



University of London
COLLEGIATE COUNCIL

Friday, 26 February 2010
8.30am
The Court Room, Senate House

MINUTES

PRESENT

Vice-Chancellor (Chairman)	Professor Latchman (Bbk)
Professor Crossick (GC)	Dr McDade (HC)
Sir Howard Davies (LSE)	Professor Rigby (ICR)
Professor Edwards (SAS)	Professor Shepherd (CSSD alternate)
Professor Freeman-Attwood (RAM)	Professor Smith (SoP)
Professor Gaskell (QMUL)	Professor Swallow (CIA)
Professor Sir Andrew Haines (LSHTM)	Professor Trainor (KCL)
Professor Kemp (RH)	Professor Webley (SOAS)
Professor Kopelman (SGUL)	Professor Whitty (IoE)

APOLOGIES

Professor McKellar (RVC)	Professor Henderson (CSSD)
Professor Grant (UCL)	Professor Sir Andrew Likierman (LBS)

OBSERVER

Professor Kydd (ES)

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr Andrew Bollington (for CCMM 0532 – 0540)	Mrs C Muller (for CCMM 0541 – 0549)
Mr R Cryer	Mr M Dalton (Secretary)
Ms C Cushion	Ms C Swarbrick

Minutes

0511 The Collegiate Council approved the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 December 2009.

Matters Arising

CCMM 0502 - 0504: Academic Trust Funds Committee – Scholarship Fund

0512 The Vice-Chancellor reported that further discussions had taken place between representatives of the University and the Charity Commission regarding a revised Scheme for the Scholarship Fund. Charity Commission Officers had been sympathetic to the University's difficulties in complying with the current terms of the Trust and had agreed to draft a Scheme which would enable the University to allocate income from the Scholarship Fund to the Colleges for award. The Officers had indicated that they would be concerned if the University were to consider passing the capital to the Colleges, but they had been assured that this would not be the case.

CCMM 0509 – 0510: Capital Investment Framework (CIF)

- 0513 The Collegiate Council received a report (**CC106**) by the Secretary on the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) consultation document 2009/48: *Capital Investment Framework: consultation on the assessment process* (Appendix **CC106A**).
- 0514 It was noted that, at the previous meeting, a member of the Collegiate Council had expressed concern about the HEFCE's carbon reduction targets under the proposed second CIF. The Collegiate Council shared the member's concerns, especially given the limited scope for London-based Colleges to implement renewable energy schemes on campuses. Additionally, it was noted that whilst institutions were being asked to demonstrate reductions in carbon emissions against the 1990 baseline figures, there seemed to be little concession within the consultation document to the fact that many Colleges' infrastructures had increased substantially since that time.
- 0515 It was suggested that a possible method for London-based Colleges to meet the targets could be to enter into bilateral agreements with Colleges based outside London. However, it was unclear whether such a venture would be admissible under the proposed second CIF. Moreover, it was noted that very few Colleges of the University had campuses and energy sources outside London. The Collegiate Council concluded that it would be highly unlikely that many of the Colleges could meet the proposed carbon reduction targets without entering into bilateral agreements or as part of a consortium. Members agreed that the HEFCE should be contacted to confirm whether such arrangements would be permissible and that a Working Group should be established to consider the matter further.

AGREED

- 0516 (i) That the HEFCE would be asked to confirm whether Colleges would be permitted to establish consortium-type arrangements for the purposes of meeting the proposed CIF carbon reduction targets.
- (ii) That the request to the HEFCE should stress that any such arrangement would constitute a consortium of autonomous Colleges rather than a single entity.
- (iii) That a Working Group of Heads of Colleges, or their representatives, should be formed to consider how Colleges might meet the proposed CIF carbon reduction targets.
- (iv) That membership of the Working Group would include an expert from within the Colleges, if available, or external expertise.
- (v) That both the HEFCE and the Department of Energy and Climate Change would be asked to address the Working Group.

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT - Vice-Chancellor's Report

0517 The Collegiate Council received a confidential report by the Vice-Chancellor on matters not considered elsewhere on the agenda (**CC107**).

Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Institutional Audit Steering Group

0518 The Collegiate Council was informed that the QAA Institutional Audit Steering Group had met on 18 February 2010 to continue its consideration of the content of the briefing document which the University would be required to submit prior to the QAA's visit. The Collegiate Council was asked to note a tabled amendment to paragraph 2 of the Vice-Chancellor's Report which clarified that the Steering Group, in its discussions, had been focusing on the 'collective responsibility for the University of London degree', which each College shared with the other Colleges. The Steering Group had recognised the need to distinguish between the positions of Colleges and of the Central Academic Bodies (CABs) within the University's briefing document (the External System would be subject to a separate QAA audit, whereas the other CABs would be dealt with appropriately within the briefing document).

0519 At its meeting, the Steering Group had noted that universities were being asked to provide information in the briefing document on areas in which University of London academic committees had never been involved in respect of students registered by Colleges, e.g. the management of learning opportunities. The Steering Group considered it important to respect the autonomy of Colleges and, therefore, had suggested that a minimalist approach should be adopted. The briefing document would indicate that a number of aspects on which the University would be expected to report (e.g. management of learning opportunities) were dealt with at College level, but it would provide, where appropriate, any direction or guidance which was given at University level.

0520 The other substantive issue discussed by the Steering Group had been the comparability of standards of the University of London degree across Colleges. The Steering Group had agreed to suggest that the University's approach be outlined in the briefing document as follows: just as the sector sets basic threshold standards for nationally recognised awards, *via* compliance with the QAA's points of reference, so the University of London establishes threshold standards for its constituent Colleges in terms of programmes leading to awards of the University. Likewise, just as the sector's awards varied according to the culture and emphases of its autonomous institutions, so the programmes and awards of the autonomous, constituent Colleges of the federal University differed according to the context and culture of the College in which they had been developed, but always based on the common University threshold standard.

Note CCM 0521 is exempt from disclosure according to the meaning of Part II of the Freedom of Information Act

London Science and Creativity Park (LSCP)

0522 The Collegiate Council noted from its previous meeting that the application to establish a Centre for Creative Collaboration (C4CC) under the Leading Transformational Change Initiative of the HEFCE Leadership, Governance and Management Fund had been successful and that £255k had been awarded (CCM 0467 refers). An inception meeting, arranged by the HEFCE, would be held on 10 March 2010, which the Vice-Chancellor would attend. Members were informed that the lease for 16 Acton Street had been signed and that this location would serve as the base for the C4CC. The University had taken possession on 1 February 2010 and a formal launch, to which Heads of Colleges would be invited, would be held in the late spring 2010. Royal Holloway, University of London, Goldsmiths, University of London, the Central School of Speech and Drama (CSSD), and the UCL Bartlett School of Architecture had all committed to being involved in the C4CC.

Central School of Speech and Drama

0523 It was noted that, at its meeting on 6 November 2009, the Collegiate Council had agreed that a small group would be formed to review information received from the CSSD on the development of its research strategy (CCM 0430(iii) refers). The undertaking of such a review had been a proviso of the University Council's admission of the CSSD as a College of the University in 2005. Members were informed that a small group had been formed under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Crossick. The Group had received a number of documents from the CSSD, including the College's 2008 Research Assessment Exercise Submission and its latest Research Strategy. The Group had met on 22 February 2010 and the report of its discussions would be received by the Collegiate Council at its meeting on 30 April 2010. The Collegiate Council noted that membership of the Group had not included an expert in the field of education and the Chairman of the Group agreed that, on receipt of the Group's final report, he would, if appropriate, seek input from an expert in this area.

Federal Subscription and Charges 2010-11

0524 The Collegiate Council was informed that the Working Group of Directors of Finance which had considered proposals for the Federal Subscription and Charges for 2008-09 and 2009-10 had been reconstituted, with an expanded membership, to consider proposals for the 2010-11 Federal Subscription and Charges. The Working Group had met on 19 February 2010 and had agreed to recommend to the Collegiate Council a total Federal Subscription for 2010-11 of £2,015k, which constituted a reduction of approximately 10% from the level agreed for 2009-10; proposals for Charges for 2010-11 would be considered at a later date. The final recommendations of the Working Group would be considered by the Collegiate Council at its meeting on 30 April 2010.

Heads of Colleges on the University Board of Trustees

0525 The Collegiate Council agreed that the current Deputy Vice-Chancellor would consult with members with a view to proposing, at the next meeting, three Heads of Colleges to serve on the University Board of Trustees.

Collegiate Council Representation on the University of London Union (ULU) Board of Trustees

0526 The Collegiate Council noted that no responses had been received to the most recent request for a nomination from Colleges for membership of the ULU Board of Trustees to replace Mr Paul Shanley who would be stepping down from the role in March 2010. It was agreed that the Secretary would draft a rota whereby each College took it in turn to nominate one of their staff to serve as the Collegiate Council's representative on the ULU Board of Trustees for a fixed period.

Appointment of Deputy Vice-Chancellor

0527 The Collegiate Council was informed that Professor Crossick would be leaving his post as Warden of Goldsmiths, University of London, in April 2010. Members would be advised by correspondence of his replacement as Deputy Vice-Chancellor, which was expected to be confirmed by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on 24 March 2010.

Institute of Cancer Research (ICR)

0528 The Collegiate Council, in accordance with paragraph 69.5 of Regulation 1, was informed that a meeting had taken place in February 2010 between representatives of the ICR and QAA regarding the QAA's Institutional Audit Report of June 2008 which had stated that 'limited confidence can be placed in the soundness of the institution's current and likely future management of the academic standards of postgraduate taught awards'. The Vice-Chancellor had been provided with a copy of the ICR's action plan and advised by the ICR that the QAA had indicated orally that it was satisfied with the action taken by the Institute and it was expected that the audit would be signed off as complete by the QAA Board in March 2010.

Conference Office

0529 The Collegiate Council was informed that following the reopening of the refurbished Senate House, South Block, much improved teaching and conference facilities were available for hire. In conjunction with the University's residences at College Hall, Malet Street, the facilities in Senate House were expected to generate significant future income from conferences during the summer months. A member of the Collegiate Council expressed concern about the University competing directly against Colleges in the Bloomsbury area with similar facilities. It was reported that Heads of Administration at Bloomsbury Colleges had already been contacted with a view to discussing how the University and local Colleges could collaborate in

this area. It was agreed that a formal meeting between representatives of the University and Colleges in the Bloomsbury area should be arranged.

AGREED

- 0530 (i) To endorse the QAA Institutional Audit Steering Group's approach to the issue of comparability of standards of the University of London degree across Colleges as outlined at CCM 0520 above.
- (ii) That the current Deputy Vice-Chancellor would consult members of the Collegiate Council and propose, for approval at the next meeting, three Heads of Colleges to serve on the Board of Trustees.
- (iii) That the Secretary would draft a rota whereby each College took it in turn to nominate one of their staff to serve as the Colleges' representative on the ULU Board of Trustees for a fixed period.
- (iv) That a meeting would be arranged with representatives of the University and Colleges in the Bloomsbury area to discuss collaborative working on conference hosting.

Management Accounts to 31 January 2010 and Forecasts for 2009-10

- 0531 The Collegiate Council received and noted a report by the Director of Finance (**CC108**) which included the Management Accounts to 31 January 2010 and Forecasts for 2009-10 (Appendices **CC108B** and **CC108C**).

Changing the Name of the External System

- 0532 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Vice-Chancellor which proposed a change of name for the External System so that the brand name (to be used in all external marketing and communication) would be *University of London International Programmes* and the name of the Central Academic Body which implemented the University's responsibilities for the programmes would be *University of London International Academy* (rather than the current *External and Internal Student Administration*) (**CC109**).
- 0533 It was noted that the report was unchanged from that received at the previous meeting on 11 December 2009, when Collegiate Council members had agreed to consult within their Colleges about the proposals (CCMM 0483 – 0487 refer). Immediately following the previous meeting, the Dean of the External System had contacted all Heads of Colleges by email and offered to provide them with any further information which they might need, including further background details on the proposal. It was reported that, subsequent to the Dean's email, several members of the Collegiate Council and their senior colleagues had met separately with the Dean to discuss the proposals.
- 0534 Members of the Collegiate Council raised two specific concerns in relation to the proposals. Firstly, it had been suggested during the Dean's discussions with Heads of Colleges that the use of the word 'international' in the proposed

names could have a detrimental impact upon the External System's UK-based market. In reply, the Dean noted that of the 11% of students currently resident in the UK, many would be unlikely to be inhibited by the term 'international' as they may have come from overseas to the UK to study at independent teaching institutions. A further segment of UK-resident students were studying for postgraduate programmes with a strong international focus. However, it had been agreed that if 'University of London International Programmes' was proven to inhibit development of the UK-based market, then corrective action would be taken. This action could include the adoption of an additional name for a UK-focussed portfolio of courses (which would be largely the same portfolio as that offered internationally).

0535 The second concern was the potential confusion of 'University of London International Programmes' with the various overseas activities of Colleges, often termed as 'international programmes'. The Dean noted the concern and stated that marketing materials of the 'University of London International Programmes' would be adjusted in the light of any evidence of brand confusion. The Vice-Chancellor added that if the two concerns raised by the Collegiate Council could not be resolved in practice, then the name change would need to be revisited.

0536 Having noted the assurances provided by the Dean and the Vice-Chancellor in regard to the concerns of the Collegiate Council, members agreed the proposed name changes for recommendation to the Board of Trustees at its meeting on 24 March 2010.

AGREED

0537 To recommend to the Board of Trustees a change of name for the External System, as set out in paragraphs 20-23 of Document **CC109**.

External System Financial Arrangements

0538 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Chief Operating Officer of the External System on the financial arrangements of the External System (**CC110**). It was noted that the report had been drafted following a request by the Collegiate Council at its meeting on 6 November 2009 (CCM 440 refers).

0539 The Chief Operating Officer drew the Collegiate Council's attention to paragraphs 9 – 13 of his report and, in particular, the issue of contracts between the University and Lead Colleges. It was noted that, currently, a wide range of financial agreements existed which ensured that Colleges were compensated and rewarded for their participation in the External System. The range of financial arrangements reflected a varied history of collaborations. Work had commenced to develop new consistent forms of agreement based on a new financial model to be put in place for first use in the academic year 2010-11. Following initial consultation with Lead Colleges and discussions at the External System Finance Committee (ESFC) meeting on 25 February 2010, a number of principles for new forms of agreement had been drafted and would be considered by the Board of the External System (BES) at its

meeting on 9 March 2010. The principles would then be submitted to the Collegiate Council for formal approval.

- 0540 A member of the Collegiate Council commended the report and especially welcomed the Chief Operating Officer's commitment to an 'open book' policy with regard to the External System's financial arrangements. However, he commented on concerns within his College about the External System's reserves policy. Members were informed that a report on the reserves policy had been considered by the ESFC at its meeting on 25 February 2010 and would be considered by the BES at its meeting on 9 March 2010, with further information to be provided to the Collegiate Council in due course.

University of London Research Library Services (ULRLS)

Strategic Plan 2009-14

- 0541 The Collegiate Council received and noted a report by the ULRLS Project Manager on progress, as at 12 January 2010, on implementation of the ULRLS Strategic Plan 2009-14 (**CC111**).

Colleges' Subscription Allocation Model

- 0542 The Collegiate Council received the report of the Working Group on the ULRLS Subscription Allocation Model (**CC112**) which contained a number of recommendations on moving to a usage-based model. It was noted that the current ULRLS Subscription allocation model, which was based on an outdated (2004-05) Federal Subscription allocation model, took no account of actual library usage. The Collegiate Council, when it approved the recommendations of the Senate House Library Review Steering Group at its Extraordinary Meeting on 30 April 2009, had agreed that the current model was inequitable and should be replaced by a usage-based model.
- 0543 The Chair of the Working Group commented that, at its first meeting in July 2009, the Working Group had agreed the following five variables for inclusion within a usage-based formula: loans; fetching (i.e. enabling access to materials not on shelves); visits; offsite access to e-resources; and membership. However, it had become evident at subsequent meetings of the Working Group that data relating to fetching and e-resources were not of sufficient quality to merit their inclusion within the new formula. In addition, the Working Group also established that the cost of special collections was significant and agreed that this variable should be added to the provisional list agreed at the first meeting. The Working Group had concluded, therefore, that the following variables would form the basis for a sound usage-based model: loans; members; mean visits by College; and special collections.
- 0544 The Working Group had agreed to recommend that the proposed model should include a flat fee element, a principle which the Collegiate Council had adopted for the purposes of the allocation of the Federal Subscription. The Working Group had taken the view that ULRLS was a collective academic service and federal asset marketed by Colleges and made available to all

University of London students. As such, it was an asset which added prestige to the University of London brand, from which all Colleges benefited. The Working Group had concluded that 10% would be an appropriate flat fee element.

- 0545 The following formula for the allocation of the ULRIS Subscription was proposed by the Working Group:

Total College Subscription = Flat-Rate Charge (10%) + Special Collections Charge (based on usage) + Residual Costs (Total divided into three separate components: Visits, Loans, and Membership, each allocated proportionately across Colleges according to usage)

- 0546 The Collegiate Council noted, at Appendix **CC112A**, the results for each College of applying the above formula using the 2009-10 College Subscription of £2,791k (including transitional costs) and usage statistics for 2008-09. Given that some Colleges would experience significant increases in their ULRIS Subscription following implementation of the proposed model, the Working Group had recommended that the new model be phased in over a two-year period so that, during 2010-11, 50% of the Subscription be allocated on the new basis and 50% on the historic basis; the new model being implemented in full in 2011-12. The Collegiate Council noted a tabled paper, Appendix **CC112B**, which outlined the effects on each College's ULRIS Subscription from a phased implementation.

- 0547 The Collegiate Council was asked to note that Heads of three of the Colleges most adversely affected by the proposed changes were members of the Working Group. Two of the members informed the Collegiate Council that the Working Group had taken an evidence-based approach during its discussions on the various options. Despite a resultant increase in their own Colleges' contributions, both supported the proposed usage-based model. Whilst the model proposed was imperfect, it was based on the most robust data available and the Working Group had proposed that its effectiveness should be reviewed in 2013-14 when it would be possible to introduce further variables if appropriate.

- 0548 A Collegiate Council member raised concern about the significant cost per loan for his institution. It was noted that the cost of other variables, such as special collections, impacted on each College's total Subscription amount. Additionally, it was noted that the quantum for the overall ULRIS Subscription was expected to decrease during the implementation of the ULRIS Strategic Plan 2009-14 and that Colleges' Subscriptions would decrease commensurately.

AGREED

- 0549 (i) The ULRIS Subscription allocation formula as outlined at CCM 0545 above.

- (ii) That the new ULRSL Subscription allocation formula be implemented over a two-year period so that, during 2010-11, 50% of the Subscription be allocated on the new basis and 50% on the historic basis, and that the new model be implemented in full in 2011-12.
- (iii) That the effectiveness of the new formula be reviewed in 2013-14 and that, during the review, consideration be given to the introduction of further variables to the formula.
- (iv) That if any new College was to be admitted to the University in the next three years, it should be expected to pay, in its first year of membership, the flat fee element and a payment on account which could be adjusted when usage data became available after the first year of membership.

Revised Terms of Reference for the Quality Practitioners' Forum (QPF)

0550 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Head of the Academic Office which proposed amendments to the terms of reference of the QPF (**CC113**). The Collegiate Council noted that the current terms of reference of the QPF predated the University's governance arrangements implemented in 2008. The proposed terms of reference reflected the current activities of the QPF, with the addition of a provision that the QPF should advise the Collegiate Council, as requested and when appropriate, on issues related to the quality and standards of University of London awards. It was also proposed that the QPF be renamed as the Academic Quality Advisory Committee.

APPROVED

- 0551 (i) The revised terms of reference of the Quality Practitioners' Forum as outlined at paragraph 3 of Document **CC113**.
- (ii) That the Quality Practitioners' Forum be renamed as the Academic Quality Advisory Committee.

Note CCMM 0552 – 0554 are exempt from disclosure according to the meaning of Part II of the Freedom of Information Act

HEFCE Consultation on Revisions to the Financial Memorandum

0555 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Secretary on the HEFCE consultation document 2009/46: *Revisions to the Financial Memorandum: consultation on changes to the funding agreement between HEFCE and institutions* (**CC115**). A summary of the proposed changes to the Financial Memorandum between the HEFCE and institutions was attached at Appendix **CC115A**. It was noted that Officers were currently preparing a University response to the consultation following comments received at the Board of Trustees meeting on 27 January 2010 and the Audit and Risk Committee

meeting on 10 February 2010. Any additional comments by the Collegiate Council would be taken into account in the University's response.

- 0556 The Collegiate Council noted the five questions posed by the HEFCE and, in particular, question 1 which asked: 'Do you agree that the term 'accountable officer' should replace that of designated officer, and with the arrangements being proposed for the approval of accountable officers?' The Collegiate Council expressed concern that, under the proposed arrangements, the HEFCE would, in exceptional circumstances, reserve the right to reject the nomination of an 'accountable officer'. It was the Collegiate Council's view that it was inappropriate for the HEFCE to assume powers to dismiss 'accountable officers'; there was a consensus that this was a responsibility which should remain strictly within the purview of governing bodies. Members added that introducing legislation which seemed to have been drafted in response to adverse events at one institution was inappropriate.

AGREED

- 0557 That the Collegiate Council's comments outlined at CCM 0556 above should be taken into account within the University's response to the HEFCE consultation on revisions to the Financial Memorandum

University of London Union (ULU) Financial Performance 2009-10

- 0558 The Collegiate Council noted a report by the ULU General Manager on ULU's financial performance for the period 1 August 2009 to 31 January 2010 (**CC0116**).

Award of Degrees and Diplomas

- 0559 The Collegiate Council noted a report by the Vice-Chancellor on the award of degrees and diplomas (**CC117**).

Dates of Meetings 2009-10

- 0560 The Collegiate Council noted the following dates of meetings for 2009-10:
Friday, 30 April 2010
Friday, 2 July 2010