items would be handled sensitively, especially where someone had expressed an interest in a particular item.

Resolved: That the transfer to the College Fund of the main campus north at the Wye Campus and of the other non-core items and artefacts, as set out in Paper H, be approved, with the proviso that the disposal of any of the non-core items and artefacts be handled in a manner which is sensitive to the concerns of the local community at Wye.

**SINGAPORE MEDICAL SCHOOL (PAPER I)**

Professor Smith introduced Paper I and said that Singapore wanted to train an extra 150 – 200 doctors a year. To assist them in accomplishing this, the Singapore Government and the Nanyang Technical University (NTU) had asked Imperial to create a new Medical School in Singapore in partnership with the NTU. The College already had very strong links with the NTU, which had a very good academic reputation and was a natural partner in this enterprise. Professor Smith confirmed that the new School would not be an overseas campus of the College, but would be an autonomous institution within the NTU offering a joint medical degree from Imperial College and NTU. It was hoped that the first students would enter the new institution in 2013. He reassured the Council that the College was not spending its own funds on this development as the new School would have to be funded by the Singapore Government. Crucially, there was also considerable support for this within the Faculty, so he did not anticipate any problems in arranging for staff to teach in the new School. Discussions on the Memorandum of Understanding were continuing, but it was hoped that this would be finalised in time for it to be approved at the
64. The Chairman confirmed that the Council was not being asked to approve anything at this stage, but that if any members had concerns about this proposal, they could raise them now. Ms. Lomax said she could see that this was a relatively low risk development, but asked what the College would gain from joining with NTU in this way. The Rector said that this was an important project for the College and that it had much to gain. This would provide College staff with access to medical and research facilities that were amongst the best in the world. While in Singapore, they could also apply for research funding from the Singapore Government. The College would also be seeking a financial settlement that provided a suitable incentive for the College and its staff. Professor Smith agreed and said that the Faculty of Medicine’s goal was to be recognised as one of the top five medical schools in the world and this development would place the Faculty amongst the top half-dozen international medical schools. For the College to launch a successful and high profile joint medical school in Singapore would also enhance its reputation worldwide. The Rector said he understood that there might be a degree of nervousness given the problems that had been experienced by John Hopkins University, whose joint venture in Singapore had floundered. He assured members that the Singapore Government was very keen to avoid a repetition of that experience. He also understood that one of the problems with that development had been a lack of enthusiasm amongst the staff at John Hopkins for the joint venture. That was not the case here.

65. Ms. Owen noted that the major areas for development in the coming years were likely to be India and China and she queried if Singapore was still relevant to these two markets. The Rector said this development was very relevant to the College’s future international strategy with China and India and would give the College a very useful introduction into these territories. It would also provide a concrete demonstration of what the College was able to achieve. Sir Peter Gershon said that this development only involved the Faculty of Medicine, which was also engaged in the AHSC and in the management of the Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust. He was concerned that these were all significant managerial challenges and there was a risk that the same individuals would be stretched too far by this. Professor Smith said that the Singapore proposals were being led by the Faculty’s Undergraduate Medicine Office, which was not involved at all in the AHSC. The Office was fully engaged with, and was enthusiastic about, this project. He was, he said, fully confident that the Office could cope with the additional pressure this would bring.

66. The Chairman said he was relatively relaxed about this proposal. The Council had received a presentation on this at its Away Day: it had been the aspect of the international programme that had inspired the most confidence. He looked forward to the scheme being developed further and being brought back for approval at the Council’s next Meeting.

REPORT ON THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE MEDAL (PAPER K)

67. The Clerk introduced Paper K and noted that the proposed recipient of the Imperial College Medal had been honoured to be nominated, but had not felt able to accept the award. The Management Board was therefore making a further nomination for the receipt of the Imperial College Medal.
Resolved: That the nomination of the award of the Imperial College Medal to the Revd Kingsmill-Lunn, as set out in Paper K, be approved.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE A8, MEMBERSHIP AND MEETINGS OF THE SENATE (PAPER L)

68. The Clerk introduced Paper L and noted that the proposed changes to Ordinance A8 were designed to give effect to the changes to the Senate’s terms of reference and membership that had been agreed by the Council at its last Meeting.

Resolved: That the proposed revisions to Ordinance A8, Membership and Meetings of the Senate, as set out in Paper L, be approved.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COLLEGE POLICY FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN (PAPER M)

69. The Clerk introduced Paper M saying that the amendments to the Child Protection Policy were required to take account of the latest guidance produced by the Government.

Resolved: That the revisions to the College Child Protection Policy, as set out in Paper M, be approved.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

70. There was none.

NEXT MEETING

71. The Clerk reminded members that the Council’s next Meeting would be held on Friday, 7 May 2010.
WOODLANDS MASTERPLAN
WORK TO DATE

Masterplan brief approved by Woodlands Project Board

CREATE A MASTERPLAN FOR A NEW MIXED USE IMPERIAL COLLEGE CAMPUS

- POSTGRADUATE RESIDENTIAL UNITS (600 BEDS)
- IMPERIAL COLLEGE OFFICES FOR 525 STAFF
- UNDERGRADUATE RESIDENTIAL UNITS (660 BEDS)
- STUDENT ASSOCIATED FACILITIES
- ACADEMIC SPACE FOR UP TO 700 STAFF
- INCUBATOR/SPIN OUT OFFICE SPACE
- GYM, GP SURGERY, CAFÉ BAR, CRÈCHE
- DATA CENTRE

BALANCE OF MASTERPLAN TO PROVIDE ENABLING DEVELOPMENT

- OFFICES
- RESIDENTIAL
- HOTEL
- RETAIL

THE MASTERPLAN MUST

- OPTIMISE COMMERCIAL RETURN
- CREATE A VIBRANT CAMPUS IN WHICH TO LIVE, WORK AND PLAY
- TARGET DELIVERY OF POSTGRADUATE UNITS BY 2012
**Location and transport links**

**Proposed uses**

- **A ACADEMIC**
  Imperial College Uses: Academic Incubator

- **B POSTGRADUATE STUDENT ACCOMMODATION**
  600 Postgraduate Rooms
  Private gardens

- **C UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ACCOMMODATION**
  660 Undergraduate Rooms
  GP Surgery
  Crèche
  Communal Space
  Café / Bar
  Essential Space
  Data Centre

- **D COMMERCIAL OFFICES**
  Commercial Offices / Imperial Uses
  Showroom potential

- **E COMMERCIAL 150+ BED HOTEL**
  Health Club + Pool

- **F COMMERCIAL RESIDENTIAL**

- **G ACADEMIC/ RETAIL**
  Ground Floor - Retail
  Upper Floors - Imperial Uses
  Office
  Conference

- **H CAFE / BAR/COMMUNAL**

- **I PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL UNITS**
Scale and Mass

EXISTING MASS
250,000 SQ FT

PROPOSED VIEW FROM WOOD LANE LOOKING SOUTH
**Sectional views PG Buildings – existing buildings represented by dotted lines**

**STAGE 1**

DEMOLITION OF:
- EXISTING BLOCK A
- EXISTING BLOCK C
- EXISTING BLOCK D
- EXISTING BLOCK E
- EXISTING BLOCKS B / F

RETAIN / REFURBISH
- EXISTING SPORTS CENTRE

ADDITION OF:
- MODULAR OFFICE IF REQUIRED

**PHASING / TIMING / DEMOLITIONS**
**CONSTRUCTION OF:**
- Postgraduate accommodation
- Private residential units

**TEMPORARY USE OF:**
- Existing sports centre
- Modular office optional

**REMAINING PHASES ARE FUNDS DEPENDENT:**
- Academic
- Commercial
- Undergraduate accommodation

**Sports Centre remains available until Block D ready for commercial market**

**FIRST PHASE OF DEVELOPMENT**

**TIMELINE FOR POSTGRADUATE HOUSING AND MASTERPLAN PROPOSALS**

- Prepare planning application: December 2009
- Present masterplan to college management board: January 2010
- College council to approve rental guarantee: February 2010
- Share masterplan with LBHF: February 2010
- Submit planning application for: April 2010
  - Outline masterplan
  - Detailed postgraduate accommodation

- Planning decision: August 2010
- Demolition: September 2010
- Commence construction of postgraduate accommodation: January 2011
- Practical completion of postgraduate accommodation: August 2012
- Occupation of postgraduate accommodation: October 2012
### Woodlands Consulting Advisers/Project Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOREDA CAPITAL</td>
<td>Development Manager and JV Partner for PG Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUKETT FITZROY ROBINSON</td>
<td>Masterplanning &amp; Student Accommodation Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEEDHURST</td>
<td>Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL FRISCHMANN</td>
<td>Structural/Transport Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOARE LEA</td>
<td>Mechanical and Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITELAW TURKINGTON</td>
<td>Landscape Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYRIL SWEETT</td>
<td>Cost Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES LANG LASALLE</td>
<td>Planning Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUATRO</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDA</td>
<td>Daylight and Sunlight Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVILLS</td>
<td>Development Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Student Accommodation Facility Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Sustainability Advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMERON MCKENNA</td>
<td>College Legal Advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVERS SMITH</td>
<td>Voreda Solicitors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B

Post Graduate Accommodation Development Scheme

Paddy Jackman, Director of Commercial Services
John Anderson, Chief Executive Officer of the College Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGT Students</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>2198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR Students</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>2509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PG Students</strong></td>
<td><strong>3309</strong></td>
<td><strong>3440</strong></td>
<td><strong>3783</strong></td>
<td><strong>3900</strong></td>
<td><strong>4707</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas PG Students</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Overseas</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Imperial College Specific Demand and Supply 2009

Marketing:
- Lack of available space made abundantly clear in all literature and material

Demand:
- Total Post Graduate applications for post grad accommodation: 1678
- Number of applications for studios in Orient House: 335

Supply:
- Clayponds: 331 beds
- Orient House: 25 beds

- 5:1 applications to spaces overall
- Over 10:1 applications for self sufficient studio accommodation

London Student Accommodation pipeline: May 09

Source: Savills
a. Location: Winstanley Road, London SW11
b. Travel to SW7: 52 and 345 Buses and Train and Tube 25-40 minutes
c. Development Partner: Berkeley First, a subsidiary of Berkeley Group
d. Bed Spaces: 454
e. Ancillary Accommodation: Common Room, Gymnasium and Laundry
f. Studio Layout: 19.25 sqm Studio
Winstanley Road Phase II

An opportunity has arisen to purchase an adjacent site:

a) 0.29 acre, two-storey building
b) Former Children’s Home owned by Wandsworth Council
c) 6-storey, 135 bed building feasible on site
d) Would take the overall scheme to 587 beds
Winstanley Phases I and II

Phase I
Planning Approved
454 Studios, Social Space and Gym

Phase II
Up to an additional 135 Studios

Studio Specification
Woodlands

a) Location: College owned Freehold site at Wood Lane, London W12
b) Travel to:
   • The South Kensington Campus: 40 minutes door-to-door
   • The Hammersmith Campus: 5 minutes by foot
   • The St Mary’s Campus: 20 minutes door-to-door
c) Development Partner: Voreda Capital
d) Bedspaces: 600
e) Ancillary Accommodation: Common Room and Laundry
Proposed Uses of Woodlands Site – Masterplan Context

Sector Analysis: Starting position

Number of Post Graduate beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of Post Graduate beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew's</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings College London</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary's</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Including Winstanley Phase I and II and Woodlands

Number of Post Graduate beds
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PAPER A

STAFF MATTERS

A Note by the Rector

ACTING RECTOR

Sir Keith O’NIONS, FRS, currently Director of the Institute for Security Science and Technology, has been appointed as Acting Rector with effect from 1 January 2010.

DEPUTY RECTOR

Professor Stephen RICHARDSON, FREng, Principal of the Faculty of Engineering, has also been appointed as Deputy Rector with effect from 9 November 2009.

DEPUTY RECTOR (RESEARCH)

Professor Sir Peter KNIGHT, FRS, formerly Senior Principal, has been appointed as Deputy Rector (Research) with effect from 20 November 2009.

DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professor Bernie MORLEY, Director of the Graduate School of Life Sciences and Medicine, has combined his current role with a new appointment as Director of the School of Professional Development, with effect from 1 October 2009.

Professor Andrew GEORGE, Professor of Molecular Immunology, Department of Medicine, will take over as Director of the Graduate School of Life Sciences and Medicine and Director of the School of Professional Development with effect from 13 February 2010. He will also continue in his present role on a part time basis.

DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Professor Chris HANKIN, Professor in Computing Science, has been appointed as the Director of the Institute for Security Science and Technology, with effect from 1 January 2010. Professor Hankin will hold this position while Sir Keith O’Nions, the previous Director of the Institute, serves as Acting Rector of the College.

PROFESSORS

Professor Bengt R LANGSTROM, formerly Professor of Chemistry at Uppsala University, Sweden, has been appointed on a part time basis to the Chair in Radiochemical Neuroscience, in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of one year.

Professor Gianni D ANGELINI, MD, MCh, FRCS, FETCS, formerly British Heart Foundation Professor of Cardiac Surgery, at the Bristol Heart Institute, University of
Bristol, has been appointed on a part time basis to the Clinical Chair in Cardiothoracic Surgery and as Head of Cardiac Surgery, in the National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 January 2010 for a period of five years. He will also hold an honorary contract with the Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust.

Professor Iain Colin PRENTICE, formerly Professor of Earth System Science, University of Bristol, and also Research Programme Leader, Quantifying and Understanding the Earth System (QUEST), Natural Environment Research Council (NERC), has been appointed on a part time basis to the Chair in Biosphere and Atmosphere Interactions. The appointment will be held jointly in the Grantham Institute of Climate Change and in the Department of Life Sciences, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 January 2010 for a period of four years.

Professor Thomas Alfred (Tom) HOEHN, formerly Visiting Professor at the College, has been appointed as Director, Intellectual Property Centre, within the Business School, with effect from 1 December 2009.

Dr Heidi Jane LARSIB, formerly Associate Research Professor in the Department of International Development and Social Change, at the Clark University, Worcester, MA, USA, has been appointed to the post of Principal Research Fellow in Global Health, at the Institute of Global Health, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 January 2010 for a period of two years.

READERS

Dr Thomas (Tom) H COATES, formerly Royal Society University Research Fellow, in the Department of Mathematics, has been appointed to the post of Reader in Pure Mathematics, in the same department, with effect from 1 December 2009.

VISITING PROFESSORS

Professor Sidney NELSON, formerly Dean Emeritus and Endowed Professor of Drug Metabolism at the University of Washington, USA, 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 December 2009 for a period of six months.

Professor John ELLIS, formerly employed at CERN, Geneva, has accepted an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of eighteen months.

Professor Vladimir FORTOV, formerly Director at the Joint Institute for High Temperature, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of three years.

Professor Gannady KANEL, formerly Head of Laboratory/Division and Deputy Director at the Joint Institute for High Temperature, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of eighteen months.

Prof Sergey RAZORENOV, formerly Professor at the Tomsk State University and Head of Laboratory at the Institute of Problems of Chemical Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences,
Moscow has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of three years.

Professor Vladimir MILYAVSKIY, formerly Head of the Department of Shock Waves Effect at the Joint Institute for High Temperature, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of three years.

Dr Gabriel KHOURY, formerly Research Fellow at Imperial College, has accepted an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of three years.

Dr Jonathan GIBBINS, formerly Senior Lecturer at Imperial College, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 December 2009 for a period of two years.

RETIREMENTS

Professor Michael Albert LESCHZINER, Professor in Computational Aerodynamics, Department of Aeronautics, Faculty of Engineering, will retire from his full time role on 30 January 2010. Following retirement, he will continue in the same role on a part-time basis for a period of three years.

Professor Richard HILLIER, Department of Aeronautics, Faculty of Engineering, retired on 31 December 2009. Following retirement an emeritus title has been conferred and he will also continue his association with the College as a Senior Research Fellow.

RESIGNATIONS

Dr James Brown LOUTTIT, GCGH Programme Director, Division of Investigative Science, Faculty of Medicine, resigned with effect from 31 December 2009, to take up an appointment as Cardiovascular Investigator at GlaxoSmithKline.

Professor Paul Henry Robert DOLAN, Professor of Economics, within the Business School resigned with effect from 31 December 2009, to take up an appointment at the London School of Economics.

Professor Donna Gail BLACKMOND, Professor of Catalysis, Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Natural Sciences, resigned with effect from 31 January 2010, to take up an appointment at The Scripps Research Institute, California, USA. She has also been offered continued association with the College as a Visiting Professor.

Professor Dominic John WELLS, Professor of Gene Transfer, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, resigned with effect from 3 January 2010.
1. The College's current strategy was published in 2006, setting out its mission, vision and strategic aims until 2009. A College strategy development process is currently in progress and a new strategy for the College is due to be published in summer 2010.

2. The successful development of an overall College strategy is critically dependent on being informed by individual strategy developments already underway that are addressing in particular, the College’s existing core themes of Education, Research and Translation. The College’s International strategy will also form an integral part of the publication.

3. Following a review of consultations to date, the Management Board has helped shape a set of updated “vision and aims” statements as outlined in Appendix A.

4. Appendix B shows some examples that could be used to help illustrate the more recent theme of Translation.

The Council is invited to consider the updated “vision and aims” statements and offer their guidance and endorsement on their suitability for wider College consultation and subsequent use in the College’s strategy publication.

K.O’N.

2nd February 2010
Appendix A

Version 3

Mission

Imperial College embodies and delivers world class scholarship, education and research in science, engineering, medicine and business, with particular regard to their application in industry, commerce and healthcare. We foster interdisciplinary working internally and collaborate widely externally.

Vision

- To remain a world leading institution for scientific research and education
- To harness the quality, breadth and depth of our research capabilities to address the global challenges of today and the future
- To provide an education for students from around the world that equips them with the knowledge and skills they require to pursue their ambitions
- To make a demonstrable economic and social impact through the translation of our work into practice worldwide
- To engage, inspire and communicate the importance and benefits of science to society

Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>To undertake research of the highest international quality within an intellectually challenging and inspiring environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To extend the frontiers of knowledge within and beyond existing research disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To bring together research expertise within and beyond the College to address major science challenges of today and the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>To identify, attract and develop students of the highest ability who are most able to benefit from an education at the College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To provide research-led teaching of the highest international quality within an intellectually challenging and inspiring environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To offer an educational experience that empowers graduates to be leaders in their chosen careers and contribute to the long-term needs of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>To engage with the world to understand, identify and lead the next generation of scientific challenges and solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To maximise the social and economic value of our research and education through the transfer of both talent and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To find innovative ways to extend the reach and impact of all our work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>To attract, develop, reward and retain a diverse community of staff of the highest calibre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To invest in our facilities and estate and be financially sustainable with diverse sources of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To transform information and data into insight and intelligence that guides our thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>To maintain excellence by being efficient, effective, adaptable and integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To build mutually beneficial relationships with appropriate organisations in the UK and worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To achieve high standards of health, safety and environmental practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>To be a world leading source of independent scientific advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To anticipate, understand and shape the thinking of stakeholders and policy makers worldwide, including those in government, academia and industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To help create a wide awareness of the benefits of world-class research and education in science, engineering, medicine and business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research into Practice

GSK Clinical Imaging Centre

Imperial Innovations

Academic Health Sciences Centre

Translation

Education into Practice

Commemoration Day

Council
12th February 2010
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT

A Report by the Chief Operating Officer

MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS TO 31/12/09 (1)

1. We are now five months into the financial year and most of the trends seen in the prior months have continued. It should be noted that we are about to undertake the detailed half year review for the University, including a reforecast of the year end financial position, which will be presented to Management Board next month.

2. Total Income remains 3% up on last year (pg 2), some £3.6m ahead of budget. Research income is flat year on year and £3.1m higher than budget (pg 8), and pleasingly research staff costs are ahead of budget and contribution is £0.8m favourable. However there are some noteworthy differences between the Faculties:

   a. FoNS continues to run ahead of budget, by £3.8m, and up 12% on last year, driven primarily by Research Councils and Commercial sponsors.

   b. FoE are running behind budget and flat on last year, although the budget includes £0.75m for Icon work that will now not be reported as research.

   c. FoM are now £0.4m ahead of budget but some 5% down on last year, driven by adverse performance on charity sponsors.

3. At this stage of the year Academic Fees are on budget, which is 16% higher than last year. Other Faculty income is 7% up on last year, partly driven by Training Award monies which are also paid out to students in the same period.

4. The operating I&E surplus of £19.1m is some £4.3m ahead of budget (pg 2). The Faculties are overall £3.1m ahead of budget, driven by favourable variances on recurring costs, primarily non staff costs, research contribution and other income (pg 7). Academic Services are broadly on budget, inclusive of the £0.5m savings target (pg 13). Support Services are £0.5m favourable, due primarily to Property and Facilities Management and timing differences on expenditure in ICT (pg 13). Corporate Costs are £0.5m favourable (pg 14). The College Fund has a surplus of £0.6m which is £0.4m better than budget.

5. The continued management of and focus on the directly controllable elements of the balance sheet (pg. 3) remain of prime importance. Debtors have fallen over the quarter and are lower than in December 2008 reflecting earlier billing, and hence collection, of student fees this year. Pleasingly there is a continued reduction in the aged debt (pg 11). There has been an increase in research WIP, as expected, reflecting the normal trend at a quarter end and also lower billings due to the short working month in December. Payments in advance have increased to £134m.

6. Cash flow is £6.7m behind budget. However this includes the £28m purchase of Woodlands (which was not in the budget) and so after allowing for this it is ahead of budget, driven by favourable operating funds and working capital movements. The net debt position is £0.3m. The University’s cash position is net £19.1m positive.

MPK February 2010

1. The full Financial Management Report is not included with these Minutes.
BACKGROUND

1. The purpose of this report is to bring the Council up to date with the progress of the College Fund in the two months to the 31st of December.

YEAR TO DATE

2. At the consolidated level, the position of the College Fund is as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>31 Jul 09</th>
<th>31 Dec 09</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitised Scheme*</td>
<td>£69.1m</td>
<td>£72.9m</td>
<td>£3.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Circumstances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Innovations</td>
<td>£98.8m</td>
<td>£119.1m</td>
<td>£20.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Core Property</td>
<td>£89.7m</td>
<td>£114.4m</td>
<td>£24.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt</td>
<td>(£18.0m)</td>
<td>(£19.7m)</td>
<td>(£1.7m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands Loan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(£20.0m)</td>
<td>(£20.0m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£239.6m</td>
<td>£266.7m</td>
<td>£27.1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* After Distributions and Net Additions

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES PORTFOLIO

3. Imperial Innovations – Innovations has continued its strong performance, with the share price rising 11% from the opening position of 355p at 1 December to 395p at the end of December. This has added £11.9m of value to the Special Circumstances Portfolio from the position at 31 October 09. The rising share price is a trend which has continued into the New Year, with the share price standing at 480.00 as of the 27th of January.

4. Operational Property – Rental activity remains high, with the highlight being the continued strong performance of our recent development in South Kensington:

   a. Cornerstone (46-48 Princes Gate) – The 15 completed apartments were launched to the market in late September 2009, and as of the end of January only three remain vacant. Savills have been instructed to review the rental levels for the remaining apartments, and it is anticipated that this will result in 100% occupation before the end of the first quarter of 2010.

5. Across the rest of the operational portfolio of property, the main development has been the impending let of 52 Princes Gate. The proposal would see a Publishing company take a long-lease interest for a premium of £7.5m and an ongoing ground rent, with Imperial Innovations taking a 25 year leasehold at a starting rate of £225k per annum, with tenant
and landlord breaks at 10 and 20 years. The two deals would take place simultaneously, but would be independent of one another. The terms of these two elements of the transaction were approved by the College Fund Board, noting that the terms of the lease to Innovations were comparable with the open market and on an arms length basis. Completion is targeted for April 2010.

6. **Development Properties** – There is currently only one property under construction, the Farmhouse at Silwood Park, a scheme to create an 8,000 square foot seven bedroom property with pool and grounds. The project is subject to a 10-week delay, which means the new target completion date is the 10th of April. It should be noted that the project is being undertaken under a fixed price contract, therefore this is only an impact on timing not the capital budget. It is anticipated that the finished product will be marketed in late spring with a target £12,500 per month in rental income.

7. **Planning Schemes** – Progress has been made in relation to the following projects:

a. **Pembridge Annex** – Following a request from the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea that the planning application for six town houses on the Pembridge Annex site be withdrawn, the project has been revised to create three three-bedroom houses and six two and three-bedroom apartments. The outline programme of the project suggests demolition in the summer to permit a construction start date of October 2010, with practical completion in November 2011. Present estimates price the project at £3.5-£4m with a target gross rental return of £550k per annum on delivery.

b. **Withersdane, Wye** – The scheme to create c.200,000 square feet of residential care accommodation at the Withersdane site continues. The planning application for the conversion of the site to a continuing care facility was submitted to Ashford Borough Council in early January 2010. It is hoped that the application will be considered in April.

c. **Fisher Hall, Evelyn Gardens** – Concept proposals have been taken forwards with the Wellcome Trust (the freeholders) to create a residential care facility at the Fisher Hall student residence in Evelyn Gardens have also been submitted to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea for consideration. This would convert the existing hall into 20-25 sheltered housing units, in a ‘care hotel’ style development. Initial indications are that the development is likely to be viewed in a positive light by councillors, and therefore options to take forward and application ahead of the General Election are being considered.

8. **New Postgraduate Student Accommodation Schemes** – Good progress has been made on both the Winstanley Road and Woodlands postgraduate accommodation schemes, which are addressed separately in a paper to this Council. The investment terms for a 600 bed scheme at Woodlands and an extended 587 bed scheme at Winstanley Road have been approved by the Board, and subject to Council approval of the rental guarantees, both schemes remain on target for occupation in January and October 2012 respectively.

9. **Woodlands Scheme** – In addition to the postgraduate scheme development, significant progress has also been made on the overall Masterplan and on agreeing the terms for equity participation. Voreda Capital were formally appointed as joint venture partners for the masterplan and postgraduate development by the November Woodlands Project Board, with final terms agreed in time for 10 December 2009, when their original consultancy commitment came to an end. An outline Masterplan for the site was approved at the January Woodlands Project Board and January Management Board to permit formal consultation to commence imminently. The formal application is targeted for August 2010.
UNITISED SCHEME

10. **Performance** – In the five months to the end of December the Unitised Scheme delivered a total return of 7.2%. Against the Investment Objective the Scheme was slightly ahead of the target of RPI +4% measured over a rolling five year term.

![Graph showing performance over the last five years]

11. On a comparative basis the returns of the Unitised Scheme since the inception of the College Fund have been independently reviewed by Asset Risk Consultants for the period to the end December 2009. ARC noted that the Scheme’s Return vs Risk profile compared very well with their universe of Sterling Private Client Indices outperforming all constituents on a risk adjusted basis.

![Graph showing return vs risk for different benchmarks]

**44 months to the end of December 2009**

SN Feb 2010
1. **South East Quadrant (£76m)**
   
a. **Skempton Phase 2.** This is progressing to programme and budget. Works to swap over the main power transformer was successfully completed over the Christmas period. Following the topping out of the new lecture theatre slab the works have progressed on the first fix services.

   b. **Mech Eng Levels 0 & 1.** On programme and budget. The structure of the new rooftop plant room is now in place and the majority of the demolition and strip out internally is complete. New plant and first fix services are progressing well.

2. **Blocks L & J (£82m).** Excavation of basement was completed prior to Christmas and tower cranes installed. Construction of pile caps and basement structure is underway. A claim from Bovis for disruption through services in the ground is being analysed. On budget. Extension of time being claimed but within our programme float.

3. **Institute Of Shock Physics (£0.8m).** Parkeray has been appointed as the contractor and works commence on 1st February with August completion.

4. **Energy Futures Teaching Space (£1.2m).** Phase 3 workshop construction works commenced on programme on December 7th. Completion is due at the end of June. The contractor worked over Christmas to pull back time lost on existing defective timber flooring.

5. **Lecture Theatre Refurbishment (£1.4m) RSM.** Air conditioning plant is now installed and commissioned and final BMS handover is in progress.

6. **Hammersmith CBSH1 Facility (£10.5m).** A challenging project with a great deal of existing services issues being discovered as the work progresses. Contractor is performing very well given the difficult circumstances. First phase will be 6 days late, but users are happy with situation, particularly as this will not be used until the Imaging Suite is active in the Spring.

7. **Wolfson Pre-Clinical Imaging Facility (£1.4M).** Modifications to accommodate equipment are complete. Arrangements are being made to crane lift the scanner in. Completion due in March.

8. **Toilet and Communal Area Enhancements 2009-10 (£1m).** This work is a continuation of the programme of refurbishment first established in 2007/2008 making much needed investment in our communal facilities by enhancing toilet and common areas by improving the current poor conditions in the remaining priority areas while ensuring that benefits are delivered across the whole estate. The programme is on track to be delivered / completed by the end of the financial year.
9. **Capital Plant Replacement Phase 4 2009-10 (£4m)**
   a. This work is a continuation of the previous programme to replace plant that has either reached the end of its useful life or has become uneconomic to maintain.
   b. This year’s programme includes completion of the works to replace the majority of the remaining heating / hot water calorifiers with plate heat exchanges, continuation of the lift replacement programme, replacement of air handling units and works to Fume Cupboards.
   c. The programme is on track to be delivered / completed by the end of the financial year.

**PROJECTS IN PRE-CONSTRUCTION**

10. **Pilot Plant (£8.9m)**. Coming to the end of Stage E design, working very closely with department on design aspects and procurement. Due to start on site in April.

11. **5th Floor Office Refurbishment St Mary’s (£1.5m)**. Surveys underway. Insufficient low temperature hot water in the infrastructure so options are being developed.

12. **5th Floor Space Utilisation Refurbishment (£1.1m)**. Numerous small projects – progressing to plan. Feasibility on vacated NHS pace due to start – awaiting accommodation schedule and brief from FOM.

13. **Cancer Imaging Centre (£0.95m)**. Design at Stage A/B and being reviewed with Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

14. **Synthesis of Organic Photovoltaic Polymers Lab (£0.3m)**. Design at Stage C – due for presentation to TAG on 26th Jan.

**STUDENTS’ UNION**

15. **Beit Quad Phase 3 (£2.4m)**. Design work has commenced. Student’s business case approved by PRB for loan from College to part fund the project.

**COLLEGE FUND PROJECTS**

16. **Pembridge Gardens**. Redesign to meet budget underway. Planned commencement on site in October.

17. **Wye Campus Projects – various (£1.3m)**. Tender negotiation underway.

18. **Silwood Farmhouse (£2.0m)**. Will be completed in March. Water supply issues delayed completion.

M.P.K.
BACKGROUND

1. In 2009 the decision was taken by the Council to allow the College Fund to make an investment in joint ventures for the provision of postgraduate accommodation. Council also agreed that the College would provide a rental guarantee to underpin these investments. This was on condition that certain criteria were satisfied:

   a. That satisfactory planning consents were obtained and that the accommodation would be to a standard specified by the College through the Director of Commercial Services;
   
   b. The operational risks associated with the schemes were underwritten by the College Fund from the investment returns from the activity;
   
   c. The scheme would be demonstrably off balance sheet and would not conflict with covenants on existing debt facilities;
   
   d. The terms of any rental guarantee required to support the developments would be limited to a maximum of fifteen years from practical completion, with each rental guarantee being specifically approved by Council;
   
   e. The number of beds being created within this activity should be subject to a cap of 25% (c.1300) of the currently estimated postgraduate population of the College; and
   
   f. The rental guarantees for such schemes would be at a level at least 10% below the market level at opening.

3. Although from the College Fund’s perspective these developments were to be driven by investment returns, it was emphasised at the time by the Management Board that the provision of modern accommodation for prospective postgraduate students would be a significant advantage for the College in student recruitment in an increasingly competitive international market place.

4. This paper updates Council on progress at Winstanley Road and details the proposals for the Woodlands site.

WINSTANLEY ROAD, CLAPHAM

5. The College Fund negotiated terms with Berkeley First for College participation in a scheme at Winstanley Road directly opposite the west entrance to Clapham Junction railway station, to provide 452 Studio beds for postgraduates from January 2012, with an approved rental guarantee of £215p/w.

6. Since being approved at the May meeting of the Council, the Winstanley scheme has progressed significantly and in line with the target occupation date of January 2012, although
construction techniques are currently being considered that could mean the building might be delivered in 2011, twelve months ahead of the originally agreed date.

7. In terms of the site, hoardings were put up in November, and following a strip out of the buildings, demolition has commenced. With regard to the planning process, consent for the scheme was granted in September 2009 and the judicial review period ended on the 16th of January. Drawdown of the initial funds to complete the land transfer were completed on the 16th January – this process involved the provision of an opinion from the College Solicitors, Mills & Reeve, on the authority of the College to enter into the Rental Guarantee. At the request of the solicitors a clarification of the resolution made by the Council at its meeting last May is attached here at Annex A.

WINSTANLEY EXPANSION

8. Subsequent to the completion of the Winstanley Scheme, an opportunity has arisen to create an additional 135 postgraduate beds on an adjoining site at Winstanley Road, bringing the overall scheme total to 587. This adjoining site is 0.29 acres and currently has a two storey building, which was formerly a Children's Home owned by the London Borough of Wandsworth. It has now been acquired by Berkley First. Site investigations and initial discussions with the planners have established that a 6 storey building on site would be feasible and appropriate, producing 135 postgraduate studios.

9. The two sites would share management and facilities, and would benefit from the economies of scale of using the same building contractor. The projected completion date for the additional rooms is September 2012.

10. The financial proposal for the additional 135 beds mirrors the structure used for the first 452 bed phase of the Winstanley scheme. The rental guarantee, in line with the first phase of the scheme, is proposed at £215p/w, meaning a further opening annual rental commitment of £1.44m, in addition to the first phase commitment of £4.81m. Investment terms have been agreed with Berkeley First to act as the Developer and with Santander to extend their debt to incorporate the second phase. The Fund will again only be required to provide 42% of the equity for a 49% interest in the property and has negotiated an increased fee for the marketing of the property. Santander have also agreed to reduce their margin for the entire loan (including Phase 1) by 25bp – representing a 12% reduction in the debt service cost for the SPV.

11. As with the agreed Rental Guarantee on Winstanley phase 1, assuming that a rent approaching market levels is charged, any excess is split on a 50:50 basis between the College and the SPV. As the College Fund owns 49% of the SPV, the College effectively receives nearly 75% of any excess revenues.

12. The College Fund Board approved the proposed investment terms for the College’s involvement in the expanded scheme at its 2 February meeting, and Council is asked to approve the extension of the rent guarantee on the existing terms for an additional 135 rooms at the Winstanley scheme.

WOODLANDS, WHITE CITY

13. The Woodlands site meets the criteria for the location of a postgraduate scheme (ie it is within 40 minutes door to door travel to the main South Kensington Campus and within London Transport’s Zone 2). Postgraduate accommodation use was a major factor in determining the value of the site to the College. A 600 bed development would drive a land
value of £21m whilst only utilising approximately two ninths of the overall site, thereby allowing other College and commercial activity on the remainder of the land, 5.5 acres. The postgraduate accommodation is phase one of a much more significant mixed use scheme and, planning permitting, will open in October 2012. In the context of the original Council approval, Winstanley (including the second phase) and Woodlands would therefore provide 1187 of the targeted 1300 bedspaces.

WOODLANDS DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

14. In order to take forward the proposed development in line with the strategy determined by the Council and the College Fund Board, the following elements have been considered and addressed:

a. A development agreement has been signed between the College Fund and Voreda Capital, who are also Masterplan consultants for the entire Woodlands site. The agreement takes forward the development in a timely and cost effective manner and also meets the Council requirement that the development is off balance sheet and does not breach the covenants on the College’s existing debt facilities; Service levels have been defined by and agreed with the Director of Commercial Services.

b. The planning risk for the scheme has been taken into account ensuring that the proposal is delivered within sensible timescales, October 2012 being the objective;

c. The scheme has been developed in concert with the masterplan for the Woodlands site, thereby ensuring that it enhances the overall concept and does not reduce long term land value of the overall site;

d. The postgraduate scheme must return at least £20m in land value back to the College Fund from the Development Vehicle in order to cover its initial investment in the site; and

e. The College must establish the level of rental guarantee it is willing to support for the proposed scheme

15. While joint venture schemes such as this inherently entail some degree of risk, it is important to note that the deal has been conceived and structured in such a way that these risks are minimised. The three primary risks – partner risk; the demand risk involved in releasing 600 additional bedrooms to Imperial’s postgraduate community; and the development risk – have been recognised and mitigated, and will be addressed in turn.

PARTNER RISK

16. As noted above, Voreda Capital have been appointed as third party development partner for the Woodlands postgraduate scheme and overall Masterplan development. Voreda Capital have the individuals with the development expertise necessary to deliver the Postgraduate Scheme in the context of a much larger mixed use development of the site, and they also directly manage a property fund with over £50m of issued equity available for deployment (Voreda Real Estate Fund LLP). This provides the financial backing to fully support the matching equity required to deliver this joint venture project.

1. Council should note that LMS Capital is one of the significant shareholders in the property fund, and that the Honorable Robert Rayne (a Non Executive member of the College Fund Board) has
17. As with the Winstanley Road scheme, to meet the requirements of College and the College Fund, the development partner needed to have planning and development expertise within the London context; needed to be able to bring significant direct investment capacity to provide the majority, 50.1%, of the equity involved; and needed to be a proven and dependable partner for the banks to ensure competitive terms are provided for the debt funding.

18. A range of options and partners were considered; however it was deemed that Voreda Capital were the best potential partner as they agreed to investment terms that reflected the need to deliver a significant upfront return to the College Fund through the land sale; provided a preferential return to the Fund on an IRR of over 20% on the development and were also being willing and able to take the majority interest in the scheme, thus keeping it off the College balance sheet. Options considered included the Wellcome Trust, Generation Estates and Berkley First. Whilst they each had their specific benefits, they were not ultimately acceptable as they would either require either an unacceptable level of priority equity return for providing the capital; would require that the College enter into a rental guarantee at near market levels; or were unable to bring the broader mixed use expertise to the overall 7.5 acre site.

19. Voreda have also been prepared to advance the postgraduate scheme on a stand-alone basis, whilst acting as lead Masterplan consultants, developing a vision for the site on the understanding that each future equity investment operates on a project by project basis. Therefore their appointment, as sanctioned by the Woodlands Project Board at its November meeting and by the subsequent Management Board, has permitted both aspects of the Woodlands development to move forward at pace.

20. Once Voreda Capital were deemed to be the most appropriate development partner, an agreement was put in place which broadly mirrors the Winstanley Road agreement. It is worth reiterating that this is an agreement between the College Fund and Voreda, and is a deal which both Price Waterhouse Coopers and Cameron McKennas have agreed will not impact on the College’s existing debt facilities. The deal is being underwritten by the College Fund, and will not impact on the College’s balance sheet.

WOODLANDS RENTAL GUARANTEE DEMAND RISK

21. If the College is to provide a rental guarantee for Woodlands it is essential that the extent of the demand is fully understood to ensure that the risk is perceived as being acceptable.

therefore declared an interest due to his position as Chief Executive of LMS Capital and his shareholding in the company. Robert Rayne absented himself from all decisions made by the College Fund Board in relation to this opportunity.
POSTGRADUATE ACCOMMODATION – WIDER MARKET CONTEXT

22. The number of students in London over the last 10 years has risen greatly. Nationwide, applications to UCAS rose by 10% from October 2008-2009, while London has seen a 30% increase in full-time students in the last 10 years, with an 88% increase in the number of international students over the same period. This is a trend forecasted to continue, with the government estimating that the numbers of postgraduate and overseas students will rise by 14% and 18% respectively between 2006 and 2011.

23. Approximately 83% of London students rely on accommodation away from halls of residence or privately owned halls, the majority of whom live in shared flats or with their parents. Whilst there has been an increase in the number of planning applications for student schemes since 2007, King Sturge report that the total number of bedrooms under construction is less than 2% of current full-time student numbers, with HESA stating that student numbers are growing at 15 times the rate of bed supply in London.

24. Any demand risk is off-set by the ability of the College, should any rooms be left vacant, to direct let rooms to other universities. The site is highly accessible to, amongst others, LSE and UCL in the centre of London via the Central tube line and bus routes.

25. In addition the demand risk is also mitigated by the new draft of the Greater London Plan, which indicates that to avoid an affordable housing levy in the future, all student schemes will need to be directly linked to an existing Higher Education Institution. Therefore the risk of the market being flooded by commercial developers looking to convert existing residential and commercial schemes into student accommodation has been reduced.

IMPERIAL COLLEGE CONTEXT

26. This wider picture echoes that at Imperial, which also suffers from under-provision of accommodation for a postgraduate population which is forecast to grow in the medium-term. In 2008/09 there were 4373 full time postgraduates at Imperial, of which 432 were based at the Hammersmith Campus and 2996 were not from the UK.

27. The College Five Year Plan estimates postgraduate numbers to increase by 13% by 2012/13 to 4962. Assuming Winstanley phase 2 and the Woodlands scheme are approved this would mean that the College could provide modern studio accommodation for 23% of its full-time postgraduate population.

RENTAL GUARANTEE LEVEL

28. The May 2009 Council approved a rental guarantee level for the Winstanley scheme of £215 p/w. This was based on a comprehensive market analysis of both specialist private sector providers of postgraduate accommodation and the private rental market as a whole. This indicated an average rental level in comparable accommodation from specialist providers of £279p/w, which according to the Council’s criteria meant a maximum rental guarantee level of £250p/w.

29. The proposed rental guarantee at Woodlands follows an identical arrangement, but sets a reduced rental level of £185p/w. The reduced level reflects the differential market rate for this W12 location in comparison to Clapham, and again has been established following an extensive rents survey. This surveyed 3 areas which are presently popular with postgraduate students searching for accommodation in the private rental market and display some similar characteristics to White City. As can be seen in the table below, the average...
price for a one-bed studio across these areas is £210p/w, with quality generally inferior to what is proposed at Woodlands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Weekly Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>£162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Street</td>
<td>£254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>£213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price</strong></td>
<td><strong>£210</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. The research shows that for specialist private sector suppliers of postgraduate accommodation, in areas similar in character to White City, the average rent for a studio is £227p/w. The £185 figure is in line with the College’s present core accommodation pricing, with a deluxe room (offering ensuite accommodation but no personal kitchenette) in the newly opened Eastside Halls of Residence priced at £212/pw, and a studio at the Postgraduate accommodation at Clayponds, (Zone 4 in Ealing), priced at £185p/w.

31. Thus a rental guarantee of £185 is calculated to be 18.5% below the current average market rent for comparable accommodation.

**DEVELOPMENT RISK**

32. Other than the College’s status as Landlord and the benefit achieved from transferring a long lease to the Joint Venture party for a significant capital sum, the only significant variation between the proposals for Woodlands and the agreement on Winstanley is the Fund’s participation in the development element of the project. This presents an opportunity to gain on the differential between the cost of developing the property and its market value, but also introduces a further area of risk management as generating a return from this element of the scheme is dependent upon ensuring the cost of delivery, including financing, is below the final development management.

33. The financial review of the scheme – based on detailed advice from the professional team - indicates that a 600 bed scheme can be delivered for £66.5m – covering effectively a turnkey delivery with all costs and fees and the costs associated with the Masterplan for the site and including a £3m contingency above identified costs. Based on a two year development programme, the debt service cost would represent a further £3.4m to take total estimated costs to £69.9m. This compares with the Net Development Value of the scheme of £77.4m, on the basis of a prudent 6.25% Net Initial Yield, which indicates a profit of £7.5m should be delivered on the project.

34. The profit level is relatively thin, at just over 10%, and this reflects a number of factors: Firstly, the profit is after the cost of acquiring the land interest from the College – the £20.5m sum identified for this transfer has been driven by the desire to maximise the return to the Fund upfront to cover the initial contribution for the acquisition of the entire Woodlands site. It is notable that this return relates to just two ninths of the whole site and represents over £10m per acre versus an acquisition level of £3.7m per acre. Secondly, the full cost of achieving the overall masterplan for the site (estimated at £3m) have been incorporated into this first project. If the College directly funded this aspect of the activity, the estimated profit on the scheme would increase to £10.5m on cost base of £67m taking the developers profit over 15%. Finally, the effective pre-let of the building through the rental guarantee from the College and the context of the development within the broader aspirations for the whole site...
provides a greater degree of certainty on the delivery of the scheme – thus enabling the developer to approach the risk with greater certainty which is ultimately reflected in the target profit.

35. Under the Joint Venture structure the profit will be shared in line with equity interests – ie the College Fund will receive 49% in circumstances where the effective IRR on the development is 20% or below; however all returns achieved over and above this level (either through cost reduction, improved finance terms or an improvement in market value) will be shared 60% to the College Fund and 40% to the Joint Venture so that in real terms the College Fund will receive 80% of the benefit. The base case targets a 20% IRR on the development and assumes that income is based purely on the level established under the guarantee – which as noted is 18.5% below the prevailing market rent. Therefore there is significant scope for ‘super-profits’ in the event the College successfully markets the property at closer to market levels.

36. Therefore whilst there are additional factors associated with accepting the construction risk, the Fund is well placed to benefit from the differential between the estimated construction cost and the output value of the property. In assessing the appetite for this risk the Fund has also taken into account the College’s existing expertise and experience in delivering and monitoring projects of this size and nature and the current state of the construction market that increases the confidence that tender estimates can be matched, or even improved upon.

DECISIONS REQUIRED

37. The College, both at the operational level and through the College Fund, is uniquely well-positioned to take advantage of sustained strong demand for high-quality, purpose-built accommodation for Imperial’s growing population of postgraduate students. The terms of this proposal have been positively received by the Management Board and the investment terms were approved by the College Fund Board at its 2 February meeting.

38. These two schemes together will create 1187 postgraduate student beds. This figure represents 25% of full-time postgraduate numbers in the academic year 2009-10 and means that the ambition of College to provide accommodation for a quarter of postgraduate students will be realised for the 2012 academic year. Both schemes are framed around rental guarantees that are comfortably below the prevailing market rates and structured in such a way that the debt is on an entirely non-recourse basis and will remain off the College’s balance sheet.

39. In line with the resolution of the Council at its May meeting last year, the Council are asked to approve two further specific 25 year rental guarantee commitments, each subject to a mutual break on 12 months notice after 15 years, to a total of £6.93m per annum. These commitments are to be in addition to the guarantee already provided at Winstanley Road for £4.81m to give a grand total annual commitment of £11.74m per annum consisting of –

   a. The 135 beds at Winstanley, in addition to the already approved 452 beds, at £215 p/w
   b. The 600 bed scheme at Woodlands at £185 p/w

40. In each case, the approval shall be subject to the final specification for the schemes being approved by the College’s Director of Commercial Services and planning permission being achieved.
Excerpt from Mills & Reeve in relation to perfecting the Council's resolution in relation to the provision of a Rental Guarantee for 452 Bed spaces at Winstanley Road

“It was noted that at the meeting of Council on 8th May 2009, Council had resolved “that authority to enter into all and any documentation necessary to facilitate the proposed development of postgraduate student accommodation, as set out in Paper D, be delegated to the College Fund, provided that ……. (d) the terms of the rental guarantees required to support the developments are limited to a maximum of fifteen years from practical completion with each rental guarantee being specifically approved by the Council.”

The commercial terms on which the rental guarantee is to be given are clearly set out in Paper D and the provision of such a rental guarantee has already been accepted in principle by Council. However, the terms on which the project was approved by Council suggest that the actual form of document itself must be presented to and approved by Council.

The form of Rental Guarantee Agreement was presented to the meeting. It was noted that the terms of the agreement were substantially in line with the commercial overview set out in Paper D as presented to the Council meeting in May. However, it was noted that the Rental Guarantee Agreement was for a maximum period of 25 years, with an option for the College to exercise a break clause after 15 years provided that 12 months notice had been given. The form of Rental Guarantee Agreement did not therefore fit within the terms of the proviso to the general approval of the project that it should be subject to a maximum of 15 years.
INTRODUCTION

1. Members may recall their meeting of July 2008, when they approved the expenditure of up to £78m towards the SEQ programme. This sum was allocated to enable initial construction, decant and design work. A commitment was also made to return to Council in February 2010 with a view to updating Council on, and seeking funding approval for, the next phases of SEQ.

AIM

2. The aim of this paper is to outline the current position on SEQ and to notify Council of the Management Board plans in respect of

   a. A proposed response to Westminster County Council (WCC) in respect of the recent SEQ planning submission.

   b. Postponing, for subsequent revisiting at a later date, any further SEQ investment after completion of the current phase.

   c. The pursuit of alternative, cheaper, routes that could satisfy the space needs of the Faculty of Engineering and the Imperial College Business School.

BACKGROUND

3. Members will recall that the SEQ programme focuses on the South Kensington, Skempton and Mechanical Engineering buildings, at the corner of Exhibition Road and Imperial College Road. Its original objectives were:

   a. The co-location and expansion of the Departments of Aeronautics, Mechanical and Civil Engineering.

   b. Provision of additional space for the Business School.

   c. Construction of a Fosters designed building in place of the existing Annex and Black Tower.

   d. Vacation of space currently used by Aeronautics in Roderick Hill/ACE extension, thereby freeing that space for further College development.

4. The initial SEQ programme (July 2008 baseline cost model £277m) was originally envisaged as being achieved in three phases:

   a. Phase 1. Construction of new lecture theatre, teaching and workshop spaces in Skempton, refurbishment of Mech Eng 0/1 and design of Exhibition Road building; cost £74m.
b. **Phase 2.** Construction of new Exhibition Road building, including new teaching and research facilities; cost £130m.

c. **Phase 3.** Refurbishment of Mech Eng 4/8 and building a ‘West Extension’; cost £73m.

5. In July 2008 Council approved funding for Phase 1 in a range up to £78m. Phases 2 and 3 were subject to Council approval in February 2010. Construction work on Phase 2 was due to start in 2010 (completion 2014) and Phase 3 in 2014 (completion 2016).

**DISCUSSION**

6. Between 2008 and end 2009 the construction and design programme proceeded according to schedule. An original, well developed, scheme has been produced that satisfies Engineering and Business School user requirements. It has been the subject of extensive consultation with relevant planning and architectural bodies, as well as local residents, and modifications made according to the responses received. The result is that:

a. Phase 1 will complete on budget and on schedule (by November 2010).

b. Future funding requirements for Phases 2 and 3 have been significantly reduced, (from over £200m), though total further funding of up to £178m would still be required to complete the programme.

7. However, a WCC planning problem has now emerged. Our original strategy of gaining planning consent, concluding design work and then fundraising on the back of the planning approval/ completed design has fallen, at the last hurdle, over WCC planning approval. This is despite us rigorously following the guidance of our planning advisers. It has been derailed by the response to a request for a ‘steer’ from the WCC Planning Sub Committee meeting, held on 17th December 2009, which resolved that:

a. A ‘setting back’ (*i.e.* moving the front backwards) of the proposed building by 2 metres is required both for good neighbour/ townscape reasons and to reduce the sense of ‘enclosure’ within Exhibition Road.

b. Imperial should mitigate the loss of sunlight caused to neighbours by the scale of the proposed building. (1)

8. We therefore now have a number of planning options:

a. Pursue planning with the current design.

b. Redesign in line with WCC requirements (or a negotiated, modified design).

c. Appeal against the WCC decision, using the existing design, on the grounds of ‘non determination’ (*i.e.* WCC’s failure to decide on the IC application within its own time limits).

d. Withdraw the application

1. In the Project Team’s view, it is not feasible to design a viable new building that would meet the College’s space needs without it affecting the neighbours’ sunlight and daylight.
9. The advantages and disadvantages of each of the options have been carefully considered by the SEQ Executive Board. However, of overwhelming significance for any decision are the current financial climate and the likely consequential difficulties of raising significant sums from donors. There would seem to be little value in submitting an application, or in appealing (which would cost perhaps £1m), when:

   a. Capital funds of the scale needed for completion of SEQ (£178m) are not currently available, and are unlikely to become so for some years.

   b. There would be value in looking again, independently of SEQ, at the academic drivers/priorities for future building work on the South Kensington campus

   c. The choices made from these priorities could be informed through exploring other routes to satisfying Engineering and Business School needs

OUTCOME

10. The Management Board considered the recommendations of the SEQ Executive Board and agreed that

   a. The SEQ planning application to WCC should be withdrawn.

   b. The College should postpone any further work on the next phases of SEQ once the current work on Skempton, Mechanical Engineering and SEQ design comes to an end

   c. The College should explore alternative, cheaper, routes that could satisfy the space needs of Engineering and the Business School

11. Council is asked to note the above for information

M.P.K.
PAPER H

WYE CAMPUS NORTH: TRANSFER TO COLLEGE FUND

A Paper by the Chief Operating Officer

INTRODUCTION

1. Members will recall their discussions from the December 2009 meeting when they considered a paper on the history of activity at Wye, the current status and proposals for the future.

2. At that meeting members agreed in-principle that the main campus north asset was no longer required for College core activity and should be transferred to the College Fund. However, there was some discussion whether such a transfer should be made conditional and subject to certain restrictions.

AIM

3. The main aim of this Paper is to seek Council’s approval on the transfer of the main campus north land and buildings to the College Fund without condition or restriction. At the same time, it is proposed to transfer a number of other items and artefacts associated with Wye to the College Fund.

CAMPUS NORTH

4. The College executive has considered whether any restrictions would be applicable or suitable for an internal transfer of the main campus north assets at Wye to the College Fund.

5. Council has previously agreed to transfer assets at Wye to the College Fund without restriction. These transfers included the Withersdane site, campus south land and buildings, ADAS, the Horticultural site, Sidelands, Prospect Park together with all the farmland and buildings. It would create an anomaly if conditions and restrictions were placed on the one remaining asset at Wye upon transfer to the College Fund.

6. Any application of conditions would restrict the ability of the College Fund to meet its objective in making the best use of the assets no longer required for core activity.

7. It is therefore recommended that the main campus north facility at Wye be transferred to the College Fund without restriction or condition.

OTHER ITEMS

8. Last year the Management Board agreed a Treasures Policy and established a College Treasures Committee to review the various collections, items and artefacts owned by the College. While most of this material has always been College property, there are several items which have been inherited as a result of the mergers with the medical schools in the 1980s and 1990s and with Wye College in 2000. As with the other College assets, these items can be categorised into core and non-core items. All items held in College Collections are considered to be ‘core’ unless and until a determination is made by the
College Treasures Committee that an individual item should be categorised as 'non-core'. Non-core items will have no significant association with the College and have no reputational interest.

9. Following the end of academic activity at the Wye Campus, the Treasures Committee met to discuss various items which had previously been held at Wye. The Treasures Committee agreed the designation of these items as either core or non-core. The core items will remain either in situ at Wye Campus or be transferred to the College Archives for safe storage and eventual display. The non-core items, which include items of furniture, some relatively low-value artworks and other similar objects and artefacts, could be transferred to the College Fund for eventual exploitation or disposal taking into consideration the best financial return that can be obtained for them.

10. The Management Board has reviewed the list of non-core items and had agreed to recommend that Council approve the transfer of these items to the College Fund.

RESOLUTION

11. Council is asked to consider, and if its sees fit, approve the transfer of the remaining assets at Wye (i.e. the main campus north and the other non-core items as agreed by the Management Board) to the College Fund without conditions or restrictions with immediate effect.
PAPER I

UPDATE ON PROPOSED SINGAPORE MEDICAL SCHOOL

A Note by the Pro-Rector (Commercial Development),
the Pro-Rector (International Affairs) and the Principal, Faculty of Medicine

This Paper is commercially sensitive and confidential and has therefore not been included with the published Minutes.
THE WORK OF THE OFFICE OF ALUMNI AND DEVELOPMENT

A Note by the Development Director

INTRODUCTION

1. This paper is divided into three sections. The first section describes the work and teams of the Office of Alumni and Development (OAD). The second sets out the way the fundraising role of the department has operated in recent years and offers suggestions for ways in which the team could be more effective. The final section is an appendix which provides some facts and figures about the OAD’s work.

SECTION 1

OBJECTIVES

2. The Office of Alumni and Development (OAD) has two main objectives which are to:

   a. Deliver more engaged alumni as advocates, ambassadors and supporters of Imperial College.

   b. Raise philanthropic funds and sponsorship for priority projects from alumni and other benefactors.

THE DEPARTMENT

3. The OAD has 22 staff operating in six teams and an advisory board of senior volunteers, the Development Advisory Board (DAB). This composition of the team is similar to most fundraising and alumni relations teams in the Russell Group universities. There are three front-line teams and three support teams:

4. Front-Line Teams

   a. **The Major Projects team** raises and stewards large gifts and sponsorship from individuals (including alumni), trusts and foundations and companies for major projects across the three faculties and the Business School as well as the institutes and centres which connect them. The team raises funds for scholarships, fellowships and academic chairs as well as capital projects. It works with prospective and existing donors on a face to face basis, tailoring activity to the prospect’s or donor’s individual requirements. It uses a range of intelligence to find prospects, identifies a route to reach them and then tracks the development and progress of each relationship, recording all the information on the department’s database. It creates individual stewardship plans for each donor to ensure that the College delivers on its side of the deal. This includes working with faculty members on bespoke reports. The purpose of good stewardship is to build the donor’s long term commitment to the College.

   b. **The Individual Giving team** engages in mass fundraising through telephone, direct mail and some face to face activities, usually at events. This team generates donations from alumni and other interested parties including staff, parents and those employers which
match employee gifts. The Individual Giving team aims to provide a regular stream of philanthropic income and to raise the profile of giving to the College. It also identifies prospective higher level donors for the Major Project team to develop. It runs Imperial 1000 for those who give more than £1,000 per year and raises funds from legacies. Money raised goes into designated funds such as the Student Opportunities Fund and the Rector’s Fund.

c. **The Alumni Relations team** builds relationships with alumni around the world by delivering services and benefits which include an alumni magazine, a dedicated website which offers a range of benefits including classmate searches, an events programme and incentives which include discounted use of campus facilities such as the library and sports centre. There are more than 70 alumni groups around the world which provide their own networking events for alumni. The purpose of these activities is to engage alumni in the life and work of Imperial College so that they act as advocates, ambassadors, mentors and donors.

5. **Support Teams**

a. **The Communications team** is responsible for the production of publications and materials (both printed and online) which communicate or promote activities such as events, fundraising appeals and campaigns, and wider news about the College to the OAD’s target audiences – alumni, prospects and donors.

b. **The Database and Systems team** maintains and develops the department’s database of alumni and donors (*Raiser’s Edge*) and provides technical support to the website to support and develop the department’s work.

c. **The Research team** identifies and tracks potential donors by providing profile information for cultivation and engagement. They do this through press scanning, online databases such as *Hemscott*, and *FAME*, as well as specialised publications such as *Philanthropy in Europe* and *Wealth Watch*.

6. **The Development Advisory Board.** supports OAD by providing independent guidance and help to realise financial goals for philanthropic giving. Board members, who include the Chairman of the Council, are asked to be advocates and enthusiastic communicators of Imperial’s mission and vision, and to play an integral role in fundraising by using their networks to open doors. Board members are encouraged to make personal donations in support of the College. This board is managed by the Major Projects team.

**SECTION 2**

**WORKING PRACTICES IN FUNDRAISING**

7. In the last few years the work of the OAD has been shaped by the Centenary Appeal. It provides a useful case study for the way that OAD has operated. The campaign reached its zenith in 2007, the centenary year, and will finish at the end of 2010. Funds raised have been counted from the year 2000. The campaign has focused on three broad themes – campus renewal, academic mission and student support. The original target was set at £207 million but the estimated result will be nearer £170m. Despite this there have been some notable successes within the campaign.

a. Under the heading “campus renewal” the Wolfson Foundation have been big supporters of the College’s library redevelopments and the Goldsmiths Company have supported the *three in one* learning space.
b. Under “academic mission” donations from the Grantham Foundation and the Helen Hamlyn Trust for £22.8 million have funded the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Hamlyn Centre for Robotic Surgery. OAD did not find this money but has contributed to securing it through agreements and stewardship. Support for neurosciences from the Edmond J Safra Foundation, for the Rajiv Gandhi Centre from the Kasuma Trust and for lung cancer research from the Hunter Foundation, while not of the same magnitude, have laid good foundations for future support.

c. On the theme of “student support” OAD has worked hard to develop a scholarships funding strategy resulting in a £1m donation from the Arcadia Trust for PhD scholarships, Vodafone support (introduced by Simon Murray, Chairman of DAB) for undergraduate engineering scholarships and City and Guilds for EnVision scholarships.

8. There are a number of reasons why the appeal will miss its target:

a. The current economic climate has slowed down the pace of high end fundraising so that donors are taking longer to commit to making donations.

b. 90% of the biggest pledge of £27 million is unlikely to be fulfilled.

c. The figure of £207 million was neither based on need nor a case for support built up project by project but instead was a creative play to link the target to the year 2007. To reach a target of this magnitude would require identified flagship projects around which to build the fundraising strategy.

d. In the absence of a long term big vision the OAD responded to requests for funding from enterprising and engaged academics. As a result it has been cast in a short term, support role rather than one in which it has been able to build long term relationships to secure large scale support for strategic plans.

e. Plans for some major projects have changed, sometimes mid-application process, so that commitment to capital projects such as St Mary's library, St Mary’s Triangle and latterly SEQ has waned. An example of the impact of this is that the Wolfson application for the cardiovascular centre at Hammersmith was reprioritised by Wolfson in favour of the robotics centre at St Mary’s/South Kensington.

THE WAY FORWARD

9. Learning from this experience, the OAD as a small but experienced and self-motivated team, could make more impact and be more effective if:

a. It could focus on those major projects which were agreed as College priorities, rather than responding to a range of individual academic requests.

b. It could act as expert fundraising adviser to those whose projects were not deemed priorities.

c. It could coordinate approaches across the College to philanthropic donors thereby eliminating multiple approaches and ensuring that all donors are properly stewarded by taking on the stewardship role.

d. It delivered a service that was understood and recognised within the College.

10. To do this there would need to be:
a. A clear process whereby the Management Board (and Council) agree which major projects are College priorities for fundraising.

b. Active backing and engagement in the fundraising process from both the Management Board and the Council to support these priority projects.

c. Support and acknowledgement for the OAD from the Management Board and Council for its role as fundraiser, adviser and co-ordinator.

J Beard.
MEMBERSHIP OF DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Ahmed, Professor Haroon - Emeritus Professor of Microelectronics at the Cavendish Laboratory, the Physics Department of the University of Cambridge (Alumnus)
Arumugam, Tan Sri – Charman, Sri Inderajaya Holdings Sdn Bhd
Bond, Sir John – Chairman, Vodafone
Grierson, Sir Ronald – Chairman, The Blackstone Group
Howard, Mrs Sabine
Kapany, Dr Narinder – Chairman, K2 Optronics Inc (Alumnus)
Kerr, Lord – Chairman, Imperial College London
Loh, Ms Isabella – CEO & Vice President, Shell Marine Products Ltd (Alumna)
Maini, Dr Tidu – Science and Technology Advisor to His Highness, Qatar Foundation (Alumnus)
Mistry, Mr Cyrus – Managing Director, Shapoorji Pallonji & Co Ltd
Murray, Mr Simon – Chairman, GEMS Ltd (Chairman of DAB)
O’Nions, Sir Keith – Rector, Imperial College London
Ritblat, Sir John – Chairman of the Asset Management Advisory Board, Delancey Real Estate
Robertson, Mr Simon – Chairman, Rolls-Royce Plc
Robins, Sir Ralph – former Chairman, Rolls-Royce Plc (Alumnus)
Winston, Professor the Lord – Chair of Science & Society, Imperial College London
Wong, Professor Winston – President & CEO, Grace T H W Group (Alumnus)

Total cash Income for past three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Fund Income for past three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2008/9 - £m</th>
<th>2007/8 - £m</th>
<th>2006/7 - £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Giving (alumni)</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacies</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alumni information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressable alumni</td>
<td>108,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of total of 151,625)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Alumni (addressable)</td>
<td>73,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donating alumni</td>
<td>1,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff numbers by team (full-time equivalents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Full-time equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director’s Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database and Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Giving (and Legacies)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Note by the Rector

1. Council will recall that at its meeting on 20 November, it approved the establishment of an Imperial College Medal. The Medal is intended to recognise individuals (whether members of staff or not) who have given meritorious service to the College but for whom the award of an Associateship or Fellowship would not be appropriate. The criteria approved for the award are: “The Imperial College Medal may be awarded to such persons or organisations, whether members of the University or not, as may be deemed eligible by reason of their having rendered meritorious or praiseworthy service to Imperial College or having otherwise acted over a period of time to enhance its reputation, mission and/ or objectives.”

2. At its meeting on 20 November, the Council approved the conferment of the first Medal to Mr Bob Brighton, artist, who had donated 54 of his paintings to the College and which can be found displayed in the Central Library and Sherfield Building. In response to the rector’s letter informing him of the award, Mr Brighton replied to say he was very honoured but preferred not to receive any award.

3. The Management Board at its meeting on 29 January 2010 considered another candidate to be the first recipient of the Imperial College Medal and, in accordance with Ordinance B2, nominates the Reverend Brooke Kingsmill-Lunn. The Rev Kingsmill-Lunn, as Tower Captain, is in charge of bell-ringing in the Queens Tower, a position he has held since 1976. The ‘Alexandra’ peal of bells is one of the finest in the country and the heaviest set of 10 bells in London. The bells, which were given to Princess Alexandra in 1892 and remain the property of the monarch, are rung on seven royal anniversaries each year and for the two College graduation ceremonies in May and October. The Revd Kingsmill-Lunn has since 1976 arranged for suitably experienced ringers to provide a reminder of royal occasions and a distinctive aural accompaniment to our graduation ceremonies.

Citation:

The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to the Reverend Kingsmill-Lunn in recognition of the contribution he has made over many years to the life of the South Kensington campus.

4. The Council is invited to consider, and if it sees fit, approve the nomination for the award of the Imperial College Medal.
1. At its last Meeting, the Council approved changes to the terms of reference and membership of the Senate, which had been proposed by the Senate. The changes have the effect of reducing the size of the Senate from 68 to 31 members and also ensure that its terms of reference accurately reflect the Senate’s role within the College’s governance structure. At the time it was acknowledged that these changes would have to be reflected in Ordinance A8, which serves to delegate authority from the Council to the Senate and defines the mechanisms by which its members are appointed.

2. Attached at Annex A to this Paper is a revised version of Ordinance A8, in which the revisions have been highlighted. The proposed revisions have the effect of implementing the changes to the terms of reference and membership of the Senate approved by the Council at its last Meeting.

3. The Council is asked to consider, and if it sees fit, approve the proposed revisions to Ordinance A8.

R.F.E.
MEMBERSHIP AND MEETINGS OF THE SENATE

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE

1. The Senate shall consist of the following persons, namely:

a. **Ex Officio Members**

- The Rector, who shall preside over meetings of the Senate
- The Deputy Rector
- The Pro-Rectors for Education and International Affairs
- The Principals of the Faculties and of the Imperial College Business School
- The Directors of the Graduate Schools
- The Chairmen of the Studies Committees
- The Senior Deans
- The Dean of Students
- The Dean of Learning and Teaching
- The College Librarian
- The Head of Department of Humanities
- The Director of the School of Professional Developments

b. **Appointed Members**

- Five Heads of Department from the Science and Engineering Departments/Divisions, appointed by fellow Heads of Departments/Divisions.
- Five Heads of the Faculty of Medicine Divisions, appointed by fellow Heads of Divisions.
- Two representatives appointed by the Imperial College Union.
- One College Tutor, appointed by the Dean of Students.

- Two Heads of the Faculty of Medicine Divisions, appointed by fellow Heads of Divisions.

- Twenty-four members of the academic staff, eight each appointed by the Engineering Studies, the Medical Studies and the Science Studies Committees.

- Six members elected by and from the academic members of staff employed by the University, of whom not more than two should be Professors.
f. Three co-opted members of the academic staff, to include academic interests not otherwise represented.

g. Three students of the University, one of whom shall be the President of the Imperial College Union and two nominated by the Imperial College Union.

c. **Elected Members**

Four members of the academic staff, one from each of the Faculties of Engineering, Natural Sciences and Medicine and from the Imperial College Business School, elected by and from among the academic staff.

Four members of the non-professorial academic staff, one from each of the Faculties of Engineering, Natural Sciences and Medicine and from the Imperial College Business School, elected by and from among the academic staff.

d. **Chairman and Deputy Chairman**

The Chairman of the Senate shall be the Rector.

The Rector may appoint a Deputy Chairman from amongst the other ex-officio staff members of the Senate to preside over meetings of the Senate when he or she is unable to do so.

---

**APPOINTMENT, AND ELECTION AND CO-OPTION OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE**

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

3. **Ex Officio Staff Members.**

   a. The definitions of offices used in this Ordinance shall be as set out in Ordinance D4.

   b. Ex-officio staff members may appoint a deputy to attend meetings of the Senate on their behalf when they are unable to do so. Where an ex-officio staff member is to be represented at a meeting by a deputy, the Chairman and Secretary to the Senate must be informed of the name of the deputy before that meeting.

4. **Appointed Members.**

   a. Appointed members of the Senate shall be those nominated by the Appointing Bodies listed in Paragraph 1(b), (c) and (d) above.
b. No later than 1 March-June in any year that a Science or Engineering Head of Department vacancy is due to occur the Secretary to the Senate shall invite nominations for appointment from the Heads of the Departments/Divisions in the Faculties of Engineering and Natural Sciences and Medicine to nominate from their own number up to five Heads for appointment to the Senate. In the event that more nominations are received than the number of vacancies expected, an election will be held in accordance with the procedures outlined in Paragraph 5 below.

c. No later than 1 March in any year that a medical vacancy is due to occur, the Secretary to the Senate shall invite the Heads of the Faculty of Medicine Divisions to nominate from their own number up to two Heads for appointment to the Senate. In the event that more nominations are received than the number of vacancies expected, an election will be held in accordance with the procedures outlined in Paragraph 5 below.

d. The Secretary to the Senate shall invite the Chairmen of the Engineering Studies Committee, the Medical Studies Committee and the Science Studies Committee each to nominate members of the academic staff to fill any vacancies expected to occur for appointment to the Senate. The process for nomination shall be for each Committee to determine. The Chairmen of the Committees shall notify the Secretary to the Senate of their nominations no later than 31 May in any year that the vacancies are expected.

e. In the list of Nominating Bodies in Paragraph 1(gb) above the “Three students of the University. Two representatives appointed by the Imperial College Union” shall be the Deputy President (Education) of the Imperial College Union and two other registered students nominated/appointed by the Imperial College Union Council in accordance with any such policy established for that purpose as determined by the Imperial College Union’s Constitution.

f. In the event that an election is required to determine nominations for the appointment of the Heads of Science and Engineering Departments/Divisions or Heads of Faculty of Medicine Divisions of Department to the Senate the Secretary shall hold a secret ballot for the group concerned. Ballot papers must reach the Secretary to the Senate by the closing date stated in the notice of ballot, which shall be not less than two weeks from the date of that notice. The persons to be elected shall be determined by a simple majority of those voting.

5. **Elected Members of Academic Staff**

a. For the purposes of this Ordinance, the term “academic staff” shall be as defined in entitled to vote for representatives of their academic grouping 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. Ordinance A7, Paragraph 6. Eligible members of academic staff shall be those in post as at 1 April.

b. No later than 1 June in any year that a vacancy for an elected academic staff member is due to occur the Secretary to the Senate shall invite nominations for
election to the Senate by notice in writing to members of the academic staff. Each person nominated for election to the Senate from the academic staff shall be nominated by two members of the academic staff and nominations must reach the Secretary to the Senate in writing by the closing date given in the notice, which shall be not less than two weeks from the date of that notice. The person nominated must countersign the nomination paper to indicate that he or she is prepared to stand for election.

c. If only sufficient nominations are received to fill the expected vacant places on the Senate, those nominated will be declared elected without a ballot.

d. If insufficient nominations are received, those nominated will be declared elected without a ballot and the remaining place or places shall be filled by co-option at the next following meeting of the Senate. shall remain vacant for a further year, at which point the Secretary to the Senate will invite nominations in accordance with Paragraph 5(b) of this Ordinance.

e. If more nominations are received than there are vacancies, a secret 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. Ballot papers must reach the Secretary to the Senate by the closing date stated in the notice of ballot, 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 in such a way as to ensure that no more than two Professors are elected at any one time to fill the six places allocated.

f. As soon as possible after the closing date for the receipt of ballot papers, the Secretary to the Senate shall inform the candidates, their proposers and seconders of the result, the candidates shall be informed of the result which shall also be sent to Heads of Departments and Divisions for display locally, and shall be reported in the IC Reporter and on the University’s website as soon as possible thereafter.

6. **Co-Opted Members.** In any year that a vacancy is due to occur for a co-opted member on the Senate, the Rector shall propose that the Senate approve the co-option of such additional members of the full-time academic staff nominated by him to fill these expected vacancies, always ensuring that academic interests are widely represented.

76. **Casual Vacancies.** In the event of a vacancy occurring before the end of the appointed or elected period of a member of the Senate, the Secretary to the Senate shall arrange for an appointment or election forthwith to fill that vacancy for the remainder of the period of office outstanding in accordance with the procedures outlined above. Any such person appointed or elected to fill a casual vacancy shall be eligible for re-appointment or re-
election for each of two periods of membership of the Senate following the completion of the period of membership for which he or she was first appointed or elected.

**PERIOD OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE**

87. Appointed and elected members shall be appointed, co-opted or elected for a period of three years and shall be eligible for re-appointment, co-option or re-election except that members shall not normally serve for more than three consecutive terms of three years.

98. 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 be a member only for the unexpired portion of the period of appointment or election of the member replaced, but any such period shall be disregarded in determining that member's eligibility for further appointment or election.

**CESSATION OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE**

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

110. Appointed and elected members shall cease to be members if they cease to be eligible in the categories in which they were appointed or elected or if they send notice of resignation in writing to the Academic Registrar.

**POWERS OF THE SENATE**

111. The Senate shall be the supreme academic authority of the University, is the principal body responsible to the Council for the academic work of the University, and shall take such measures as shall appear to it to be best calculated to promote the academic-educational work of the University, both in teaching and research, and for the regulation, quality assurance and superintendence of the education and discipline of the students of the University.

112. The Senate has delegated authority from the Council to make such Academic Regulations as are necessary to fulfil its responsibilities under the preceding paragraph.

113. The Senate may establish Committees in Engineering Studies, in Medical Studies and in Science Studies and such other committees with such terms of reference as it deems appropriate.

**DELEGATION OF POWERS OF THE SENATE**

114. The Senate may delegate any of its functions, powers and duties (other than its power to make Academic Regulations) to committees appointed by it or to its officers as it sees fit, and such committees and individuals may further delegate unless the Senate has provided to the contrary.
MEETINGS OF THE SENATE

16. The Senate shall meet at least three times during the academic year. One meeting shall normally be held in each term. Additional meetings shall be called as required by the Chairman or at the written request of no fewer than one-third of the members.

17. The Senate shall be deemed to be quorate when one-third of the nominated, elected and co-opted members are present.

Approved by the Council 23 March 2007
Effective from 8 July 2007
Revised by the Council 12 February 2009
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REVISIONS TO THE CHILD PROTECTION POLICY

A Note by the Clerk

1. Members will recall that the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act, which was passed in 2006, together with the Children’s Act 1989 and other relevant legislation, places a number of obligations on institutions, including the College, which offer activities in which children and vulnerable adults may participate. These obligations include undertaking various checks on staff who will interact with children and also having in place appropriate procedures to deal with allegations of abuse. The resultant Vetting and Barring Scheme is being introduced gradually and will come into force for new employees at the College in November 2010.

2. The College’s Child Protection Policy was approved in May last year. At the time the Government had still to clarify how the Vetting and Barring Scheme was going to be implemented. However, as, the Policy and associated Code of Practice contained advice on good practice, it was decided to approve and promulgate the Policy in order to take advantage of this advice. In doing so, it was recognised that it would be necessary to make further adjustments to the Policy as and when the Government published further guidance on the implementation of the Vetting and Barring Scheme.

3. The Government has issued a number updates in the past year, which, together with practical guidance which has recently been issued, means that revisions to the approved Policy are required. A copy of the revised Policy is attached at Annex A to this Paper.

4. The Council is now asked to consider, and if it sees fit, approve the revised Child Protection Policy.

R.F.E
INTRODUCTION

1. The Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 defines a “child” as a person under the age of 18. For the purpose of this Policy and associated Code of Practice, the terms “child” and “children” will be used to describe all children and young people under the age of 18 years old participating in College-led activities. Though the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 refers to vulnerable adults as well as children, for the purpose of this Policy and associated Code of Practice, children will be the main focus.

2. For the purpose of this Policy and associated Code of Practice, the term “staff” will be used to describe those people employed on a contract of employment at the College, including those employed on consultancy agreements, contractors and those working on a voluntary and/or unpaid basis. The term “student” will be used to describe any undergraduate or postgraduate student registered with the College.

POLICY

3. Under the Children Act 1989, the College has a responsibility to protect children who are involved in College activities from harm and abuse including neglect, physical injury, sexual abuse and emotional abuse. The College recognises and accepts this responsibility and seeks to safeguard the welfare of all children that attend or visit it, or engage with College staff or students on a professional basis, by taking appropriate steps to ensure that its responsibility is met.

4. These steps include:

   a. Complying with Undertaking checks under the Vetting and Barring Scheme (the “Scheme”) and, as well as undertaking checks with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) if necessary (see paragraphs 15-17 of the Policy Code of Practice) for those staff and students who have contact with children;

   b. Requiring that risk assessments are undertaken in relation to any situation where children may interact with College staff or students. (For example risk assessment see Annex D of the Code of Practice).

   c. Requiring that staff and students who have access to children are given guidance and proper training in how to deal with children.

1. Definitions of “harm” and “abuse” from the Children Act 1989 can be found in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Annex B of the Code of Practice.

2. The Vetting and Barring Scheme is established under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Act 2006 and is due to be launched in 2010. The Scheme is discussed in more detail under sections 9-12 of the Child Protection Code of Practice.

3. Staff who must be registered under the Vetting and Barring Scheme may also need to have a check made with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB). See paragraphs 15--17 for further information on when such checks might need to be carried out.
5. A member of staff who has any concerns regarding the welfare of a child that is involved in College activities, must report their concerns to the Dean of Students. The Dean of Students will refer to the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA), cases where s/he has concluded (in consultation with College Tutors or otherwise) that someone has caused harm or abuse or poses a risk of harm or abuse to a child. It is not the responsibility of the College to investigate abuse. However, it has a duty to act if there is a cause for concern and to notify the appropriate Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs, established by and defined in the Children Act 2004) such as the Social Care Services Department or the police, so that they can investigate and take any necessary action (see the relevant referral forms at Annex C of the Code of Practice). The Dean of Students will also notify HR of the referral, which will take any relevant action, such as commencing disciplinary proceedings, if necessary.


DISSEMINATION OF THE POLICY

7. This Policy and associated Code of Practice will be available for reference on the College’s Human Resources web pages.

8. Parents of children involved in activities related to the College will be issued with a copy of this Policy and associated Code of Practice.

MONITORING

9. The College will consider the implications of any cause for concern arising under this Policy and associated Code of Practice and whether, as a result, it might be necessary to take further action itself or to review or amend its Policy, Code of Practice and procedures.

REVIEW

10. The operation of the Policy and its associated Code of Practice will be reviewed annually.

11. This Policy and associated Code of Practice should be read in conjunction with the College’s Policy on Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults, the College’s Procedures for Conducting Criminal Records Checks and the College’s Policy on Risk Management.

LEGISLATION

Together to Safeguard Children and What to do if You’re Worried a Child is Being Abused, both published by the Department of Health.

Approved by the Council: 8 May 2009
CHILD PROTECTION - CODE OF PRACTICE

COLLEGE POLICY

1. The College Child Protection Policy can be found on pages 1 and 2 of this document, preceding this Code of Practice is at [link].

RESPONSIBILITIES

2. The Council and the Rector. The responsibility for oversight of the College’s Child Protection Policy rests with the Council and the Rector, with delegated responsibility to the relevant members of the Senior Management of the College.

3. The Pro-Rector for Education. The Pro-Rector for Education has a delegated responsibility to oversee the implementation of the Policy on a day to day basis.

4. Human Resources (HR). The HR Division has a responsibility for advising the relevant individuals about how to register with the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA), the new body convened under the Safeguarding and Vulnerable Groups Act 2006, and for handling any Criminal Records Bureau checks, monitoring applications made under the Vetting and Barring Scheme, and for handling any disclosures made under the Criminal Records Bureau and any disclosures made as a result.

5. Faculty Principals, Heads of Departments/Divisions. Faculty Principals, Heads of Department/Divisions and all other managers have delegated responsibility in their own areas.

6. Individual staff members. Individual members of staff are responsible for familiarising themselves with the Policy and informing colleagues and/or managers of their particular requirements, for example regarding training.

7. Child Protection Officer. Guidance issued under sections 157 and 175 of the Education Act 2002 suggests that educational establishments such as schools and further education institutions should have, "a senior member of the establishment's leadership team who is designated to take lead responsibility for dealing with child protection issues, providing advice and support to other staff, liaising with the local authority, and working with other agencies". The College has decided to follow this good practice and the nominated Child Protection Officer at the College is the Dean of Students. Members of staff should report any concerns regarding the welfare of a child to the Dean of Students. The Dean of Students will be responsible for liaising with investigative agencies and Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs, established by and defined in the Children Act 2004), the ISA, in the event of any cause for concern of abuse. The Dean of Students may designate other full time members of College staff to cover for absence or to act on his/her behalf as of the Officer.

8. Annex A shows a chart of these responsibilities.

REGULATED ACTIVITY AND THE VETTING AND BARRING SCHEME
9. The Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 requires that all persons engaged in Regulated Activity \(^{(4)}\) must be registered to do so. It is currently proposed that this registration will be administered by a new body, the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) in the form of the Vetting and Barring Scheme which comes into force in November 2010.

10. Guidance issued by the Government on the establishment of the ISA recognises that, in some circumstances, children will participate in an activity which is not specifically targeted at children. In relation to teaching, training or instruction in a higher education institution where 16 and 17 year olds are part of a mixed age group who are mostly 18 or older, they will be regarded as merely incidental to the teaching of the adult students and the person teaching, training or instructing the group will not be required to be registered with the ISA for that activity. However, if there are students who are under 16 in the class then their presence will not be regarded as merely incidental to the teaching of adults and this will be a ‘Regulated Activity’. This is because of the likely increased vulnerability of those aged under 16 in an adult setting.

11. Under the Vetting and Barring Scheme, all staff who engage in a Regulated Activity will need to apply to be registered as “subject to monitoring”, with their case then decided by the Independent Barring Board (usually within five days of the application being made). Once a decision has been made the College will be able to check an on-line database (through making an enhanced check with the Criminal Records Bureau - see below paragraphs 15-17) to establish whether staff have been cleared to work with children. Under the process of continuous monitoring, the College will be notified if the status of that member of staff then changes. As a result, College staff will not need to be rechecked with the CRB at regular intervals.

12. Under the new Scheme, staff will remain “subject to monitoring” for the rest of their life unless they ask to be removed from the Scheme or they are barred by the Independent Barring Board from working with children.

13. The HR Department will put into place the administrative system necessary to obtain the requisite clearance of newly appointed staff under the Vetting and Barring Scheme when it comes into force in November 2010.

14. The requirement to check existing staff under the Vetting and Barring Scheme will come into force in April 2011.

**CRIMINAL RECORD BUREAU CHECKS**

4. Under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006, “Regulated Activity” includes:

- any form of teaching, training or instruction of children, unless the teaching, training or instruction is merely incidental to teaching, training or instruction of persons who are not children;
- care for or supervision of under 18s unless merely incidental to the care for or supervision of people over 18; and
- any form of advice or guidance on physical, emotional or educational well being being provided wholly or mainly for children.

The definition of Regulated Activity applies equally to activities undertaken with vulnerable adults as to with children. The Act generally seeks only to impose the full registration and monitoring regime on those who carry out these activities “frequently” or for more than 2 days in any 30 day period.
The introduction of the Vetting and Barring Scheme is in addition to the procedure for making checks with the Criminal Record Bureau (CRB), and does not replace it. Under the Vetting and Barring Scheme individuals who will engage in a Regulated Activity will need to apply to register with the ISA (the HR Department will assist in this process, see paragraph 16) which will then assess if the individual is a suitable person to work with children. Where the ISA considers the individual unsuitable they can bar them from working with children. Managers managing activities in which staff or students are working with children should ensure that an enhanced CRB check is undertaken for any person in a regulated position. Standard CRB checks are no longer available for those working with children. The three former barred lists (POCA, POVA and List 99) have been replaced by two new ISA-barred lists which can be accessed as part of enhanced CRB checks. These will only bar people who are unsuitable for work with children and/ or vulnerable adults. There may, however, be other factors in a person’s background which it will be appropriate for the College to investigate, for example, motoring convictions in the case of a person being employed as a driver for children. Such convictions could be found through a check with the CRB. As a result, the College will decide whether the implementation of CRB disclosure checks is appropriate to investigate a person’s background aside from their suitability to work with children. Though this Policy refers only to the Vetting and Barring Scheme, it should be noted that that a CRB check may also need to be carried out.

The HR Department has put into place the administrative system necessary to obtain the requisite clearance from the CRB, and will advise individuals how to register with the ISA under the Scheme when it comes into force in November 2010, during the following recruitment of staff to posts where it is appropriate for a check to be made. (See paragraphs 26-33 below regarding procedures for staff and students working in the Early Years Centre, with Outreach or when on work experience etc). This process, by necessity, will potentially result in a delay in appointments. It is now a criminal offence for a university to knowingly employ staff or place students who have been barred by the ISA in posts working with children, and it is a criminal offence for individuals barred by the ISA to work in or apply to work in those positions.

There is no requirement to obtain a CRB check on existing staff in education (subject to, for example, the duties of an existing member of staff, changing). Nor will College staff be rechecked with the CRB at regular intervals. All CRB checks will consequently be conducted in accordance with the College’s Procedures for Conducting Criminal Records Checks.

**CHILDREN INVOLVED IN COLLEGE ACTIVITIES**

18. Within the College there are several main categories of children (this is not an exhaustive list):

a. Students under the age of 18 (see paragraphs 19-22).

b. Students under the age of 16 (see paragraphs 23-25).

c. Children in the Early Years Education Centre and at Ethos (see paragraphs 26-28).

d. Children engaged with Outreach activities (see paragraphs 29-31).

---

5. See the College CRB Guidelines for Managers for more information on circumstances in which the College carries out CRB checks.
e. Children with whom College staff and students come into contact as a result of studies including placements, research and voluntary activities and children on work experience (see paragraph 332-33).

f. Children staying as part of a family in halls of residence over the summer vacation period (see paragraphs 21 and 22 below).

g. UCAS applicants who come for admissions interviews (see paragraph 20 below).

STUDENTS UNDER THE AGE OF 18

19. The College has a duty of care towards those students who are defined as children. For these students, good practice means that the College will:

   a. Inform parents and guardians that it does not act in the place of a parent;
   b. Have a list of the student’s emergency contact details, in particular those of parents and guardians; and
   c. Inform the student that he/she may not enter licensed premises or hold office.

20. Admissions. Admissions staff may need to be registered under the Scheme if they are likely to have “frequent” (as defined in endnote 4) face to face contact with students under 18. It is the responsibility of the relevant Head of Department/Division to identify at the earliest possible opportunity children who will be studying in the Department/Division, and to notify the appropriate members of staff of these students, as well as ensuring that the steps in the paragraph above are carried out and the Scheme is complied with. With regard to interviewing students for places on degree programmes, given the short, one-off nature of such interviews, it will be permissible for interviewing panels to consist of one or more interviewers as necessary.

21. Halls of Residence Staff. Where a student under the age of 18 is admitted to the College and is to be placed in a College Hall of Residence, Wardens, Sub-Wardens, Assistant Wardens and residences staff at student residences will be subject to an application being made registration under the new Independent Safeguarding Authority Scheme, and the Director of Commercial Services will advise the HR Department of new personnel to ensure that necessary applications checks under the Vetting and Barring Scheme are being made prior to commencement of employment.

22. Contractors. College contracts with external companies for the provision of services will ensure that contractor personnel that will come into contact with children have been checked under the Vetting and Barring Scheme. For example, contracts regarding services such as cleaning, security and maintenance at the College must include a requirement for the contractor to ensure that at least some of their contractors employed at the College have been checked and registered under the Vetting and Barring Scheme. The Commercial Services Department will notify Facilities Management as to any students under the age of 18 who are staying in Halls of Residence. If a visit by maintenance, security or cleaning staff, to a room being inhabited by a child under 18 is necessary, then these staff (either in-house or contracted) must either be:

   a. accompanied by a member of the Residences team; or
b. be registered to undertake Regulated Activity under the Scheme safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act.

**ADDITIONAL MEASURES FOR STUDENTS UNDER THE AGE OF 16**

23. As is noted in paragraph 10 above, the presence of students under the age of 16 will result in the activity in which they are engaged being considered as a ‘Regulated Activity’ and the person supervising the activity will need to be required to be registered under the Scheme with the ISA.

24. **Academic Staff.** Within Departments/ Divisions, academic staff will have the primary contact with students under 16 and the College will therefore put in place the administration system to obtain the necessary clearance following recruitment to advertised academic posts. The relevant Head of Department/ Division will have the responsibility to ensure that this clearance is obtained by way of the new Vetting and Barring Scheme.

25. If any of the staff mentioned in paragraphs 20-24 above are not able to be checked in time (for example, student choices of modules may not be known in time to ensure that relevant staff are registered) it is acceptable to have different arrangements for students under 16. For example requiring under 16s to be accompanied by a designated adult/ chaperone at all times, with whom the risk would reside, with the student’s funding body/ family/ guardians meeting the costs of such arrangements. It is College Policy not to accommodate students under the age of 16 in Halls of Residence.

**CHILDREN IN THE EARLY YEARS EDUCATION CENTRE AND AT ETHOS SPORTS CENTRE**

26. All staff working at the Early Years Education Centre are required to be make an application under the Vetting and Barring Scheme which finds them cleared to work with children under the Scheme before commencing work. Staff at Ethos Sports Centre who come into frequent contact with children are also required to be cleared under the Scheme.

27. Access to the Early Years Education Centre is restricted to those staff that have been checked under the Vetting and Barring Scheme.

28. The Early Years Education Centre will have in place its own detailed child safeguarding policies relevant to the activities undertaken.

**CHILDREN ENGAGED WITH OUTREACH ACTIVITIES SUCH AS OPEN DAYS, SUMMER SCHOOLS AND COURSES, MENTORING AND TUTORING AND WIDENING PARTICIPATION SCHEMES**

29. All staff and students who sign up to undertake a project with Outreach will be required to be registered make an application under the Vetting and Barring Scheme. Outreach offers a CRB and Vetting and Barring Scheme service for student volunteers to use, whereas staff volunteers will need to use the service provided by an application to the Vetting and Barring Scheme to be made through the HR Department.

30. Where an activity involving children has been organised by the Students’ Union, the Students’ Union President, in co-operation with the Students’ Union General Manager, will ensure that those staff and students who are involved have undergone the relevant checks an application under the Vetting and Barring Scheme made.
31. The Imperial Outreach programme will have in place its own detailed child safeguarding policies relevant to the activities undertaken.

32. In relation to children undertaking work experience of a temporary nature in the College, the College must register an interest in the student for the duration of the student’s work experience with them, and deregister its interest once the student has left.

CHILDREN WITH WHOM COLLEGE STAFF AND STUDENTS COME INTO CONTACT AS A RESULT OF STUDIES, INCLUDING PLACEMENTS, RESEARCH AND VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES AND CHILDREN ON WORK EXPERIENCE

323. As a condition of admission, students applying for subjects or postgraduate research where they will come into contact with children or vulnerable adults are required to be checked make an application under the Vetting and Barring Scheme. (Please note that the government has agreed to exempt 16 and 17 year olds are not required to register, and students whose 18th birthday occurs during the course will also be exempt for the duration of the academic year in which their 18th birthday falls.) The relevant Head of Department/Division will be responsible for ensuring that the relevant checks and application are carried out in conjunction with the Registry. Similarly, staff who undertake work or research with such groups, or who work with children that are on work experience placements within the College, will also be required subject to make an application under the Vetting and Barring Scheme, and the relevant Head of Department/Division will be responsible for ensuring that the relevant checks are carried out.

33. In relation to children undertaking work experience of a temporary nature in the College, the College must register an interest with the ISA in the student for the duration of the student’s work experience with them, and deregister its interest once the student has left.

GUIDELINES FOR STAFF AND STUDENTS

34. It is recommended that staff and students who have access to children take steps to ensure that they do not put themselves in a position where an allegation can be made against them. Such staff and students must give special consideration to ensuring that they do not become involved in circumstances where an allegation can be raised. Such consideration might involve, but is in no means limited to:

a. Treating students under 18 with respect and dignity at all times, reflecting their age, background, culture and special needs;

b. Ensuring that interaction with students under 18 occurs in the company of others wherever possible to ensure that an allegation of improper behaviour does not arise;

c. Retaining a professional approach to students under 18 which will involve behaviour such as not divulging home telephone numbers or addresses, ensuring that there is no physical contact, avoiding inappropriate familiarity, including discussing matters of a sexual nature, losing self control and being sensitive to issues that can be misconstrued; and

d. Discussing potential concerns with the Pro-Rector for Education, Dean of Students, Faculty Principal, and/ or Head of Department/ Division before an allegation is raised; and
35. Under no circumstances should a member of staff or student ever:
   a. Engage in rough, physical or sexually provocative games with a child, including horseplay;
   b. Share a room with a child;
   c. Engage in any form of inappropriate touching;
   d. Make sexually suggestive comments to a child;
   e. Fail to act upon and record any allegations made by a child;
   f. Do things of a personal nature for children that they are able to do for themselves; and
   g. Invite or allow a child to stay at their home unsupervised.

36. While this recommended course of action for staff or students will usually apply in the context of coming into contact with those students under the age of 18 years, it may also apply to staff or students working with vulnerable adults and students over the age of 18.

37. Any employee or volunteer at the College who looks after children under the age of 18 is considered to be in a “position of trust”. Under the Sexual Offences Act 2003, any sexual activity between a person under 18 and a person over 18 who is in a “position of trust” is a criminal offence. The College will be obliged to report allegations or suspicions of any such activity to the Local Safeguarding Children Boards or Independent Safeguarding Authority and anyone found guilty of this offence will be required to sign the sex offenders register.

38. A brief guide for staff and students on how to respond if a child makes an allegation of abuse can be found at Annex B.

TRAINING

39. The HR Division, in conjunction with the Learning and Development Centre, will provide a programme of training events for nominated staff with child protection responsibilities and for staff responsible for activities involving children. The Outreach programme will provide training to students who take part in activities involving children.
ANNEX A

CHART OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR CHILD PROTECTION POLICY
ANNEX B

GUIDELINES FOR STAFF ON HOW TO RESPOND TO ALLEGATIONS OF CHILD ABUSE OR HARM

1. Child abuse includes acts of both omission and commission that have caused, or are likely to cause, enduring harm to the child. There are different forms of abuse and they include neglect, physical abuse and non-accidental injury, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, exploitation and fabricated or induced illness by a parent of or person responsible for a child (including persons in a position of trust).6

2. Harm includes ill-treatment or impairment of a child’s health (mental or physical) or development (physical, intellectual, emotional, social or behavioural) that has been caused, or is likely to be caused, and is attributable to a lack of adequate care or control by a parent of or person responsible for (including persons in a position of trust) the child’s health or welfare.7

3. For the purposes of this section the word “abuse” includes reference to harm and the word “harm” includes reference to abuse.

4. These procedures provide step-by-step guidance on how to respond to a concern about a child’s welfare. It is the duty of any staff working with children to report disclosures of abuse to the Dean of Students. It is not for staff to decide whether or not a suspicion or allegation is true. All suspicions or allegations must be taken seriously and dealt with according to this procedure Policy and Code of Practice.

5. Concerns may arise because:
   a. A child alleges abuse;
   b. Someone else discloses that a child has alleged abuse to him/ her or that s/he strongly believes a child has been or is being abused;
   c. There are suspicions or indicators that a child is being abused;
   d. There are observable changes in a child’s behaviour that may be related to abuse; and/or
   e. The behaviour of a member of staff towards children causes concern or there is suspicion that a member of staff is abusing a child.

6. The basic premise of a child protection procedure is to ensure that children who are suffering from harm, abuse and neglect are identified, and that information is shared appropriately to afford them protection and ensure access to requisite services.

HOW TO RESPOND IF A CHILD DISCLOSES ABUSE

6. “Position of trust” is defined under sections 16-24 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. See also paragraph 34 of the Code of Practice.

7. Section 31 of the Children Act 1989. In the Act, the term “significant harm” replaces the terms “child abuse” and neglect.”
7. If a child alleges abuse, staff should:
   a. Stay calm, listen and re-assure the child;
   b. Check with the child that they have their consent to share the information. If consent is withheld then be clear about the rationale for any decision to override this;
   c. Record information and ask the child whether what has been recorded accords with what they have said;
   d. Invite the child to be party to any discussion with the Dean of Students;
   e. Make a report to the Dean of Students (see relevant form at Annex C);
   f. The Dean of Students should decide upon next steps: seeking further advice, informing parents, informing children’s social care, informing the Independent Safeguarding Authority and/or the police;
   g. Advise the child what is going to happen and should it be decided to make a report to children’s social care, seek their consent wherever possible; and
   h. Advise the child of the outcome of any conversations with outside agencies and what will happen next.

HOW TO RESPOND IF THERE ARE SUSPICIONS A CHILD IS BEING ABUSED

8. If there are serious suspicions that a child is being abused, staff should:
   a. Speak to the Dean of Students;
   b. Keep records of conversations and decisions; and
   c. Wherever possible, involve the child in conversations and keep them informed of any actions or possible outcome;
   d. Where a referral has been made to children’s social care, social care must receive a written report within 48 hours.

HOW TO RESPOND IF THERE ARE SUSPICIONS A STAFF MEMBER IS ABUSING A CHILD

9. If there are genuine suspicions that a staff member is abusing a child, staff should:
   a. Maintain confidentiality but alert the Dean of Students in the first instance.
   b. The Dean of Students should take such steps as s/he considers necessary to ensure the safety of the child in question and any other child who might be at risk. The Dean of Students should speak to the child about any actions taken and offer support and advice about what will happen next.
c. The Dean of Students shall liaise with the person who reported the original concern informed of how the matter is progressing, and notify HR where necessary and ensure that a report if the matter is completed.

d. Report the matter to the local Social Care Services Department.

e. Notify the Rector.

f. Senior managers should implement a press strategy, and an internal investigation should be conducted in consultation with children's social care and police.

**RECORDING INFORMATION**

10. The member of staff who raises the initial concern must record what they have observed or what the child disclosed, and speak with the Dean of Students about the case as soon as reasonably possible.

11. The Dean of Students should record any subsequent actions, decisions or conversations.

12. The Dean of Students is responsible for forwarding written referrals to children's social care and the Independent Safeguarding Authority.

13. The Dean of Students is responsible for storing information in a secure area and ensuring that only authorised staff have access to this.

14. Timescales for passing on information. The government guidance “What to do if You're Worried a Child is Being Abused” (Department of Health 2003) sets timescales for action. A telephone referral to children’s social care should be followed up in writing within 48 hours. The guidance timeframes should be incorporated into any procedures.
ANNEX C

FORMS

TEMPLATE RECORD OF ALLEGATION OF CHILD ABUSE

(To be sent to the Dean of Students)

Date………………………………. Time of initial call………………………….

To: Dean of Students -(Name):………………………………………………

Name of Complainant

Name of Child – if not Complainant (and school if relevant) (if not complainant)

Place of alleged abuse

Name of alleged abuser(s) of people present…………………………………………………………

Details of Allegation

The account of the allegation as given by the Complainant, this should include any injuries observed.

Name of person reporting incident (capitals): …………………………………..............

Signed:……………………………… Date:………………………………..............

DesignationJob Title:…………………………………………………………

Dept:……………………………… Ext No: ……………………………

Email address:……………………………………………………………………
REFERRAL FORM TO THE SOCIAL SERVICES INDEPENDENT SAFEGUARDING AUTHORITY

REFERRAL FORM

(For completion by the Dean of Students)

Telephone Referral made on: Date:....................

Time:....................

To: Social Worker/Duty Officer (Name):..........................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Child/children</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>School (if relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address:..................................................................................................................

Tel. No:.................................. Tel. No:....................

Reason for Referral/Information

From:
(Name of Dean of Students):..............................................................................

Signed: .................................................... Designation:..........................

Address:..................................................................................................................

This form is available from the ISA website at the following link: http://www.isa.gov.org.uk/Docs/SVGA2006_ISA_Referral_form_19-09-2009.doc

The form should be used when making a referral (ie providing information) to the Independent Safeguarding Authority. A referral should be made when there is harm or risk of harm to children or vulnerable adults in the workplace, relevant conduct has occurred or an individual has received a caution or conviction for a relevant offence.

Accompanying ISA Referral Guidance can be found on the ISA website at the following link: http://www.isa.gov.org.uk/PDF/ISA%20Referral%20Guidance%20V2009-02.pdf and should be read in order to understand our duty in relation to making a referral to the ISA and in providing information requested by the ISA.

Copies of the form and the guidance can also be obtained from the Central Secretariat.

All information provided to the ISA will be handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Detailed information on the Independent Safeguarding Authority and the Vetting and Barring Scheme can be found on the ISA website: www.isa.gov.org.uk
### ANNEX D

**EXAMPLE OF HEALTH & SAFETY RISK ASSESSMENT**  
**SUMMER SCHOOL/EVENT INVOLVING UNDER 18 YEAR OLDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Hazard</th>
<th>Likelihood of injury occurring with current control measures in place</th>
<th>Level of Harm if injury does occur</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Further Controls Required</th>
<th>Date to be implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to toxic substances, harmful radiation, unrecognisable danger, extreme temperatures, noise or vibration. Working with</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities will not involve such exposure. Any activity taking place in a laboratory or workshop will be carried out under close supervision of competent persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All activities will be risk assessed separately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Hazard</td>
<td>Likelihood of injury occurring with current control measures in place</td>
<td>Level of Harm if injury does occur</td>
<td>Existing Controls</td>
<td>Further Controls Required</td>
<td>Date to be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemicals, carcinogens, asbestos etc</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>Participants under 18 will be supervised at all times during the event. Staff, student guides and participants will be briefed on emergency procedures and will be shown escape routes. Trained first aiders are available on all sites.</td>
<td>Fire Wardens will be nominated for the event and be in attendance throughout the duration of the event. Details of emergency procedures are included in participants’ information packs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire/emergency</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>Staff and guides will be briefed on first aid procedures. and have a list of first-aiders nominated for the event. Participants will receive packs which include information about first aid and safety procedures. They will at all times be accompanied by College students or staff who are briefed on health and safety procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident related to College premises such as tripping on stairs, falling heavy object etc</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>Parents and participants will be informed of the locations at which each day begins and ends and it will be made clear to them how to get back to the location.</td>
<td>Participants will be accompanied by student guides at all times. Participants will be provided with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident or getting lost when travelling to and from</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Hazard</td>
<td>Likelihood of injury occurring with current control measures in place</td>
<td>Level of Harm if injury does occur</td>
<td>Existing Controls</td>
<td>Further Controls Required</td>
<td>Date to be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>L M H</td>
<td>be made clear that the College only takes responsibility for participants from their arrival at the first venue each day until their departure from the last venue each day.</td>
<td>maps and clear directions indicating the safest route. A register will be taken at the beginning of each session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiredness, which could lead to accidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants will be given a break at least after every two hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical details are held on the parental consent forms retained at the xxxx. Contact details of parents/carers are retained in the xxxx. A member of staff will be available to escort students home if necessary. Trained first aiders are available on all sites.</td>
<td>xxxxxx will check medical details and, if necessary, consults with parents of all students who declare health problems. S/he will advise on any extra precautions required and will be available to advise staff in the event of a crisis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect treatment of pre-existing medical conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical details and instructions are held on the parental consent forms retained at the xxxxxxx. Medication required during the day will be stored securely by the event leader and dispensed only according to instructions provided on the parental consent form.</td>
<td>xxxxxx will check medical details and consulted with parents if necessary on all students who declare health problems. S/he will advise on any extra precautions required and will be available to advise staff in the event of a crisis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Hazard</td>
<td>Likelihood of injury occurring with current control measures in place</td>
<td>Level of Harm if injury does occur</td>
<td>Existing Controls</td>
<td>Further Controls Required</td>
<td>Date to be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal welfare of student compromised</td>
<td>L MH</td>
<td>L MH</td>
<td>Child protection guidelines and training for all staff supervising programmes for under 18s.</td>
<td>CRB checks and applications under the Vetting and Barring Scheme for staff with substantial unsupervised access to children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food allergy /anaphylaxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants will be given vouchers for redemption at the College's food outlets, so there are no unknown sources and the choice of food is under the participants' own control. Only cold drinks will be provided at break times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food poisoning, scalding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>