MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

at the

Thirtieth Meeting of the

COUNCIL

of the

IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE

The Thirtieth Meeting of the Council was held in the Ballroom, 58 Prince’s Gate, South Kensington Campus, Imperial College London, at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, 15th February 2013, when there were present:

The Baroness Manningham-Buller (Chair), Mr. P.J. Beaumont, Mr. I. Conn, Mrs. P. Couttie, Professor M.J. Dallman, Mr. P. Dilley, Professor D. Griffiths, Sir Tom Hughes-Hallett, Professor D.P.A. Kelleher, Professor J. Kramer, Ms. J.R. Lomax, Professor J. Magee, Mr. J. Newsum, Mr. M. Sanderson, Mr. S. Newton, Ms. K. Owen, Professor S.M. Richardson, the Lord Tugendhat and the President & Rector and the Clerk to the Court and Council.

Apologies

Professor Dame Julia Higgins

In attendance:

The Assistant Clerk to the Court and Council.

WELCOME

1. The Chair welcomed Sir Tom Hughes-Hallett to his first meeting of the Council.

MINUTES

Council – 23rd November 2012

2. The Minutes of the twenty-ninth Meeting of the Council, held on Friday, 23rd November 2012 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

CHAIR’S REPORT

3. Following the appointment of Professor James Stirling as Provost, which had been formally announced in December, the Chair provided the Council with a progress report on the search for the next President & Rector.
PRESIDENT & RECTOR’S REPORT

4. The President & Rector reported that Professor James Stirling would take up his appointment as Provost on 1 August 2013, but would attend various meetings and events at the College in advance of this and would be attending Management Board meetings from March onwards. The search for the Principal of the Imperial College Business School was also proceeding well. Interviews would be held in the coming week and the President & Rector said he was pleased with the calibre of candidates.

5. Preparation for the launch of the Imperial West Campus on 6th March were also going well. The Mayor of London, Boris Johnson would be attending and there had also been a very positive response from the external invitees. There was also considerable worldwide interest in the College’s plans for Imperial West, with particular interest coming from India and China.

6. The President & Rector reported that the College had been granted one of the twelve new Regius professorships awarded to outstanding university departments to mark H.M. The Queen’s Diamond Jubilee. Professor Chris Toumazou FRS FREng would be appointed as the Regius Professor of Engineering at the College. He also welcomed the recently announced appointment of Professor Sir Mark Walport as the Government’s Chief Scientific Adviser. Sir Mark Walport had been the Director of the Wellcome Trust since 2003, but before that he had been Professor of Medicine and Head of the Division of Medicine at the College. A number of other government scientific adviser posts were held by current or former College staff. Professor Vernon Gibson was Chief Scientific Adviser at the Ministry of Defence, and Professor Robin Grimes had just been appointed as the new Chief Scientific Adviser to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

7. The President & Rector was asked about the College’s relationship with Francis Crick Institute. The College was engaged with the Institute at all levels. Recognising its importance for the College, the Management Board had recently reviewed the College’s relationship with, and its priorities for, the Crick Institute. The creation of this Institute was the most exciting development in Biomedical Sciences in recent times and was attracting significant international attention. It was clearly in the College’s interest to be a member of the Institute and to be fully engaged with the development of its scientific strategy. However, there were always risks associated with such a large and complex undertaking and the Board had also considered the potential consequences for both the College and its staff of its involvement with the Institute. The Board’s view was that these risks were manageable and that the considerable benefits to the College outweighed any risks. Turning to more operational matters, the contract for the building had also now been signed with Laing O’Rourke and good progress was being made on the building works. Professor Dallman, who had that morning attended a meeting of the Board of the Francis Crick Institute, said that the Council members would be welcome to visit the Institute and tour the development. The discussion at the Management Board had been valuable and the Board had agreed to repeat this in-depth discussion every six months.

8. The Council noted the importance of the Francis Crick Institute to the College and some of the associated risks. It was noted that the Risk Committee would be considering the College’s relationship with the Francis Crick Institute at its next meeting.
REPORT ON CHAIR’S ACTION (PAPER A)

9. The Chair presented Paper A and noted that the response of Council members to the proposals circulated out of committee had been positive. She acknowledged that the President of the Imperial College Union had expressed concerns about the proposal, which had also been circulated to members. In relation to these, she reported that Professor Dame Julia Higgins, who was not able to attend this meeting, had commented that the issues raised by Mr Beaumont were primarily concerned with the risk of a fragmentation of the student body. She had suggested that the Union and College, including those involved in its welfare systems, should continue to monitor and mitigate such risks before they adversely affected the College. Members agreed that this was an important point and that ensuring that students based at the W3 scheme did not feel isolated would be key for the success of the scheme.

The Council formally ratified the following resolutions, which had previously been passed by Chair’s action:

(i) That the purchase of the W3 Scheme with a total project cost of £62.4M, as set out in the paper entitled Student Accommodation Proposal, a New Facility in London W3, be approved.

(ii) That Mr. Muir Sanderson and Mr. Simon Harding-Roots be given delegated authority on behalf of the College to enter into all and any documentation and agreements necessary for the College to complete the purchase of the W3 Scheme.

UPDATE ON COLLEGE/ICHT RELATIONS (PAPER B)

10. Professor Kelleher presented Paper B and reminded the Council that the College now had a range of relationships with the NHS Trusts in North West London. It had formed the Academic Health Science Centre (AHSC) with the Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, and it was now also a member of an Academic Health Science Partnership (AHSP) with all of the trusts in NW London. The AHSP, which had been formed as a limited company – Imperial Healthcare Partners – had now applied for recognition by the Government as one of the new Academic Health Science Networks (AHSN) it was establishing across the country. The AHSC itself had developed considerably since it had originally been established. A key part of this development was the recent signing of a Joint Working Agreement between the College and the Trust, which included important agreements on intellectual property and to protect the College’s trademarks. This Agreement had also been used as the basis for a similar agreement with the Royal Brompton Hospital Trust. The Council congratulated Professor Kelleher and the rest of the College team on concluding discussions and reaching agreement with the Trust on these important issues.

11. Professor Kelleher said that appointment as an AHSN would be important for the AHSP as the Government intended to use the AHSN as the primary route for distributing funding for healthcare translation. In North West London the AHSN could be responsible for distributing £50 – 60M over 5 years. Furthermore, the AHSN would also provide the College with access to a patient base of around 2 million, which would be a valuable resource for clinical trials and would also be important if the aim of translating research outcomes into healthcare was to be achieved. Given the complexity of these various
relationships, it was suggested that Council members might benefit from a diagrammatic explanation of the College’s relationship to and with the AHSC, AHSP and the AHSN. Professor Kelleher agreed to provide this for the Council.

12. Closing his report, Professor Kelleher reminded the Council about the NHS’s proposals for the reconfiguration of healthcare services in North West London. Under these proposals Charing Cross would become a local hospital, thereby necessitating the re-provision of the College’s research and education facilities at another hospital, most probably St. Mary’s. The College and the Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust had previously supported this option (option A) with the proviso that the NHS honour its previous commitment to fund fully the re-provision of the medical school. Although the NHS had since acknowledged its commitment, it was now proposing that the business case for the re-provided medical school should be submitted as part of a wider business case for the development of the Trust's services. Because of forthcoming changes in NHS governance, there was no guarantee that such a business case would be supported in its entirety and, if it was not, there was similarly no guarantee that the element concerned with the re-provision of the medical school would be protected within the overall envelope of funding provided to the Trust. This was unacceptable for the College and the President & Rector therefore proposed that the College’s continued support for Option A should be conditional on the College being able to submit a separate business case for the re-provision of its medical school in line with the NHS’s previous commitments. Funding for this element should also be ring-fenced within the overall budget for the whole scheme. The Council agreed that it was important for the College’s case to be considered separately and endorsed the approach proposed by the President & Rector.

REF 2014 SUBMISSION UPDATE (PAPER C)

13. Professor Richardson presented Paper C and reminded the Council of the importance of the REF exercise in determining the distribution of public research funds and its influence on the College’s ability to continue to retain and recruit outstanding staff and students, invest in world-class facilities and attract other sources of research funding. It was noted that the College’s HEFCE research grant for 2012-13 was £99.5m, 6.38% of the sector share for allocation. Professor Richardson was asked how this related to the College’s performance in previous years and to the performance of its peers and if the College’s share was increasing or decreasing. Professor Richardson said the College’s sector share had increased and agreed to provide members with figures after the meeting.

14. It was noted that universities were now expected to demonstrate the impact of research in the REF. Professor Richardson agreed that the College should be better able to demonstrate the impact of its research than many other universities, but it was important to provide evidential support for this. Researchers were being encouraged to find clear evidence of impact to support the College’s submission.

PROPOSALS FOR THE AWARD OF HONORARY DEGREES AND THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE MEDAL (PAPER D)

15. The President & Rector presented Paper D and commended the recommended candidates to the Council for consideration.
Resolved:

That the nominations for the conferment of Honorary Degrees and for the award of the Imperial College Medal, as set out in Paper D, be approved.

**IMPERIAL WEST REPORT (PAPER E)**

16. The Chair of the Imperial West Syndicate, Mr. Newsum, presented Paper E and drew members' attention to the possibility that the St Helen's Residents' Association might seek a Judicial Review of the planning approval of the Imperial West Masterplan. Otherwise, good progress was being made on the feasibility study for the Research and Translation hub. Mr. Newsum noted that the College might at some point tender for further development partners to assist in the future development of Imperial West. It was also possible that Grosvenor might submit a tender as part of that process. As he was also an Executive Trustee of the Grosvenor Estate he would have to participate in a manner appropriate to any potential conflict of interest.

**ENDOWMENT REPORT (PAPER F)**

17. The Chairman of the Endowment Board, Mr. Newton, presented Paper F and drew members' attention in particular to the proposed sale of the Clayponds site.

Resolved:

That the sale of Clayponds to Notting Hill Housing Trust for £26.55m, as set out in Paper F, be approved.

**CAPITAL PROJECTS APPROVAL (PAPER G)**

18. Mr. Sanderson presented Paper G and noted that two capital projects might fall within the range for which formal Council approval would be required. These were the refurbishment of the basement at the Guy Scadding building in the Royal Brompton Hospital and the refurbishment of two CBS facilities. Details of each project would be brought to Council when formal approval was sought for each project.

**PROCEDURE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF FITNESS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE (PAPER H)**

19. Mr. Neilson presented Paper H and noted that the revisions proposed to the Fitness to Practise Medicine procedures were in line with best practice as recommended by the GMC and had been fully considered by the Faculty of Medicine and by the Senate.

Resolved:

That the revised Procedure for the Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine, as set out in Paper H, be approved with immediate effect.
IMPERIAL COLLEGE UNION ANNUAL REPORT (PAPER I)

20. The Imperial College Union President, Mr. Beaumont, presented Paper I. The Council commended the President for the high quality of the Union’s annual report and for the many activities supported by the Union in the previous year.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT (PAPER J)

21. Mr. Sanderson presented Paper J. He reminded the Council that the College, in common with many other universities, had generated significant surpluses in recent years and that the College also had healthy cash holdings. However, these were now predicted to reduce significantly because of the College’s decision to invest in new student accommodation at W3 as well as other investment decisions made by the College. Although these investments could be afforded this year, this could not be repeated in future years. Furthermore, despite its strong balance sheet, the College could not itself fund the level of investment required to develop all of its capital projects, including the rest of the Imperial West site. If the College was to continue to make the capital investments it needed to maintain its position as a world-class university, it would have to enter into joint ventures or increase its borrowing capacity to provide the necessary funds. Proposals on these aspects of the financial strategy would be presented to the Council in due course.

DEVELOPMENT BOARD UPDATE (PAPER K)

22. The President & Rector presented Paper K, which was received for information.

COLLEGE METRICS (PAPER L)

23. The President & Rector presented Paper L, which was received for information.

REMUNERATION COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT (PAPER M)

24. The Chair presented Paper M, which was received for information.

HARLINGTON GRANT FUND COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT (PAPER N)

25. Mr. Neilson presented Paper N, which was received for information.

HEFCE RISK ASSESSMENT (PAPER O)

26. Mr. Neilson presented Paper O, which was received for information.

STAFF MATTERS (PAPER P)

27. Paper P was received for information.
CHIEF OPERATIONS OFFICER REPORT (PAPER Q)

28. Paper Q was received for information.

SENATE REPORT (PAPER R)

29. Paper R was received for information.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Translation Studies Unit (Paper S).

30. The Deputy Rector presented Paper S, which set out a proposal to close the College’s Translation Studies Unit. The Management Board had considered all parts of the College in terms of strategic fit and had come to the view that the Translation Unit did not have a natural fit with the rest of the College, that its activities were not core to College strategy and that it should therefore be transferred or closed. Consultation with the staff affected had commenced on 18 January and would end on 18 February 2013. A decision on whether to proceed with the proposal would be taken following the conclusion of the consultation period. As this was a reserved area of business, the Imperial College Union President took no part in the discussion of this issue.

Resolved:

That the Rector, or another person so authorised by the Rector, be given delegated authority in accordance with the procedures set out in Ordinance D11, the Dismissal of Members of Staff by Reasons of Redundancy, to implement the selection process and subsequent proposed redundancy if the Rector or his nominee consider this appropriate following the comments and counter-proposals gathered during the consultation period.

NEXT MEETINGS

31. Mr. Neilson reminded members that the next Meeting of the Council would be held on Friday, 3 May 2013.
1. At its last meeting, the Council was advised of an opportunity to purchase new undergraduate accommodation in North Acton that had recently arisen. As a decision on whether to proceed with the purchase would be required by the end of January and before the next scheduled Council meeting, the Council agreed an approval process that would allow due consideration to be given to the proposal, but would also enable a decision to be made by the end of January. The approval process agreed by the Council was that:

   a. The Management Board would consider the business case at its meeting in December and make a recommendation to the Imperial West Syndicate.

   b. The Syndicate would consider both the business case and the Board's recommendation before itself making a recommendation to Council members out of committee.

   c. If the Syndicate and Council members supported the proposal, the Chair would be asked to approve the purchase by Chairman's Action.

   d. Finally, Chair's action would be ratified formally at the next Council meeting on 15 February.

2. In line with this process, the W3 proposal was considered and agreed by the Management Board at its meeting on 30 November 2012. The Imperial West Syndicate then met on 22 January to consider the proposal in detail. Paul Beaumont, the ICU President, and Philip Dilley were both invited to attend the meeting, although Philip was unfortunately unable to attend. The full list of attendees was: Jeremy Newsum (Chair), Stewart Newton, Rachel Lomax, Keith O’Nions, Stephen Richardson, Muir Sanderson and Paul Beaumont.

3. The members of the Imperial West Syndicate supported the proposal and agreed that it should be recommended to the Council for formal approval by Chair's action. Before the meeting Paul Beaumont had provided the Syndicate with a paper setting out why he did not support the proposal. At the end of the meeting Paul Beaumont had confirmed that he still felt unable to support the proposal.

4. On 24 January 2013, a copy of the proposal was sent to all members of the Council together with the Syndicate’s recommendation. A copy of Paul Beaumont’s paper was also provided to Council members. Members were invited to comment on the proposal. A majority of members responded to signal their assent to the proposal.
5. In accordance with the powers set out in Ordinance A4, **Delegation of Powers of the Council**, on 29 January 2013, the Chair approved by Chair’s Action, on behalf of the Council, the following resolutions:

(i) That the purchase of the W3 Scheme with a total project cost of £62.4M, as set out in the paper entitled Student **Accommodation Proposal, a New Facility in London W3**, be approved.

(ii) That Mr Muir Sanderson and Mr Simon Harding-Roots be given delegated authority on behalf of the College to enter into all and any documentation and agreements necessary for the College to complete the purchase of the W3 Scheme.

6. The Council is now invited to ratify the approval of these resolutions by the Chair. A copy of the W3 Proposal is attached to this Paper.¹

J.S.N.

---

¹ The W3 Proposal contains information that is commercially sensitive and confidential. For this reason, the Annex is not included with these published papers.
BACKGROUND

1. Members will recall from their meeting of September 2012 that the College’s relationship with the NHS was discussed. At that time members noted the challenges facing the College over NHS reforms, particularly in relation to finances and how this represented a reputational and financial risk to the College. Potential restructuring or redundancies within NHS Trusts would have a particular knock-on effect as the College was the joint employer in a number of cases. Service Increment For Teaching funding from the Department of Health to NHS Trusts is one way of securing the academic enterprise within NHS Trusts, as it can be identified by NHS Trusts to support directly the costs of teaching in a clinical environment.

2. Members also noted the critical importance of the Academic Health Science Centre (AHSC) and how it can provide a strong and coherent partnership between the College and the IC Trust. The triple mission of excellence in clinical service research and education, delivery of academic benefit and delivery of clinical service benefits all have to flow from proposed reconfigurations and all have equal priority within the AHSC.

AHSC JOINT WORKING AGREEMENT

3. Members will recall that the College and the ICNHST had been working together for some time to develop and complete a formal agreement detailing the AHSC structure, governance and legal basis for joint activities.

4. The Trust and the College completed such an agreement in December 2012. The agreement includes details of governance, IP and protections for the College’s trademark. In future the ICHT would require Imperial’s agreement to use its brand in any agreements with third parties, but that agreement would not be unreasonably withheld. This agreement therefore provides the College with protection where it has clear commercial interests but would enable the Trust to continue to use the College brand provided it was not in conflict with the College’s interests. The agreement includes protection for the use of the trademark both within the UK and abroad.

5. The creation of a formal agreement has allowed the ICNHST to meet one of the NIHR demands following their allocation of BRC funds to the Trust.

6. The agreement has also resolved the governance of the AHSC, which includes the creation of a Strategic Partnership Board with responsibilities for ensuring that the AHSC achieves its mission. The SPB will have an independent Chair. A Joint Executive Group,
accountable to the SPB, is also agreed and will be responsible for operational matters including (but not exclusively) finance and approval of academic/clinical posts.

7. Professor David Taube was appointed as the AHSC Director in November 2012. He is accountable jointly to the CEO of the Trust and to the Faculty Principal. He is responsible for the establishment of a number of Delivery Groups to integrate the activities of the AHSC.

8. Professor Jonathon Weber was appointed as the Director of Research for the AHSC in November 2012 and in line with the JWA is also the BRC Director for the Trust and Deputy Principal (Research) for the Faculty of Medicine.

9. The JWA has agreed IP matters including IP governance and ownership and exploitation of foreground IP. A parallel agreement on IP with the Royal Brompton and Harefield Trust has also been finalised, thereby supporting their BRU finding from NIHR.

ACADEMIC HEALTH SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT (AHSP)

10. The Partnership was interviewed in December 2012 for designation by the Department of Health & NHS Commissioning Board as an Academic Health Science Network (AHSN).

11. The Partnership anticipates being informed of the outcome of the designation process in March, along with all the other Networks. The AHSN designation will be for 5 years.

12. Mr Adrian Bull, currently CEO at the specialist Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, East Grinstead, has been appointed as the Partnership’s Managing Director and will start on 1 April 2013.

NORTH WEST LONDON NHS REVIEW – SHAPING A HEALTHIER FUTURE

13. The College and the ICNHST, as the Imperial AHSC, has supported the proposed changes to NW London NHS service reconfiguration on the basis that any costs to the College resulting from such changes are met by the NHS in full. This included the ‘preferred’ option that Charing Cross would become a local hospital and as a consequence the Medical School at Charing Cross would be relocated to the St Mary’s campus in Paddington.

14. The AHSC’s stance was communicated to the NHS in October 2012 and remains the College’s position. This requirement for NHS funding of the consequences for our medical training is supported by both a NHS Executive Letter issued by the Department of Health in 1996 and a HEFCE memoranda on Joint NHS/University capital projects issued the same year.
15. Following the discussion at Council on 25 September 2012 on the College-Trust relationship, the College's Risk Committee have requested a review for their March 2013 meeting on the risk elements of the College's relationship with the NHS.

16. The main areas of concern continue to be reputational, financial and managerial and the Risk Committee will consider the following matters in detail at their March meeting;

   a. Given the College's plans for Imperial West its relationship with the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Authority is very significant. The proposed NHS changes to Charing Cross are currently opposed by their Local Authority and the College will need to bear in mind such sensitivities when presenting the case for change as part of the AHSC.

   b. Similarly NHS assumptions that the College will be able to contribute financially towards the proposals have to be considered carefully and any agreement will be subject to due diligence and formal contract. The AHSC has consistently maintained its opposition to the position that the College will contribute to the replacement of our academic facilities. This position has now been accepted; however, this will require vigilance and careful follow-up.

   c. During this period the College has to commit significant managerial resources towards dealing with the NHS proposals. These are not without opportunity costs.

17. The College continues to monitor the situation and make its stance clear to the NHS. The College and the ICNHST continue to coordinate their responses to the NWL proposals. This is being done at AHSC level and through direct communication between Principal and CEO.
BACKGROUND

1. This paper provides an update to Council on preparations for the REF 2014 submission.

REF AND ITS IMPORTANCE

2. The Research Excellence Framework (REF2014) is the new peer review assessment of the quality of the research conducted at UK Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). It replaces the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE2008). Its background stems from the Government research policy objective of research concentration and selectivity, namely to fund the highest quality research areas to conduct research.

3. The outcomes of REF are published in the form of a quality profile for each subject based submission, in the range of 4* (highest) through to 1* (lowest). The descriptors for each aspect of the quality profile are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four star</td>
<td>Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three star</td>
<td>Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two star</td>
<td>Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One star</td>
<td>Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purposes of this assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The REF has significant financial and reputational consequences. The outcomes form one aspect of the dual support system for research and will be used by HEFCE to distribute its quality-related research (QR) funding from 2015-16. At present, HEFCE fund only research assessed as 3* or above, with research assessed as 4* attracting three times the amount of funding as that assessed as 3*. The College’s HEFCE research grant for 2012-13 is £99.5m, comprising 6.38% of the sector share for allocation.
5. REF2014 will also influence our ability to continue to retain and recruit outstanding staff and students, invest in world-class facilities and attract other sources of research funding.

6. As a reminder, in RAE2008, six of the College’s 22 submissions were top rated in their subject (based on the proportion of 4* research) and, at 73%, the College had the highest proportion of 4* and 3* work combined.

KEY REF REQUIREMENTS

7. The assessment period for REF2014 is January 2008 to December 2013 and the College will put forward the work of academic staff who are in post on the REF census date of 31st October 2013. Each submission will be assessed in terms of:

- the quality of the research outputs (publications) for submitted staff,
- the impact achieved during the assessment period arising from research at the College,
- the research environment (strategy).

The weightings for these components are 65%, 20% and 15% respectively. As for all institutions, the biggest challenge for REF2014 is to respond to the new requirement to identify, describe and clearly evidence impact. This aspect measures the reach and significance of the research and is measured through individual impact case studies and an impact narrative which describes the supporting infrastructure to promote impact.

8. The REF submission must be returned to HEFCE by the submission deadline of 29th November 2013. Assessment panels will meet during 2014 and the REF outcomes will be published in December 2014.

COLLEGE REF SUBMISSION NUMBERS

9. The College, along with all institutions submitting to REF, is free to determine which of its academic staff in post on the REF census date it wishes to submit. Funding is a multiplier of quality and volume (staff numbers submitted) and thus there is trade-off to be made between quality and staff volume. For information, in RAE2008, for the College to have had the highest proportion of submitted activity assessed as 4*, then, other things being equal, it would needed to have submitted 348 fewer staff FTEs. This would have had a financial cost to the College in terms of HEFCE grant of approximately £4m per annum.

10. The College intends to make 15 submissions to the HEFCE Units of Assessment (UoAs), as follows:

   1 Clinical Medicine
COLLEGE PROGRESS IN PREPARING THE REF SUBMISSION

11. Good progress is being made with the preparation of the College’s REF submission and overall, we are where we would expect to be at this stage in the REF cycle.

12. Information on staff has been checked and approximately 60% of submission decisions have been made. These staff have identified their best research outputs and Departments continue to review these. Impact examples have been drafted and feedback provided at Faculty and College review level.

13. The focus over the period to summer 2013 is to ensure that all of the information is accurate and optimal in the sense that it enables the College to achieve the best possible performance in REF. This includes significant work on the narrative aspects of the submissions (impact and environment, and supporting information for staff and research outputs).
A Note by the Rector

1. The Management Board met on 25 January 2013 to consider, in accordance with the recently revised Ordinance B2, nominations for the conferment of Honorary Degrees and for the award of Imperial College Medals in 2013.

2. The Management Board’s recommendations are set out below.

HONORARY DEGREES

3. The Management Board agreed to make the following recommendations to the Council for the conferment of Honorary Degrees during 2013:

a. **Sir John Bell FRS**

   Sir John Bell is Regius Chair of Medicine, Oxford, and Chair of the Office for the Strategic Coordination of Health Research (OSCHR). Sir John Bell was President of the Academy of Medical Sciences from 2006 – 2011. Professor Bell has been extensively involved in the development of research programmes in genetics and genomics and in the development of a clinical research programme across the UK. He was the Founder of the Wellcome Trust Centre for Human Genetics and has led the significant expansion in biomedical research activities in the Clinical School in Oxford since 1992. His research programme has contributed to clearer understanding of genetic determinants of susceptibility in Type 1 diabetes and rheumatoid arthritis and also of the molecular interactions on the surface of the T-lymphocyte associated with immune activation. He has helped to pioneer a large number of high-throughput genomic methodologies applied to biomedical science, including programmes in structural genomics, ENU mutagenesis and genetics. In addition to his research, Sir John Bell has made a significant contribution to the leadership of research in the UK as Chair of OSCHR. OSCHR was jointly set up as a Government office in January 2007 by the Department of Heath and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. Its mission is to facilitate more efficient translation of health research into health and economic benefits in the UK through better coordination of health research and more coherent funding arrangements to support translation.

   **Citation:** The Board recommends the conferment of an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science (Medicine) on Professor Sir John Bell in recognition of his outstanding contribution to genetics and genomics and, more widely, to the leadership of research in the UK.

b. **Dr Fatih Birol**

   Fatih Birol is one of the most influential international energy economists of his generation. His
achievement has been to present penetrating economic analysis of global energy issues in an accessible form. As the Chief Economist of the International Energy Agency he has developed its publication World Energy Outlook to become the point of reference for energy policy makers and analysts in government and industry around the world, addressing critical issues of energy security, climate change, and fuel poverty. He is a compelling and much sought after speaker. He chairs the Davos Energy Advisory Board and has been recognised as one of the most influential people in world energy by Forbes magazine. He is regularly consulted by energy ministers and has received personal honours and awards for academic excellence from many governments and institutions. In January 2011 and January 2012, Fatih Birol delivered guest lectures at Imperial College. The most recent was to an audience of some 400, including journalists, business leaders, government officials, members of parliament, NGO's, academics and students. The Grantham Institute received very positive feedback after each of these events, which attracted influential figures from business, government, and academia.

**Citation:** The Board recommends the conferment of an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science on Dr Fatih Birol in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the economic analysis of global energy issues.

c. **Professor Dame Ann Dowling DBE FRS FREng**

Head of the Department of Engineering, Cambridge University. Dame Ann Dowling is a Fellow of the Royal Society, Royal Academy of Engineering and is a Foreign Member of the US National Academy of Engineering and of the French Academy of Sciences. Professor Dowling’s research is primarily in the fields of combustion, acoustics and vibration and is aimed at low-emission combustion and quiet vehicles. She is one of the founders of the Energy Efficient Cities initiative in Cambridge and was the UK lead of the Silent Aircraft Initiative, a collaboration between researchers at Cambridge and MIT. She was appointed CBE by the Queen for services to Mechanical Engineering in 2002, and DBE for services to Science in 2007.

**Citation:** The Board recommends the conferment of an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science (Engineering) on Professor Dame Ann Dowling in recognition of her outstanding contribution to Mechanical Engineering.

d. **Sir John Parker**

President of the Royal Academy of Engineering since 2011. Sir John Parker has chaired five FTSE100 companies, including National Grid, Lattice, RMC and P&O. He is currently Chairman of the mining conglomerate Anglo American. He is Vice Chairman of DP World (Dubai) and a Non-Executive Director of Carnival Corporation and EADS (AIRBUS). Elected to The Royal Academy of Engineering as one of its youngest Fellows in 1983, Sir John is also an Elder Brother of Trinity House (2010), a Visiting Fellow of University of Oxford, a member of the General Committee of Lloyds Register of Shipping, Vice President of The Royal Navy and Marines Charity and a governor of the Royal National Lifeboat Institution. He has been President of the Royal Institution of Naval Architects, Prime Warden of the Worshipful Company of Shipwrights, an Honorary Freeman of the Worshipful Company of Fuellers and the Tallow Chandlers Livery Company and President of the Smeatonian Society of Civil Engineers. He is a member of the
Appointing Committee for the President & Rector.

Citation: The Board recommends the conferment of an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science (Engineering) on Sir John Parker in recognition of his outstanding contribution to Engineering.

e. Professor Tim Pedley FRS

Professor of Fluid Mechanics, Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics (DAMTP), Cambridge University. Tim Pedley is one of the outstanding mathematicians of his generation. He was made FRS in 1995 and has been Professor of Fluid Mechanics at Cambridge since 1996. He was head of DAMTP for 5 years (2000-2005) and was a lecturer at Imperial College for 5 years here in the early 1970s. He has around 150 publications on internal, physiological fluid mechanics and recently mostly on external fluid mechanics and the interaction of living organisms with their fluid environment.

Citation: The Board recommends the conferment of an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science on Professor Tim Pedley in recognition of his outstanding contribution to Fluid Mechanics.

f. Sir Adrian Smith

Sir Adrian Smith FRS took up his post as Vice Chancellor of the University of London in September 2012. Before that he was the Director General, Knowledge and Innovation at the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills, where he was responsible for the research councils and the development of the government’s science and innovation policies. Adrian Smith is a distinguished statistician who previously was head of the Department of Mathematics at Imperial College from 1992 until 1998. He went on to become Principal of Queen Mary College, University of London until 2008 when he was appointed Director General, Science and Research at the Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills. Prior to coming to the College in 1990 he was professor of statistics and head of the department of mathematics at the University of Nottingham. Adrian Smith was President of the Royal Statistical Society from 1995-1997 and was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 2001. He led a review for government of post-14 mathematics education in the UK in 2004. He has made significant contributions to Bayesian statistics. The citation for the fellowship of the Royal Society said that “his monographs are the most comprehensive available and his work has had a major impact on the development of monitoring tools for clinicians.”

Citation: The Board recommends the conferment of an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science on Sir Adrian Smith in recognition of his outstanding contribution to Mathematics and to the leadership of research in the UK.

IMPERIAL COLLEGE MEDAL

7. The Management Board makes the following recommendation to the Council for the award of the Imperial College Medal during 2011:
a. Dr Maha Barakat

Director General of the Abu Dhabi Health Authority, Medical & Research Director, Imperial College London Diabetes Centre, Abu Dhabi. Dr Maha Barakat was appointed Senior Lecturer and Consultant Endocrinologist at Imperial College London and Hammersmith Hospital in 2004. In October of that year she also became the first director of her planned Imperial College London Diabetes Centre in Abu Dhabi, a post she still holds. In 2009 she was promoted to a Readership in Imperial College and in August 2010 received the OBE for services to medical research, training and public health. In 2012 Dr Barakat received the great honour of The Abu Dhabi Award - for medical services to the Abu Dhabi community.

Citation: The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to Dr Maha Barakat in recognition of the outstanding contribution she has made to the life and work of Imperial College.

b. Professor David Begg

As Principal of the Business School David Begg was responsible for its transformation to a world ranked, world recognised, research led Business School worthy of its place in the College. He did this through courageously implementing a clear vision of what a Business School at Imperial should and could be. He led the integration of the School into the College to create the almost unique combination of STEM. He built the strong international faculty which now characterise the School. He constantly pushed the School to grow towards a critical size and made it an exciting place to work for staff at all levels and in all roles. His contribution was not limited to the Business School. He played a key role in the development and life of the College over the last decade.

Citation: The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to Professor David Begg in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made to the life and work of Imperial College.

c. Professor Sinclair Goodlad

Sinclair Goodlad, was from 1992 until his retirement Director of the Humanities Programme at Imperial College London. He studied English Literature at King’s College, Cambridge, and did his PhD in Sociology at the London School of Economics. He is a Fellow of the Society for Research into Higher Education. For seven years, he was editor of the journal Studies in Higher Education. He has written and/or edited 17 books on education (on theories and methods of higher education, service learning, and student tutoring). He made an outstanding contribution to Imperial College in promoting good teaching and broadening education throughout his time at the College. His legacy includes valuable and enduring initiatives such as the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Programme (UROP) and the Pimlico Connection. UROP has furthered the research ambitions of students for over 30 years and continues to be the College’s focal point for students who wish to develop an appreciation of research and the environment within which it takes place. The Pimlico Connection is a scheme that has been running at the College since 1975 in which students volunteer as classroom assistants and mentors in local
primary and secondary schools. The scheme aims to inspire the pupils in Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths subjects whilst raising aspirations and providing a positive role model for both science and higher education.

Citation: The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to Professor Sinclair Goodlad in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made to the life and work of Imperial College.

d. **Professor Sir Peter Knight**

Professor Sir Peter Knight is the Principal of the Kavli Royal Society International Centre at Chicheley Hall. He retired from the College in September 2010 as Deputy Rector (Research) and is now a Senior Research Investigator in the Physics Department. He was until 2008 Principal of the Faculty of Natural Sciences and he was Head of the Physics Department from 2001 to 2005. Until December 2010 he chaired the Defence Scientific Advisory Council at the UK Ministry of Defence, and he remains a Government science advisor and is a Council member of the Science and Technology Facilities Council. Sir Peter was also Chief Scientific Advisor at the UK National Physical Laboratory until the end of 2005. He was knighted in the Queen’s Birthday Honours List in 2005 for his work in optical physics.

Citation: The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to Professor Sir Peter Knight in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made to the life and work of Imperial College.

e. **Mr Roderick Rhys-Jones**

Roderick has been Chairman of Friends of Imperial College for over 10 years, organising scientific lectures and visits to the College, a volunteer position he took up after working for a year at Imperial to set up a new department for fundraising and alumni relations (2002). Rod took the Friends independent of the College in 2004, and by 2009 had professionalised it with part-time admin and an active and supportive committee drawn from its membership. It now puts on 15 events a year, has 300 members growing at about 10% per year and attracts 2000 people a year to its events. It now makes annual gifts to the College; in 2012 it gave £3,000 to the Rector’s Scholarship Fund. As an alumnus Rod has been a strong supporter of the College over many decades has attended a great many events including alumni reunions, networking events as well as annual fund and cultivation events.

Citation: The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to Mr Roderick Rhys-Jones in recognition of his outstanding service to Imperial College.

f. **Mr Dick Sheppard**

Dick Sheppard did his degree in chemistry at Imperial College in the early 1960s. Although he did not complete his PhD, he nevertheless stayed in the department doing various practical physical chemistry related jobs. He ran the NMR laboratory from its inception in 1979 (initially jointly with Henry Rzepa), having dabbled with building instruments for research use for ca. 10
years before that. Even after his official retirement in 2009 he has continued to take a substantial role in the operation of the laboratory. He was particularly active in getting the laboratory up and running again after a major flood in August 2012 caused severe disruption. A particularly notable feature of his time running the laboratory has been the low maintenance costs. His expertise at fixing the spectrometers got him such a reputation with the manufacturers that he was often given spare parts at a substantial discount or even for free on the understanding he would fit them himself. This has saved the Department tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of pounds. Inherent in how the superconducting magnets that form the heart of an nmr machine work, they need to kept cold at all times, and as such they magnets require regular top-ups of liquid nitrogen. For almost all of his 30 years in charge of the nmr laboratory, Dick has interrupted his Christmas break to top up all of the magnets between Christmas and New Year. These are only a couple of snapshots of the many ways in which Dick’s dedication to the nmr laboratory has contributed in a major fashion to the work of the department.

*Citation:* The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to Mr Dick Sheppard in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made to the life and work of Imperial College.

g. **Professor Howard Thomas**

Howard Thomas was Professor of Medicine at St Mary's from 1987 to 2011. He was responsible for a huge scientific output in the field of viral hepatitis and was the first to develop a hepatitis B vaccine. He was responsible for organising MBBS final exams for 25 years on the St Mary's site and was responsible for postgraduate and undergraduate teaching. He won the Hans Popper Award (the highest award in his discipline in 2002) and was President of the European Association for the Study of the Liver in 1997. He is the grandfather of Hepatology as a modern medical discipline and he retired from Imperial in 2011, having been at various times Campus Dean at St Mary’s and Clinical Dean for the Faculty of Medicine. He was also Deputy Head of the Division of Medicine under Mark Walport, following the merger with the RPMS. He was unfailingly kind to students as he always had time for everyone, no matter how busy he was.

*Citation:* The Board recommends the award of the Imperial College Medal to Professor Howard Thomas in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made to the life and work of Imperial College.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

8. The Council is invited to consider and, if it sees fit, approve the nominations for the conferment of Honorary Degrees and for the award of the Imperial College Medal.
HONORARY AWARDS

1. The Council may confer any degree of the College on any person honoris causa (hereinafter referred to as 'honorary degrees') (1). The Council may also award the Imperial College Medal to such persons or organisations who have, in the opinion of the Council, rendered exceptional service to the College.

2. Although Imperial College welcomes the support provided to the College by philanthropic donations, it does not and will not confer honorary degrees of Imperial College in return for such donations. For this reason, a person who has made a philanthropic donation to the College may only be considered for the award of an honorary degree if they satisfy the stringent criteria for these awards set out below.

CONFERMENT OF DEGREES HONORIS CAUSA

3. An honorary degree may be conferred on persons of conspicuous merit, who have achieved the highest national or international prominence in fields which are highly valued by the College.

4. An honorary degree shall not, save in exceptional circumstances, be conferred in absentia.

5. An honorary degree shall not be conferred posthumously. However, where the Council has formally resolved to confer an honorary degree on a person, and the death of that person occurs before the conferment takes place, the honorary degree shall be deemed to have been conferred, the date of the conferment being deemed to be the day preceding the date of death.

6. An honorary degree conferred by the College shall be cited in the following form:

Title of degree (Imperial College London) honoris causa, e.g. DSc (Imperial College London) honoris causa.

---

1. See Ordinance B1, Paragraph 1 for the list of degrees.
7. The Council shall prescribe the form of the diploma for those upon whom an honorary degree has been conferred and shall determine the procedures for inviting and considering nominations and the arrangements for conferring the degrees. It may also develop the criteria for the conferment of honorary degrees more fully, if it sees fit.

8. The Higher Doctorates that may be awarded are as follows:

- Doctor of Literature (DLit)
- Doctor of Literature (Education) (DLit(Ed))
- Doctor of Science (DSc)
- Doctor of Science (Economics) (DSc(Econ))
- Doctor of Science (Engineering) (DSc(Eng))
- Doctor of Science (Medicine) (DSc(Med))

**AWARD OF THE IMPERIAL COLLEGE MEDAL**

9. The Imperial College Medal may be awarded to such persons or organisations, whether members of the College or not, as may be deemed eligible by reason of their having rendered exceptional or outstanding service to Imperial College or having otherwise acted over a period of time to enhance its reputation, mission and/ or objectives.

**REVOCATION**

10. The Council may revoke any degree, diploma, certificate or other award, qualification or distinction granted by the College and all privileges connected therewith, if it shall at any time be discovered and proved to the satisfaction of the Council that there was any irregularity in the events or circumstances leading to the grant of that degree, diploma, certificate, or other award, qualification or distinction and, in the case of degrees and other distinctions conferred *honoris causa*, for such reasons as shall satisfy the Council.

Approved by the Council 23 March 2007, effective from 8 July 2007
Revised by the Council 23 November 2007
Revised by the Council 20 November 2009
Revised by the Council 26 November 2010
Revised by the Council 10 February 2012
Revised by the Council 23 November 2012
IMPERIAL WEST REPORT
A Report by the Director of the Imperial West Project

IMPERIAL WEST CAMPUS

1. Planning permission for the hybrid Masterplan scheme was granted on 21 December 2012. The Section 106 was signed and executed on 21 December 2012 and the Decision Notice issued the same day. The Judicial Review period runs for three months, ending on 21 March 2013.

2. The demolition of the remaining two BBC buildings at the Imperial West campus was completed at the end of November 2012.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

3. LBHF has received a letter before action from Webster Dixon solicitors, acting for St Helen's Residents' Association in relation to a Judicial Review on the Imperial West Masterplan approval. At this stage the two grounds identified are; inappropriate weight to the draft WCOAPF and the misapplication of affordable housing policy. This does not constitute an application for a judicial review, but a warning of their intention.

UKRPIF AWARD

4. The terms of the UK RIPF grant funding from HEFCE for the Research and Translation Hub have been released and are not considered to be onerous. The College must share the terms of their agreement with Voreda once it has been established and report any significant deviations on time, budget or scope of the project from the bid document are communicated promptly to HEFCE. The programme for the delivery of the Hub will be challenging as the £35m grant funding must be spent by March 2015. The team are currently in a further feasibility stage to establish the scope of the design and legal work that needs to be undertaken to enter into a formal agreement with Voreda.
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PAPER F – FOR DECISION

ENDOWMENT REPORT

A Report by the Chairman of the Endowment Board

YEAR TO DATE

1. At the consolidated level, the position of the Endowment at 31 December 2012 is as follows -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Asset Classes</th>
<th>31 Jul 12</th>
<th>31 Dec 12</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitised Scheme*</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovations</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Core Property**</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Fund</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5.2)</td>
<td>(100)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Total</td>
<td>305.6</td>
<td>343.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

UNITISED SCHEME

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

2. Structural changes to the Unitised Scheme during the 5 months ended 31 December 2012 accounted for c.£16m of the positive variance reported above, as detailed here:

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. As reported to Council on 23rd November 2012, the Defence Fund was then unitised on 30 September 2012.

b. The Unitised Scheme realised £8.3m cash from its Wood Lane Studios investment on 27th November 2012 and expects to receive an additional £1.3m cash distribution from the Woodlands SPV in early 2013. This resulted in a £2.5m increase in the Unitised Scheme’s value.

c. Ceres Power announced on 29th November 2011 its intention to pursue an alternative business strategy (limiting their activity to the creation of an effective Fuel Cell Module) together with a proposed equity issue to raise £3.3m. The Unitised
Scheme took part in the equity issue and received an additional 5.5 million shares at a total cost of £55k (1p/share). As a result the College now owns 10m shares representing a 2.4% shareholding. At the end of December, the shares were valued at 5.9 pence, valuing the investment in Ceres Power at £593k. This investment has been identified as a strategic investment and will be transferred out of the Unitised Scheme prior to the outsourcing of the Scheme.

3. In order to retain the Unitised Scheme’s cash balance at 30% of the overall portfolio, a £22m investment into L&G Global 100 Index was made on 30 September 2012 and a £9.7m investment into iShares MSCI World (IWRD) shares was made at the end of November 2012. The Unitised Scheme cash balance at the end of December 2012 was £39.9m, representing 29.6% of the overall portfolio.

4. Work on the outsourcing of the Unitised Scheme is continuing. Legal contracts have been signed with ARC and Northern Trust (global custodian) to open a College account on the Northern Trust platform by 31 January 2013. The fund managers are on track to be formally appointed on 31 January 2013. The transfer of assets to the new fund managers will be staggered through February with a target date of completion of 28 February 2013. Attached at Annex A are the Investment Guidelines, approved for distribution to the fund managers. These have been designed to maximise the fund manager’s flexibility in delivering the long term investment target within a reasonable risk profile.

PERFORMANCE – 5 MONTHS ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2012

5. ARC’s most recent independent review of the Unitised Scheme performance is attached at Annex B.(1) It is pleasing to note that the long run performance remains well ahead of the relative benchmark and the Endowment’s peer group. Although the Scheme remains marginally behind the absolute target of RPI + 4% in the longer term, over 2012 the Scheme’s performance beat the absolute return target.

STRATEGIC ASSET INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO

IMPERIAL INNOVATIONS AND CERES POWER

6. Imperial Innovations - The Endowment’s holding in Innovations grew by 7.4% in the five months to the end of December 2012, delivering a gain of £6.4m to the Endowment over the period. The share price at the end of December 2012 was 311p. Following the Board’s acknowledgement that there was a need to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the underlying assets that underpin the valuation of Innovations, a shortlist of potential independent advisers was drawn up and invited to pitch. After the procurement process was completed, the Board approved the appointment of Peel Hunt to carry out this work and expect to review their report at the next Endowment Board in April 2013.

---

1. Annex B contains information which is commercially sensitive and confidential and has not been included with these published minutes.
7. **Ceres Power** - As detailed above, the Board approved the transfer of its investment in Ceres Power out of the Unitised Scheme on the basis that this represented a strategic investment to the College. The Board approved the establishment of a new Strategic Asset Investment portfolio (to initially contain the Endowment’s investments in Innovations and Ceres Power). The Board reaffirmed the policy that any shares donated to the College with restrictive covenants would be placed in the Strategic Asset Investment portfolio for management in line with the covenants. Any unrestricted listed shares donated to the College would be divested immediately with the proceeds invested into the Unitised Scheme.

---

**NON CORE PROPERTY PORTFOLIO**

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES**

8. **Clayponds.**

   a. As reported to the November meeting of Council, at its October meeting, the Endowment Board approved in principle the freehold disposal of the Clayponds site – a former postgraduate hall of residence transferred to the Endowment as a non-core asset at the beginning of October 2012. Subsequent to this, a targeted marketing programme has been undertaken and at its meeting on the 22nd of January the Endowment formally delegated authority to the Chief Executive of the Endowment to proceed with the sale of the site to the Notting Hill Housing Trust, which has submitted a bid of £26.55m. The final offer was received on the 15th of January, following interviews with the four organisations which submitted bids at or above our target figure of £24m. The final bid represents an uplift over both our target figure and the £18m holding value of the asset. Notting Hill submitted the strongest bid for the site, and at the interview demonstrated that they have the ability and desire to complete the transaction quickly.

   b. Exchange is targeted for the end of February. The deal remains subject to surveys and Board approval, although Notting Hill has delegated authority to proceed with their due diligence prior to their next Board meeting on the 13th of February. Completion will follow 28 days after exchange. Transactional fees will be payable of £537,000, resulting in net proceeds to the College of £25,963,000.

   c. Following the decision of the Endowment Board, Council is therefore formally requested to approve the sale of Clayponds to Notting Hill Housing Trust.

9. **Wye 3 Masterplan.**

   a. The development of the ‘Wye 3’ site at Imperial’s former campus in Kent continues. Since the last meeting of Council, the second public consultation event has been held in Wye. At the event, a presentation was made by our Masterplan architects which summarised the results of the public consultation to that point, and
invited discussion around scenarios of development based around two distinct
guiding and contradictory principles:

(1) **Compact Village:** This would see the development of our land Wye 3
guided by the principle that Wye should exist as a ‘walkable settlement’ from
the centre of the village. This reflects a desire amongst many respondents to
the consultation that that boundary of the village should be defined, and that
Wye should not develop with ‘sprawl’.

(2) **Clustered Development:** This would see our land developed in
clusters. Smaller pockets of development over a larger total area would, in
this scenario, have through routes and landscaped barriers between them.
This reflects feedback which stated that any development should not be
overly dense, and sympathetic to the landscape – the theory being that
smaller clusters would be easily sheltered from the road, and nestled into the
landscape, protecting the view from the Crown which overlooks the village.

b. Examples were shown of a range of uses within each guiding philosophy, with
each scenario featuring a mixed-use Masterplan. These contained an element of
residential development, some community facilities, business units, and other plans,
including a hotel and residential care facility. We were clear that any quantum of
development were not going to be presented at this time, with discussions
concentrating on the principle of development uses. The presentations were
generally well-received, with nearly 100 locals in attendance over the two days.
Feedback forms were handed out, and a video of the presentation has now been
produced and is online. Concerns amongst the local population concentrated, as
usual, on the impact of any development on the infrastructure of the village
(particularly transport), and a latent desire to see the return of the agricultural college
to the village. While there remains, amongst some within the village, an underlying
suspicion towards Imperial, the new approach adopted throughout this process is
making a positive impression, and the project team are building a constructive
dialogue locally. The feedback – much of it contradictory – is being analysed now,
and a session with our ‘Sounding Board’ of local residents will take place in February,
with the aim to drill down and draw out themes from the feedback. Meanwhile,
viability assessments are being carried out, to gauge the quantum of residential
development required to deliver a return for the Endowment within the context of
these plans, in addition to some of the community facilities requested by the locals.

c. Meanwhile, the Education Funding Agency (EFA) has now finally decided that
the listed buildings in Main Campus North are inappropriate to house the Free
School, as proposed by a group of local residents, instead favouring a new build site
to the rear of (and incorporating) the Kempe Centre. A period of consultation will be
embarked upon now by the EFA in conjunction with the United Learning Trust (ULT).
It is likely that, in the face of opposition locally, the project will fall away. We have, to
this point, maintained our neutral stance to the principle of the school, which remains
the most developed proposal for the campus.
d. Relations with the village are improving, although the next few months will clearly be a more challenging phase of the project, with a draft Masterplan presented to the village in April. The project team will present a draft of the Masterplan, including a financial analysis, to the Endowment Board in March, which will give enough time for feedback to be digested and adjustments to be made prior to the plans being released externally. In terms of media interest and relations, the Public Relations consultant employed on the project is in regular dialogue with Imperial’s Communications Division, who are fully briefed on the project, although it should be noted that, to this point, media interest in the progress of the project has been relatively low-key and local in nature.

10. **Pembridge Gardens Annex.**

a. Less positive is the development of the Pembridge Gardens Annex scheme. As reported at the last meeting of Council, the scheme was due to be considered by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea’s Planning Committee on the 9th of January. The decision was taken, however, to withdraw the application prior to committee after RBKC’s officers recommended refusal. This is deeply frustrating, particularly considering the lengths that had been gone to secure Officers consent for the scheme. Three pre-application meetings were held with RBKC, at which the form, bulk, design, layout and materials were agreed. In the committee report, officers agreed that the re-designed scheme enhanced the conservation area, and only two objections to the scheme were received, neither of which were material.

b. However, there was an error in the application submitted in the daylight/sunlight assessment carried out. Moreover, while the level of affordable housing had not been agreed prior to the submission of the application, the advice was that an ongoing dialogue was taking place with the valuation office, and that an agreement would be reached prior to the report being produced. Although this demand for on-site provision was based on incorrect assessments on the part of the Planning Authority, and it is likely that on this point we would have been successful on appeal, clearly relying on appeal is not an acceptable outcome, and the relationship with the Valuation Office should have been robust enough to prevent this point from being outstanding as the report was written.

c. While no additional fees will be paid, the additional work prior to re-submission –revising the daylight/sunlight assessments and agreeing the level of affordable housing contribution within the scheme – will take two weeks, meaning, including the 13-week determination period, that we will target a committee in the spring, with a view to starting on site over the summer holidays, as work to the Annex cannot take place during term time. The Project Manager will present a weekly update report, and the project team’s ongoing output will be subject to close review.

11. **Silwood Park.** Representations have been submitted to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) as part of their Borough Local Plan Sites Consultation. This Borough Plan will define the planning environment in the Borough for the next planning cycle (5-years). While the representations do not bind us to any firm commitments, it is critical that the College, as a major landowner in the Borough, flags its presence in the area.
Affirming the status of the developed areas of the campus as a Major Developed Site (MDS) within the Greenbelt allows discussions over the future academic direction of the campus – as well as discussions over the future of the Silwood Business Zone, which continues to operate in a challenging marketplace - to be conducted over the next five years with all options open to the College.
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1. The Finance Regulations give the Rector authority to approve capital projects up to £10m in value provided any that fall in the range between £5m and £10m have been previously included in a Capital Investment Approval Plan that has been reviewed and approved in principle by Council. Note that this excludes non-core assets within the Endowment for which separate procedures exist.

2. In recent years capital expenditure has been constrained, reflecting the economic uncertainty surrounding higher education provision. The more limited number of projects have tended to be either high value and so have needed to be brought straight to Council for approval or low value and below Council limits for consideration. We are now returning to a period where it is likely that there will be a number of projects each year in the £5m-£10m range and so propose to submit a Capital Investment Approval Plan in July as part of the budget submission to Council. These projects will form part of the College’s overall Strategic Masterplan and an update on the progress of the latter, along with some of the more significant capital proposals associated with it, will also be presented at that stage. It is likely that finalising the overall Masterplan vision for the College will take at least another 18 months to complete beyond July.

3. Council approval in principle will only be sought for those items on the Capital Investment Approval Plan valued between £5-£10m and where commitment is expected to be needed during 2013-14. Prior to July, it is anticipated that the following two projects might fall in the £5m-10m range for which approval will be required:

   a. Refurbishment of the basement at the Guy Scadding building in the Royal Brompton Hospital

   b. Refurbishing of the CBS facilities in the Guy Scadding building and the Sir Alexander Fleming building.

4. These are noted for information at this stage and details will be brought to Council when formal approval is sought.

5. Also for information, work on both the development of building C (a core College asset) at Imperial West and the W3 student accommodation project will commence before July. Both of these have been previously approved by Council.

6. Council will be aware that the College is embarking on a further phase of development at Imperial West (the Research and Translation Hub), following on from the successful planning application achieved for the future phases of development on the site. The College has successfully bid for a UK Research Infrastructure Partnership Fund grant of
£35m from HEFCE with up to £90m provided by Voreda, the company with whom we have been working on the current developments at Imperial West.

7. Further design work has therefore been commissioned to ensure that there is clarity on the specification and delivery obligations for the Research and Translation Hub, and to finalise the total cost of the project, ensuring that it remains within the terms required for the HEFCE grant. It is anticipated that this work will conclude around Easter, by which point the legal documentation to support both project delivery and the long term operational structure will also have been concluded. It is therefore likely that a final approval to enter into these significant contractual commitments will be required prior to the July review of the Capital Plan. The Council is therefore advised that a full proposal, supported by the current review work, will be brought forwards at the next meeting of Council for final approval.
PAPER H – FOR DECISION

PROCEDURE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF FITNESS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE

A Note by the Academic Registrar

1. At its December 2012 meeting the Senate approved, on the recommendation of the Medical Studies Committee, substantial revisions to the College’s Procedure for the Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine to bring it in line with the General Medical Council’s (GMC) Medical Students, Professional Values and Fitness to Practise. The revisions have also been informed by feedback from two recent College Fitness to Practise panels. The revised procedure (attached at Appendix A) reduces the number of panel members to seven and proposes the appointment of a standing Chair, normally the Clinical Dean. The new procedure also makes available to the panel a wider range of potential outcomes, in line with GMC guidance.

2. The Senate recommends to Council the introduction of the revised Procedure for the Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine, with immediate effect.
IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

PROCEDURE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF FITNESS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE

PREAMBLE

1. The College offers several programmes of study that leads to the degree of MBBS which qualifies graduates for provisional registration as doctors. Graduates then undertake a further year as a pre-registration Foundation year 1 doctor (F1) in order to achieve full registration by the General Medical Council (GMC). Under the Medical Act (1983) the College is responsible for the education and training of doctors up to full registration, including both the undergraduate and foundation stages of education and training. The Act also places a duty upon the College to ensure that those who graduate from undergraduate programmes and who subsequently complete their F1 training are fit to practise.

2. Imperial College’s Code of Student Discipline (Ordinance E2) sets out the jurisdictional areas for discipline purposes and details of the summary punishments, procedures and penalties, is prefaced by a note which is addressed specifically to medical students.

3. This Note, in its entirety, states that:

“Students must note that conduct of a nature which would be inappropriate in a member of some professions could require additional disciplinary action. In particular students of the Faculty of Medicine must note that conduct which would be improper in the case of a member of the medical profession could constitute a disciplinary offence which will be considered under these procedures. Additionally, students whose course of study leads to provisional registration as doctors and whose conduct falls to be considered under these procedures may also fall to be considered under the College’s Procedure for the Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine.”

4. The following procedure provides the arrangements for assessing any conduct, behaviour or other matter that could bear on a student’s/ F1’s suitability in respect of fitness to practise medicine. The procedure has three distinct components, details of which are given below. These are:

   a. Procedure for the Initiation of an Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine.

   b. Procedure for a meeting of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel.

   c. Procedure for making appeals against the decision of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel.

5. In the procedure references to “College working days” means days upon which the College administration is open and should not be confused with “term-time”.
PROCEDURE FOR THE INITIATION OF AN ASSESSMENT OF
FITNESS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE

6. A flow diagram outlining the procedure for the initiation of an assessment of fitness to practise medicine is given in Annex A.

7. All issues relating to the conduct or behaviour of a medical student may amount to misconduct under the College’s Code of Student Discipline and will be considered first under those Procedures. Accusations of such misconduct should be submitted to the Responsible Authority, as defined in the College’s Code of Student Discipline, in writing, as set out in the Procedures. Anonymous allegations will not be considered, although the accuser has the right to confidentiality. Allegations must be substantiated and, if necessary, action, including disciplinary action, may be taken against individuals who use the system to make false, vexatious or malicious accusations.

8. The student’s case will be dealt with by the appropriate disciplinary authority defined in the College’s Code of Student Discipline, who will determine whether a disciplinary offence has been committed and, if so, what penalty should be imposed. The disciplinary authority will refer the case, once any appeals procedures have been completed, on to the Faculty of Medicine’s Student Progress Group in any of the following situations:

    a. All cases where the student is found guilty of a disciplinary offence regardless of whether a penalty is prescribed or not

    b. Where the case raises an issue relating to the student that questions his or her physical or mental health.

9. Allegations against a student that are based solely on that student’s physical or mental health will be made directly to the Faculty of Medicine’s Student Progress Group. It is inappropriate for such allegations to be considered under the College’s Code of Student Discipline.

10. Any disciplinary matter that falls outside the jurisdiction of the College’s Code of Student Discipline but which causes concern from a fitness to practise medicine perspective will be dealt with initially by the Student Progress Group.

11. The Terms of Reference of the Faculty of Medicine’s Student Progress Group are attached at Annex B.

12. When a case is referred to the Student Progress Group, that Group will consider whether a prima facie case exists for finding the student unfit to practise medicine. The Group is entitled to consider the student’s disciplinary record in making its determination. Should the Group decide that a prima facie case exists, it shall inform the Head of Central Secretariat that a meeting of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel should be convened.

13. The decision of the Student Progress Group will be informed by guidance published by the GMC and the Medical Schools Council (MSC) entitled “Medical Students:
Professional Values and Fitness to Practise” (November 2009) and particularly advice on the professional behaviour expected of medical students in order for them to be fit to practise and areas of misconduct and the sanctions available. Other sources of guidance from the GMC relevant to the decision-making process include “Good Medical Practice” and “Tomorrow’s Doctors”. This Procedure will be reviewed and updated upon the release of new or updated guidance from the GMC and the MSC.

14. **Areas of Concern/ Misconduct.** The GMC lists the following types of concern that could lead to fitness to practise investigations and procedures:

   a. **Criminal conviction or caution**
      - Child pornography
      - Theft
      - Financial fraud
      - Possession of illegal substances
      - Child abuse or any other abuse
      - Physical violence

   b. **Drug or alcohol misuse**
      - Drunk driving
      - Alcohol consumption that affects clinical work or the work environment
      - Dealing, possessing or misusing drugs even if there are no legal proceedings

   c. **Aggressive, violent or threatening behaviour**
      - Assault
      - Physical violence
      - Bullying
      - Abuse

   d. **Persistent inappropriate attitude or behaviour**
      - Uncommitted to work
      - Neglect of administrative tasks
      - Poor time management
      - Non-attendance
      - Poor communications skills
      - Failure to accept and follow educational advice

   e. **Cheating or plagiarising**
      - Cheating in examinations, logbooks or portfolios
      - Passing off others’ work as one’s own
      - Forging a supervisor’s name on assessments

   f. **Dishonesty or fraud including dishonesty outside the role**
      - Falsifying research
      - Financial fraud
• Fraudulent CVs or other documents
• Misrepresentation of qualifications

g. Unprofessional behaviour or attitudes
• Breach of confidentiality
• Misleading patients about their care or treatment
• Culpable involvement in a failure to obtain proper consent from a patient
• Sexual, racial or other forms of harassment
• Inappropriate examinations or failure to keep appropriate boundaries in behaviour
• Persistent rudeness to patients, colleagues or others
• Unlawful discrimination

h. Health concerns and insight or management of these concerns
• Failure to seek medical treatment or other support
• Refusal to follow medical advice or care plans, including monitoring and reviews, in relations to maintaining fitness to practise.
• Failure to recognise limits and abilities or lack of insight into health concerns
• Treatment-resistant condition

15. The Student Progress Group will effectively act as ‘the investigator’ in determining whether a case needs to be considered as a fitness to practise issue; the Student Progress Group may appoint an individual member to follow up investigations and make recommendations back to them as necessary.

16. Any investigation must be conducted in a proportionate manner, balancing the interests of patients and the public against those of the student, except that the protection of the public shall be treated as the paramount consideration.

17. The Student Progress Group will bear in mind that the above guidance states “a student’s fitness to practise is called into question when their behaviour raises a serious or persistent cause for concern about their ability to continue on a medical course, or to practise as a doctor after graduation. This includes, but is not limited to, the possibility that they could put patients or the public at risk.”

18. Where there is found to be a prima facie case, the Student Progress Group may consider that the conduct or health issue is so serious that restrictions should be placed on the student’s activities. The Group may make recommendations to the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine who shall consider the material provided by the Group and invite the student to make representations. Taking the protection of the public as the paramount consideration, the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine shall decide whether, and if so what, restrictions should be placed on the student’s activities. Any restrictions imposed shall

1. The Principal of the Faculty of Medicine may delegate his responsibilities under these Procedures to another senior member of staff within the Faculty of Medicine; this will usually be the Director of Education or their designated deputy.
remain in place until the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel or the Principal of the Medical Faculty direct otherwise.

19. Upon receipt of notification from the Student Progress Group, the Head of Central Secretariat will write to the student and the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine informing them of this decision and advising them what the next stages of the procedure will be.

20. The Student Progress Group has the right to initiate action under Regulation 9 of the Regulations for Students to seek a medical examination of a student, if the mental or physical health of that student has had any bearing on the case.

21. Where the Student Progress Group decides that there is not a prima facie case in relation to fitness to practise, it will inform the student and the disciplinary authority that referred the matter (if any) of its decision.

22. The student has the right to support from the College’s counselling service, which will be confidential except in wholly exceptional circumstances where the counsellor believes that the student is actively a danger to him/herself or to others.

23. The student has the right to support from the Imperial College Union, as well as from the Faculty Senior Tutor in the Faculty of Medicine. Support is also available through the College pastoral care system, which includes Personal Tutors, College Tutors and the College Disabilities Officer.

**PROCEDURE FOR A MEETING OF THE FITNESS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE PANEL**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CONSTITUTION OF THE FITNESS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE PANEL**

24. The Terms of Reference of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel are to consider cases referred to it by the Student Progress Group, where that Group has determined that there is a prima facie case to be heard. Its constitution shall be:

   a. A Chair, normally the Faculty of Medicine Clinical Dean. Where a conflict of interest may arise, a person of equivalent standing may stand in e.g. previous Clinical Dean.

   b. One clinical member of the academic staff of the Faculty of Medicine, appointed by the Principal’s Advisory Group;

   c. A practising consultant psychiatrist;

   d. One person who is both a teacher and practitioner of law, appointed by the Law Society;
e. A Lay member of the Panel, to be appointed by the College Council or Court;

f. Wherever possible, an occupational physician working for the NHS and not from the College’s Occupational Health Service;

g. The Imperial College Union President or his or her nominee from among the other Imperial College Union Sabbatical Officers;

25. No person shall sit as a member of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel if he or she is:

a. The subject of a charge;

b. The complainant;

c. A witness or a potential witness (i.e. has personal knowledge of the facts surrounding the case);

d. Successfully challenged for any good cause;

e. Connected with the student being charged, to include the Personal Tutor, or any other person involved with the case;

f. Formed part of a disciplinary authority referring the case to the Panel.

26. The Clerk of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel will normally be appointed by the Head of Central Secretariat. The Clerk will be responsible for ensuring that all members of the Panel are familiar, and comply, with the Fitness to Practice Medicine Procedures.

27. No member of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall be a member of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel.

28. The quorum for a meeting of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel shall be five including the Chair and the persons appointed under paragraphs 24 d., f. and g. If a hearing before the Panel is adjourned, only those members who have been present at that meeting shall continue the hearing when it is resumed.

29. Should the Chair, responding to the particular circumstances of a case, feel that the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel would benefit from specialist advice, then a ‘specialist advisor’ may be appointed. Such an ‘advisor’ may only provide advice, which must be given in the presence of all the parties. Specialist advisors are not appointed as members of the Panel and have no voting rights.
PROCEDURE FOR A MEETING OF THE FITNESS TO PRACTISE MEDICINE PANEL

30. Students whose cases are referred to the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel shall be informed in writing by the Clerk at least twenty College working days before the date of the hearing of:

a. The charges against them;

b. The date, time and venue of the hearing;

c. Their right to have the hearing in public;

d. Their right to be represented (at their own expense) at the hearing by a person of their choice, including a lawyer;

e. Their right to be accompanied by a friend, relative or Student Union representative;

f. Their right to bring witnesses;

g. Any suspension from his/her clinical course or limitations or conditions placed upon the continuance of his/her studies or practise during the period of the investigation;

h. The names of the members of the Panel and of the Clerk and of his/her right to challenge the Panel members for any good cause;

i. The procedure of presenting evidence including the provision of original versions of documentation.

31. The Notice of the hearing shall include a copy of this Procedure.

32. If the student wishes to challenge the inclusion of any member of the Panel he/she should notify the Clerk immediately in writing setting out the reasons for the challenge. Prior to the hearing, the Chair of the Panel shall decide whether to uphold the challenge or not, having heard from the Student or his/ her representative as is necessary. If the challenge is to the Chair of the Panel, the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine shall rule on the challenge.

33. The Fitness to Practice Medicine Panel hearing will normally be held within thirty College working days of the referral from the Student Progress Group.

34. The Principal of the Faculty of Medicine shall determine who from the Faculty will formulate the charge and present the case. That person will send to the Clerk of the Panel in good time before the hearing, any documents to be submitted, which shall include the record made of any disciplinary hearing under the College Code of Student Discipline, and the name of any witnesses to be called and at least a summary of the evidence each witness is expected to give. The Clerk shall forward the material received to the student with the notice of the hearing.
35. If the student wishes to be represented, to call witnesses or present documents either bearing on the charge or in mitigation of any penalty which may be imposed, he/she shall notify the Clerk to the Panel accordingly no fewer than ten days before the scheduled hearing, providing they have received the material to be presented by the person presenting the case against the student’s fitness to practise medicine.

36. All documentary information concerning the case against a student’s fitness to practise medicine must be submitted prior to the hearing to the Clerk of the Panel; documents which will be taken into consideration by the Panel during the hearing shall be provided to all parties, including the Panel, within the previously stated timeframes.

37. Any request to extend this timeframe shall be heard and decided by the Chair before the initial deadline. Extensions should only be granted where there are extenuating circumstances and may result in a delaying of the hearing, as determined by the Chair.

38. Documents should not normally be tabled during the hearing; any exception to this is at the Chair’s discretion. It is expected that any tabled documents would be either very small in content, such as a certificate. More substantial documents would normally only be accepted where there are extenuating circumstances.

39. Any witness to be presented by either party shall be named in advance as per the above timings; the Chair will have the power to limit the number of witnesses, at his or her discretion.

40. The Panel shall base its decision on the evidence presented and examined in the presence of the person bringing the charge and the student charged. The proceedings of the Panel shall not be invalidated by the failure to appear of the student charged following notification of the proceedings and case against him/her in accordance with the preceding paragraphs. Evidence of earlier misconduct by the student, which has already been the subject of previous disciplinary procedures, may be admitted and considered in deciding on any action.

41. The burden of proof rests with the person presenting the evidence who must prove the facts of the case according to the civil standard of proof. This means that cases will be judged on the balance of probabilities (i.e. that it is more likely than not to have happened). The civil standard of proof will, however, be applied flexibly. This means that the more serious an allegation, and the more serious the implications for the student, the more cogent and compelling the evidence must be before that allegation can be found proven, on the balance of probabilities.

42. Hearings shall normally be in private and confidentiality observed. A written account of the proceedings, prepared by the Clerk, may be released at the discretion of the Chair or Vice Chair acting as Chair. The student charged may request that the hearing is held in public.

43. A full record shall be made and retained for possible use in connection with an appeal. This will usually be by recording electronically the proceedings of the Panel except
when the Panel withdraws to consider its decision. A full written report must be provided to
the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine if the student makes an appeal, and to the student
and to members of the Appeals Panel if a meeting is convened to consider an appeal by the
student.

44. The Panel shall be empowered to call any person before it to clarify evidence. The
student or his/her representative will be entitled to cross-examine those individuals called to
clarify evidence.

DECISIONS OF THE PANEL

45. All Panels shall reach their decision by a simple majority voting. The Chair may
exercise a casting vote. The Clerk, and any specialist advisors, in each case shall not be
entitled to vote.

46. The Panel shall deliberate in the absence of all parties. The Clerk will remain
present in order to provide procedural advice to the Panel, and to record their reasons.

47. At the conclusion of the hearing the Panel may either find that:

a. The student should receive no warning or sanction; or

b. The student receives a warning as there is evidence of misconduct, but the
student’s fitness to practise is not impaired and does not require any of the sanctions
listed below; or

c. The student’s fitness to practise is judged to be impaired and they receive a
sanction. The purpose of any warning or sanction is to protect patients and the public
rather than to be a punishment for the student. Beginning with the least severe, the
sanctions are:

- Conditions or undertakings
- Suspension from the medical course
- Expulsion from the medical course

The Panel may take account of the GMC’s guidance when reaching a decision.

d. In cases where the student’s fitness to practise is impaired for health reasons
and the decision is to suspend the student from the course until such time as they
are fit to continue, the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel shall set a minimum period
of time before the student may seek review of the decision, during which the student
shall be granted an interruption of studies. After the expiry of the stated minimum
period of time, the student may write to the Head of Central Secretariat and ask that
a Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel be convened to review their suspension. The
student’s request must be received at the Central Secretariat not less than 25
College working days before the expiry of the time permitted for completion of
medical training as set out in the course requirements. A student whose fitness to practise is deemed to be sufficiently impaired to warrant suspension from the course may not continue with their clinical studies. A suspension would exceed no more than two years as per the College Regulations.

e. In cases where the student’s fitness to practise is impaired for health reasons and the decision is to allow them to continue to study with conditions or undertakings, the terms shall relate to adjustments to the course that the Faculty of Medicine agrees to make and shall be conditions upon which the student may continue with his/her clinical studies.

48. In accordance with guidance from the GMC “Any mitigating factors should be considered by the panel members when they are deciding on the appropriate outcome. The panel members should also make sure the warning or sanction they decide upon is proportional to the behaviour and will deal effectively with the fitness to practise concern.” In addition the panel “should keep in mind the balance between patient safety and the interests of the medical student.”

49. Not withstanding the need to consider a student’s behaviour on a case-by-case basis, panel members may wish to refer to “Medical Students: Professional Values and Fitness to Practise” (November 2009) for additional guidance on the appropriateness of any proposed warnings and sanctions. Panel members may also make recommendations on the expected duration will remain on a student’s record.

50. In keeping with the Human Rights Act (1998), should the student wish, the decision of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel will be published on an appropriate College notice-board. A record of the reasons for those decisions made in paragraph 47 above will be kept, although these will remain confidential with the exception of possible disclosure to the GMC or other public authority at the discretion of the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine.

51. Upon completion of its deliberations the Clerk to the Panel shall notify its decision in writing giving a summary of its reasons to the Head of Central Secretariat, within seven College working days of the hearing. The Head of Central Secretariat shall then notify the student and other relevant parties, including the Director of Education or their designated deputy, the Academic Registrar and, if appropriate, the GMC, in writing within two College working days of receiving this. This will include notice of the student’s right to appeal, the time within which the appeal must be made and the grounds upon which it may be made.

52. Where a student seeks a review of a Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel’s decision under paragraph 47 d. above and has notified the Head of Central Secretariat, the Head of Central Secretariat shall notify the Student Progress Group and the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, who shall consider and present any case against the student’s fitness to practise. The Head of Central Secretariat shall make arrangements for the convening of a Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel, including the giving of directions as to the delivery and exchange of documents to be relied upon. The student should co-operate with the Student Progress Group in the obtaining of such medical reports as are necessary under Regulation 9 of the Regulations for Students.
PROCEDURES FOR MAKING APPEALS

53. Appeals may be made on the grounds of procedural or other material irregularity, unreasonable conclusions or excessive penalty. All appeals must be made within five College working days in accordance with the guidance as follows:

a. Any student wishing to appeal against the decision of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel must do so in writing to the Head of Central Secretariat stating their grounds. The factual basis of the decision shall not be open to appeal unless evidence is produced which the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine regards as both new and significant. Where the allegation relates to the student's conduct, the student should have exhausted the appeals process under the disciplinary procedure before the matter was considered by the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel, however, the Principal shall retain a discretion to remit a matter to the appropriate disciplinary appeal body. The student will have one month from the date of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel's decision to provide all supporting documentary evidence for the appeal.

b. The Clerk to the Panel will prepare a full report of the proceedings before the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel. The report shall contain a statement of the matters investigated, a summary of the evidence given by each witness and the reasons for the decisions reached. The appellant will be supplied with a copy of the report and may submit comments.

c. The Principal of the Faculty of Medicine shall be supplied with a copy of the Clerk’s report and the appellant’s comments and grounds of appeal. The Principal shall decide on the evidence available whether or not the appeal should be proceeded with and should only dismiss unmeritorious claims.

d. If it is decided not to proceed with the appeal, the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine shall inform the Clerk to the Panel and the appellant of the decision, normally within seven College working days of having received the documentation.

e. Where it is decided that the appeal shall be proceeded with, the Principal shall inform the Head of Central Secretariat of the College, who shall inform all parties of the decision and make the necessary arrangements for the appeal to be held as early as possible. All parties shall be informed of the date of the appeal in good time.

f. Where an appeal is referred, the student shall be permitted to continue with his/ her programme of study at the discretion of the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, until the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel has reached its decision.

g. Students whose cases are referred to the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeal Panel shall be informed in writing of the date of the appeal and shall be notified of their right to have the hearing in public, and to be represented and/or accompanied at
the hearing by a person of their choice (and normally the person who acted in this capacity at the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel hearing). They will also be informed of their right to be represented by a solicitor whom he/she may pay for his/her services.

54. The Terms of Reference of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel are to consider appeals by reviewing the findings of Fitness to Practise Medicine Panels made on the allowable grounds. The Panel shall consist of:

   a. A Chair who shall normally be a member of the legal profession, nominated by the Chairman of the Bar Council and appointed by the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine as and when required;

   b. Two individuals not being members of the College Council, Staff or Students of the College, one to be a medical professional registered with the GMC and to be appointed by the Chair as and when the Appeals Panel needs to be convened.

55. No person shall sit as a member of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel if he/she is:

   a. The subject of a charge;

   b. The complainant;

   c. A witness or a potential witness (i.e. has personal knowledge of the facts surrounding the case);

   d. Successfully challenged for any good cause. The Chairman of the Panel shall decide whether or not to uphold the challenge, including a challenge to his/her own inclusion on the Appeal Panel, prior to the hearing;

   e. Connected with the student being charged, to include the Personal Tutor, or any other person involved with the case;

   f. A member of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel or any other committee or body which heard the original case.

56. The quorum for a Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall be three including the Chair.

57. Should the Chair, responding to the particular circumstances of a case, feel that the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel would benefit from a ‘specialist advisor’ then they can be appointed for the particular instance only to provide advice. Such an ‘advisor’ may only provide advice, which must be given in the presence of all the parties. Specialist advisors are not appointed as members of the Panel and have no voting rights.

58. The Clerk to the Appeals Panel shall normally be appointed by the Head of Central Secretariat and may have been the Clerk to the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel.
59. The Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall be supplied with the report of the proceedings of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel prepared by the Clerk to the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel provided to the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine. Members of the Appeals Panel will also be provided with any comments submitted by the appellant and any new or relevant documentation submitted to the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine.

60. At any hearing before the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel, the student whose case is being considered shall be entitled to be present throughout the hearing, except when the Appeals Panel considers its decision.

61. A Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall have power to reverse or modify the decision appealed against, in any way within the permitted findings at 47.c.

62. The decision of a Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall be based on evidence and submissions presented and examined in the presence of the student bringing the appeal. The proceedings of the Appeal Panel shall not be invalidated by the failure to appear of the student charged, following notification of the proceedings in accordance with paragraphs 53.e, and g.

63. The decision of a Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall be reached by a majority vote of the members of the Panel and shall be announced as the decision of the Panel. The Chair shall have a second or casting vote in the event of one member abstaining. The Clerk to the Panel shall not have a vote. The votes of the individual Appeal Panel members shall always be treated as confidential and there shall be no disclosure either of such votes or of information showing whether the decision was reached by a unanimous or a majority vote.

64. A full record of the proceedings shall be made and retained normally by recording electronically the proceedings of the Panel except when the Panel withdraws to consider its decision.

65. The Clerk of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall notify the appellant and the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine of the decision of the Appeals Panel, within seven College working days of the decision being made. The Clerk will also provide the appellant and the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine with the reasons for the decision. A report on the proceedings shall be submitted to the next appropriate meeting of the Medical Studies Committee.

66. The decision of the Fitness to Practise Medicine Appeals Panel shall be final as far as internal College Procedures are concerned.

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

RELEVANT LINKS

General Medical Council (GMC): www.gmc-uk.org
Imperial College London Registry Forms, Procedures and Regulations: http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/information/formsproceduresandregulations

Approved by the Council 28 March 2003
Revised by the Council 11 February 2005
Revised by the Student Progress Group, 14 November 2012
Approved by the Medical Studies Committee 27 November 2012
DISCIPLINARY ISSUE
1. Student breaches College Discipline.
2. Student breaches medical discipline

Consideration under the College Code of Student Discipline

GUILTY
Student expelled from College

NOT GUILTY
No health issues raised

GUILTY
But not expelled from College

NOT GUILTY
Health issues raised

END
END

If a disciplinary issue has not previously been considered by a disciplinary authority, refer back for consideration under the College disciplinary procedures

HEALTH ISSUE

Referred to Principal of Faculty of Medicine

Consideration by Student Progress Group (see Annex B for terms of reference)
- SPG can call for medical reports
- SPG decides on a prima facie basis whether Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel should be convened

Issue of health and/or conduct involves fitness to practise medicine

No issue involving fitness to practise medicine

END

To next diagram

END
STUDENT PROGRESS GROUP

Health and/or conduct raises issue of fitness to practise medicine

SPG considers whether issue merits restriction on student's activity

Yes

Makes recommendation to Principal of Faculty of Medicine

No

Principal of Faculty of Medicine: Hears from student; Decides what, if any, restriction is required

SPG considers whether it requires a health report under Student Regulation 9

SPG Informs Head of Central Secretariat who appoints Clerk

Clerk notifies student of charges, their rights and the membership of the Panel

Student may challenge the membership of the Panel

Person presenting the case against the student provides information

Chairman of Principal or Principal of Faculty rules on the challenge

Student provides their response

HEARING

OUTCOMES

• Fit to practise – no warning or sanction (47.a)
• Fitness to practise not impaired, but warned about misconduct (47.b)
• Fitness to practise is impaired with a sanction to be imposed. Sanctions include conditions, suspension or expulsion (47.c)
• (health issue only) fitness to practise impaired, suspension may be reviewed by a Panel at a later date (47.d)
• (health issue only) Fit to practise on certain conditions (47.e)
STUDENT PROGRESS GROUP - TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP

The Student Progress Group is responsible to the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, who may delegate this responsibility to the Director of Education or their designated deputy for all aspects of undergraduate medical student academic progress, including:

1. To make certain that systems are in place to:
   a. Monitor student attendance and progress throughout the course, in addition to “formative” and MBBS/BSc examinations, following an initial consideration of the student.
   b. Identify cases of significant non-attendance or poor academic progress, and that such cases are discussed with the student and his/her personal tutor initially by a member of staff at an appropriate level, and that a report of the discussion is logged with the Undergraduate Medicine Office.
   c. Select and pass on, with appropriate confidentiality, information on students who have experienced difficulties to Heads of Years, Directors of Clinical Studies, teaching staff and/or tutors to enable them to assist the students in their subsequent studies and to monitor the future performance of students who have been referred to the Group.

2. To receive and consider reports on students where no improvement is noted following the initial consideration, or where (multiple) reports from tutors/teachers indicate that remedial action may be required.

3. To commission and receive health assessments on students where considered appropriate, under Regulations for Students Number 9, and to recommend to the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, periods of leave of absence on medical or compassionate grounds, and conditions under which students may return or continue their studies, in consultation with the College Health Centre or Occupational Health Service.

4. To consider all disciplinary findings against medical students and to refer to the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel any student whose conduct and/or health (physical or mental) may bear on that student’s suitability to practise medicine.

5. To consider all recommendations from the Medical School's Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) Assessment Panel regarding positive CRB Returns against current and prospective medical students and to refer to the Fitness to Practise Medicine Panel any current student whose criminal record may bear on that student's suitability to practise medicine. Regarding new applicants, to recommend to the College Registry that admission is permitted or declined.

6. To confirm formally that students being entered for examinations have “attended the appropriate course of study to the satisfaction of their teachers” and if appropriate, after meeting with the student, to withdraw his/her entry to an examination.
7. To provide the Examinations Board with information about factors affecting performance at the time of the exams.

8. In consultation with representatives of the examiners, course tutors and the students’ personal tutors where appropriate, to advise the Director of Education or their designated deputy on appropriate action in the case of students who have failed formative and MBBS/BSc examinations.
**Membership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Faculty Senior Tutor</td>
<td>Dr Mike Schachter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Tutor (Years 1 and 2)</td>
<td>Dr Mike Emerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Tutor (BSc's and GE)</td>
<td>Prof Terry Tetley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal and Director of Education</td>
<td>Prof Jenny Higham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director of Education</td>
<td>Prof Sue Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director of Education</td>
<td>Mr Martin Lupton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Clinical Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St Mary’s</td>
<td>Prof Tim Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chelsea &amp; Westminster</td>
<td>Mr Martin Lupton / Dr Suveer Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Charing Cross</td>
<td>Prof Edwina Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hammersmith Hospital</td>
<td>Dr Niamh Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Years 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Prof John Laycock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Year 3</td>
<td>Dr Sarvesh Saini/ Prof Alun Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Year 4 (BSc)</td>
<td>Prof Alison McGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Year 5</td>
<td>Mr Martin Lupton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Year 6</td>
<td>Dr Nina Salooja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Head of GE1</td>
<td>Dr Chris John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Panel Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Student Experience (VTH)</td>
<td>Dr James Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Deans (Medicine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-Clinical</td>
<td>Prof Myra McClure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clinical</td>
<td>Prof Simon Taylor-Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In attendance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Manager</td>
<td>Ms Janette Shiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Curriculum Manager</td>
<td>Mr Jitender Yadav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 and 2 Curriculum Administrator</td>
<td>Ms Jo Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare and Admissions Assistant – Committee Secretary</td>
<td>Ms Katy Tognon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Education Officer, FEO</td>
<td>Ms Susan English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations Manager</td>
<td>Ms Erika McGovern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative from the Imperial College Health Centre</td>
<td>Dr Irene Weinreb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative from the Imperial College Occupational Health Department</td>
<td>Dr Alan Swann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency of Meetings**

Normally bi-monthly. However, regular meetings may be cancelled if there is no business and/or ad hoc meetings convened to deal with urgent business.
The Imperial College Union Annual Report is published separately by the Imperial College Union. For this reason, it has not been included with these published minutes.
The Financial Management Report is commercially sensitive and confidential. For this reason it is not included with these published minutes.
PAPER K – FOR REPORT

DEVELOPMENT REPORT

A Note by the Director of Communications and Development

The Development Report is commercially sensitive and confidential. For this reason it is not included with these published minutes.
PAPER L – FOR REPORT

METRICS TO SUPPORT THE COLLEGE STRATEGY 2010-2014

A Note by the Director of Strategic Planning

BACKGROUND

1. The Margetts report on the College’s governance in 2010 recommended that key performance indicators (KPIs) be generated for Council to monitor progress against the College’s strategy (paragraph 28 of the report).

2. This paper presents an update to the metrics that were presented to Council in November 2011. These metrics were presented to Management Board in December 2012.

METRICS

3. The metrics (presented at Annex A)¹ have been selected to quantify the aims of the new College Strategy and represent a baseline against which to measure College performance and future trends. They provide multiple years worth of data where relevant for Imperial (shown in blue), and comparison to competitor institutions (Oxford - shown in red, Cambridge - green, UCL - purple and Manchester - orange) where appropriate and possible. For each metric, an explanation is given to explain its relevance and any associated caveats.

4. Where possible, leading indicators have been used, which provide early indications of where underlying changes in key activities may occur.

5. Members are asked to note that future iterations of the metrics will be revised substantially so that they more appropriately support College strategic decision making. A key set of strategic questions aligned to the College mission will be defined and new metrics to measure progress will be developed and grouped together, so that the indicators are not considered in isolation. The associated commentary will show key trends, opportunities and threats and indicate contra indicators thereby informing decisions and supporting appropriate actions.

Strategic Planning Division
February 2013

¹. The metrics contain information which is commercially sensitive and confidential and have not been included with these published minutes.
INTRODUCTION

1. The Remuneration Committee met in December 2012 to receive information on the College’s remuneration strategy, pay and pension developments and to review and approve the salary and emoluments of the President Rector and his direct reports. The main issues that were reviewed are set out below.

LOCAL PAY BARGAINING 2012

2. The College’s local pay negotiations concluded with the imposition of an £800 pay award on all points with a minimum 1% increase. Staff earning above £80,000 received 1%. When incremental progression was taken into consideration, 75% of staff received an increase in excess of 4%.

3. The Trades Unions did not agree the terms of the pay offer and registered a formal dispute. Two of the unions balloted for industrial action but did not subsequently proceed with a strike or action short of a strike. The mandate supporting action was very low. The main union objection to the College offer was that it fell below RPI/CPI at a time when the University was delivering a ‘historic surplus’.

4. The national pay award was a 1% across the board increase. The College was willing to pay in excess of the national position in recognition of the particular constraints for those living, working and paying commuting costs in London.

PAY REVIEWS AND BENCHMARKING 2012

5. Management Board’s agreed criteria for any additional increases to pay were:

   - To address a significant misalignment of a member of staff’s salary when compared to others who have a similar role size and profile
   - To aid retention of staff based on external benchmark data
   - To address equal pay differentials
   - To recognise substantial and sustained exceptional individual contribution

6. Each Faculty and Support/Academic Services Department has undertaken a review of its staff pay to ensure equity. This exercise is informed by the provision of total pay data
for each individual, average pay in grade, equal pay analysis and internal and external benchmark data (where external data is available).

7. Staff were notified when the pay reviews were taking place in their department to meet the College’s aim for transparency in process (an issue of concern that was highlighted in the College staff survey feedback) and to allow representation if the individual considered their pay to be inequitable or uncompetitive.

**LIVING WAGE**

8. The Living Wage campaign is still being pursued in both national and local forums. All substantive staff employed by the College are on rates in excess of the London Living Wage – the College minimum pay rate is £8.95 p/hr and the London Living Wage rate is £8.55 p/hr. Contracted out services (in particular the cleaning services) and student employment falls below this rate. The minimum wage is currently £6.19 p/hr.

9. The College has had reservations about the campaign. It does not get involved in wage setting for contracted out services and the Living Wage rate is set by an external organisation so would run counter to the College’s strategy to manage and determine pay locally. After debate at Management Board, and lengthy discussions with the Trades Unions, it was agreed to establish a College ‘worker’ minimum rate of pay. This has been set for 2012 at £7.25 p/hr. This rate will apply to the contracted out cleaning service. Students are excluded from the worker rate.

10. The College expects there to be continuing internal and external pressure to increase the £7.25 hourly rate in 2013 to the London Living Wage.

**PENSIONS AND TAX**

11. Council members had recently received a briefing from the Chief Financial Officer on the financial sustainability of the pension schemes.

12. The changes in taxation limiting tax relief for high earners have impacted on a number of senior staff. Personal decisions to manage the taxation on the lifetime allowance have varied. Some staff have chosen to draw benefits through flexible retirement options, some have ceased to make contributions to the scheme and some have continued in the scheme and decided to pay the 55% tax recovery on their benefits in excess of £1.5m.

13. The College, in common with most Russell Group Universities, does not automatically convert the employer pension contributions of 16% into basic pay if a member of staff does not join the pension scheme. There are a number of reasons for this with the key constraint being the pension scheme rules which do not permit the College to offer ‘pay or pension’ or to directly fund alternative private pension arrangements.

14. The College has sufficient flexibility in its pay structures to adjust basic pay where there is a recruitment or retention reason to do so.
BENEFITS

15. The College keeps its standard contractual benefits under review to ensure they are competitive. Staff survey feedback noted the training and development provision and sports facilities are particularly valued by staff.

16. Two aspects of benefit provision have been reviewed – housing support and childcare support. To assist with recruitment and retention (particularly when recruiting for senior academic staff from outside the South East) the College operates a shared equity scheme. This has now been supplemented to include options for housing allowance and housing deposit loans.

17. There is a highly valued nursery facility on the South Kensington site that has been rated ‘outstanding’ by Ofsted and is used by 121 parents. The College provides a £500k subsidy to this facility. However, the onsite nursery can only be used by some parents and the College is reviewing what alternative arrangements, including alternative financing, can be offered to support childcare costs for parents who cannot get use of the on-site facility.

GENDER PAY EQUALITY

18. The College monitors pay equity based on protected characteristics in line with legal obligations. Previous analysis has shown gender pay gaps in certain grades and each department has been required to give careful consideration to pay distribution to ensure the approach to pay for men and women is consistent based on contribution.

19. The Remuneration Committee has asked the College for further information on equal pay trends over the years including an explanation of any remaining pay gaps and the College’s strategy for managing this important issue. This will be reviewed in detail at a meeting of the Remuneration Committee during 2013.

PAY OF THE PRESIDENT & RECTOR’S DIRECT REPORTS

20. The Committee reviewed the remuneration details and benchmark pay data for the Rector’s direct reports. In line with the pay restraint adopted elsewhere in the College, only two increases in pay were agreed.

PAY OF THE PRESIDENT & RECTOR

21. The Committee recognised that the salaries for the new roles of President and Provost have been set to reflect their different roles.

22. They reviewed the salary of the current role of President and Rector against external benchmarks and agreed that an increase was appropriate to match external comparable
roles and to reflect excellent performance. This has been offered and is limited to 2% in light of other pay constraints.

CONCLUSION

23. The Remuneration Committee are assured that effective and appropriate remuneration systems are in place but intend to review further the College’s management of equal pay at their next meeting.

Louise Lindsay 24.1.13
PAPER N – FOR REPORT

THE HARLINGTON TRUST

A Note by the Clerk

1. In 1936 the Students’ Union sought to buy some land in Harlington, North of Sipson Lane for use as a sports ground. The Students’ Union, as an unincorporated association, could not itself purchase the land and therefore the College bought it in its name holding the land on a bare trust for the benefit of Imperial students. The Trustees of the trust are the College’s Governing Body.

2. In the 1980s, the opportunity arose to raise funds by allowing the extraction of gravel from the site. It was decided that part of the proceeds would be used to set up a Grants Fund, the income of which would be available for disbursement for the benefit of students of Imperial College in relation to sporting, athletic and recreational facilities.

3. The Trustees agreed in 1990 to delegate some of their powers to a grants committee (“the Harlington Trust Fund Committee”), which would henceforward be responsible for dispensing annual grants within financial limits set by the Governing Body; the financial limit is currently set at £50,000 per year.

4. The Harlington Trust Fund Committee is chaired by the Pro-Rector (Education) and includes as members the incumbent Imperial College Union (“ICU”) President and a former ICU President. The Committee scrutinises all applications for funding on a monthly basis before confirming any awards.

5. The Grants Fund is held as long term investments within the Imperial College Endowment Unitisation Scheme. The financial accounts for the year 2011/12 are shown below.
ACCOUNTS FOR 2011/12


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

The long term investments comprise 6.4% Listed UK Equity, 46.0% Listed Global Equity, 15.0% Property, and 32.6% cash.

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

The balances as at 31st July 2012 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31/07/2012</th>
<th>31/07/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value of long term Investments</td>
<td>2,263,474</td>
<td>2,245,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated cash</td>
<td>365,791</td>
<td>289,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Harlington Gravel Trust Fund</td>
<td>2,629,265</td>
<td>2,535,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income & Expenditure for the Fund in last financial year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Investment Income</td>
<td>19,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>21,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Grants awarded/refunded</td>
<td>34,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for year</td>
<td>16,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Movement on Fund from 31/07/11 to 31/07/12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Harlington Gravel Trust Fund as at 1 August 2011</td>
<td>2,535,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Investments – realised gains for year</td>
<td>174,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for year (from above)</td>
<td>16,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year on year movement in unrealised gains/(losses)</td>
<td>(97,049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Harlington Gravel Trust Fund as at 31 July 2012</td>
<td>2,629,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. As is noted in the attached letter, the HEFCE monitors the risk of the institutions it funds and now shares its annual risk assessments with each institution.

2. Members will note from the attached that the HEFCE has assessed that Imperial is not at higher risk.

3. The full assessment from the HEFCE is attached at Annex A.¹

¹ The HEFCE Risk Assessment is provided in confidence to Imperial College and is therefore not included with these published minutes.
PAPER P – FOR INFORMATION

STAFF MATTERS

A Note by the Rector

PROVOST

Professor James STIRLING CBE FRS, currently the Jacksonian Professor of Natural Philosophy and Head of the Department of Physics, The University of Cambridge, has been appointed to the post of Provost, with effect from August 2013.

DIRECTOR OF EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS

Ms Fedelma Margaret McNAMARA, has been appointed to the post of Director of External Partnerships, Faculty of Medicine Centre, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 10 December 2012.

ACTING CO-DIRECTORS OF LIBRARY SERVICES

Ms Frances BOYLE, currently Assistant Director (Library Academic Services, Support Services, and Ms Susan HOWARD, currently Assistant and Director (Library Resource Innovation Services), Support Services have been appointed to the posts of Acting Co-Directors of Library Services, with effect from 1 January 2013 following the retirement of Mrs Deborah Shorley.

PROFESSORS

Professor Philip William INGHAM, currently Research Director, A*STAR (Agency for Science, Technology and Research) – Institute of Molecular Cell Biology (IMCB), Singapore, has been appointed to the part-time post of Professor of Developmental Biology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, with effect from 1 May 2013 for a period of three years.

Professor Alexander MICHAELIDES, currently Professor of Finance, Director of the Centre for Banking and Financial Research, University of Cyprus, has been appointed to the post of Professor of Finance, Finance Group, Imperial College Business School, with effect from 1 September 2013.

READERS

Dr Guy WOODWARD, currently Senior Lecturer in Ecology, Queen Mary, University of London, has been appointed to the post of Reader in Ecology, Division of Ecology and
Evolution, Department of Life Sciences, Faculty of Natural Sciences, with effect from 1 March 2013.

VISITING PROFESSORS

Dr Gautam KALGHATGI, formerly Senior Research Science Consultant, Saudi Aramco, has accepted an association with the College as Visiting Professor, in the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 December 2012 for a period of two years.

Dr Hartmut SCHAEFER, currently Head of Methods Development of Business Development Applied NMR, Bruker BioSpin GmbH, 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 November 2012 for a period of five years.

Dr Manfred SPRAUL, currently Director, Business Development Applied NMR, Bruker BioSpin GmbH, 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 November 2012 for a period of five years.

Professor Dato Zaini UJANG, has been offered an association with the College as Visiting Professor, Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 December 2012.

RETIREMENTS

Professor Jonathan Robert LAMB MA DSc FRCPath FRSE FMedSci, Chair in Immunoregulation, Division of Cell and Molecular Biology, Faculty of Natural Sciences, retired with effect from 30 November 2012. Following his retirement he will continue his association with the College as a Senior Research Investigator, with effect from 1 January 2013 for a period of one year.

Mrs Deborah Catherine SHORLEY, Director of Library Services, Support Services, retired with effect from 31 December 2012.

RESIGNATIONS

Professor David BLANE, Professor of Medical Sociology, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, resigned with effect from 31 December 2012 to take up an appointment at University College London. Following his resignation he will continue his association with the College as Emeritus Professor.

Professor Timothy Neal (Tim) COULSON, Professor of Population Biology, Division of Ecology and Evolution, Faculty of Natural Sciences, resigned with effect from 31 December 2012 to take up an appointment as Zoology Chair, University of Oxford, with effect from
January 2013. Following his resignation he will continue his association with the College as Visiting Professor for a period of two years and five months.

**Professor Gary R HUNT**, Professor of Fluid Mechanics, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, resigned with effect from 31 December 2012.

**Dr Neil Robert McINTYRE**, Reader in Surface Water Hydrology, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, resigned with effect from 25 January 2013. Following his resignation he will continue his association with the College as a Senior Research Investigator for a period of one year.

**Mr Andrew MURPHY**, Director of Finance, Finance Division, Support Services, resigned with effect from 31 December 2012.

**Dr Stefan SCHEEL**, Reader in Quantum Optics, Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences, resigned with effect from 31 December 2012 to take up an appointment as Chair of Theoretical Physics, University of Rostock, Germany. Following his resignation he will continue his association with the College as an Academic Visitor, with effect from 1 January 2013 for a period of nine months.

**Dr Sandra SHEFELBINE**, Reader in Bone Mechanics, Department of Bioengineering, Faculty of Engineering, resigned with effect from 31 December 2012 to take up an appointment as Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Northeastern University, Boston, USA. Following her resignation she will continue her association with the College as a Senior Research Investigator for a period of three years.

**Professor Henning WALCZAK**, Chair in Tumour Immunology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, resigned with effect from 31 December 2012.
PAPER Q – FOR INFORMATION

CHIEF OPERATIONS OFFICER REPORT

1. Updates are provided within this report on the following:
   a. Masterplanner Appointment Status
   b. Major Project Overview
      - Wilson House
      - AMP Phase 2
      - Imperial West, Building C
      - Level 0, Catering Facility
   c. Change in Name for Commercial Services

MASTERPLANNER APPOINTMENT STATUS

2. As part of the process to select the Masterplan consultant, an internal panel was convened to review submissions and to support the decision-making.

3. A long-list of 15 architects submitted proposals describing their relevant background and experience. From this a short-list of five practices was drafted for Stage 2, for which further submissions were invited, and detailed interviews conducted by the panel.

4. In the Stage 2 review the panel considered, inter alia, capability in relevant sectors, approach to stakeholders, attitude & experience of proposed personnel, appreciation of salient client issues, and practicality of approach. The overall intent was to seek excellence and proven capability in delivering practical, flexible and meaningful masterplans within our industry sector.

5. SOM emerged as an extremely strong front-runner for the appointment. It has first class international masterplanning capability and a proven track record with leading academic institutions. Its work has been inspected at Harvard and is first rate. Representatives at Harvard have also been engaged and are highly supportive of SOM and what they have delivered for them.

6. Having concluded commercial negotiations with SOM to ensure IC secured acceptable terms, SOM have now been appointed as strategic Masterplanner.

MAJOR PROJECT OVERVIEW

7. **Wilson House**
   a. Now in week 7 of 39, work on the refurbishment and new-build of Wilson House is well under way with the contractor, Overbury, making good progress. Demolition of the old sports hall and squash courts is largely complete allowing the
removal of rubble from the site to commence. The enabling and strip-out works are in progress and inspections are now being carried out to finalise the scope of window and joinery repairs.

b. Some unforeseen issues have arisen during the asbestos removal which has taken four weeks longer than originally anticipated. However, these works have now been certified as complete by the College Asbestos Manager. At present, the modular new-build bedroom units are being procured and a sample will be produced and presented to the College at the end of March. Even with the asbestos delay it is still anticipated that the works (400 bed spaces) will be completed and handed over to the College on schedule.

8. AMP Phase 2. AMP Phase 2 is progressing as planned with Stage E (Detailed Design) approximately 50% complete. The Planning Application was submitted in early December 2012 and Westminster City Council have registered the application with an expected decision date in early March 2013. An early enabling works package commenced in November 2012 with removal of asbestos from the Mechanical Engineering Building Annexe and further demolition/enabling works are planned in the Annexe between February 2013 and July 2013. The main Phase 2 works will be procured from May 2013 with a start on site in August 2013.
9. **Imperial West Building C**
   
a. A project development board has been set up to co-ordinate the delivery of both buildings C and D at IW. Building C will be a core College asset, occupied by academic departments. Building D will be managed and operated by the College Fund with the emphasis being on incubation along with accelerator and translation activity.

b. Whilst the two buildings are separate, they are linked by a common basement housing services and have direct adjacency and shared access infrastructure. A co-ordinated approach to the project design and delivery of these buildings is therefore essential.

c. The Deputy Rector and COO have engaged with the Faculty Principals to commence discussions regarding potential future academic uses for the 22,000 m² (GIA) nine storey property – due for completion Q4 2015.

d. A number of possibilities for future uses of the building are being discussed but understandably at this stage it is too early to be prescriptive in precise usage allocations. Discussions will continue across the coming six months and will feed into the overall design process.

e. Notwithstanding this, there will be a need by the end of February 2013 to finalise the basic design, structure and servicing for the building. A series of workshops are ongoing to test the parameters for achieving significant flexibility in the building with regard to servicing to enable not only current thoughts on space use to be accommodated but also future needs across the building’s life span.

f. There is always a trade-off between ultimate flexibility and overall cost efficiency and this needs to be tested vigorously. Nonetheless the overall motivation is to provide a facility with the optimal flexibility to accommodate Imperial’s perceived needs in to the future.

g. Initially a building comprising 50% ‘wet-lab’ function with the remainder more traditional dry / open plan space is being analysed. Whilst the overall envelope of the building is fixed in planning terms, we shall test whether increasing the floor-to-floor heights for example, which will potentially involve losing a floor, may be desirable so as to widen the range of uses that could be accommodated, whilst seeking to optimize the efficiency of servicing throughout. Alternatively it may be possible to add a basement level or reduce the scale of the atrium in order to increase the net useable space. Such options are currently under review and will be tested against value for money criteria.

10. **Sherfield Level 0 Catering Facility**
   
a. The Holland Club closed for business on 21 December 2012 with the management retained to close out the affairs of the club until 14 January 2013.
b. Handover to the Project team was achieved on 14 January and a Refurbishment and Demolition Asbestos survey carried out immediately. Minimal asbestos was discovered thereby enabling the strip out of ceilings to commence. Tenders were issued to three contractors to begin demolition works and an appointment will be made to commence the work on 28 January.

c. Main contract tenders have been issued to three contractors and tender returns are due 12 February for start on site 11 March. The construction project will be complete by 22 August for handover to Commercial Services allowing sufficient time for staff training ahead of the 2013/14 year.

**CHANGE IN NAME FOR COMMERCIAL SERVICES**

11. The current name, Commercial Services, is not considered reflective of the majority of the Division’s activities and, as such, the College community is not necessarily fully aware of the ways in which Commercial Services contributes to wider College life. The focus on ‘commercial’ perhaps misleads people into thinking that the Division’s commercial activities are its main focus when really the prime motivation is to enhance the student, staff and visitor experience.

12. In July 2012, Commercial Services initiated the process of rethinking its name to reflect more closely what the Division does. A new name, **Campus Services**, was approved by the Rector on 27 November 2012. It needs to now be launched to the College community to inform and explain the name, aims and vision of Campus Services.

13. It is proposed to distribute internal communications through various avenues and there will be a new Campus Services website. The Launch Day will be 14 February with two main goals: first, to actively engage with staff and students and help them to understand what the Division does, and secondly, to make practical use of the launch by seeking feedback and suggestions on the Division’s services. There will be a physical presence on the day with staff from across the Division’s operations along with billboards displaying photos and buzzwords following the “Valentine” theme “We Love Campus Services”.
1. The Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 12 December 2012 are attached. The following points are drawn to the attention of the Council:

**Minute 1695(1): Quality Assurance Advisory Committee – Change of Name**

2. The Senate approved a change of name of the Quality Assurance Advisory Committee to Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) with immediate effect to reflect the fact that quality enhancement is a key feature of the Committee’s work.

**Minute 1695(2): Periodic Review**

3. The Senate approved amendments to the *Procedures for the Review of Departmental Research Degree Provision*, with immediate effect.

4. The Senate also noted that following a successful pilot last session, it had been agreed that a student representative should continue to be included on the panel for all periodic reviews.

**Minute 1698(1): Revised Procedure for the Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine**

5. The Senate approved substantial revisions to the College’s *Procedure for the Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine* and agreed that these should be recommended to Council. Please see Paper G for further information.

**Minute 1698(2): Update from the Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine**

6. The Senate received an update on the Singapore project, noting that the project team had finalised the content and teaching methods for Phase 1 of the joint Imperial/Nanyang Technological University MBBS and that the programme had also now received approval from the Singapore Medical Council.

7. The Senate approved the General Regulations for the MBBS programme, which would commence in August 2013.

---

1. The Minutes of Senate Meetings are published separately and have not been included with these published minutes.
Minute 1700(1): Introduction of an Admissions Test by the Department of Mathematics

8. The Senate approved the introduction of an additional admissions test in the Department of Mathematics, with effect from 2014 entry, to assist in the selection of applicants for making an offer. The test, which was first scheduled to run in November 2013, would be used to inform and enhance the admissions decisions made by the Mathematics Admissions Tutor and thus allow Mathematics to better select students who were likely to perform well on their degrees.

N.W
PAPER S

TRANSLATION STUDIES UNIT

A Note by the Deputy Rector

Paper S constitutes a ‘reserved area of business’ as defined in the College Statutes. These state that:

“Student members of the Council, the Court and the Senate and of their Committees and of such other committees or bodies of the University as may from time to time be established shall not be entitled to participate in the consideration of reserved areas of business. Reserved areas of business shall be the appointment, re-appointment, promotion and any other matter affecting individual members of staff; the admission, re-admission and academic assessment of individual students; the appointment of examiners for individual students; the consideration of courses of study for individual students, including research projects; and discussion of the award of grants, scholarships and prizes for individuals. It shall be for the relevant Chairman to decide in any case of doubt whether a matter is one to which this Statute applies, and that decision shall be final. In respect of any item of business to which this Statute does apply, papers for consideration at meetings of any such bodies and minutes and other records relating to such matters shall not at any time be available to a student member.”

For this reason, Paper S is not included with these minutes.