MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

at the

Thirty-second Meeting of the

COUNCIL

of the

IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE

The Thirty-second Meeting of the Council was held in the Dining Room, 170 Queen’s Gate, South Kensington Campus, Imperial College London, at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, 12th July 2013, when there were present:

The Baroness Manningham-Buller (Chair), Mr. P.J. Beaumont, Mr. I. Conn, Professor M.J. Dallman, Professor D. Griffiths, Professor Dame Julia Higgins, Professor D.P.A. Kelleher, Professor J. Kramer, Ms. J.R. Lomax, Professor J. Magee, Mr. J. Newsum, Mr. M. Sanderson, Mr. S. Newton, Professor S.M. Richardson, the Lord Tugendhat and the President & Rector and the Clerk to the Court and Council.

Apologies

Mrs. P. Couttie, Mr. P. Dilley, Sir Tom Hughes-Hallett and Ms K Owen.

In attendance:

Mr. D. Goldsmith, Mr. E. Astle (for Minutes 15 – 16 only) and the Assistant Clerk to the Court and Council.

WELCOME

The Chair welcomed Mr. David Goldsmith, the Imperial College Union President elect, to his first meeting of the Council.

MINUTES

Council – 3rd May 2013

1. The Minutes of the thirty-first Meeting of the Council, held on Friday, 3rd May 2013 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.
CHAIR’S REPORT

2. The Chair provided the Council with a progress report on the search for the next President & Rector. It was clear that the post of President & Rector was very attractive internationally and that the College was able to attract outstanding candidates. The Council confirmed that the College should continue to search across the world for an outstanding candidate for the post of President & Rector. It recognised that this focus on excellence might mean that the search would take longer than usual and it thanked the President & Rector, Sir Keith O’Nions, for agreeing to extend his appointment for a further eight months to allow the Council time to find a truly outstanding successor. It was also agreed that Perrett Laver would continue to assist the Appointing Committee on the search.

3. The Chair also updated members on the Nomination Committee’s search for new external members of the Council. Since the last meeting she had written to members with a proposed nomination, which she was pleased to say had been accepted.

Resolved:

That the appointment of Mr. Christopher Brinsmead as an external member of the Council be approved from 1 October 2013 and with a first term of office ending 30 September 2017.

PRESIDENT & RECTOR’S REPORT

4. The President & Rector reported on the new governance and management arrangements to be implemented once Professor Stirling joined the College as Provost. The Management Board had now met for the last time and would be replaced by a College Cabinet and Provost’s Board. The College Cabinet would be chaired by the President & Rector and would consider College-level strategic issues. The Provost’s Board would be responsible for the delivery of the College’s core academic mission in line with the College Strategy. In practice, the Provost’s Board would inherit much of the business of the current Management Board, including the quality and efficacy of education, research and translation; recruitment, development and retention of staff; in-year financial performance and financial control of academic budgets; and generally ensuring the effective and efficient running of the university.

5. The President & Rector was pleased to report that Professor David Gann, as Vice-President (Development and Innovation), was already bringing real improvements to the College’s development activities. In particular he was taking an integrated approach to development, corporate partnerships & alumni and was developing a new suite of fundraising materials which could be used in forthcoming campaigns for Imperial West and the Molecular Science and Engineering Building, as well as more generally for chairs, scholarships and bursaries. The future development of Imperial West would form the major topic for discussion for the President’s Away Day with Heads of Department in October, with a particular focus on the College’s academic priorities for Imperial West. Finally the President & Rector noted that the outcome of the Government’s recent Spending Review for Higher Education had probably been as good as could have been expected. There would be no further cuts to the science budget, the MRC had not been moved to the Department of Health, as had originally been suggested, and there was the likelihood of some capital funding through the continuation of schemes such as the UKRPIF (UK Research Partnership Investment Fund), which had provided the College with £35M towards the Research
and Translation Hub at Imperial West.

COLLEGE PLAN AND FORECAST FOR 2013-14 (PAPER A)

6. Mr. Sanderson presented Paper A and said that although a budget plan and forecast for the next three years were being presented to the Council, it was only being asked formally to approve the budget for 2013-14. Mr. Sanderson then went through the plan in detail and drew members’ attention in particular to the following points:

a. That the College was still coming to terms with the major shift in the funding environment following the substantial decline in capital funding from Government. This was reflected in the shift to other potential sources of income and the proposed increase in postgraduate students.

b. The College was forecasting a healthy surplus for this year and for 2013-14. However, the projected operating surpluses in future years were significantly lower. This was a reflection of the significant investments the College was making in staffing, scholarship, IT systems and maternity support.

c. The forecasts did not include any estimates for additional funding that had yet to be secured.

7. It was suggested that the forecasts showed that the College was healthy and would continue to grow by about 5% per annum, so the declining operating surpluses in future years were not a result of a reduction in income. This suggested that the College would have to address some medium term challenges around its cost base. It would also have to consider carefully how to fund the additional investment required at Imperial West.

8. It was noted that the forecasts for future years included a number of assumptions about increases to student numbers and other income. The basis for deriving these assumptions was not always clear and it was also not clear how working capital and central costs were being allocated to the Faculties. It was suggested that in future it would be useful for Council to have more information on the underlying assumptions and risks associated with the budget, as well as information on longer-term trends.

9. The Deans confirmed that dependence on Research Council funding was being reduced through increased applications for grant funding from the EU and other sources. The College was also becoming better at predicting student numbers. Although over-dependence on overseas student recruitment was a potential risk, those departments with the largest numbers of overseas students were still seeing an increase in overseas applications. The Faculty of Medicine was also rationalising its postgraduate offering to provide a more coherent and better marketed offering. The Faculties’ forecasts and underlying assumptions had been rigorously tested through the Planning Round and so the Deans were confident that the income targets in particular were realistic and achievable. It was also stated that the new planning and budgeting process provided a greater degree of transparency about the real costs of activities and the levels of contribution made by each of the Faculties. This had exposed some issues, but the overall impact had been positive and departments welcomed the greater transparency provided by the new processes.
10. Mr. Sanderson agreed that the provision of trend information in future would improve the reports presented to the Council. He also acknowledged that there were multiple options for funding the development of Imperial West. These were being worked through by the College and firmer proposals would come back to the Council in due course. However, he noted that the changing funding environment meant that, even without Imperial West, the College would need to generate additional income from other sources if it was to continue to develop and invest in the future; it was clear that a ‘business as usual’ position was not sustainable in the longer term. Summing up, the Chair noted that there were challenges facing the College in future years, but that the budget for 2013-14, which the Council was being asked to approve, was both prudent and achievable and should provide the College with a healthy operating surplus for the year.

Resolved:

That the College consolidated budget for 2013/14 as set out in Paper A be approved

ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY RETURN (PAPER B)

11. Mr. Sanderson presented Paper B and noted that the forecasts, which had to be submitted to HEFCE, had been prepared within the parameters set by HEFCE. The associated risk assessment was therefore rather generic in nature. The forecasts were consistent with the more detailed plans set out in Paper A.

Resolved:

That the HEFCE forecast 2013-14 – 2015-16, as set out in Paper B, be approved

IMPERIAL WEST UPDATE (PAPER C)

12. Mr. Newsum presented Paper C and noted that the Syndicate was developing Key Performance Indicators to assess the success of the Research and Translation Hub project. He also paid tribute to the work of the College’s Director of Financial Strategy, Mr. John Anderson, and his team in securing this project for the College. The Council asked for its gratitude to Mr. Anderson and his team to be noted in the Minutes.

13. The Council recognised that the cost of developing the whole site would be substantial and that the College would not itself be able to generate all the funds required. It was suggested that significant entrepreneurial activity would be needed alongside the provision of academic facilities in order to create the necessary profit/cash to fund the College’s academic vision for Imperial West. Although the College now had control of most of the Land between Imperial West and White City, it was noted that the Berkeley Group had now purchased the M&S land adjacent to the College’s holdings.
ETHICS CODE FOR IMPERIAL COLLEGE (PAPER D)

14. Mr. Neilson presented Paper D. The Ethics Code and associated documents had been prepared following the Woolf Inquiry into the LSE’s Links with Libya, which recommended that, as universities now resembled global companies in size, complexity and reach, they should have an overall code dealing with ethics and the management of reputational risk. The proposed Ethics Code, Relationship Review Policy and Philanthropic Income Guidelines had already been considered by the Audit and Risk Committees and amended in the light of their comments and recommendations. The Council welcomed the Code, but it was suggested that the College should always be dedicated to the highest intellectual standards and objective judgement and that this commitment should not be modified by the operation of this or any other code.

Resolved:

That the Ethics Code, Relationship Review Policy and Guidelines for Accepting Philanthropic Income and Other Gifts for Imperial College London, as set out in Paper D, be approved for operation with effect from 1 November 2013.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES AND DIVERSITY ANNUAL REPORT (PAPER E)

15. The Chair of the College’s Equal Opportunities and Diversity Committee, Mr. Edward Astle, presented Paper E. There was, he said, considerable energy and enthusiasm across the College for making real improvements in equality and diversity. A number of initiatives had been implemented in the last few years and the College had had some notable successes, not least its receipt of an Athena Swan Silver Award, making it only the third university in the country to receive a Silver institutional award. However, despite these initiatives and considerable high level support, the College was not making the desired progress in addressing the overall balance of its staff and student bodies. Female representation in the academic and senior support grades was static, as was the percentage of female undergraduates. More worryingly, the percentage of female research postgraduates had fallen slightly and there had also been a recent decrease in staff and students who declared as black and minority ethnic (BME). The College was taking further action to address these issues and Mr. Astle highlighted the recommendations made by the Academic Diversity Task Force, which were appended to the Report. The recruitment changes recommended by the Task Force were an important initiative and had received widespread support across the College. It was hoped that the greater involvement of the College Consuls in the recruitment process, and their production of an annual audit report, would also help to share and encourage the adoption of best practice across the College.

16. Members asked if the reasons for the lack of significant change were understood, and also asked if this pattern reflected the national picture or was specific to the College. It was reported that the College’s gender balance was just behind the national average for STEM subjects, although the College’s record on ethnicity was slightly better than average. It was noted that there had been a national push to encourage females to study science and engineering subjects at school in the 1980s. Although this had initially had a positive impact, it was no longer being undertaken so actively at a national level and the numbers of female school students taking science subjects had fallen back. It was also suggested that external perception of the College as a high pressure and
male-dominated environment could be off-putting for some female students. The Council thanked Mr. Astle for his report and for the improvements that had been made during his time as Chair of the Equal Opportunities and Diversity Committee. It was hoped that the further initiatives noted in the report would have a positive impact on the College’s performance in this area.

**IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION IMPACT REPORT (PAPER F)**

17. The Imperial College Union President, Mr. Beaumont, presented Paper F, which was intended to highlight the Union’s achievements during the year and show how its various initiatives had improved students’ experience of the College and also how the Union had represented student interests. Mr. Beaumont also reported that the Union had awarded an Imperial College Union Fellowship with Distinction to Professor Stephen Richardson, in recognition of his contribution to enhancing the student experience at the College.

18. The Council welcomed the report and paid tribute to the Union’s and to Mr. Beaumont’s achievements during the year. Members recognised that the College was fortunate to have a Students’ Union that was so engaged and constructive and that wanted to work with the College for the benefit of the student body.

**DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS (PAPER G)**

19. Mr. Neilson presented Paper G.

Resolved:

That the dates of future Council Meetings, as set out in Paper G, be approved

**FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT (PAPER H)**

20. Mr. Sanderson presented Paper H.

**ENDOWMENT BOARD REPORT (PAPER I)**

21. The Chairman of the Endowment Board, Mr. Newton, presented Paper I.

**HEALTH AND SAFETY ANNUAL REPORT (PAPER J)**

22. Mr. Neilson presented Paper J and drew members’ attention to the major fire in the Chemical Engineering Department in October 2012. Although no one had been injured, there had been extensive damage to the laboratory concerned and significant damage to its neighbouring laboratories. An inquiry into the fire by Professor Richard Jardine had made a number of recommendations which were now being implemented. These included: identifying an “academic champion” in each faculty to promote health and safety; revised risk assessment procedures; peer
safety review; increased emphasis on competency; introduction of “buddy systems”; and increased use of near-miss reporting.

**STAFF MATTERS (PAPER K)**

23. Paper K was received for information

**SENATE REPORT (PAPER L)**

24. Paper L was received for information

**VALETE**

25. The Chair advised members that this would be several members’ last meeting as members of the Council. She asked that the Council’s thanks to each of the following members be recorded in the Minutes:

   Mr. Paul Beaumont.

   Professor Dot Griffiths.

   Professor Jeff Kramer.

   Professor Stephen Richardson.

**NEXT MEETING**

27. Mr. Neilson reminded members that the next Meeting of the Council would be held on **Friday, 20 September 2013**.
The College’s Consolidated Financial Plan is commercially confidential and is therefore not included with these minutes.
PAPER B

ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY RETURN 2013

A Note by the Chief Financial Officer

The information and forecasts contained in the Annual Accountability Return to the HEFCE is commercially confidential and is therefore not included with these minutes.
RESEARCH AND TRANSLATION HUB

1. Following Council approval of the Heads of Terms and capital expenditure of £68m, the first drafting of the legal documents are being shared by the lawyers acting for Voreda and the College. The target date for executing all the conditional documentation is mid-July 2013 with the project going unconditional by the end of the year.

2. The delivery programme to be submitted to HEFCE confirms that a total spend of £35m on Building C will be achieved by end April 2015 and that the 2:1 ratio between HEFCE funding and private investment will be achieved.

3. Planning permission was issued on 21 December 2012. No Judicial Review challenge has been made. St Helen’s Residents Association (SHRA) has requested release of the s106 viability appraisals threatening to take their request to the FOI Inspector if we continue to resist. The College Secretary has responded formally explaining the commercial sensitivities involved in providing this detail and therefore reaffirming that it will not be provided.

IMPERIAL WEST EXPANSION

4. Aviva / Helical Bar
   a. Imperial College exchanged contracts to acquire the Dairy Crest and Stadium House site for £138m from Aviva. The latter property was required to ensure that Imperial College has adequate landholdings on both sides of the Central line cutting to allow construction of a new access bridge to the site. The acquisition completes on 30 August 2013.
   b. The College has taken over the negotiation of the s106 terms and discussions with TfL for bridge improvement works for access to the site in relation to the planning application submitted by Helical Bar on behalf of Aviva. Once the s106 has been signed, the resolution to grant planning permission issued by Hammersmith and Fulham will take effect and formal planning permission will be granted for 1.6m sq ft of mixed use development.

5. Marks and Spencer
   a. Following the decision at the May Council meeting to prioritise the acquisition of the Aviva site and the exchange of contracts on that purchase, the College withdrew from the M&S purchase. We explored the option of sourcing an investment partner to purchase the land through a joint venture; however, we were unable to reach agreement with Marks and Spencer on how this would be achieved.
b. We understand that the property is now under offer by St James of the Berkeley Group on materially the same terms agreed between Imperial College and M&S. It is likely that they will have exchanged contracts before the Council meeting. The College has begun correspondence with Berkeley to establish support for joint working on areas of mutual benefit around planning, access and infrastructure, whilst reserving our commercial position over the relationship between the M&S site and the consolidated College assets.

Figure 1 shows the extent of the landholdings now under ICL’s control, which total 6.108 hectares (15.1 acres) to the south of Imperial West Phases 1 and 2.
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PAPER D

ADOPTION OF AN ETHICS CODE FOR IMPERIAL COLLEGE

Paper by the College Secretary & Registrar

1. INTRODUCTION

The Woolf Inquiry into the LSE’s Links with Libya (“Woolf Inquiry”) noted that, as universities now resemble global companies in size, complexity and reach, they should have an overall code dealing with ethics and the management of reputational risk.

Accordingly, an overall Ethics Code for Imperial College has been prepared for Council’s consideration. It builds on the LSE’s model.

The Woolf Inquiry recommended that specific policies are needed to deal with ethical issues which are complex and which require a detailed level of consideration, but that these should fall under the umbrella of a wider institutional statement on ethical practice: this would provide a first port of call for individuals facing a situation involving ethical or reputational risk and should help the institution in publicising associated policies. It should also help to guard against individual policies that develop in a fragmented way. We have developed our proposed Code accordingly.

Current position

Ethics is referenced in the College’s Strategic Plan. The College also has a number of policies that seek to set a high ethical standard of behaviour in specific areas, including research integrity, academic collaborations and procurement. However, the College does not at present have an Ethics Code which covers activities across Imperial College.

In light of the conclusions of the Woolf Inquiry and further work from within the sector on ethics matters, the College’s Risk and Audit Committees recommended that the College should adopt an overall Ethics Code which reflects good practice.

Taking account of the recommendations of the Risk and Audit Committees over the last year, the following structure is proposed:

(a) An overall Ethics Code setting out conduct expected from the College community to promote and support good ethical behaviour.
(b) A supporting Relationship Review Policy which highlights the mechanisms through which staff and other members of the College community should raise any ethical concerns in connection with proposed and continuing relationships with third parties, and explaining how the ethical review process dovetails with the existing College review processes in certain areas.

(c) Key elements of the College’s Gift Acceptance Policy introduced last year have been incorporated into the Relationship Review Policy and in more specific ‘Guidelines for accepting philanthropic income and other gifts’.

2. **ETHICS CODE (APPENDIX A)**

The proposed overall Ethics Code has been drafted to reflect good practice in higher education and more widely. It is proposed that this Ethics Code should apply to all staff, students and other members of the College community, and it is intended to encourage all relevant parties to consider the ethical aspects of their work and studies.

It provides that any ethical concerns should be raised either:

(a) in accordance with a specific policy or procedure; or
(b) (where the matter does not fall within a specific policy or procedure) with the relevant Head of Department/equivalent, who will either resolve the matter or escalate it to College Cabinet (via the Head of the Central Secretariat) as appropriate.

3. **RELATIONSHIP REVIEW POLICY (APPENDIX B)**

It is proposed that the College adopts a Relationship Review Policy in the terms attached.

This Relationship Review Policy sets out the required ethical review process that should be undertaken before College members solicit or establish relationships with third parties. It does not seek to set out absolute prohibitions, but sets out matters that need to be considered and a clear approval and escalation procedure. It is proposed that the Relationship Review Policy provides a consistent approach to such consideration within a framework of proportionate scrutiny and clear accountability, whilst providing sufficient flexibility in areas where difficult value judgements sometimes need to be made.

The document covers all relationships, but contains specific detail in relation to:

(a) Academic collaborations
(b) Commercial partnering
(c) Receipt of philanthropic income and other gifts
(d) Receipt of research funding and related relationship agreements
(e) Receipt of certain other income
(f) Procurement and supplier relationships

It informs College members of the need to notify certain proposed relationships for consideration in accordance with detailed policies and procedures in each of these areas.

4. **GUIDELINES FOR ACCEPTING PHILANTHROPIC INCOME AND OTHER GIFTS (APPENDIX C)**

It is recommended that the College adopts new guidelines for accepting philanthropic income and other gifts in the terms proposed, and that this document replaces the College’s existing Gift Acceptance Policy.
These guidelines take into account the guidance provided by the Audit Committee and Risk Committees in relation to the existing Gift Acceptance Policy, specifically in connection with:

(a) *The income to which the policy applies* - the draft makes it clear that the policy governs the acceptance of all philanthropic income, including income that is in essence (albeit not entirely) philanthropic.

(b) *The simplification of existing procedures* - it is proposed that a review of proposed receipts of philanthropic income over a £100k threshold is undertaken by the College Secretary & Registrar in addition to the Director of Development.

(c) *The review of legacies and gifts of unknown duration* - provision is included to require that legacies and gifts of unknown duration are properly considered at appropriate intervals.

5. **CONSULTATION AND COMMITTEE REVIEW**

The Management Board, Audit and Risk Committees have considered and commented on the draft documentation in May and June 2013. They were supportive of the broad approach.

6. **ROLE OF COUNCIL IN ETHICAL REVIEW**

Experience of the initial working of the Gift Acceptance Policy has suggested that a considerably wider range of income than philanthropic gifts should be considered from an ethical standpoint. This has led to a more strategic role proposed for Council and its Committees in the escalation procedures for ethical issues set out in the Ethics Code and Relationship Review Policy.

It is proposed that ethical matters which cannot be resolved through specific review and escalation processes applicable to the particular work area or relationship will be referred to the College Cabinet (or Senate for academic collaborations) for decision. In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the Council as required before coming to a decision. There will also be full transparency to each meeting of the Audit Committee about the issues which have been escalated.

The Audit Committee will report to the Council on the functioning of the Ethics Code and Relationship Review Policy as part of its annual report, highlighting specific areas where necessary.

7. **IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMUNICATION**

It is proposed that the documents are adopted on the basis that they will become effective on 1 November 2013.

This will enable:

(a) the various Departments to check that the appropriate mechanisms have been put in place to enable compliance with these policies and procedures; and

(b) the proposed action outlined in the attached communications plan to be taken *(Annex 1).*
It will be essential if the Code is to be effective for understanding about it to be cascaded to staff and other members of the College community through training sessions, committee and team meetings, written communications, and online resources. It is proposed that the approved documents are housed on a dedicated webpage managed by the Central Secretariat to act as an ethical “hub”, where members of the College community can locate College policies which have ethical relevance, and find guidance on ethical matters.

8. POLICY REVIEW

It is proposed that the Ethics Code and the other documents proposed for adoption should be formally reviewed by the Audit Committee one year after adoption and every three years thereafter.

We shall need to continue to learn from our experiences in this area, as we have with the Gift Acceptance Policy. Such learning can be made available via the Ethics Hub referred to above.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the (a) Ethics Code, (b) Relationship Review Policy and (c) Guidelines for Accepting Philanthropic Income and Other Gifts for Imperial College London with effect from 1 November 2013.
AN ETHICS CODE

for Imperial College London

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Code is to establish an overall ethics code for Imperial College.

This Code is not intended to replace the College’s established policies and procedures relating to ethics which are listed in Appendix 1. Those carrying out research or other activities governed by established policies and procedures relating to ethics should continue to follow these established policies and procedures in relation to such matters, as well as the wider requirements set out in this Code.

Whilst it is impossible to devise a single set of rules to resolve every ethical dilemma, this Code is intended to provide a starting point to help members of the College to identify and tackle ethical issues faced in the course of their activities at Imperial.

The whole of the College’s community, including all its staff, students, governors and associates are expected to comply with this Code and to behave in line with the principles set out in it (and references to “members”, “members of the College” or “members of the College community” should be construed as referring to all such people.) For the avoidance of doubt:

(a) this includes where College staff engage in consultancy arrangements; whether or not through Imperial Consultants,
(b) those issued with honorary contracts from the College are expected to comply with the terms of this Code in the same manner as staff members.

The College will look to those in senior positions in particular to set an example in their conduct and to promote and support good ethical behaviour.

The Code sets out a number of key principles and behaviours which the College expects of its members. It is structured around the following themes:

- Section 1: Integrity as the guiding principle
- Section 2: Facilitating a leading academic community
- Section 3: Third party interactions
- Section 4: Other ethical matters.

Section 5 deals with ethical governance of matters raised pursuant to this Code. It is not intended to replace existing review mechanisms but is intended to supplement them and to provide for appropriate reporting and accountability at the highest level in cases not falling under other review procedures. Please note that nothing in this policy is intended to affect the application of the College’s whistle blowing policy.

In appropriate cases, breaches of the Code and related policies may be treated as offences under the College’s disciplinary procedures.
SECTION 1: INTEGRITY AS THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE

The College is committed to demonstrating independence, honesty and transparency in all its activities and expects its staff, students and other members of the College community to show the same commitment.

Members are expected to:

A. **Be honest and truthful** in their dealings with each other and with third parties

B. **Manage conflicts in interests** in line with the College’s procedures

Members should declare outside interests relevant to their activities at the College and manage any potential, perceived or actual conflicts appropriately and always in accordance with the College’s External Interests Policy. All proposed gifts should be considered against the College’s anti-bribery, Gifts and Hospitality and Relationship Review policies and any other policy relating to the proposed gift. Members of the College should not be involved in any decision from which they (or others close to them) might derive some personal benefit.

C. **Display transparency and fairness in decision making**

The College aims to make decisions in a transparent and fair manner in accordance with its published policies and procedures, whilst honouring its obligations in relation to privacy and confidentiality. Members should conduct their activities avoiding any suggestion of bribery, fraud, corruption and other such practices which may prevent them from making decisions or being seen to make decisions in a transparent and fair manner.

---

2 [http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/hr/procedures/externalinterests/registerinterests](http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/hr/procedures/externalinterests/registerinterests)
3 [https://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/secretariat/public/Policy%20on%20Gifts%20and%20Hospitality%20%28Jan%202009%29.pdf](https://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/secretariat/public/Policy%20on%20Gifts%20and%20Hospitality%20%28Jan%202009%29.pdf)
4 [Insert link to proposed Relationship Review policy and related procedures]
SECTION 2: FACILITATING A LEADING ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

It is important that all members of the College community work together to achieve the College’s academic mission and to facilitate a leading academic community.

The College expects its members to:

A. Behave appropriately

All members of the College community should behave in a manner which aims to enhance the reputation of the university and always in accordance with the principles set out in this Code and the College’s wider policies and procedures. They should meet the highest standards of professional and academic conduct. The College has an agreed set of principles which govern the behaviour of our staff, Imperial Expectations, and staff with leadership, management or supervisory responsibility are, in particular, expected to set an example by undertaking their roles in accordance with these principles. The College also has in place rigorous procedures relating to expected levels of academic conduct by students.

B. Play their part within the College community

Members should strive to contribute to the functioning of the College to the best of their ability and work with others in a supportive manner.

C. Treat people with dignity and respect

Members of the College community should treat others as they would like to be treated themselves, and with dignity and due respect at all times. The College will not tolerate unlawful discrimination, bullying, harassment or victimisation and will deal with such matters in accordance with the applicable policies.

D. Promote equality of opportunity and diversity

The College is committed to promoting equality and diversity within the College community and has a number of policies to support its aims. All members should treat other people equitably, regardless of political opinions, race, gender, disability, age, religion and belief, sexual orientation, gender identity, social economic background and personal history and should work to promote a culture free of discrimination.

E. Uphold individuals’ freedom of expression

The College upholds the principle of freedom of expression within the law. All members should recognise the right of others to such freedoms and exercise their own freedom of expression responsibly.

F. Research and educate responsibly

https://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/staffdevelopment/Public/HR/imperialexpectationsfeb2012.pdf
Research and education is central to the College’s work but can raise ethical issues which need careful consideration. Those involved in research should conduct their research responsibly and in accordance with the College’s policies and procedures relating to research ethics. Academic staff are expected to teach to the best of their ability, be open to new ideas, and incorporate consideration of ethical issues in their teaching content when relevant.

G. Uphold the freedoms to research

The College fully upholds academic freedom within the law for staff and students.
SECTION 3: THIRD PARTY INTERACTIONS

The College interacts with third parties and is reliant upon them for, amongst other things, providing income to assist the College to fulfil its aims, to provide services and collaborative opportunities to the College and to facilitate knowledge transfer opportunities.

Whilst many such relationships are highly beneficial, certain relationships may be harmful for the College and may have a significant negative impact on its reputation, its ability to secure funding and its capacity to develop beneficial relationships in the future. Ethical issues may arise, for example, from the source of funding, from the partners or collaborators involved, or from what is being agreed to (in terms of output, methodology, potential use of the output, restrictions on publication or otherwise).

It is necessary to consider relationships with third parties in a holistic manner, considering the rights and interests of all parties that may be affected. In such interactions, the College expects members of the College community to:

A. Manage proposed relationships appropriately

Members need to consider carefully the relationships they form with third parties and the impact that this can have on the College and its reputation before entering into them.

The College has in place a Relationship Review Policy\(^6\) which sets out guidelines for reviewing all relationships, with specific requirements in relation to certain types of relationship:

- Academic collaborations
- Commercial partnering
- Philanthropic income and other gifts
- Procurement, purchasing and supplier relationships
- Research funding and related relationship agreements
- Other income

The Relationship Review Policy also sets out guidance regarding what members of College identifying ethical issues should do, and in particular sets out clear processes for escalating ethical concerns in appropriate cases.

B. Admit, assess and deal with students fairly

The College is committed to fair, rigorous and transparent student admission and assessment procedures. The College’s selection criteria for admissions are fully independent of philanthropic or other support of the institution. No gift or grant will affect the academic record of any student, nor have a bearing on any dispute between a student and the College about his/her programme of study.

C. Manage resources responsibly

\(^6\) [links to RRP etc]
Members of the College community should manage any financial, physical, human and intellectual resources within their control in a responsible manner, making sure that appropriate protections for the College and its community are in place and that their actions are in line with the College’s policies, procedures and regulations (including in relation to health and safety, finance and purchasing, the protection of intellectual property, the use of the College name and brand, communications and publications, and environmental matters).

D. Foster strong relationships with Alumni

SECTION 4: OTHER ETHICAL MATTERS

The College views ethical issues as extremely important and a number of its policies and procedures have ethical relevance.

The College expects members of the College community to:

A. Be aware of the College’s ethical policies and procedures

This Code is intended to act as a general ethical reference point, whilst acknowledging that there are a number of other policies and procedures applying to the various aspects of the College’s operation which have ethical relevance. Members should be familiar with the policies and procedures that apply to their work and follow them.

The Central Secretariat is developing an “Ethics Hub” listing the key policies and procedures with ethical relevance. Members of the College community are encouraged to notify any policy which they feel has ethical relevance and which is not listed in the Hub to the Central Secretariat.

B. Raise matters of ethical concern though the prescribed channels

Every member of the College community has a responsibility to refer ethical concerns in accordance with this Code and the College’s established policies and procedures relating to ethics listed in Appendix 1 of this document.

The Relationship Review Policy describes the methods for raising ethical issues in certain contexts. There are specific policies and procedures (for example in relation to the ethics of research processes and concerns about research misconduct) which provide for escalation of ethical issues in certain other areas. Members should refer to their Departments and the Ethics Hub for guidance.

Ethical issues that are not covered by specific policies should be escalated to a member’s Head of Department or equivalent using the prescribed notification documentation which can be found on the Governance Hub webpage. Thereafter, such ethical issues will be considered in accordance with the procedures set out in section 5.
SECTION 5: ETHICAL GOVERNANCE

A. Escalation procedures

Where a matter is raised in accordance with a specific policy or procedure, the escalation procedure specified in that policy shall apply.

In the event that a matter is raised with a Head of Department in accordance with the terms of this policy, and the relevant Head of Department does not feel able to resolve the matter, the Head of Department should provide a written report to the Head of Central Secretariat, setting out the issues and including (where appropriate) a recommendation as to how the matter should progress.

In appropriate cases, the College Cabinet will then review the matter in light of the report provided and other matters brought to its attention, seeking further advice from College members and third parties as required. Any decision reached in this forum will be reported back to the Head of Department making the reference to it via the Head of Central Secretariat (and may be used in general guidance for future use).

In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached by the College Cabinet, a formal reference will be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee will consider the matter in light of the report provided to it by the College Secretary & Registrar, seeking further advice from College members, third parties and the College Council as required before coming to a decision. Any decision reached in this forum will be reported back to the Head of Department making the original reference via the Head of Central Secretariat (and may be used in general guidance for future use).

B. Record keeping

A system of sign off and record keeping should be in place so that the College and individual decision makers can demonstrate that ethical matters have been properly considered.

Heads of Department/equivalent should retain a record of all ethical issues raised with them, including:

- Copies of all ethical proformas received from members of their department
- Details of how each ethical issue has been dealt with by that individual
- Details (where applicable) of how that issue has been dealt with by the College Cabinet/Audit Committee
- Copies of all relevant reports

(Record keeping in relation to the matters dealt with under the specific procedures referred to under section 3 should take place in accordance with those policies.)

C. Accountability reporting

The College Secretary & Registrar (in consultation with others as appropriate) is required to produce a formal report for the Audit Committee each term, outlining the ethical issues considered by the College
Cabinet/Senate and how such matters have been dealt with. Any concerns with how the Code or related policies are functioning should be included within the report.

The Audit Committee will report to the Council on the functioning of the policy as part of its annual report, highlighting specific areas where necessary.

D. Assistance

Members requiring further advice or assistance on the applicability of this Code or the issues raised by it should contact the Central Secretariat.
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF ESTABLISHED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO ETHICS

A. Research policies and procedures
   ➢ Research Integrity
   ➢ College authorisation of research proposals and related agreements
   ➢ Corporate Partnerships guidelines for ethical review of relationships
   ➢ Guidelines for proper scientific conduct in research
   ➢ Policy on the use of animals in research
   ➢ Health-related research governance framework

   ➢ Academic collaborations
     ➢ Establishing Collaborative Degree Programmes: Due Diligence Checks
     ➢ Guidelines for Establishing Collaborative Programmes

B. Financial policies and procedures
   ➢ Acceptance of Gifts and Hospitality Policy
   ➢ Guidelines for accepting and developing philanthropic income
   ➢ Ordinance C1, Financial Matters Part 8, Financial Ethics and Conflict of Interest
   ➢ External Interests Policy
   ➢ National Institutes of Health Financial Conflict of Interest
   ➢ Expenses policy
   ➢ Purchasing regulations
RELATIONSHIP REVIEW POLICY

1. **Introduction and purpose**

   All relationships with third parties entered into by Imperial College London (the College) should be subject to prior and continuing consideration at the appropriate level to check that they support the College’s mission, vision and strategic aims and are consistent with the overall objectives of the College.

   Linked to the above, section 3A of the College’s *Ethics Code* [date approved] makes it clear that, in order to mitigate the risk of ethical issues causing damage to the College’s reputation, ability to secure funding and capacity to develop beneficial relationships in the future, the whole of the College community, including all its staff, students, governors and associates, should consider the ethical aspects of relationships and manage such issues appropriately.

   This policy is not intended to replace the current approval mechanisms and delegated authorities in place across the College and its academic and administrative departments. It is intended:

   (a) to remind all staff and other members of the College community of the need to carefully consider the relationships they form, and to be alert to ethical issues in connection with proposed and continuing relationships;

   (b) to highlight the mechanisms under which staff and other members of the College community should raise any ethical concerns; and

   (c) to explain how the ethical review process dovetails with the existing College review processes in certain areas.

2. **College mission and vision**

   The mission of the College is: to embody and deliver world class scholarship, education and research in science, engineering, medicine and business, with particular regard to their application in industry, commerce and healthcare. It fosters multidisciplinary working internally and collaborates widely externally.

   The College’s vision is:

   a) To remain a world-leading institution for scientific research and education.

   b) To harness the quality, breadth and depth of our research capabilities to address the difficult challenges of today and the future.

   c) To develop the next generation of researchers, scientists and academics.

   d) To provide an education for students from around the world that equips them with the knowledge and skills they require to pursue their ambitions.

   e) To make a demonstrable economic and social impact through the translation of our work into practice worldwide.

   f) To engage with the world and communicate the importance and benefits of science to society.

3. **Scope and definitions**
The scope of this policy includes all relationships with third parties entered into by or in connection with the College, with particular focus on:

- Academic collaborations
- Commercial partnering
- Receipt of philanthropic income and other gifts
- Receipt of research funding and related relationship agreements
- Receipt of other income
- Procurement and supplier relationships

4. **Guidelines for reviewing all relationships**

In considering any relationship, the following guidelines apply irrespective of income source or type of relationship.

Relationships should:

1. Support the College's mission, vision and strategic aims
2. Be consistent with the overall objectives of the College

Relationships should not:

1. Compromise the College’s status as an independent institution
2. Create material conflicts of interest
3. Arise, in whole or in part, from illegal activity that might include:
   - Tax evasion
   - Fraud
   - Bribery
   - Violation of international conventions on human rights or the environment
   - Suppression or falsification of academic research
4. Lead the College to contravene data protection and/or freedom of information legislation
5. Require the College to be involved in action that is illegal
6. Require the College to suppress or falsify academic research
7. Require the College to deviate from its normal hiring, promotion, procurement and contracting procedures.\(^7\)

8. Require the College to provide special consideration for admission to its programmes of study

Judgement is required to check that the College’s interests are maintained when reviewing a relationship if it has the potential to:

1. Restrict academic freedom

2. Deter others from supporting or working with the College

3. Cause any other damage, including financial or reputational, to the College

4. Expose the College to potentially significant liability.

Relationships where the sources of income or funding are difficult to establish require special scrutiny.

5. Processes for reviewing relationships and escalating ethical concerns

The College has in place policies, procedures and regulations which set out the scope of authorities delegated to its staff. Individual members of the College community must abide by these policies, procedures and regulations when forming relationships with third parties.

Individual members of the College community also retain responsibility for considering ethical issues relevant to their work and escalating matters where appropriate in accordance with the processes set out below, and any specific processes applicable to the particular work area or relationship.

The following sections set out specific requirements that apply to particular relationships. In the event that a member of the College community is not clear which procedure applies in the relevant circumstances, they should seek guidance from their Head of Department or equivalent, who may seek further guidance as required. Where a relationship does not fall within a particular section below, members of the College community should, having considered the matter in accordance with the guidelines above, escalate any ethical concerns in accordance with section [6] below.

The majority of ethical review will occur when forming new relationships or extending existing relationships. However, members of the College community should also be aware of ethical concerns arising while relationships are on-going and escalate these concerns following the escalation processes set out below.

---

\(^7\) For example, the provision of funds to the College for research or other purposes should not cause the College to deviate from such procedures without specific clearance under the escalation processes set out in section 5.
A. Academic Collaborations

“Academic Collaboration” means a formal relationship of an academic nature entered into with third parties such as joint degree programmes, memoranda of understanding, joint institutes or centres and such similar relationships as are typically considered by the Registry.

Collaborative or consortia research\(^8\) grants are excluded from the definition and are considered through the research review process set out at section [E] below. Grants and other income which does not fall within the definition of Academic Collaboration and are not classified by HEFCE as research grants/research income are considered by the relevant Department/Faculty in accordance with section [F] below. For broader forms of academic collaboration such as co-authored papers, if ethical issues are identified these should raised following process for raising matters of general ethical concern set out at section [6] below: such matters are not treated as Academic Collaborations for the purposes of this policy.

The College has in place policies and procedures for certain collaborative arrangements and placements which lay out the approval and associated due diligence processes for establishing new Academic Collaborations.\(^9\) Staff are required to notify proposed Academic Collaborations to the Registry to enable these processes and procedures to operate effectively.

If during the design and/or negotiation of a new Academic Collaboration, an ethical or other concern is identified in light of the guidelines for reviewing relationships, this concern should be escalated to the Head of the Central Secretariat, who will review the concern and provide guidance. Matters that cannot then be resolved through the usual procedures for such Academic Collaborations will be referred to Senate.

A record of all proposed Academic Collaborations should be retained by Registry, including:

- Confirmation in each case that the Academic Collaboration has been approved/rejected by the appropriate College area/body, including from an ethical perspective.
- Details of escalations, recommendations and subsequent decisions
- Records of ethical due diligence carried out.
- All reports containing details of the ethical due diligence carried out/any recommendations made/signatures or documentation confirming approval
- Copies of material relationship documentation.

\(^8\) “Research” is to be defined in accordance with HEFCE’s research income definition
\(^9\) [http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/collaborative](http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/collaborative) [also procedure for review of MoUs]
B. Commercial Partnering

The College’s Corporate Partnerships team seeks to develop commercial partnerships with a range of organisations, whether on their own initiative or following a request for assistance from other College areas seeking to develop significant relationships. There will also be a wide variety of commercial relationships that are developed without input from the Corporate Partnerships team, including relationships that are specific to a research proposal or Academic Collaboration. In such cases, the Corporate Partnerships team will not have responsibility for carrying out ethical due diligence, unless this is specifically agreed. Such review should be undertaken by the relevant College area as specified in this policy. Where no specific College area is specified, it will be a matter for the relevant individual forming the relationship to consider the ethical aspects of any proposed commercial partnering and to consider whether it is necessary to escalate an issue in accordance with section [6] below.

The College has developed Guidelines for Establishing Corporate Partnerships[10] which lay out the approval and associated due diligence processes which will be undertaken by the College’s Corporate Partnerships team in conjunction with academic stakeholders when instigating or developing relationships on behalf of College stakeholders. [DN: not yet prepared].

If, during the negotiation of a partnership, an ethical concern is identified by a member of the Corporate Partnerships team, the relevant stakeholders should be advised and the matter should be escalated to the Director of Corporate Partnerships and academic champion for the relationship, who will review the concern and provide guidance. Matters that cannot be resolved at this level should be referred by the Director of Corporate Partnerships or relevant academic champion to the College Cabinet (via the Head of Central Secretariat) for decision. In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the College’s Council as required before coming to a decision.

In addition to the procedure above, any proposed commercial partnering involving sums of £100k and above, which is not being negotiated and authorised through the research funding or Academic Collaboration process, must be referred to the College Secretary & Registrar for review for ethical issues prior to completion of the contract negotiation process.

A record of all proposed commercial partnerships reviewed by the Corporate Partnerships team is to be retained by that team, including:

- Confirmation in each case that the Director of Corporate Partnerships and any academic champion for the relationship have approved/rejected the commercial partnering from an ethical perspective or escalated the matter to the Head of the Central Secretariat if a concern is raised or the College Secretary & Registrar if the applicable thresholds have been exceeded.
- Details of any subsequent approvals/rejections provided by the College Secretary & Registrar and/or College Cabinet/Audit Committee.
- All reports containing details of the ethical due diligence carried out/any recommendations made/signatures confirming approval.

[10][Insert link to agreed policy]
C. Philanthropic income and other gifts

This section relates to the receipt of philanthropic income and gifts, including legacies. For these purposes “philanthropic income” means:

(a) Income which does not confer full or partial ownership of a deliverable on the funder in return for the funding; and

(b) Income that is in essence (albeit not entirely) philanthropic.

“Gifts” include philanthropic income and other non-financial gifts of a philanthropic nature.

The College has developed Guidelines for Accepting Philanthropic Income and other Gifts which supersede the Gift Acceptance Policy (May 2012) and which lay out the approval and associated due diligence processes for accepting philanthropic income and other gifts, including legacies. This includes a review of the ethical considerations as well as the wider scope of any proposal.

The Director of Development must approve all gifts prior to receipt, including the terms of such gifts. Staff are required to notify proposed receipt of all philanthropic income and gifts (including proposed legacies) to the Development team to enable this process to operate effectively.

Responsibility for the review of proposed gifts rests with the Development Team, reporting to the Director of Development. In addition, where a Department/Faculty is affected by the gift, the gift will need to be considered and approved by that Department/Faculty and approved by the relevant Head of Department/Dean/equivalent prior to acceptance. The Development team should also seek input from other college areas as appropriate where income is not purely philanthropic.

If an ethical concern is identified during the solicitation or negotiation of philanthropic income or other gifts, this should be escalated to the Director of Development, who will review the concern and provide guidance. Matters that cannot be resolved at this level should be referred by the Director of Development to the College Cabinet (via the Head of Central Secretariat) for decision. In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the College’s Council as required before coming to a decision.

In addition, any proposed receipts of philanthropic income or other gifts involving sums or values of £100k and above must be referred to the College Secretary & Registrar for review and approval prior to acceptance.

Where gifts are accepted subject to certain conditions, care must be taken to properly reflect such conditions in the terms of the gift agreement or similar document to be entered into with the relevant donor.

---

11 [Insert link to agreed policy]
12 Staff should provide the details to their usual link within the Development Team. Where a member of staff does not have a specific link with a member of the Development Team, details should be provided to the Head of Operations.
A record of all philanthropic income and other gifts notified is to be retained by the Development Team, including:

- Confirmation in each case that the Director of Development has approved/rejected receipt or escalated the matter to the Head of Central Secretariat if an issue is raised or the College Secretary & Registrar if the £100k threshold has been exceeded.
- Details of any subsequent approvals/rejections provided by the College Secretary & Registrar and/or the College Cabinet/Audit Committee.
- Records of ethical due diligence carried out
- All reports containing details of the ethical due diligence carried out/any recommendations made/relevant signatures confirming approval.
- Copies of material relationship documentation.

D. Procurement, purchasing and supplier relationships

The College’s procurement and purchasing is governed by the Purchasing Regulations\(^\text{13}\) which set out the need for ethical matters to be considered in certain circumstances. The purchasing process should include a requirement upon all staff raising and authorising a new supplier request to confirm that no ethical issues are raised to their knowledge or set out any relevant ethical issues for further consideration by the Director of Financial Services and Procurement.

If during the appointment of a new supplier an ethical concern is identified, this should be escalated to the Director of Financial Services and Procurement, who will review the concern and provide guidance. Matters that cannot be resolved at this level should be referred by the Director of Financial Services and Procurement to the College Cabinet (via the Head of Central Secretariat) for decision. In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the College’s Council as required before coming to a decision.

A record is to be retained by the Purchasing Team of all proposed new suppliers raised under the procurement policies or otherwise, including:

- confirmation in each case that the Director of Financial Services and Procurement has approved/rejected the use of the supplier or escalated the matter to the College Cabinet where a concern was raised
- details of any subsequent approvals/rejections provided by the College Cabinet/Audit Committee
- records of ethical due diligence carried out
- all reports containing details of the ethical due diligence carried out/any recommendations made/signatures confirming approval.
- Copies of material relationship documentation.

\(^{13}\) [http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/purchasing/regulations](http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/purchasing/regulations)
A record should also be kept of any other ethical issues raised with the finance team and how that matter has been dealt with.

E. Research funding and related relationship agreements

For the purposes of this policy, “research” is defined in accordance with the HEFCE definition of research.

Neither the Ethical Code, nor the Relationship Review Policy, refer specifically to research ethics, which is subject to specific policies and procedures. Concerns about research misconduct should continue to be handled under the existing College policy for such matters. Grants or arrangements of a research nature which do not meet the HEFCE definition for research should be considered in accordance with section [F] below.

The College has in place review procedures relating to Bid Management, Faculty Approval and College Authorisation of Research Proposals and Related Agreements which require proper review of (amongst other things):

(a) research funding proposals; and
(b) research related agreements

within an agreed policy framework prior to approval by the relevant Head of Department or other authorised person with responsibility. Within each Faculty are Research Services teams who work closely with their Departments and the Research Office to secure the proper review of research matters in accordance with these procedures.

In addition to the existing review and approval procedures operated by the Departments in conjunction with the Research Services teams and the Research Office, the relevant Research Services team are required to conduct an appropriate ethical review both prior to submission of research proposals and prior to research related agreements being entered into. Research Services managers will be required to confirm that each matter has been considered from an ethical perspective at each of the stages and record the results of that review within the existing mechanisms for review and approval (currently the College’s InfoEd system).

Where the review raises an ethical concern, the relevant member of the Research Services team should advise the Head of Department or other authorised person and escalate the matter to the Director of the Research Office and the relevant Faculty Operating Officer/Faculty Dean simultaneously, who will each review the concern and, having discussed the matter between them, provide guidance. Where an ethical issue has been escalated, the confirmation of both the Faculty Operating Officer/Faculty Dean and the Director of the Research Office that the ethical matter has been resolved is required before any binding commitments are made. In the event that the Faculty Dean/Faculty Operating Officer and/or the Director of the Research Office is not satisfied that the matter has been resolved, the issue should be referred to the College Cabinet (via the Head of Central Secretariat) for decision. In the exceptional

---

event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the College’s Council as required before coming to a decision. Any such approvals should be captured on the InfoEd system (or subsequent replacement).

Where no ethical issues are raised, this will be confirmed to the relevant Head of Department or other authorised person to enable that individual to consider the wider implications of the proposal before indicating any approval.

As part of the general procedures for keeping records of research grant applications and related agreements, a record of all proposed research funding grant applications and research related agreements and approvals is to be retained by the Research Office/research services teams (as appropriate), including:

- confirmation in each case that the appropriate College authority has approved/rejected each grant application and the execution of each research related agreement or escalated the matter in accordance with the applicable policies and procedures
- Confirmation that all necessary approvals have been received under the applicable escalation procedures
- Records of the review process that has been conducted, including records of ethical due diligence carried out and all reports containing details of the ethical due diligence carried out/any recommendations made/approvals given
- Copies of material relationship documentation

F. Other income

The proposed receipt of any grants or similar income for purposes related to research and academic matters (including income from industry, charity and other sources) which do not meet the HEFCE criteria for research should be referred to the appropriate Faculty Finance team, who will be responsible for reviewing the proposal and for the conduct of appropriate ethical due diligence. The results of their review will be provided to the appropriate Faculty Operating Officer, who will consider whether or not to approve the proposed receipt.

This does not negate the need for a proposed Academic Collaboration (as that term is defined in section [A]) to be considered in accordance with the procedures for review and consideration of proposed Academic Collaborations.

Where the Faculty Finance team identify an ethical matter for further consideration, the Faculty Operating Officer will consider whether the matter can be resolved at Faculty level, in consultation with the Faculty Dean as appropriate. Matters that cannot be resolved at this level should be referred by the Faculty Operating Officer to the College Cabinet (via the Head of Central Secretariat) for decision. In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the College’s Council as required before coming to a decision.
Where this is required, the Faculty Operating Officer will seek appropriate input from the Research Office and/or Legal Services Office in connection with the form of the documentation to formalise any relationship relating to the receipt of non-research funding.

The Faculty Finance team shall keep a record of all such income and related documentation, including:

- confirmation in each case that the appropriate College authority has approved/rejected each receipt and the execution of each related agreement or escalated the matter in accordance with the applicable policies and procedures
- Confirmation that all necessary approvals have been received under the applicable escalation procedures
- Records of the review process that has been conducted, including records of ethical due diligence carried out and all reports containing details of the ethical due diligence carried out/any recommendations made/approvals given
- Copies of material relationship documentation

G. Overlap

It is acknowledged that there will be some instances where College needs to consider relationships or the receipt of income, review of which falls within the domain of more than one review regime. Where there are overlapping elements, the relevant College areas should discuss and agree where the responsibilities for review and any appropriate approvals should lie. Where there is a conflict of opinion which cannot be resolved the matter should be escalated to the Head of Central Secretariat, who will obtain guidance from the College Secretary & Registrar as appropriate.

6. General process – ethical matters

a. Matters not falling within sections A-F

Where an ethical matter is identified in connection with a relationship or a proposed relationship with a third party, and where the matter does not fall to be considered under the policies and procedures referred to at sections A-F above, members of the College community should raise that issue with their Head of Department for consideration and, where possible, resolution. Matters that cannot be resolved at this level should be referred by the Head of Department to the College Cabinet (via the Head of Central Secretariat) for decision. In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the College’s Council as required before coming to a decision.

b. All matters

Where any matter falling within the scope of this policy requires escalation to the College Secretary & Registrar and/or College Cabinet and/or Audit Committee, the individual charged with escalating the matter will be responsible for providing the proforma attached at Appendix A, setting out the issues and including (where appropriate) a recommendation as to how the matter should progress. Referrals should be made as early as possible in the process.
If there are any areas where the College Secretary & Registrar/College Cabinet/Audit Committee (as appropriate) requires more information on which to base a decision, these should be listed in the proforma and returned to the referring individual, who is responsible for arranging any additional due diligence checks and for collating any additional information requested before resubmitting the matter for further consideration.

The College Cabinet and/or Audit Committee should accept referrals by email between meetings where necessary so that issues can be considered before commitments need to be made.

7. Accountability reporting

The College Secretary & Registrar (in consultation with others as appropriate) should produce a report to the Audit Committee each term, outlining the ethical issues considered by him and by the College Cabinet and how such matters have been dealt with. Any concerns with how the Code or related policies are functioning should be included within the report.

The College aims to be transparent about relationships entered into, the parties involved, and the purposes of those relationships. However, there will be cases where anonymity should be properly respected, and College will carefully consider any requests for anonymity. The College will, however, disclose details of relationships where it is required to do so by law, by any applicable governmental or other regulatory authority, or by order of a court.

A report detailing gifts received will be included in the College’s annual Fundraising Report.
NOTIFICATION OF MATTER FOR ETHICAL CONSIDERATION
UNDER THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE RELATIONSHIP REVIEW POLICY

A. DETAILS OF INDIVIDUAL MAKING THE NOTIFICATION  (to be completed by the individual making
the notification, being one of the following: Head of Central Secretariat, Director of Corporate
Partnerships, Director of Development, Director of Financial Services and Procurement or Director of
the Research Office, Faculty Operating Officer, College Secretary & Registrar):

Name: [xx]
Position: [xx]
Date: [xx]

B. DETAILS OF THE ETHICAL ISSUE  (to be completed by the individual making the notification).

1. Type of relationship i.e. gift, corporate partnership, research partner etc) [xx]

2. Reason for notification (i.e. gift above £100k, corporate partnership above [£100k], ethical
concern arising in the course of due diligence or otherwise)

3. Is there a specific ethical issue that needs to be considered? (yes/no) [xx]

4. (If there is a specific ethical issue that needs to be considered) Detail of the ethical issue and
your recommendation as to how the matter should proceed: [xx]

5. Brief history of the matter (including whether the proposed relationship arises from a
solicitation from (or a contact within) Imperial College or from an independent approach): [xx]

6. Details of any non-standard or potentially onerous conditions proposed in connection with
the proposed gift/relationship: [xx]

7. Details of the due diligence that has been carried out and the results of that due diligence:
[xx]

8. Status of the relationship and timescales: (including details of the current status of
negotiations/previous contact between the College and relevant individual or organisation/
when it is intended that the relationship will be entered into): [xx]

9. Further comments and reference to additional documentation provided (include all further
details that you would like to draw to the attention of the decision maker and refer to all
supplementary documents included for review) [xx].
C. DETAILS OF FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED BY DECISION MAKER (to be completed by the College Secretary & Registrar where a matter has been referred to him/the College Cabinet or by the Clerk of the Audit Committee following a referral to that Committee)

Decision maker: [xx]

Name of person completing this section: [xx]

Date: [xx]

Further information required: (if none, please specify) [xx]

D. CONFIRMATION OF DECISION AND GUIDANCE (to be completed by the College Secretary & Registrar where a decision has been made by him/the College Cabinet or by the Clerk of the Audit Committee following a decision by that Committee)

Decision maker: [xx]

Name of person completing this section: [xx]

Date: [xx]

Do you/does the decision maker approve the proposed relationship? Yes/No

Details of any conditions attached to an approval: [xx]

Any further comments (please include details of further guidance or reasons where appropriate) [xx]
GUIDELINES FOR ACCEPTING PHILANTHROPIC INCOME AND OTHER GIFTS

These guidelines will be operative from [date].

These Guidelines are supplemental to the College Ethics Code and its Relationship Review Policy and supersede the Gift Acceptance Policy (May 2012). They are intended to set out the approval and associated due diligence processes for accepting philanthropic income and gifts, including legacies.

For the purposes of these guidelines, “philanthropic income” is:

(a) income which does not confer full or partial ownership of a deliverable on the funder in return for the funding; and
(b) Income that is in essence (albeit not entirely) philanthropic.

“Gifts” include philanthropic income and other non-financial gifts of a philanthropic nature.

1. INTRODUCTION

The College seeks and encourages charitable donations from a range of sources including individuals, companies, charitable trusts and foundations, alumni and friends of the College. These gifts may be in the form of cash, property, works of art, shares, in-kind services or pro-bono voluntary work.

However, as is acknowledged in the College’s Relationship Review Policy:

(a) All relationships with third parties should be subject to prior and continuing consideration in order to confirm that they support the College’s mission, vision and strategic aims and are consistent with the overall objectives of the College; and
(b) Careful review of proposed and on-going relationships is required in order to mitigate the risk of ethical issues causing damage to the College’s reputation, reducing the College’s ability to secure funding and reducing its capacity to develop beneficial relationships in the future.

Further consideration is also required to confirm that proposed receipts and the terms of such receipts are in the College’s best interest.

Accordingly, all gifts are accepted at the College’s discretion and following a proportionate review. This policy sets out the process for such review. The College reserves the right to refuse or refund any income thought not to meet these requirements.

2. RESPONSIBILITY FOR REVIEW

Responsibility for the review of proposed gifts rests with the Development Team, reporting to the Director of Development. This includes a review of the ethical considerations as well as the wider scope of any proposal.

Where the Development Team is considering the receipt of income which is in essence (albeit not entirely) philanthropic, the team should liaise with other relevant College areas as appropriate, to discuss and agree where the responsibilities for review and any appropriate approvals should lie. Where there is a conflict of opinion which cannot be resolved, the matter should be escalated to the Head of Central Secretariat, who will obtain guidance from the College Secretary & Registrar as appropriate.
Where a Department/Faculty is involved in the gift, the gift will need to be considered and approved by that Department/Faculty/other College area and approved by the relevant Head of Department/Dean/equivalent prior to acceptance.
3. ALL STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

All staff at the College have a responsibility to notify the proposed receipt of all gifts to the Development Team. Members of staff must give details of the proposed gift in the format developed by the Development Team.

Staff should provide the details to their usual link within the Development Team. Where a member of staff does not have a specific link with a member of the Development Team, details should be provided to the Head of Advancement Operations.

No action should be taken in relation to a proposed gift (or agreement of any terms of a gift) until confirmation has been provided by the Development Team that the matter has been considered by them, including from an ethical perspective, and that a decision has been made at the appropriate level that the income may be accepted.

4. REVIEW BY THE DEVELOPMENT TEAM

A. GENERAL

In line with the requirements of the Relationship Review Policy, when considering a proposed receipt of philanthropic income, the following guidelines will be considered by the Development Team (in light of the information they receive and the due diligence they conduct):

1. Proposed receipts and related arrangements should:
   a. Support the College’s mission, vision and strategic aims
   b. Be consistent with the overall objectives of the College

The mission of the College is: to embody and deliver world class scholarship, education and research in science, engineering, medicine and business, with particular regard to their application in industry, commerce and healthcare. It fosters multidisciplinary working internally and collaborates widely externally.

The College’s vision is:
   a. To remain a world-leading institution for scientific research and education.
   b. To harness the quality, breadth and depth of our research capabilities to address the difficult challenges of today and the future.
   c. To develop the next generation of researchers, scientists and academics.
   d. To provide an education for students from around the world that equips them with the knowledge and skills they require to pursue their ambitions.
   e. To make a demonstrable economic and social impact through the translation of our work into practice worldwide.
   f. To engage with the world and communicate the importance and benefits of science to society.

2. Proposed receipts and related arrangements should not:
   a. Compromise the College’s status as an independent institution
   b. Create material conflicts of interest
   c. Arise, in whole or in part, from illegal activity that might include: Tax evasion Fraud Bribery Violation of international conventions on human rights or the environment
Suppression or falsification of academic research

d. Lead the College to contravene data protection and/or freedom of information legislation

e. Require the College to be involved in action that is illegal

f. Require the College to suppress or falsify academic research

g. Require the College to deviate from its normal hiring, promotion, and contracting procedures

h. Require the College to provide special consideration for admission to its programmes of study

3. Judgement is required to ensure the College’s interests are maintained when reviewing a relationship if it has the potential to:

a. Restrict or limit academic freedom

b. Deter other from supporting or working with the College

c. Cause any other damage, including financial or reputational, to the College

d. Expose the College to potentially significant liability

Relationships where the sources of income or funding are difficult to establish require special scrutiny. In general, philanthropic income should not be accepted where the sources are unknown or cannot be verified.

Additional points the Development Team will need to consider before approving a proposed receipt/the terms of any such receipt include:

- **Additional costs** - Any additional costs associated with the acceptance of a philanthropic/development need to be clearly identified and agreed by those who will bear the burden of those costs.

- **Creditworthiness of the Donor** – where College will be relying on receipt of funds for certain purposes and/or where the College will be incurring financial obligations to third parties on the basis that promised funds will be received, appropriate credit checks should be carried out on the donor. A search of donation databases e.g. Factary Phi should also be used to check whether previous donations were fulfilled.

- **Intellectual property matters** - Where copyright or intellectual property issues are involved in connection with any proposed receipt, they must be clearly understood, and it must be checked that the College can comply with any associated requirements before any relationship is formalised.

- **Onerous or unusual terms and conditions** – the proposed terms of the gift must be clearly understood and appropriately documented. The Development Team will develop preferred gift terms which fundraisers will seek to agree with Donors. Any proposed gift terms departing from the preferred terms will require particular scrutiny.

- **Naming requirements** – any proposals regarding any naming benefits and use of the College brand must be in accordance with the College’s naming and branding policies.

- **Any requests for anonymity** – the College aims to be transparent about relationships entered into, such that any requests for anonymity should be carefully scrutinised. The College will, in any event, have to disclose details of relationships where it is required to do so by law, by any governmental or regulatory authority, or by order of a court.

- **Documentation of the Gift** – all gifts should be appropriately documented:

  (a) Where gifts are provided without restrictions, a letter will be sent to the donor thanking them for the gift and confirming that the gift will be used for the College’s charitable purposes.

  (b) Where gifts of less than £[50k] are provided with simple restrictions only, a letter will be sent to the donor thanking them for the gift and confirming that the gift will be used for the applicable purposes (which will be set out in full in the letter).
(c) Where active obligations are placed upon College and/or where sums of £[50k] or above are involved, a full gift agreement must be entered into.

(d) There may be other cases where it is appropriate for a formal gift agreement to be entered into. This will be considered by the Head of Advancement Operations on a case by case basis.

**B. DUE DILIGENCE PRACTICES**

In order to assist members of the Development Team to make informed decisions as to whether a proposed receipt should be approved in accordance with the guidelines above, due diligence shall be carried out in relation to potential receipts notified to the Development Team.

Due diligence will be conducted by the College’s Prospect Researcher(s). It is the responsibility of the relevant Development Officer to ensure that the Prospect Researcher is briefed on the nature of the proposal and any relevant issues.

The level of due diligence to be carried out will depend on the circumstances.

Where sums in excess of £[10k] are involved, prospects will be subject to **Standard due diligence**. This shall include:

- **Identity checking** - a review using sources which confirm a prospect’s identity e.g. Raiser Edge (for alumni), TraceSmart, Charity Commission, Companies House and FAME
- **Checking for high risk indicators** – an internet search using the prospect’s name and the following terms: tax evasion, fraud, human rights, falsification, falsification of academic research, bribe, bribery, controversy, crime
- **Biographical information search** – desk research looking at standard biographical information e.g. family members, career history
- **News source review** – broader reading of news sources regarding the prospect, seeking background information and any indications of controversy
- **Business database check** - a check on business databases (e.g. FAME and Hemscott) to analyse how a prospect acquired their wealth, including analysis of subsidiary companies, and to identify potential conflicts of interest
- **Charity Commission review** - a check of the charitable organisations linked to the prospect using the Charity Commission website
- **Public records check** - a search of online court papers for outcomes of legal proceedings involving the prospect and/or associated companies
- **Bankruptcy and court judgement check** – a search using databases e.g. Tracesmart to locate any bankruptcy or court judgements
- **College history** - a check of the College’s records (e.g. using Raiser’s Edge and electronic search tools) for information regarding previous College relationships and cultivation history. This includes details of previous donations.

Where sums in excess of £[50k] are involved, prospects will be subject to **Full due diligence** (in addition Standard due diligence). This shall include:

- **Further internet search** – further search engine research to locate possible connections to persons of disrepute e.g. fraudsters, criminals or controversial figures
- **Human Rights/environment/other record checks** – a review of research reports from NGOs e.g. Amnesty, Human Rights Watch, Greenpeace etc to consider human rights, environmental or other ethical issues

Where gifts are to be received over a specified period, the thresholds above should be considered by reference to the total values anticipated. Where gifts are to be provided over an unspecified period (unless it is clear that the values will exceed the relevant thresholds in which case the appropriate level of due diligence should be conducted) the value of the gift over the first five years should be used when assessing whether the thresholds have been reached.
It is noted that often quick decisions need to be made in relation to acceptance of gifts. To this end, the College’s Prospect Researcher(s) shall endeavour to:

- Complete all Standard due diligence and reporting within 3 working days
- Complete all Full due diligence and reporting within one week.

**A note on legacies**

Where gifts are being provided to the College under the terms of a will, appropriate due diligence needs to be taken place both at the stage a pledge is made and at the stage that the pledge is fulfilled.

The due diligence should follow the requirements set out above for non-legacy gifts. An assessment should be made at the time of the pledge as to the value of the gift likely to be received in respect of the legacy, where possible, and due diligence should be undertaken accordingly. Where the position is unclear, guidance should be sought from the Director of Development. Due diligence should be carried out according to the actual value to be received prior to acceptance of gifts in fulfilment of a pledge.

**A note on continuing relationships**

It is acknowledged that the position as regards an existing donor may change over time. Accordingly, where funding continues, the Development Team will review all gifts within [five] years of receipt and at [five-yearly] intervals thereafter. In the event that the Development Team have reason to believe that a review is required at an earlier point in time, a review shall be carried out accordingly.

**C. CONSIDERATION WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT TEAM/COLLEGE SECRETARY & REGISTRAR**

The Director of Development must approve all gifts prior to receipt, including the terms of such gifts. Additionally, any proposed receipts of gifts (including legacies) involving values of £100k and above must be referred to the College Secretary & Registrar for review prior to acceptance.

To this end:

(a) A full report will be compiled by the Prospect Researcher, with further input as required from the Head of Advancement Operations, detailing any adverse findings identified during the due diligence process within one week of receiving a request for review. The report will be provided to Director of Development (and the College Secretary & Registrar as appropriate) for consideration.

The legal and reputational rights of potential donors will be considered as part of this process. A clear distinction will be drawn between rumour or speculation and matters of confirmed fact or legal finding, while also accepting that the College may wish to consider the reputational risks to the College that could be incurred through public perception of association with any potential donor.

(b) A further report will be complied by the Head of Advancement Operations detailing the proposed terms of receipt, highlighting any additional issues (including in relation to costs, intellectual property, onerous terms and conditions, proposed departures from the College’s preferred gift terms/precedent gift agreement etc). A draft deed of gift or confirmation letter (as appropriate) shall be attached to the report. The report will be provided to the Director of Development (and the College Secretary & Registrar as appropriate) for consideration within one week of receipt of the proposed terms.
The Director of Development will notify his/her decision (following approval by the College Secretary & Registrar/College Cabinet/Audit Committee in appropriate cases) including any specific conditions of acceptance and guidance, as soon as possible.

In the event that the Director of Development does not feel able to approve a proposed receipt as a result of any ethical considerations identified, the decision may be escalated in accordance with the escalation procedure set out below.

The Development Team shall seek advice as required from the support functions within the College when assessing the proposed terms of any gift.
5. CONSIDERATION BY THE INTENDED BENEFICIARY

Where a gift is to be given without restriction, this may be accepted by the Development Team following its review. It shall be for the President to determine how the gift may be used.

Where a gift is to be given for specific purposes, the relevant Head of Department/Dean/equivalent (as appropriate) must confirm that they will accept gifts for such purposes prior to any commitment being made. The relevant individual must be made fully aware (in writing) of any restrictions on the use of the gift.

Where a gift is to be given that places any active obligations on a Department/Faculty/other area of College, the Head of Department/Dean/equivalent (as appropriate) must be satisfied that the relevant Department/Faculty/other College area can honour such obligations. The Development Team will highlight any areas for particular consideration.

6. CONSIDERATION OF NON-PHILANTHROPIC ELEMENTS

In the event that the Development Team receives details of a proposed a non-philanthropic receipt, it shall notify the Corporate Partnerships team/Research Office/other College area (as appropriate) to allow them to carry out appropriate review. If the Development Team cannot identify a team in College with responsibility for review of the non-philanthropic elements of the proposed receipts, it shall notify the Head of Central Secretariat, who will seek the opinion of the College Cabinet if necessary, and who will make any necessary directions for where the review will take place.

7. ESCALATION OF ETHICAL ISSUES

If the Director of Development identifies an area of concern during the solicitation/negotiation or review of a proposed receipt, the Director of Development shall consider the matter and direct and provide guidance to the members of the Development Team as appropriate. Matters that cannot be resolved at this level should be referred by the Director of Development to the College Cabinet (via the Head of Central Secretariat) for decision. A formal referral is required using the pro-forma attached at Appendix A.

In the exceptional event that consensus cannot be reached in this forum, a formal reference should be made by the College Secretary & Registrar to the Audit Committee, which will seek further advice from College employees, third parties and the College’s Council as required before coming to a decision. A formal referral is required using the pro-forma attached at Appendix A.

In addition, any proposed receipts (including legacies) involving values of £100k and above must be referred to the College Secretary & Registrar for review prior to acceptance. A formal referral is required using the pro-formal attached at Appendix A. Where receipts are anticipated or promised over a specified period, the threshold should be considered by reference to the total amounts/values anticipated. Where receipts are anticipated/promised over an unspecified period (unless it is clear that the values will exceed the relevant thresholds) the value over the first five years should be relevant in assessing whether the threshold is reached.

(The pro-forma attached at Appendix A provides a mechanism for a decision maker/decision making body to request further information to enable it to come to a decision and a formal method by which the decision may be notified and any guidance provided.)
8. RECORD KEEPING

A record of all gifts notified to the Development Team will be retained by the Development Team, including:

- Confirmation in each case that the Director of Development (or delegated authority) has approved/rejected receipt or escalated the matter to the Head of Central Secretariat if an issue is raised or the College Secretary & Registrar if the £100k threshold has been exceeded;
- Details of any subsequent approvals/rejections provided by the College Secretary & Registrar and/or the College Cabinet/Audit Committee.
- Records of ethical and other due diligence carried out
- All reports containing details of the due diligence carried out/any recommendations made/relevant signatures confirming approval
- Copies of material relationship documentation

9. ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTING AND TRANSPARENCY

The College Secretary & Registrar (in consultation with the Director of Development and others as appropriate) will produce a report to the Audit Committee each term, outlining the ethical issues considered by him/her and by the College Cabinet and how such matters have been dealt with. Any concerns with how the Code or related policies are functioning will be included within the report.

The College aims to be transparent about relationships entered into and a report detailing gifts received will be included in the College’s Annual Fundraising Report.
APPENDIX A

NOTIFICATION OF MATTER FOR ETHICAL CONSIDERATION
UNDER THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE RELATIONSHIP REVIEW POLICY

E. DETAILS OF INDIVIDUAL MAKING THE NOTIFICATION (to be completed by the individual making the notification, being one of the following: Head of Central Secretariat, Director of Corporate Partnerships, Director of Development, Director of Financial Services and Procurement or Director of the Research Office, College Secretary & Registrar):

Name: [xx]
Position: [xx]

F. DETAILS OF THE ETHICAL ISSUE (to be completed by the individual making the notification).

10. Type of relationship i.e. gift, corporate partnership, research partner etc) [xx]

11. Reason for notification (i.e. gift above £100k, corporate partnership above [£100k], ethical concern arising in the course of due diligence or otherwise)

12. Is there a specific ethical issue that needs to be considered? (yes/no) [xx]

13. (If there is a specific ethical issue that needs to be considered) Detail of the ethical issue and your recommendation as to how the matter should proceed: [xx]

14. Brief history of the matter (including whether the proposed relationship arises from a solicitation from (or a contact within) Imperial College or from an independent approach): [xx]

15. Details of any non-standard or potentially onerous conditions proposed in connection with the proposed gift/relationship: [xx]

16. Details of the due diligence that has been carried out and the results of that due diligence: [xx]

17. Status of the relationship and timescales: (including details of the current status of negotiations/previous contact between the College and relevant individual or organisation/ when it is intended that the relationship will be entered into): [xx]

18. Further comments and reference to additional documentation provided (include all further details that you would like to draw to the attention of the decision maker and refer to all supplementary documents included for review) [xx].

G. DETAILS OF FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED BY DECISION MAKER (to be completed by the College Secretary & Registrar where a matter has been referred to him/the College Cabinet or by the Clerk of the Audit Committee following a referral to that Committee)
Further information required: (if none, please specify) [xx]

H. CONFIRMATION OF DECISION AND GUIDANCE (to be completed by the College Secretary & Registrar where a decision has been made by him/the College Cabinet or by the Clerk of the Audit Committee following a decision by that Committee)

Do you/the Committee approve the proposed relationship? Yes/No

Details of any conditions attached to an approval: [xx]

Any further comments (please include details of further guidance or reasons where appropriate) [xx]

[Sign off mechanism to be included]
ANNEX 1: ETHICS CODE AND RELATIONSHIP REVIEW POLICY COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

The plan is for implementation following approval of the Relationship Review Policy and Ethics Code by Council.

STAKEHOLDER LIST

1. Stakeholders requiring detailed briefing (as they are likely to use the policy on a regular basis)

- Deans and Management Board / Cabinet
- Heads of Academic Departments
- Faculty Operating Officers
- Departmental Operations Managers
- Support / professional services directors and teams:
  - Director of Research Office and direct reports
  - Faculty research services teams / Medicine JRO
  - Director of Corporate Partnerships and Corporate Partnerships Managers
  - Director of Development and development / fundraising teams (in both College centre and Business School)
  - Faculty Finance Officers and finance teams
  - Director of Financial Services and Procurement and purchasing and procurement team
  - Registry and International Recruitment teams
  - Head of Legal Services Office

2. Stakeholders who should be made aware of the new policy and kept informed (as they may have to implement the policy occasionally, or have an interest in ethics related issues)

- Director / Deputy Director of HR and direct reports
- Director of Graduate School
- President of ICU

PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In month after approval at Council</th>
<th>All staff</th>
<th>Staff for detailed briefing (group 1)</th>
<th>Make aware / keep informed staff (group 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First available opportunity.</td>
<td>Note in Rector’s briefing</td>
<td>Email communication to managers outlining policy and inviting staff to seminars / short training sessions for staff closely involved in this field (e.g. Corporate Partnership managers, research services staff). Request that managers reference the new policy in team meetings and cascade to staff.</td>
<td>Email communication outlining policy with link to full policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In week after Council.</td>
<td>Note in Reporter</td>
<td>Support for managers in the development / alteration of local level processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News item on staff webpage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In week after Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In three months after approval at Council

| Staff for detailed briefing (group 1) | • Training seminars available for teams on request.  
• Presentation before HoDs dinner in October. |

On-going communication

| All staff | • Ethics hub on College website with policy and links to related policies.  
• Consider feasibility of E-training courses for staff. |

REVIEW OF POLICY

One year after approval at Council

| Staff for detailed briefing (group 1) | • Communication requesting feedback on implementation of policy in preparation for formal review at Audit Committee. |
INTRODUCTION

1. This Annual Report highlights significant equality-related activities and achievements for the period May 2012 - May 2013. The document contains:

   - an Executive Summary which provides an overview of activity in relation to last year’s objectives and identifies where further efforts are required which, in turn, are our recommended priorities for the year to come; the Executive Summary also includes ‘at a glance’ statistics;

   - an Annex (1) which provides a ‘traffic light’ summary of progress against the priorities which were set in last year’s Annual Report.

2. The Management Board considered the Report at its meeting on 28 June 2013 and endorsed the recommendations to focus upon specific activities highlighted in para. 6 and to continue the activities as shown in para. 7. Council is asked to consider the Report and recommended actions. (The full Annual Report, which provides greater detail on our activities and progress, and relevant staff and student data, is available on the website).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES DURING THE REPORT PERIOD

3. We have continued to focus upon those areas of significant inequality and lack of diversity which were identified last year, and these objectives were underpinned by analysis of our staff and student profile data. Our commitment to this strategy was strengthened by decisions made at the E&DC’s Away Afternoon, held on 11 October 2012 (attended by six members of the Management Board), where specific projects were initiated. Our most significant priorities between May 2012 and May 2013 have been:

   i. improving the representation and experience of disabled staff and students;

   ii. eliminating or minimising any disadvantages, including harassment or bullying, experienced by staff and students due to one or more of the protected characteristics; ¹

¹ age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation
iii. increasing the representation of female staff and those who declare as Black and Minority Ethnic (BME);
iv. increasing academic diversity;
v. increasing commitment to, and engagement with, equality and diversity issues.

HIGHLIGHTS

4. Success and progress can be reported in relation to the above objectives:

- Priority i. - considerable strengthening of support for disabled staff and students following approval of additional resource;
- Priority ii. - gaining an institutional Athena Silver SWAN Award in April 2013 and increasing the number of departmental SWAN Award winners from 9 to 11 – see Annex (2);
- Priority ii. - increasing equality-related activity organised, and supported by, Imperial College Union;
- Priorities ii and v. - Imperial Expectations (IEs) embedded in all significant HR processes and staff development activity, and phase 2 of the project has begun;
- Priority v. - strengthened institutional awareness and understanding of the requirement to promote equality and eliminate discrimination and harassment - the number of staff attending training with an exclusive equality focus has increased (170 in 2010, 199 in 2011, 226 in 2012);
- Priority v. - ground gained in the pursuit of ‘hearts and minds’ via the provision of equality data and visits to Head of Departments leading to explicit Faculty action plans.

LOWLIGHTS

5. Our gender and ethnic origin representation profile remains an issue in spite of the considerable amount of activity that is undertaken to engender change. In relation to last year’s objective (Priorities iii. and iv. above) regarding staff and student representation, no progress has been made in relation to the following:

- female representation in the academic and senior support grades has remained almost static over the last five years;
- the percentage of female undergraduates has remained static at around 34% since 2008-09; the percentage of female research postgraduates (PGR) has fallen steadily since 2009-10 from 38.1% to 35%;
- there has been an overall decrease in staff, and undergraduate and postgraduate research students, who declare as BME.
6. In addition, we have lost ground in relation to data capture which affects our ability to monitor and make tailored decisions:

- there has been a significant increase in the number of staff who have not declared their ethnic origin – up from 7.9% unknown to 11.9%;
- the declaration of disability rate for staff has decreased to 2.4% (169 staff) from 3.2% (222 staff) in 2011 – 3 staff changed their status to No Known Disability and most of the other 50 were leavers (exit interviews/questionnaires have not highlighted any problems specifically relating to problems experienced by disabled staff); there has also been an increase in the percentage for whom we have no data – as the total number of employees has increased, the implication is that new staff are choosing not to make a declaration;
- the percentage of undergraduates whose ethnic origin is unknown (almost 40%) is significant.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR 2013-14

7. Approval is sought for us to continue significant and focused effort on the specific following actions:

a. implement and monitor the recommendations of the *Academic Diversity Task Force* which are being brought before the Management Board at its June meeting (this initiative arose directly from the Oct. 2012 ‘Away Afternoon’ where data was presented which showed declining female representation below professor and marginal and static BME representation at all academic levels) see Annex (3);

b. implement and monitor the ‘*Giving Imperial Expectations Teeth*’ 2013-14 project (phase 2), whereby we continue to embed the seven guiding behavioural ‘Expectations’ and map where the gaps are in understanding and day-to-day implementation so as to plug them (similarly, this initiative came from the ‘Away Afternoon’ discussion);

c. reverse the downward trend on the *collection of data for staff and students* as this is affecting our capacity to analyse and make informed decisions – action will include: the annual request to staff to declare, emails from HoDs to encourage disclosure, HR to explain the reasons and benefits of disclosure to new staff, staff advisory groups to encourage disclosure; for students, action will include: encourage declaration at future Welcome Weeks and by the Disability Advisory Service (DAS);

d. implement the equality-related priorities arising from the *Education and Student Strategy* so as to achieve a world-class student experience, with a core focus on the cultural considerations arising from an international student cohort;

e. respond to the main issues arising from the survey of *returning mothers following maternity/adoption leave*;
f. implement and monitor the action plans which have resulted from the **disabled staff and student surveys** (overseen by the Disability Action Committee) and the **Imperial As One (IAO) survey**.

8. We will continue to:

- analyse why we have not made progress with our representation figures, assess what activities have achieved more success than others, identify if other, similar organisations are experiencing the same trends, and to continue to learn from best practice elsewhere;
- address our representation issues for staff and students through a wide variety of activities including: changes to recruitment and selection and admissions procedures, widening participation, positive action staff development, equality briefings, management development and unconscious bias training, responding to the results of the maternity survey;
- increase knowledge and understanding of equality and inclusion and support Deans, Heads of Departments and senior managers to implement best equalities practice for staff and students;
- provide administrative and professional central support to our staff advisory groups;
- implement the programme of action to promote understanding of the Two Ticks scheme via guidance, briefings and training - it is clear that it raises questions for many recruiters;
- implement training, communications and publicity to increase understanding and engender change.

**AT A GLANCE – OUR ‘REPRESENTATION’ ISSUES FOR STAFF AND STUDENTS**

9. Our representation issues are highlighted below.

**STAFF**

**STAFF 2 - Gender**

- female representation in the academic and senior support grades has not increased (numbers have remained almost static over the last five years)
- relative success has been achieved with female professors where the number and proportion has increased steadily since 2007 – from 60 (11.6%) to 86 (15.5%)
- the number of female staff in the research grades continues to increase slightly year on year

---

2 staff data is taken from the 2012 annual November Diversity Snapshot
STAFF - Ethnic Origin

- the most startling statistic over the past year is the significant increase in the number of staff who have not declared their ethnic origin – up from 7.9% unknown to 11.9% (the majority of those who are not declaring are research staff or those in grades 1-4)
- 24 out of 25 staff at the most senior managerial grade, Level 7, are white with 1 unknown

STAFF – Disability

- while 2011 showed a steady year-on-year increase in the declaration rate to 3.2%, 2012 shows that the declaration rate has decreased to 2.4% and there is an increase in the percentage where we have no data

STUDENTS

STUDENTS – Gender

- the percentage of female undergraduates began to fall in 2005-06 and has remained static at around 34% since 2008-09
- the percentage of female taught postgraduates (PGT) increased slightly in 2010-11 but remained almost static since last year at 43.7%
- the percentage of female research postgraduates (PGR) has fallen steadily since 2009-10 from 38.1% to 35%
STUDENTS – Ethnic Origin

- **Undergraduates** – apart from those declaring as Pakistani, the number and percentage of those from a known BME background have fallen and particularly noticeable is the fall in the, already small, Black category; the percentage of those categorised as ‘not known’ or ‘information refused’ is significant at almost 40% although unchanged over the last two years
- **PGTs** – the number and percentage of those with a known BME background remains largely static but there is a relatively significant increase in those who are Chinese
- **PGRs** – the number and percentage of those declaring as white has increased; the number and percentage of those declaring as Chinese has increased since 2009-10 but remained static last year; there is a notable decrease in the number and percentage of those declaring as Black African

STUDENTS – Disability

- the number and percentage of students formally declaring a disability has fallen slightly since last year – down to 609 (3.9%) from 655 (4.1%) - however, as last year, the number declaring to the Disability Advisory Service (DAS) continues to increase – from 870 in Oct. 2011 to 997 in Oct. 2012

STUDENTS – Attainment

- male undergraduates consistently receive more firsts while females are awarded more upper second degrees; there is no gender difference for lower second and third degrees
- the number of firsts achieved by BME students is rising – from 31% to 33%, but is still below the 40% figure for white students – however, 40% of students whose ethnic origin is unknown obtained a first
there is considerable fluctuation in the attainment of firsts for disabled students year on year, but the attainment levels for those who have declared a disability, or who have no known disability, are roughly equal for 2.1s
## Summary of Progress Against Priorities set in the 2012 Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFIC PRIORITIES</th>
<th>ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN</th>
<th>ACTION STATUS3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Continue to work with departments on the results of the 2011 staff survey. Visits to HoDs by Director and Deputy Director HR to discuss and evaluate progress on local action plans; training programmes delivered to specific teams to address issues raised e.g. bullying / management development. Action continues.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Support HoDs to incorporate best equalities practice. Comprehensive equality data supplied to all HoDs in Engineering and Natural Sciences and meetings held to discuss issues raised by the data and to agree actions as required. Visits led to reports from both Deans to the MB. Business School and Medicine are to be visited in the second half of 2013.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Implement recommendations arising from the review of recruitment and selection. Incorporated unconscious bias into recruitment and selection training; increased the number of trained HR briefers so that workshops are being provided locally; recruitment and selection guidance thoroughly overhauled; expanded ‘outreach’ to showcase us as an employer to a wider range of prospective employees. Commitment to Equality statement still to be agreed with a wide range of key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Green Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>and g. Implement a programme of training on unconscious bias, including Management Board participation. Provider has been identified and programmes to begin in the new academic year.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Increase the collection of personal details data from staff and individuals. Disclosure rates have decreased rather than increased, particularly in relation to ethnicity and disability for staff, and for ethnicity for students.</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Implement our Equality Objectives and monitor progress on our five KPIs (which help to measure the objectives’ outcomes): Considerable activity has been undertaken to progress our Equality Objectives with examples of success being: continuous improvement of the experience of disabled staff and students; greater awareness of equality issues evidenced by increased take up of training, visits to HoDs and the development of Faculty Action Plans; actions to improve the ‘staff experience’ enhanced by a focus on <em>Imperial Expectations</em>; representation issues being addressed to some extent by activity in relation to recruitment and selection and admissions practice but progress in respect of representation KPIs is disappointing.</td>
<td>Amber Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>senior level/decision – making representation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>student representation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>student attainment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>gender representation for academic and research staff;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>overall ethnic origin representation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTINUED EFFORTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN</th>
<th>ACTION STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. Further develop our training and expertise on non-confrontational approaches to discipline and conflict resolution; review influencing factors on race equality and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>Website introduced; guidance publicised; cohort of mediators trained who are being used to resolve conflict. The promotion of race equality and cultural diversity are already to the fore in conflict resolution and further consultation with staff advisory groups will be undertaken.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Continue our widening participation and outreach activities in line with the College’s Access Agreement and OFA criteria.</td>
<td>A wide variety of events offered for school pupils and teachers e.g. over 2000 pupils attended workshops; 150 places available for primary school children at the Reach Out Lab etc.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Continue to exhibit and celebrate positive practice across the College and sector.</td>
<td>Active members of equality-related forums; supporters of positive action initiatives e.g. Gen Y and Amos.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Continue to update equality website and sources of information and promote equality provision.</td>
<td>Regularly updated</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Continue to monitor and analyse data, provide progress reports and regularly revisit targets and objectives.</td>
<td>Data analysed in-depth annually; progress reports provided at each E&amp;DC meeting; targets and objectives reviewed and set at October 2012 ‘Away Afternoon’.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Continue positive action development.</td>
<td>Examples included: ‘Calibre’ for disabled staff; ‘iLead’ for BME managers; Female Academics’ Development Centre.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Continue with the implementation of Imperial Expectations to improve managerial behaviour and ‘staff experience’.</td>
<td>Imperial Expectations included within all major processes relating to employment and feature highly in relevant staff development programmes; communication plan implemented. Major focus has been on monitoring and evaluation. Work continues.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Continue to work to improve provision and support for disabled staff and students.</td>
<td>Recruitment of staff has strengthened support to both staff and students and details of activities are in the full Annual Report.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The Athena SWAN Awards: Briefing Note for Council

The Athena SWAN Charter was founded in 2005 and is managed by the Equality Challenge Unit with funding from the ECU, the Royal Society, the Biochemical Society and the Dept. of Health. It has 6 principals which centre around the promotion of excellence in the employment of women in academia in STEMM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine) subjects. There is currently some discussion about extending the scope to arts, humanities and social science.

Imperial College was a founder member of the Charter and Professor Dame Julia Higgins is currently the Patron.

The Charter has 3 levels of Award: Bronze, Silver and Gold. Awards can be held at Departmental and Institutional level. The Awards scheme has attracted a lot of attention in the last couple of years since Dame Sally Davies, the Chief Medical Officer, said that departments would be required to hold Silver level awards to continue to be eligible for BRC and other NIHR funding. This has put substantial levels of funding at risk in many universities including our own. And now other funders such as the Research Councils are also starting to require some evidence of commitment and action toward enabling equality and diversity. Athena SWAN Awards are one of their recognised indicators.

As an early member of the Charter Imperial College has been encouraging and more recently requiring all of its Departments to apply for Awards. Our view is that the Awards encourage good employment practice across the College regardless of gender issues. Departments which currently hold Awards are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silver Awards:</th>
<th>Bronze Awards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Heart and Lung Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationally 3 Departments hold Gold Awards. A Gold application from our Chemistry Department is currently being reviewed.
At the institutional level Imperial College is one of only 3 universities to hold a Silver University Award. 18 hold Bronze Awards.

Professor Dot Griffiths
Chair, Academic Opportunities Committee
ANNEX 3

ACADEMIC DIVERSITY TASK FORCE - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Seeking out a more diverse range of candidates

1. Improve recruitment guidance  
   - Establishment of departmental search committees to proactively identify candidates  
   - Departments to maintain bank of names  

2. Recruitment material to make clearer college commitment to diversity  
   - Improved wording in adverts  
   - Broader criteria in person specification  
   - Consult with Consul about re-advertising if less than say 10 applicants apply  
   - Vacancies to be posted on sites that widen potential pool of applicants  

3. Improve communication for ‘open call’ recruitment (where number, level and subject area of posts depends on number of applicants)  

Shortlisting and interviews

4. Rigorously apply training policy for all involved in selection  

5. Guidance on pre and post interviews to be added to procedures  

6. Establish ‘panel pool’ to increase panel diversity  

Role of College Consuls

7. Enhance Consuls’ recruitment role to address equality and diversity  
   - any position not to be advertised openly must be subject to Consul approval  
   - information on pre-interview recruitment process must be available for confidential inspection by Consuls in advance of interview  
   - Key recruitment information (where advertised, number shortlisted) to be captured on revised Consul sign off form (or by alternative method)  
   - Consuls to undertake refresher training on unconscious bias  

8. Consuls to provide annual audit report by Faculty to each of Faculty Deans, with overview provided to Equality and Diversity Committee  

Data Collection and Quality

9. Additional data to be collected (eg on reasons for leaving, on why offers are declined, on successful and unsuccessful candidates for JRFs etc) and reported to EDC  

Post appointment

10. Improve welcome to new appointees through amended guidance, and potentially through establishment of a ‘Welcome Service’  

PAPER F

IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION IMPACT REPORT

A Note by the President of the Imperial College Union

The Imperial College Union Impact Report is published separately by the Union and for this reason not included with these published minutes.
PAPER G

DATES OF FUTURE COUNCIL MEETINGS

A Note by the Clerk to the Council

1. Attached at Annex A is a proposed schedule for Council Meetings for the years 2013-14 to 2016-17.

2. The Council is invited to consider and, if it sees fit, approve the dates for future meetings as set out in Annex A.

J.N.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Council Meeting (20 Sep 13)</td>
<td>Council Meeting (19 Sep 14)</td>
<td>Council Meeting (18 Sep 15)</td>
<td>Council Meeting (16 Sep 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>No meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>Easter Sunday: 27 Mar 16</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Easter Sunday 20 Apr 14</td>
<td>Easter Sunday: 5 April 15</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>Easter Sunday: 16 April 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Financial Management Report contains information that is commercially confidential and for that reason has not been included with these published minutes.
ENDOWMENT REPORT

A paper by the Chairman of the Endowment Board

ENDOWMENT 13/14 BUDGET & PLAN

1. The Endowment 13/14 budget and 3 year plan reflects the restructuring of the Endowment into the Unitised Scheme, the Non Core Property portfolio and the Strategic Asset Investments portfolio (formerly Innovations).

2. Following the outsourcing of the Unitised Scheme to independent fund managers, the plan assumes investment growth of 7% and a Scheme value of £209m by the end of the plan period; supporting an in perpetuity capacity to distribute £8.3m back to College.

3. The plan shows the Non Core Property portfolio’s operational surplus increasing to £1.5m based on a property portfolio of £130m. The plan assumes no further reclassification of property between the College and the Endowment, but it is assumed that where opportunities arise through the masterplanning process the existing Non Core Property protocols will be applied.

4. The Strategic Asset Investment portfolio assumes no equity investment into Innovations but an annual £200k investment into Ceres Power to maintain our 2.4% holding; funded from a £5m overdraft facility from College. The plan assumes no dividend from Innovations throughout the plan period.

5. At a consolidated level, the Endowment will target growth up to £434m in the plan period, and the detail of the plan is set out at Annex A. It is submitted to Council for approval.

YEAR TO DATE 12/13

6. At the consolidated level, the position of the Endowment Fund at 31 May 2013 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Asset Classes</th>
<th>31 Jul 12</th>
<th>31 May 13</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitised Scheme**</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>149.3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Asset Investments</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Core Property</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Fund</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Total</td>
<td>305.6</td>
<td>361.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Net of new donations, endowments and distributions
** Net of debt
UNITISED SCHEME

7. Following the outsourcing of the Unitised Scheme, the Endowment Board invited all three fund managers to attend the most recent Endowment Board meeting to present their current strategies and explain their view of the investment environment. It was pleasing that all three fund managers had different views on the economic outlook and had constructed their individual portfolios accordingly. The Endowment Board will assess their individual portfolios on an annual basis.

8. A performance return of 14% for the 10 months ended 31 May 2013 resulted in a £20m increase in the Unitised Scheme value, against a benchmark return of 16.7%.

9. Post out-sourcing, Unitised Scheme performance returned 4.5% (increase in value of £6.5m). This was below the benchmark performance of 8% since, although Ingenious and Ruffer immediately deployed the majority of their capital, overall market exposure reduced below the historical 70% level due to Schroder’s cautious approach. ARC’s monthly update for May 2013 is included at Annex B.

10. The remaining 10% return (£13.5m increase in value) was achieved pre-outsourcing with strong absolute and comparative returns across the portfolio.

11. The remaining £17m increase in value resulted from significant structural changes to the Unitised Scheme during the 5 months ended 31 December 2012, in preparation for the outsourcing:

   a. The £8.9m proceeds from the completion of Griffon Studios phase 2 were allocated to the Defence Fund; increasing the Defence fund to £14.1m. The Defence Fund was then unitised on 30 Sept 2012;

   b. The Unitised Scheme realised £8.3m cash from its Wood Lane Studios investment on 27th Nov 2012 and expected to receive an additional £1.3m cash distribution from the Woodlands SPV in early 2013, of which £440k was received in April 2013 with the balance due in Q3 2013.

NON CORE PROPERTY – MANAGEMENT

12. Following the structural changes that have taken place within the Endowment over the last 12 months – with the removal of the role of Chief Executive – the Endowment Board have reviewed and clarified the system for the management and reporting of the Non Core Property portfolio.

13. The Board noted that under the Ordinances of the University, the Endowment Board has delegated authority in relation to non-core assets to manage them ‘as it sees fit’, and appoint ‘any persons including a company or firm to act as independent advisors or investment managers’.

14. The Board reaffirmed that the Director of Financial Management will remain as
nominated executive with authority and responsibility for the portfolio but approved the proposal to introduce different management models for the operational and developmental portfolios.

15. Up until now, the operational portfolio (which makes up 70% of the Non Core Property portfolio by value) has been managed by an in-house Endowment Operations Manager, who holds the operational budget, and – with support from the Finance Division – reports on the position on a monthly basis to the Director of Financial Management. The day-to-day property management is outsourced to Savills in their role as Corporate Real Estate Advisors. This will remain broadly unchanged, although the operations manager function will now be carried out from within the core staff of the university, reporting and being accountable to the Director of Financial Strategy in the same manner. A 12 month handover period has been agreed to enable the new operational team to review existing management and reporting systems, and make improvements and reallocate resource where necessary.

16. The Development Pipeline is ‘lumpy’, diverse and with wildly differing potential returns and deliverables from project to project. In addition, there is insufficient volume to warrant a full time in house Endowment Development team. The Board authorised the Director of Financial Strategy to hold a budget for feasibility and pre-planning expenditure to enable opportunities to be taken forward to a point where the development can then be submitted for approval by the Board. It is envisaged that a variety of developmental models may be utilised depending on the opportunity with third party Development Managers appointed on a case by case basis in consultation with the university’s Purchasing department on procurement and tendering procedures.

17. The budget outlined above has £80k in the financial year 2013/14 for this purpose, a figure appropriate for the relatively modest level of development anticipated to take place in the next financial year. As part of all such proposals submitted for consideration by the Board, the structure of the Development should be outlined and the terms of the appointment of third party development managers stated.

NON CORE PROPERTY – REPORT

18. Non Core Property portfolio has increased in value by £15m over the 10 month period. The significant structural movements to explain this are:

a. Clayponds was reclassified as a non Core Asset by College and transferred into the NCP in October at a red-book valuation of £18m. This was sold for £26m in March 2013 with the proceeds reducing the NCP overdraft from £(30m) to £(4m) with a corresponding increase in the NCP net portfolio value.

b. This gain was offset by the transfer of the Imperial West sites – D, E & F – out of the NCP portfolio in September following their reclassification as Core Assets. They were transferred out at a value of £16m, but with no corresponding consideration.
19. **Wye 3 Masterplan**

a. A draft of the Masterplan was presented to Wye village over the weekend of 27th April; this was broadly unchanged from the draft that was presented to the Endowment Board in March: a mixed-use scheme comprising a blend of residential, commercial and community uses.

b. Debate was lively, but constructive and polite, encompassing every element of the scheme – and attendees were complimentary about the way the scheme had been developed, and the process undertaken. As anticipated, the areas of the scheme which drew negative comment from the local community were the number of houses being proposed, and the impact of the development on the infrastructure of the village, particularly traffic.

c. Subsequent to the presentations work has continued with the masterplan and discussions are ongoing with Ashford Borough Council (ABC) and the Parish Council. ABC have indicated their desire that the masterplan aligns as closely as possible to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, and also requested that it has sufficient detail for them to have comfort over the quality of design being proposed. The aim remains for the masterplan to be in final form in July for submission to ABC so that it is adopted later in the year.

20. **Wye Free School.** The last meeting of the Endowment Board delegated authority to the Director of Financial Strategy to enter into a three-year lease with the Education Funding Agency (EFA) to house the Wye Free School in the Kempe Centre, subject to reassurances being received that there are no additional liabilities created in entering into such an agreement, and that sufficient comfort is gained that the EFA view this as a temporary solution. Discussions are ongoing over both of these points and an update will be provided at the next meeting.

21. **Margravine Gardens, W6.** The last meeting of the Endowment Board delegated authority to proceed with the sale of 74 Margravine Gardens for £835,000. The property previously used to house overseas postgraduate students, and was left to Imperial with a convenant in place that we continue to do this, or dispose of the property and use the proceeds to provide financial assistance to postgraduate students. The sale remains on course, with the buyer in the process of conducting their searches and surveys. The sale is on course to be completed this financial year.

22. **Pembridge Garden Annexe.** Dialogue has continued with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC) and the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) over the level of affordable housing contribution we will make as part of the planning application for the re-development of the Annexe to the rear of the Pembridge Garden hall of residence. It has been a frustrating process, with this point needing resolution prior to submission to avoid the lengthy and risky process of going to appeal. We are now in a position to submit a scheme.
23. This is a newly created portfolio containing the Endowment’s strategic investments (currently the holdings in Innovations and Ceres Power) together with share holdings donated to the College with restrictive covenants (no material holdings).

24. The Innovations share price, 283p on 31 July 2012 has shown typically intermittent levels of volatility, moving to a high of 342p on 16 November 2012 and to a low of 260p on 22 March 2013. At 31 May 2013 it was valued at 302.5p and accounts for the majority of the movement in the SAI portfolio.

25. Ceres Power was transferred into this portfolio from the Unitised Scheme prior to the Unitised Scheme’s outsourcing at a value of £818k. The SAI portfolio participated in the latest fund raising for Ceres in April acquiring an additional 2.5m shares at 8p/share at a cost of £208k, again funded by overdraft. This maintains the existing 2.4% holding in Ceres. As at 31 May Ceres shares had moved to 9.05p.
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COLLEGE HEALTH AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT

1. The development of the College Health and Safety Management System has continued. The third round of audits of the College’s Health and Safety Management System (departmental self-checks) completed via a software-based health and safety audit system, iCheck, has been carried out. The audit found that, once again, there had been an improvement in compliance with the College Safety Management System. Academic departments were also required to compile Action Plans, which were then incorporated into overall Faculty Action Plans. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are selected for verification by the College Safety Auditor and the results along with progress in implementing these plans are monitored at the College Health Safety and Environment Committee.

2. The College Health, Safety and Environment Committee met three times during the year. Its main task is to improve the health and safety culture within the College, review the performance of Faculties and Departments (including progress on implementing Action Plans), take forward the issues raised by new legislation to the Management Board, and identify the implications for the College and its departments. The Committee approved the revised Policy and Code of Practice for work involving the use of Liquid Nitrogen, and also reviewed safety audits undertaken by the College Safety Auditor. The Committee is chaired by the College Secretary and Registrar.

3. The College Health and Safety Consultative Committee fulfils the College’s legal obligation to consult with employees on safety issues and is the forum for the development of College policies on health and safety. The Committee met three times during the year. The Committee has discussed a wide range of issues brought to its notice by the College Officers with responsibility for Safety, Occupational Health and Fire, as well as by the Trades’ Union representatives. The Committee is chaired by the Director of Human Resources.

4. The development of the College/Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust Health and Safety Memorandum of Understanding has continued. A key new arrangement on fire safety is nearing completion; this is being implemented and monitored by a Joint Fire Safety Group. An additional Joint Safety Task Group has been set up to develop similar arrangements with the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Trust.
5. **Significant Hazards:** The significant hazards at the College continue to be: work with dangerous human, animal and plant pathogens; genetically modified organisms; ionising radiation; lasers; hazardous chemicals; laboratory animal allergy; liquid nitrogen; and, fieldwork. College policies and codes of practice are in place for all of these and there are specialist advisers based in Occupational Health and Safety Department who provide expert advice and support to the College. Other hazards present at the College include: lone working; machine tools in mechanical workshops; lifting equipment; pressure systems; high-voltage electrical equipment; and, electromagnetic radiation. The Safety Department works in conjunction with faculty, campus and departmental advisers to ensure that the College is meeting its statutory requirements.

6. **Pathogens and Genetically Modified Organisms:** Containment Laboratories – The College undertakes research involving Hazard Group 3 and Hazard Group 2 pathogens as well as research with Genetically Modified Organisms. The College has 44 Containment Level 3 laboratories; 29 of these laboratories are currently in use at CL3 standard, the rest are being used at CL2 level. All CL3 facilities are inspected and revalidated annually by the College BioRisk Manager. The College has over 600 Containment Level 2 laboratories. Before new work is started in any of these laboratories it needs to be reviewed by the College BioRisk Team and consent given. Inspection of the CL2 laboratories is carried out by the faculties.

7. **Ionising Radiation:** There are currently around 900 Registered Radiation Workers at the College (around 400 use unsealed sources, 500 used sealed sources of X-rays). Over 100 Users are registered to use High-Activity Sealed Sources (irradiators, etc). In addition to providing support to Users (managing ordering systems, radiological risk assessment, dosimetry, monthly training for new users, management of waste, etc), the Radiation Protection Team carry out inspection of laboratories using radioactive materials. The team have also managed the disposal of a further £60k worth of legacy materials (these are materials that have been left behind in tunnels underneath the College).

8. **Lasers:** The College probably has the largest number of high-power lasers in any university in the country. Work with lasers ranges from fundamental laser physics through to use of laser-containing equipment (such as confocal microscopes and fluorescence-assisted cell sorting) in biomedical sciences. The Safety Director runs several *Introduction to Laser Safety* courses throughout the year. A competence scheme has been introduced to record an individual’s status (Foundation Level, User, Advanced User, Authority). The Faculty of Natural Sciences is developing a Code of Practice.

9. **Chemicals:** The Safety Department has developed a detailed Code of Practice on fume cupboards and local exhaust ventilation equipment. The Code, which is based on British Standards and current best practice, includes detailed procedures on the positioning of cupboards and on commissioning testing as well as guidance on the safe use and maintenance of the equipment. The Facilities Management Division has spent a great deal of effort and funding to improve fume cupboard performance, in particular dealing with containment, and more rigorous procedures have been put into place for the testing of fume cupboards after installation to verify its performance. These procedures have identified
circumstances where, despite the fume cupboard meeting the manufacturer’s performance claims, the required level of containment was not being achieved until further changes were made to the supply ventilation arrangements.

10. **Laboratory Animal Allergy:** The College has around 800 researchers and support staff who work with laboratory animals, and there is a risk of them developing asthma as a result of exposure to laboratory animal allergens. Despite considerable investment in air-handling equipment and other engineering controls there is still the need to protect the health of researchers and support staff. The Occupational Health Department undertake health surveillance of all those who work with laboratory animals and carry out face-fit testing for all those required to wear respiratory protection. An extensive re-testing of face-fit was carried out in the latter half of the year following the supplier (3M) withdrawing the facemask used by the College and replacing it with an updated version.

11. **Asbestos:** The College continues to manage its legacy of asbestos. During the past year asbestos has been removed from many locations around the College either as part of a major project or when refurbishment has taken place. The College continues to run Asbestos Awareness Courses for staff and contractors working at the College. The College Safety Auditor undertook an in-depth audit of the College Asbestos Management procedures, which were found to be robust, but did not account sufficiently for academic departmental activities and equipment – this is being reviewed by the College Asbestos Management Group.

12. **Legionella:** Facilities Management continue to manage the control of Legionella in the various water systems present on the College’s campuses. Regular testing is carried out of the water quality in cooling towers, hot water systems and cold water systems. An Inspector from the Health and Safety Executive visited the College to check on the Cooling Towers ahead of the Olympic Games. The Inspector found our management procedures to be “exemplary”, but when he inspected two of our towers he was concerned about the access to the top of the towers and served the College with two Improvement Notices (see below under Enforcement Agency Inspections).

**AUDIT**

13. The third round of the College self-check audit system (**iCheck**), concentrated on two areas of the College Safety Management System: Responsibilities of Heads of Department; and, accident investigation. Two graphs from the audit are presented in Appendix A.

14. In-depth audits of Residences, Asbestos Management, Fume Cupboards, and the Department of Materials have been carried out. The audit reports were presented to the College Health Safety and Environment Committee.

**ACCIDENTS AND DANGEROUS OCCURRENCES**

15. The Metropolitan Police and the Health and Safety Executive continue to investigate the death of a Chelsea and Westminster NHS Trust employee which occurred on 26 October 2011 in a College-controlled laboratory in the St Stephen’s Centre adjacent to the Chelsea
and Westminster Hospital. The full circumstances of the incident are not yet known. A Coroner’s Enquiry has been opened and adjourned. The Trust has held a Serious Untoward Incident Inquiry, but the Final Report is not yet available. The Panel for the Inquiry included representatives from the College and an external adviser from the Medical Research Council. The Safety Department submitted a Supplementary Report describing the tests carried out to assess depletion of oxygen following accidental releases of liquid nitrogen in a laboratory similar to the one where the incident occurred. These tests showed it was difficult to recreate a life-threatening atmosphere in normal use.

16. There was a major fire in the Chemical Engineering Department on Tuesday 2 October 2012. No one was injured, but there was extensive damage to the laboratory and significant damage to neighbouring laboratories. The incident occurred following the changing of a hydrogen gas cylinder. There were two processes connected to the cylinder by a common manifold and a small amount of air entered the system and then got into a reactor vessel containing a palladium catalyst at 300 degrees Centigrade in a hydrogen atmosphere at 30 bar. The Principal Investigator was working in his office nearby and responded and raised the alarm. Around 50–60 people evacuated the building. The fire had produced a large amount of acrid smoke, which had in turn led to the triggering of the fire alarm system in the Royal College of Music. There was a large attendance from the Fire Brigade. The incident has been reported to the Health and Safety Executive in accordance with the Reporting of Injuries Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations – as a major fire. The laboratory where the fire occurred was out of action for around 6 months. Adjoining laboratories were out of action from 3 to 6 weeks. An enquiry into the fire was carried out by Professor Richard Jardine, Dean of Engineering, and a Working Group has been set up to implement the recommendations, which included: identifying an “academic champion” in each faculty to promote health and safety; revised risk assessment procedures (based on a risk matrix approach); peer safety review; increased emphasis on competency; introduction of “buddy systems”; and, increased use of near-miss reporting. These recommendations are incorporated into the work programme for the coming year.

17. The Health and Safety Consultative Committee receives and reviews accident reports at each of its meetings. Attached to this Report at Annex B is a review of the work-related accidents reported to the Safety Department in 2012 together with a comparison of the number of accidents reported in previous years and with other comparable universities. Imperial continues to do well in terms of the accident rates for staff, but poorly in terms of the number of incidents involving students. Anecdotal discussions with other universities suggest that there is an overall under-reporting of incidents involving students, often due to differing interpretations of what types of incident need to be reported to the HSE under RIDDOR – the College applies very strict standards on this matter. A contributing factor is the amount of practical work undertaken by students studying at Imperial. Examination of the accident summaries reveals that several of the incidents involve students going to hospital to ensure that no glass is embedded in the cuts sustained from broken glassware (some universities do not report this type of incident under RIDDOR).

18. The most serious accidents are those that are formally reportable to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in accordance with the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995 (RIDDOR). These include major injuries, injuries resulting in absence from work for more than three days (recent changes in reporting
arrangements mean that in future only “over-seven-day absences will need to be reported) and injuries to ‘members of the public’ (for reporting purposes, both visitors to the College’s campuses and students are considered to be ‘members of the public’). A summary of these accidents is included in Annex B.

ENFORCEMENT AGENCY INSPECTIONS

19. During the course of the year, the College has been visited by various inspectors from the HSE, the Environment Agency and, Counter Terrorism and Security.

20. An Inspector from the HSE visited the College to review the health and safety of our cooling towers. When he inspected the two Cooling Towers on top of the Mechanical Engineering Building he was concerned about the safety of access to the top of the towers (only required for annual maintenance). He served the College with two Improvement Notices (one for each tower). Remedial work has been carried out on both towers and the Inspector has confirmed he is content with the actions taken.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

21. The programme of work for the coming year includes: appointment of “academic champions” in each faculty to promote health and safety and improve ‘behaviour’ through greater ownership; developing memorandums of understanding with hospital trusts and other research organisations; updating Policy and procedures for Risk Management; and, issuing revised and updated procedures for Lone Working. The College’s Fire Safety Policy and procedures are also under review.

Ian Gillett
College Safety Director

June 2013
The Question Set for Heads of Department deals with the management of health and safety within the department and covers such matters as:

- formal appointments (in writing) of departmental health and safety personnel;
- departmental websites and safety management structures;
- management of departmental safety committees;
- involvement in departmental health and safety inspections.

The question set has developed over the years and incorporates one or two questions from each of the detailed studies introduced each year in order to monitor progress (these studies have included risk assessment and health and safety training).

Each year a number of questions are selected as KPIs and followed up by either the College Safety Auditor or the faculty. The ones selected for this year were: formal appointments; departmental website; departmental safety management structure; and, gap identification.

The reasons for low scores are followed up by the College Safety Auditor, for example in Civil Engineering the Departmental Safety Officer has been in post for many years – long before the requirement to appoint in writing, and the departmental noticeboard was removed during the AMP Project and a new one has been ordered.

Non-academic departments find that some of the HoDs responsibilities are not as appropriate and so may score lower. The Safety Department are developing another system to meet their particular needs. One of the KPIs for next year’s audit will focus on the health and safety implications associated with grant proposals.
The particular area selected for more detailed analysis in 2012 was ‘accident reporting’, partly to assess the impact of the newly-introduced on-line accident reporting package ‘Salus’. The areas covered included: is the new system easy to use; do staff understand why they need to report near misses as well as injury incidents; how are incidents investigated and reported.

Once again certain topics have been selected as KPIs and were subject to more detailed investigation. The two areas chosen were: Do staff, students and visitors know how to report accidents; and, Are all accidents and near misses discussed and recorded at the Departmental Health and Safety Committee. The results showed that there was a very high level of compliance – the main reason for departments having lower scores being a lack of awareness that they also needed to report accidents and near misses occurring away from College premises. There was also a delay in timely action when the remedial action was not under the control of the department concerned – in some cases departments did not realise they also needed to report the defect to the Facilities Management Customer Services Helpline.
Annex B

ACCIDENT REPORTS

1. During the Calendar Year 2012, a total of 246 work-related accidents were reported to the Safety Department. This is less than 2011 (274).

REPORTABLE ACCIDENTS

2. Certain accidents need to be reported to the Health and Safety Executive under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995 (RIDDOR). In 2012, fifteen (15) accidents were reported (in 2011, eighteen (18) accidents were reported). A summary of the incidents reported in 2012 is attached.

ACCIDENT RATE

3. Accident rate for the last eight years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of Staff</th>
<th>Accident Rate per 1000 - Staff</th>
<th>Total number of Students</th>
<th>Accident Rate per 1000 - Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5764</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>11152</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5824</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>11844</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5895</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>12509</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5999</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>12744</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6285</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13410</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6364</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13889</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6801</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>13964</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7288</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15571</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Each year the University Safety and Health Association collates injury, disease and dangerous statistics from member Higher Education Institutions. In 2012 USHA collected from 108 institutions. The data is supplied on an anonymous basis, but each institution is able to work out its own position. Some universities exchange their own information in order to provide some informal benchmarking. Imperial College’s positions in the categories were:

- Staff RIDDOR injury rate – 0.55 (4 injuries reported with 7288 staff) – 19th place
- Staff Total injury rate – 19.76 (144 injuries) – 31st place
- Student RIDDOR injury rate – 0.58 (9 injuries with 15571 students) – 101st place
- Student Total injury rate – 7.06 (71 injuries) – 100th place
REPORTABLE ACCIDENT SUMMARIES

1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012

1. In January, a postgraduate student in the Chemistry Department cut their hand when some glass apparatus broke and they went to hospital for treatment. *No further action.* [Incident 206]

2. In February, a one-year old child fell down two steps when being taken out of the nursery into the garden area. The child was being transported in a double buggy but had not been strapped in. The child was taken to hospital and kept in overnight for observation. *Staff have been reminded of the correct procedures.* [Incident 305]

3. In March, an undergraduate student in Chemistry cut their finger when a piece of glassware broke. They went to the Health Centre and then onto A&E for an X-ray to check there was no glass in the wound. *No further action.* [Incident 358]

4. In March, a member of staff fell on the stairs in the Huxley Building, which were very wet because of water brought into the building during a period of heavy rain. They were off work for 5 days because of extensive bruising. *The person was using her mobile phone at the time and not holding the handrail. No further action.* [Incident 360]

5. In March, an undergraduate in Surgery and Cancer at the Hammersmith Campus flicked a small amount of a corrosive chemical in their eye – they were not wearing eye protection because there was some confusion over procedure. They attended the Western Eye Hospital for a check-up. *Student was reminded of the need to wear eye protection.* [Incident 395]

6. In March, a member of staff from ICT sustained some back pain following the removal and re-racking of computer servers. They were absent from work for four days. *No further action.* [Incident 396]

7. In May, a member of staff slipped on some stairs at the rear of the Sir Alexander Fleming Building, made wet due to heavy rain outside, and hurt their shoulder, lower back and bottom. They were off work for 10 days. *A mat will be placed in the entrance area.* [Incident 482]

8. In July, an undergraduate in Earth Science and Engineering was taken to hospital for treatment following exposure to fumes after they dropped a flask containing nitric acid. The incident occurred under a fume hood but the student was exposed to the fumes during the clean-up operation when they put their head inside the fume cupboard. *The risk assessment has been reviewed.* [Incident 622]

9. Also in July, a postgraduate student from Life Sciences was taken to hospital as a precaution following a chemical splash to the eye. They were prescribed an anti-biotic gel. They were not wearing eye protection at the time of the incident. *No further action.* [Incident 640]

10. Also in July, a postgraduate student from Chemistry was taken to hospital for treatment to a deep cut to their finger sustained when they tried to catch a bottle that broke after they had accidentally it knocked over. *No further action.* [Incident 669]
11. A postgraduate student from Chemistry went to hospital for treatment after cutting their hand when an NMR tube broke as they were handling it. *No further action.* [Incident 698]

12. In June, a maintenance fitter sustained a back injury when installing an Air Handling Unit inside a Plant Room. The fitter remained at work for the rest of the day but felt discomfort on the way home and went to hospital where he was diagnosed with lower back pain and severe sciatica. He did not return to work and took early retirement in May 2013. (Over 300 days absence) *The activity should have been identified as a two-person job.* [Incident 769]

13. In August, a postgraduate student severed a severe reaction after allowing a large number (around 300) of mosquitoes to feed off her lower arm. She developed a fever and swelling on both arms and visited hospital. Despite medical advice she went on to feed mosquitoes a further two times. The original protocols indicated that only 10 mosquitoes would be fed at a time. *The risk assessments have been reviewed and the supervisor has spoken with the researcher.* [Incident 775]

14. In December, a postgraduate student working in the Department of Materials was splashed in the face with an acidic mixture containing nitric acid during the decanting of the mixture into a more suitable container. The process was being carried out in a fume cupboard and the Injured Person was wearing a lab coat, safety glasses and rubber gloves but the plastic container ruptured during the decanting process. The postgraduate went to hospital for treatment and, although there was some blistering to his face at the time, no permanent damage was sustained. *The procedure being used was a deviation from the agreed protocol.* [Incident 967]

15. In December, an Early Years Educator fractured their ankle when they fell (approximately one metre) after climbing on top of a cabinet to reach some children’s toys. *Storage arrangements have been revised to avoid the need to climb on cabinets.* [Incident 976]
A Note by the Rector

PRESIDENT AND RECTOR

Sir Keith O’Nions FRS, has accepted re-appointment as President and Rector of Imperial College London until 1 September 2014. The search for his successor will resume later this year.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ENGINEERING

Professor Chris TOUMAZOU FRS FREng FMedSci, currently Winston Wong Chair, Biomedical Circuits, Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, has been appointed to the post of Regius Professor of Engineering in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 23 October 2013.

RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

Dr Henry John (Harry) LAMBLE, has been appointed to the post of Research Development Director, Department of Bioengineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 7 May 2013.

PROFESSORS

Professor Miguel Bastos ARAUJO, currently Principal Researcher, Spanish Research Council, The National Museum of Natural Sciences, Spain and Full Professor (Visiting), Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, has been appointed to the post of Chair in Integrative Biogeography, Department of Life Sciences, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 August 2013.

Dr Pierre DEGOND, currently Senior Researcher (Directeur de Recherches), Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Institute de Mathématiques de Toulouse, Université Paul Sabatier, France, has been appointed to the post of Chair in Applied Mathematics, Section of Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 October 2013.

Dr Stephen GARWOOD, currently Director of Engineering and Technology – Submarines, Rolls-Royce plc and Visiting Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Imperial College London, has been appointed to the post of Professor of Structural Integrity, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 October 2013, for a period of three years.

Professor Hossein Ardeschir GHOFRANI, currently Professor of Medicine, Head of Pulmonary Hypertension Division, and Chair for Pulmonary Vascular Research, University Hospital Giessen and Marburg GmbH, Justus-Liebig University Giessen, Germany, has been appointed to the part-time post of Professor of Pulmonary Vascular Medicine, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 June 2013 for a period of three years.
Professor Phillip William INGHAM, has been appointed to the post of Professor of Developmental Biology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 May 2013.

Dr Peter SCHMID, currently Director of Research, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), France, has been appointed to the post of Chair in Applied Mathematics, Section of Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 October 2013.

Dr Caetano Reis e SOUSA, currently Head, Immunology Laboratory, Cancer Research UK, London Research Institute, has been appointed to the part-time post of Professor of Immunology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 April 2013, for a period of two years.

Dr Jonathan P STOYE, currently Head, Virology Division, Joint Head, Infections and Immunity Group, MRC-NIMR, has been appointed to the part-time post of Professor of Endogenous Retroviruses, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 April 2013, for a period of three years.

Professor Karl Birger SWEDBERG, currently Senior Professor of Medicine, Section of Emergency and Cardiovascular Medicine, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, and Senior Physician, Department of Medicine, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Sweden, has been appointed to the part-time post of Professor of Cardiology, Cardiovascular Science Division, National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 August 2013, for a period of two years.

READERS

Dr Julian MARCHESI, currently Senior Lecturer, School of Biological Sciences, Cardiff University and Visiting Reader, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, has been appointed to the part-time post of Reader in Digestive Health, Department of Surgery and Cancer and Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 July 2013.

VISITING PROFESSORS

Professor Sir Mark WALPORT FRS, currently Director of the Wellcome Trust and Government Chief Scientific Advisor, has accepted an appointment as Honorary Distinguished Professor of Medicine.

Professor Robert Ogden BONOW, currently Attending Physician, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, has accepted an association with the College as Visiting Professor, in the National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 May 2013, for a period of three years.

Professor Bas BUENO-DE-MESQUITA, currently Associate Professor of Gastrointestinal Cancer Epidemiology, Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University Medical Centre, Utrecht, The Netherlands, has accepted an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 June 2013 for a period of three years.

Professor Chris DENNING, currently Professor in Stem Cell Biology, University of Nottingham, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the
National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 June 2013 for a period of four years.

**Professor Thomas ESCHENHAGEN**, currently Professor in Pharmacology, University Medical Center, Hamburg, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor, in the National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 June 2013, for a period of four years.

**Professor Michael (Mike) Alan FERENCZI BSc, PhD**, currently Chair in Physiological Science/Head of Molecular Medicine, Imperial College London, has accepted an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, backdated with effect from 1 August 2012, for a period of three years.

**Dr Helena Maria GARDINER**, currently Professor in Obstetrics and Gynecology, Director of Fetal Cardiology, Departments of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Pediatric Surgery, University of Texas, 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 May 2013 for a period of one year.

**Dr Mikhail GRYAZNEVICH**, formerly Chief Scientist, Tokamak Solutions UK, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 May 2013, for a period of three years.

**Professor Michael HARRIS**, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Earth Science and Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 May 2013.

**Professor Wang JUN**, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 June 2013.

**Professor Ben LEHNER**, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Institute of Clinical Science, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 May 2013.

**Dr Barbara MULLOY**, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 May 2013.

**Professor Maria Pia SORMANI**, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 20 May 2013.

**Professor Nicola DE STEFANO**, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 20 May 2013.

**Professor Daniel Casanova RITUERTO**, currently Professor, Catedrático de Cirugía University of Cantabria, and Chief of Unit Service General and Digestive Surgery HUMV, Facultad de Medicina de la Universidad de Cantabria, Hospital Universitario Marqués de Valdecilla, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 3 May 2013 for a period of two years.

**Dr Dirk TASCHE**, formerly Technical Specialist, Financial Services Authority, has accepted an association with the College as Visiting Professor in the Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 May 2013, for a period of three years.
RETIREMENTS

Professor Christopher Joseph MATHIAS DPhil DSci FRCP FMedSci, Clinical Professor, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, retired with effect from 31 May 2013.

RESIGNATIONS

Mr Stephen Phillip (Steve) HOWE, Director of Capital Projects and Planning, Estates Division, Support Services, resigned with effect from 29 May 2013.

Dr John Patrick MCLoughlin, Director of Development, Communications and Development, Support Services, resigned with effect from 30 June 2013.

Dr Sarah Jennifer SHEPLEY, Director, Corporate Partnerships Development, Support Services, resigned with effect from 14 June 2013 to take up a post as Commercial Director, Plaxica Ltd.
SENATE REPORT

A Note by the Academic Registrar

SENATE MEETING - 8 MAY 2013

1. The Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 8 May 2013 are attached. The following points are drawn to the attention of the Council:

Minute 1736: Revised spring term dates for 2013-2014, Graduate Entry Medicine, MBBS/BSc and Biomedical Science Years 1 and 2

2. The Senate noted clarification of the revised spring term dates in 2013-14 for MBBS/BSc and Biomedical Science Years 1 and 2, and Graduate Entry Medicine Year 1. The revised spring term dates for these year groups were 4 January-21 March 2014.

Minute 1737: Regulations for the Examination of Taught Master’s Degrees

3. The Senate approved a minor revision to the College Regulations for the Examination of Taught Master’s Degrees, with immediate effect, to clarify the regulations for the award of merits and distinctions (Section 10 – Marking Schemes). A minor amendment was made to Section 10.2, to clarify that a candidate must achieve a mark of at least 60 per cent in each element of the examination in order to be awarded a result of merit, and a mark of at least 70 per cent in each element of the examination in order to be awarded a result of distinction.

4. The Senate noted that Boards of Examiners still retained discretion in cases where a candidate failed to satisfy the criteria above (under Section 10.2 and 10.3) and that the minor revision did not represent a change to the regulations, nor would it impact on the level of achievement expected from students.

Minute 1740(1): Times Higher Education Student Experience Survey 2013

5. The Senate was informed that the results of the Times Higher Education Student Experience Survey 2013 show Imperial as one of the top 10 improving institutions, rising from 71 in 2011 to 41 in 2012. Imperial was ranked second in London, behind Queen Mary, University of London, which had been ranked at 37.
**Minute 1740(2): Education and Student Strategy**

6. The Senate was informed that, following the initial consultation process, a discussion paper had now been prepared by the Pro Rector (Education), outlining four proposed strategic objectives and a series of actions to realise their implementation. The views of staff, students and alumni were being sought on this paper, which would inform the Education and Student Strategy and implementation plan to be considered by the Management Board in June and received by Council in July.

**Minute 1740(3): National Student Survey (NSS)**

7. The Senate was informed that initial indications were that the College’s participation rate in the National Student Survey 2013 was 81% and the Senate was pleased to note that this was an increase of 10% on the previous year.

**Minute 1741: Policy and Procedure for Admitting Students Under 18 Years of Age**

8. The Senate approved a new College policy and procedure for admitting students under the age of 18 and agreed that the policy should be introduced with immediate effect. The policy provided a framework for consideration of admission of students who are under 18 years of age. It was noted that this policy and procedure could not apply to the MBBS degree as students aged under 18 years of age on the first day of course commencement were not eligible for entry to MBBS Medicine programmes. This is a statutory requirement imposed by the GMC.

**Minute 1742(1): QAA Institutional Audit: Internal Mid-Cycle Review**

9. The Senate was informed that the draft mid-cycle review produced by Professor Denis Wright had been reviewed and that six of the eight recommendations from the QAA Institutional Audit 2010 were considered to have been addressed and that the remaining two recommendations (a review of assessment procedures and a review of procedures for collaborative programmes) were in progress.

**Minute 1744(1): New Courses**

10. The Senate approved the introduction of an MRes in Medical Device Design and Entrepreneurship in the Department of Bioengineering with effect from October 2013.

**Minute 1744(2): New Courses**

11. The Senate approved the introduction of a new pathway in Shock Physics on the MSc in Physics and the new course title of MSc in Physics with Shock Physics for students following that pathway, with effect from October 2013.
Minute 1744(3): Course Modifications

12. The Senate approved examination re-entry regulations in respect of the MRes in Plasmonics and Metamaterials to allow re-sits within the academic year retrospectively with effect from 2012-13.

Minute 1744(4): Course Modifications

13. The Senate approved the introduction of a full-time mode of study for the MSc in Systems Engineering and Innovation with effect from October 2013.

Minute 1744(5): Course Suspensions

14. The Senate approved the suspension of the MRes in Plasmonics and Metamaterials for the academic year 2013-2014.

Minute 1744(6): Course Withdrawals

15. The Senate also approved the withdrawal of the MSc in Shock Physics, with effect from October 2013.

SENATE MEETING – 19 JUNE 2013

16. Senate met on 19 June 2013. An Executive Summary of the meeting is provided for the Council’s information. The full Minutes of the meeting of the June Senate are not yet available.

17. The following points are drawn to the attention of the Council:

Education and Student Strategy

18. The Senate was informed that comments and responses to the Pro Rector (Education)’s discussion paper were being analysed and would be used to inform the Education and Student Strategy White Paper and Implementation Plan which would be considered by the Management Board on 28 June, and received by Council in July. Subject to the agreement of the Management Board, the implementation of the strategy and plan would commence in July 2013. Staff, students and alumni were thanked for their contribution to the consultation process.
Undergraduate Re-sit Opportunities and Supplementary Qualifying Tests (SQTs)

19. The Senate approved revised regulations for resit examinations for all undergraduate degree programmes to ensure consistency across degree programmes and ensure parity of treatment for examination candidates.

20. To reflect acceptable differences between the Faculties, the revised regulations applying to the award of degrees in the three Faculties were not identical, but would nevertheless ensure parity of treatment for all examination candidates within each Faculty.

21. The changes would be effective from October 2013 and would be reflected in the following Academic Regulations:

- Regulations for the award of the degrees of Bachelor of Science (BSc) and Master in Science (MSci) [for students registering in and before October 2007]
- Regulations for the award of the degrees of Bachelor of Science (BSc) and Master in Science (MSci) in the Faculty of Natural Sciences [for students registering in and after October 2008]
- Regulations for the award of the Degrees of Bachelor of Engineering (BEng), Master of Engineering (MEng), Bachelor of Science (BSc) and Master in Science (MSci) in the Faculty of Engineering
- Regulations for the award of the Degrees of MBBS/BSc
- Regulations for the award of the Degree of MBBS (Graduate Entry)
- Regulations for the award of the Degree of MBBS (Oxbridge Advanced Entry)
- Regulations for the award of the Intercalated BSc

Undergraduate Year Weightings

22. The Senate approved a new College Policy on undergraduate year weightings for the Faculties of Engineering and Natural Sciences which would harmonise weightings within the two Faculties. The policy would be introduced on a rolling basis and would be applied to Year I with effect from October 2013.

23. It was expected that a policy on undergraduate year weightings in the Faculty of Medicine would be developed in the coming year.

Conduct of Undergraduate Examination Boards

24. Following the decision of the Quality and Academic Enhancement Committee that anonymity for examination candidates should be introduced across that College, the Senate approved revisions to the document providing guidance on the purpose and conduct of the
business of Boards of Examiners’ meetings for undergraduate programmes, to include the requirement for the identity of examination candidates to remain anonymous.

25. The revised Conduct of Undergraduate Examination Boards would be fully effective from 2013-2014 in the Faculties of Medicine and Engineering. The Faculty of Natural Sciences would pilot and evaluate the arrangements in 2013-2014 with a view to full implementation in 2014-2015.

**College regulations for the submission of research degree theses**

26. The Senate approved revised regulations so that candidates are no longer required to submit a hard bound copy of their final thesis and need only submit an electronic version of the thesis.

27. The revised regulations would be effective from October 2013, and appropriate revisions would be made to the Regulations for the award of MPhil, PhD and MD(Res) respectively.

**Update from the Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine**

28. The Senate approved the detailed Regulations and Procedures for the MBBS programme, which would commence in August 2013, as follows:

- Curriculum Proposal and Assessment Strategy (updated)
- MBBS Programme Specification (updated)
- Quality Management Requirements (updated)
- Examination Regulations (updated)
- Procedure for Representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners
- Mitigating Circumstances Procedure Policy and Procedures for Examinations
- Professional Conduct & Behaviour Assessment
- Equality & Non-discrimination Policy Statement
- Disability Service Provision Statement
- Student Agreement (updated)
- Student Complaints Procedure
- Criminal Assessment Policy
- Attendance and Leave Policy
- Student Regulations
• Health & Safety Policy

New Courses

29. The Senate approved the establishment of the following new courses:

• A one-year full-time MRes in Catalysis: Chemistry and Engineering in the Department of Chemistry, with effect from October 2013.
• A one-year full-time MSc in Finance and Accounting in the Business School, with effect from September 2014.
• A one-year full-time MSc in Investment and Wealth Management in the Business School, with effect from September 2014.

30. The Senate also approved the additional award title of MSci Chemistry with a Year in Science Communication with immediate effect.

Course Modifications

31. The Senate approved the addition of a three-year part-time option for the MSc in Preventive Cardiology, retrospectively with effect from October 2012.

Course Suspensions and Withdrawals

32. The Senate approved the suspension of the following courses for the academic year 2013-2014:

• MSc in Data Science & Management
• PG Certificate, PG Diploma, MSc in Infection
• PG Certificate, PG Diploma, MSc in Infection Management for Pharmacists

33. The Senate also approved the withdrawal of the MSc Environmental Engineering cluster – 3 year part-time mode of study, with effect from October 2014.

Revisions to governance structure: Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee

34. The Senate approved the new terms of reference and membership for the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee with effect from October 2013. The terms of reference had been modified to repatriate to QAEC the consideration of the periodic reviews of undergraduate and postgraduate taught provision such that these reviews can benefit from exposure to a membership that crosses faculties and the undergraduate/postgraduate boundaries that is not always possible in the Studies and Graduate School Committees. The revised terms of reference also included preliminary consideration of any future
proposal for a joint degree with another institution, a remit which had previously resided with the Strategic Education Committee which would be disbanded.

N.W