



University of London
COLLEGIATE COUNCIL

Friday, 12 December 2008
 8.30am
 STB9, Stewart House

MINUTES

PRESENT	Vice-Chancellor (Chairman) Sir Howard Davies (LSE) Professor Grant (UCL) Professor Haines (LSHTM) Professor Henderson (CSSD) Professor Hill (RH) Professor Kopelman (SGUL) Professor Latchman (Bbk)	Professor McKellar (RVC) Professor Ogden (QMUL) Professor Rigby (ICR) Professor Smith (SoP) Professor Trainor (KCL) Professor Webley (SOAS) Professor Whitty (IoE)
APOLOGIES	Mr R Buchanan (LBS) Professor Crossick (Goldsmiths) Professor Sir Roderick Floud (SAS)	Professor Freeman-Attwood (RAM) Dr McDade (Heythrop) Professor Swallow (Courtauld)
OBSERVER	Professor J Kydd (External System)	
BY INVITATION	Mr A Schofield and Ms J Burke (CHEMS Consulting)	{CCMM 0097 – 0120}
	Mr K Ansari (President of ULU)	{CCMM 0130 – 0137}
	Ms J Adams (General Manager of ULU)	{CCMM 0130 – 0137}
IN ATTENDANCE	Mr R Cryer Ms C Cushion	Mr M Dalton (Secretary) Miss C Swarbrick

Review of Senate House Library

Presentation by CHEMS Consulting

0097 The Collegiate Council received a presentation by Mr Allan Schofield and Ms Jacqui Burke of CHEMS Consulting on its *Final Report of the Review of Senate House Library* (SHL) (copy in Minute Book). The presentation covered the following:

- (i) SHL contextual issues
- (ii) SHL users
- (iii) CHEMS consultation: what Colleges and others said
- (iv) Criteria emerging from the consultation: how to assess future options
- (v) The current projected financial position (£1.8M deficit on £4.9M total income for 2008-09)
- (vi) The options: an overview
- (vii) The shortlisted options
- (viii) The challenges of implementation

0098 CHEMS outlined some of the issues concerning the shortlisted options contained within the Final Report:

Option1 – Refocus Current Provision at University of London Research Library Services (ULRLS)

0099 The Collegiate Council noted two different versions of Option 1: (a) refocus through efficiencies, including the release of 8k square metres of linear space through de-duplication and modest service reductions; and (b) refocus through greater efficiencies and substantial service reductions. Both options were based on the existing convergence agenda and would restrict College contributions to 2007-08 Subscription levels i.e. excluding the 2008-09 one-off contribution of £473k.

0100 CHEMS reported that Option 1a would reduce the SHL deficit to £543k, but to achieve this would require three years of transitional costs of up to £3M. The main advantage of this option was that it would involve the least upheaval, but the main disadvantages were that it appeared to be financially unsustainable in the long term and it would not resolve the deep seated strategic problems.

0101 CHEMS reported that Option 1b would reduce services significantly by a number of additional measures from those outlined in Option 1a, including, amongst other things, the release of one floor of Senate House with a reduction of 50 reader seats, a 30% reduction of shelving space, and increased staff reductions. The main advantage of this option was that it would eliminate the financial deficit, but the main disadvantage was that financial retrenchment would, in all likelihood, cause damage to the integrity of SHL. Additionally, a downward spiral could follow whereby reduced service levels resulted in demands by Colleges for commensurate reductions in Subscription levels.

Option 2 – Development of ULRSL into a major Arts and Humanities Library

0102 CHEMS reported that a possible option, led by the School of Advanced Study (SAS), was the growth of ULRSL collections into a major arts and humanities library, to include other research collections in London. However, CHEMS had concluded that this option would need to be examined in detail in a separate feasibility study and suggested that it could follow on from an implementation of aspects of Option 1a.

Option 3 – Merger with UCL

0103 CHEMS reported that this proposal was a verbatim copy of a paper submitted by UCL. The proposal had emerged following informal discussions with Colleges about the concept of merger with SHL. UCL and another College had declared initial expressions of interest, but the other College withdrew its interest during the Review process.

0104 UCL had proposed the following:

- (i) A merger of UCL's collections with those of SHL and the School of Advanced Study by way of negotiating acquisition.
- (ii) To retain present College contribution levels and this would allow open access to both UCL and ULRSL collections.
- (iii) An Advisory Board of College and SAS representatives would advise on collection development, service standards, contribution levels etc.
- (iv) UCL and SHL collections would be co-located and de-duplicated and some overlaps in staffing would be resolved.
- (v) UCL would bear any deficit from the merged service.

0105 A number of advantages and disadvantages of the UCL merger option were contained within the Final Report. CHEMS reported that a major issue concerned the ownership of SHL and SAS holdings which had been valued for insurance purposes at approximately £400M.

Option 6 - Disposal

0106 CHEMS reported that Option 6 would dispose of SHL materials to Colleges and other institutions with sale proceeds retained by the University on behalf of the Colleges. Space currently occupied by SHL would be released and income from future lettings retained by the University. Significant project costs would be incurred under this option and receiving Colleges would also incur costs, with some possibly requiring capital funds for new space. This option would have financial advantages, but it was an option which nobody had supported publicly. However, failure to agree to any other option could lead to its adoption by default.

Final Report of the Review of Senate House Library

- 0107 The Collegiate Council received a copy of the *Final Report of the Review of Senate House Library (CC014)* by CHEMS and, during a wide ranging discussion, the following was noted.
- 0108 The Chairman of the Senate House Library Review Steering Group commented on the lack of a consensus on the future of SHL which had been apparent throughout the Review process, from the initial consultation through to the final meeting of the University Libraries Committee (ULC) on 24 November 2008.
- 0109 The Principal of King's College London (KCL) expressed the view that, although it was a highly professional Report, its conclusions were too pessimistic and polarising. He commented that, under the University's new Statutes, the Collegiate Council was now more directly involved in SHL governance than had previously been the case. Therefore, further time was necessary so that the Collegiate Council, in its new role, could fully absorb and consider the issues and develop a more positive solution comprising the continuation of a commonly owned shared resource complementary to College resources but at less cost than the status quo. Accordingly, he favoured a variant of Option 1a which would implement substantial efficiencies, but also draw on other Colleges' holdings in order to ensure continued accessibility levels as well as financial sustainability. He was concerned that merger *per se* was an artificial solution and too radical, with serious implications for SHL and the University. There were several large libraries, including UCL, within the locality of SHL and he advocated a more conventional and holistic approach. The Principal of KCL agreed to draft a paper which would outline the details of his suggested option.
- 0110 Another member of the Collegiate Council expressed concern at the possibility of SHL being merged with a College. He thought it would be helpful to initiate a discussion on the level of Subscription in order to establish how much extra Colleges would be prepared to pay to retain the current service. CHEMS commented that the extra cost of maintaining the current collective arrangements would be approximately the deficit outlined in Option 1a (£543k). However, during the consultation, some Colleges had indicated that they would not expect to pay more than the current level of Subscription, although it was not a view shared by all Colleges.
- 0111 The Provost of UCL commended CHEMS for its Report which he did not view as polarising. Firstly, the possibility of Option 6, closure, could encourage a consensus and, secondly, the UCL proposal was a merger rather than a takeover. He informed members that the proposed merger with UCL was financially sustainable and would maintain current access levels at a cost which was affordable to Colleges. He added that a radical solution was necessary at this stage because the CHEMS Report had shown that use of physical library resources had remained relatively consistent, whereas there had been a dramatic increase in the take up of digital resources which was a trend which was likely to increase over the next decade.

- 0112 A member of the Collegiate Council concurred with one of the conclusions of the Report of the SHL Review Steering Group (CCM 0116 below) that a final decision should be delayed for three months to allow SAS and UCL to complete their respective proposals. However, he did not support any greater delay than the three months proposed by the Steering Group, or an expansion of the remit of the Review to consider SHL within the context of Colleges' holdings.
- 0113 A member of the Collegiate Council expressed concern about the possibility of SHL moving outside Bloomsbury. He informed members that, for his College, the essential requirement of any Option would be that SHL remains within the Bloomsbury Precinct.
- 0114 An essential requirement for another member's College was continued access to the substantial electronic resources which subscription to SHL currently offered. There was concern that a future merger option might not be able to guarantee similar levels of access to electronic resources, but there were also concerns about current arrangements. CHEMS advised the Collegiate Council that consultation with experts had indicated that the current arrangements deserved further investigation and, therefore, a separate study on acquisition of e-resources across the University had been commissioned and consultants recently appointed. The outcome of this study would be incorporated into the Review process.
- 0115 With regard to Option 2, a member of the Collegiate Council asked CHEMS how widely it had enquired as to the potential for outside institutions to subscribe to SHL. CHEMS reported that its consultation had included a meeting with the M25 Group of Librarians which had expressed little interest in the use of SHL's general collection, although there had been some interest in accessing its special collections. Consequently, it was unlikely that subscriptions from outside institutions would make a significant impact upon the financial deficit.

Steering Group's Recommendations

- 0116 The Collegiate Council received a Report (**CC015**) by the Senate House Library Review Steering Group which contained the following recommendations:
- 1 That a final decision on the future of SHL should be delayed until both the School of Advanced Study (SAS) and UCL have completed their respective proposals.
 - 2 That the Collegiate Council agrees the following timetable for the completion of the Review process:
 - 2.1 That SAS and UCL be given a deadline of three months from 12 December 2008 within which to complete their respective proposals.

- 2.2 That the Steering Group, under revised membership which would exclude SAS, UCL and University of London Research Library Services (ULRLS) representatives to be replaced by two Heads of Colleges, should meet at the end of March/beginning of April 2009 to consider all four remaining proposals.
 - 2.3 That a Special Meeting of the Collegiate Council should be convened in April 2009 to consider the Steering Group's recommendations.
 - 2.4 That the Collegiate Council's recommendations from its Special Meeting should be forwarded to the Board of Trustees on 13 May 2009.
- 3 That a ULRLS Restructuring Programme, to implement the efficiencies outlined in Option 1a (Refocus), should begin with immediate effect.
 - 4 That any other measures outwith Option 1a which would have the effect of reducing the projected Option 1a deficit of £543k should be implemented, subject to those measures not prejudicing the proposals outlined in Options 2 and 3 or encroaching into Option 1b (Refocus through reduced services).
 - 5 That a ULRLS Restructuring Group, with terms of reference and membership attached at Appendix **CC015B**, should be established by the Collegiate Council to oversee the Restructuring Programme.
 - 6 That on 17 December 2008, a statement, which outlines the position at that date, should be sent to all stakeholders, including members of the Steering Group, the Collegiate Council, College Librarians, Board of Trustees and those that had taken part in the consultation.
 - 7 That the Final Report of the Review of SHL should be made available on request from 17 December 2008.
- 0117 The Chairman of the Steering Group commented that the SAS proposal had been received in outline form only at the meeting of the Steering Group on 26 November 2008. The vision of SAS libraries at the core of a primarily research based arts and humanities library was as outlined in paragraph 9 of the Steering Group's Report (**CC015**), but a business case to underpin the proposal had not been developed.
- 0118 The Collegiate Council approved the recommendations outlined in CCM 0116 above. In approving a three-month delay so that UCL and SAS could finalise their respective proposals, the Collegiate Council gave regard to the Steering Group's comments that: 'the decision on the future of SHL is a highly significant one, not just financially but also for the longer term future success of the federal University; any decision also has a great deal of symbolic weight attached. It recognised therefore the importance of a decision being reached after having considered carefully all possible options and the merits and demerits of each.' Accordingly, the Collegiate Council concurred with the Steering Group's view that a decision on the future of SHL would be inappropriate without having received the completed proposals of both UCL and SAS.

0119 In approving a ULRIS restructuring programme to implement the efficiencies outlined in Option 1a, the Collegiate Council noted the Steering Group's comment that these efficiencies would be necessary regardless of whichever option was eventually agreed.

AGREED

0120 (i) The recommendations of the SHL Review Steering Group as contained in Document **CC015** and as outlined at CCM 0116 above.

(ii) That the Principal of KCL would draft a paper, for the consideration of the SHL Steering Group, on his suggested option for the future of SHL as outlined in CCM 0109 above.

(iii) That the separate study on the acquisition of e-resources across the University would be incorporated into the Review of SHL.

[On behalf of the Collegiate Council, the Vice-Chancellor thanked Mr Schofield and Ms Burke for their informative presentation and for CHEMS' Report of the Review of SHL. He asked that the Collegiate Council's thanks also be conveyed to Mr John Fielden and Mr Colin Harris of CHEMS]

Appointment of the Vice-Chancellor

[Professor Rigby and Professor Trainor both left the room for this item]

0121 The Collegiate Council received a report on the Appointment of the Vice-Chancellor by the Secretary to the Board of Trustees (**CC016**).

0122 The Collegiate Council noted that, at its meeting on 24 November 2008, the Board of Trustees had approved, on the recommendation of the Joint Appointments Committee, the re-appointment of Sir Graeme Davies as Vice-Chancellor for a further period of one year only, from 1 September 2009 to 31 August 2010.

0123 The Collegiate Council noted also that the Board had accepted the recommendation of the Joint Appointments Committee that the recruitment process for Sir Graeme Davies's successor should start in early 2009. To that end, it had agreed that the Joint Appointments Committee, as currently constituted, should continue and undertake the appointment process for his successor. However, the Board had felt that it should consult with the Collegiate Council to ensure that it was content for its two members currently appointed to the Joint Appointments Committee (Professor Rigby and Professor Trainor) to continue to serve. Both had indicated their willingness to serve.

AGREED

0124 That Professor Rigby and Professor Trainor should continue to serve on the Joint Appointments Committee which would undertake the appointment process for Sir Graeme Davies's successor.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

0125 The Collegiate Council approved the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 November 2008.

Vice-Chancellor's Report

London Science and Creativity Park

0126 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Vice-Chancellor on matters not considered elsewhere on the agenda (**CC017**). Members were asked to note that, in paragraph 2, the final sentence should have read as follows: 'It is anticipated that a demonstrator project will be established in suitable space in the King's Cross area early in 2009, with support from Goldsmiths and Royal Holloway, and from the London Development Agency and the London Borough of Islington.'

University of London Union Financial Performance 2007-08 and 2008-09

0128 The Collegiate Council received a report from the University of London Union (ULU) on its financial performance for 2007-08 and 2008-09 (**CC018**). It was noted that ULU had achieved a turnaround from a deficit of £36k in 2007 to a surplus of £150k in 2008, during a period in which it had lost a number of senior staff and absorbed a space charge of £435k, plus VAT. It had also added another £50k to its long term maintenance fund for improvements to the ULU building.

0129 For the period August to October 2008, a surplus of £194k had been achieved against a budgeted surplus of £55k for that period and progress to date indicated that there was likely to be another substantial surplus at year end.

University of London Union Building

[The President of ULU and the General Manager of ULU were present for Minutes CCM 0130 – CCM 0137]

0130 The Collegiate Council received a report on the ULU Building by the Secretary to the Board of Trustees (**CC019**). It was noted that the Board, at its meeting on 15 October 2008, had agreed to establish a small group to examine:

- (i) the process which had taken place leading to the decision to grant the lease of the Building to ULU;
- (ii) the information provided to the original Working Group established by the Estates Committee; and
- (iii) the concerns raised by the Provost of UCL.

0131 The Trustees' Review Group had reported to the Board of Trustees meeting on 24 November 2008 and had concluded that:

- (i) it was satisfied that the process taken, which led to the decision to grant the lease of the building to ULU, was appropriate;

- (ii) that sufficient information had been provided to the Working Group established by the Estates Committee to enable it to make a decision; and
- (iii) that the concerns expressed by the Provost of UCL had been sufficiently addressed by the Vice-Chancellor.

0132 The Board of Trustees, at its meeting on 24 November 2008, had endorsed the conclusions of the Trustees' Review Group as outlined in CCM 0131 above, but it had noted that a number of strategic and political, rather than solely estates-related, issues had emerged subsequent to the decision to award the lease to ULU. Consequently, the Board of Trustees had agreed that, whilst it was minded to grant the lease to ULU, a final decision should not be taken until the Collegiate Council had discussed the broader strategic and political issues and questions. The Board of Trustees had also supported the firm view of the Trustees' Review Group that the Collegiate Council should consider the matter outwith the presence of the Provost of UCL who had previously declared a commercial interest. A copy of the Report of the Trustees' Review Group was attached at Appendix **CC019A**.

0133 In view of the Board of Trustees' recommendations, the Vice-Chancellor had circulated an email to the Collegiate Council on 10 December 2008, which had indicated that members would be asked to consider the following questions in order:

- (i) Does the University wish to retain ULU as one of its key activities and, if so, what should it comprise?
- (ii) That the Collegiate Council should give a clear view, including on the future of the swimming pool, given its previous endorsement of ULU, and knowing the potential adverse consequences for the Union if UCL does assume control of the Building, of whether the specificity of the Colleges' requirements of ULU has now changed.

0134 With regard to CCM 0133(i) above, the Collegiate Council agreed that it would wish to retain ULU as one of the University's key activities and took the firm view that it should comprise those elements which were approved by the Heads of Colleges Committee (HOCC) at its meeting on 18 January 2008 following its Review of ULU, namely Representative Sport, Societies, *London Student* and a Representative Function (President and Vice-President).

0135 The Collegiate Council considered whether ULU's role as defined in the HOCC Review of ULU could be divorced from the issue of the lease of the ULU Building. The President of ULU informed the Collegiate Council that the swimming pool, the gym and the meeting rooms in the ULU Building were all used by ULU's clubs and societies on a daily and nightly basis during the academic year. In addition, ULU's clubs and societies needed significant storage space for their equipment. The use of the building was, therefore, in his view, integral to ULU fulfilling its role as outlined in the HOCC Review. If

ULU could no longer use the building, then alternative premises would need to be found.

0136 The Provost of UCL took the view that ULU's role and the use of the ULU Building were two separate issues. Additionally, he did not believe that it was essential that ULU was granted the lease of the building in order to fulfil its role as funded by the College Subscription, of which UCL was the biggest contributor. However, he stated that UCL would be willing to enter into discussions with ULU about a possible co-existence arrangement which would include UCL's significant investment in the building and meet ULU's space requirements. The Provost expressed concern about the Board of Trustees' comments on the Collegiate Council's procedures.

0137 The Collegiate Council noted that the Board of Trustees had requested clarification on the views of the Bloomsbury Colleges which had, on 11 July 2008, indicated a strong preference for the 'ULU Building continuing in ULU's hands.' The Collegiate Council was informed that the Bloomsbury Colleges had taken a strong interest in the future use of the building as many of its own students' unions had insufficient space or did not provide activities offered by ULU. Its position was now 'agnostic' and it favoured keeping dialogue open with both ULU and UCL/UCL Union in order to establish the most appropriate arrangement to meet its needs. It was anticipated that the Bloomsbury Colleges would undertake further work in 2009 to establish its exact requirements and what it might be prepared to pay. A member of the Collegiate Council commented that the ULU Building was also important to students of non-Bloomsbury Colleges, many of whose visits to Senate House Library were supplemented by the use of ULU's facilities.

[The Provost of UCL, the President of ULU and the General Manager of ULU all withdrew from the discussion at this point]

0138 A member of the Collegiate Council highlighted the consensus about the necessity for student focussed facilities in the ULU Building. It was important, therefore, that the discussion did not bifurcate into Bloomsbury and non-Bloomsbury viewpoints, but, instead, focussed on whether the required facilities were best managed by ULU or by UCL/UCL Union. It was his view that further work on both proposals, or a joint approach, was the most appropriate way forward. Whilst it was unlikely that this further work could be completed by the date of the Board of Trustees meeting on 28 January 2009, he was concerned so as to avoid the decision being too heavily influenced by this deadline.

0139 The Collegiate Council was informed that the Board of Trustees had revisited the original decision in the light of the Provost's concerns, and because circumstances had changed since the decision was taken. However, it was noted that any further reviews or discussions would have a particularly deleterious impact on ULU's trading position. The current six-month delay had already resulted in the potential loss of some £100k income over the five-year lease period. Several members expressed concerns that any considerable

further delay could seriously compromise ULU's future, especially as it could precipitate the loss of key staff.

- 0140 A member of the Collegiate Council commented that a 'middle ground' between both proposals might be a more flexible option. He suggested a College, acting as a Lead College, managing the Building on behalf of other Colleges. He concurred with the view that a decision needed to be reached rapidly, but he also felt it important to avoid making a decision which would need to be disentangled at a later date.
- 0141 There was concern amongst the Collegiate Council that offering a College, or its students' union, the management of the ULU Building on behalf of other Colleges, would imply ULU's current management of the Building was unsatisfactory. ULU's financial performance for 2007-08 and 2008-09, noted by the Collegiate Council at CCMM 0128 – 0129 above, had shown that this was not the case.
- 0142 A member of the Collegiate Council commented that the decision to grant ULU the lease was not one which had been reached in haste as the future of the Building had been under discussion at the University's Estates Committee for some considerable time. He also expressed concern that the UCL proposal would compromise ULU's ability to provide the services as outlined in the HOCC Review of ULU given that ULU would be required to leave the Building for a considerable period of time whilst refurbishment took place. It was noted also that the existing College Subscription was predicated on ULU operating from within the ULU Building and that it was possible that the cost of ULU's core activities funded by the Subscription would increase if ULU found another location for its operations.
- 0143 Members of the Collegiate Council recognised UCL's wish for increased space, but there was concern so as to ensure that a decision was reached which, first and foremost, protected the interests of the University. With regard to the University's financial interests, it was noted that, under the UCL option, it would acquire a University asset at a time when valuations in the property market were depressed. Regarding the University's wider interests, there was concern that the loss of a collectively owned shared service might reduce the incentives for some Colleges staying within the University. Additionally, several members of the Collegiate Council commented that the Building was a shared service which instilled a sense of ownership and community amongst student users. There was concern that this might be lost under the UCL proposal whereby the building would become to be primarily identified as the UCLU centre.
- 0144 A member of the Collegiate Council stated that the President of ULU's earlier comments had suggested greater interrelatedness between ULU's core activities and its use of the Building than he had previously thought. Consequently, he was now unsure about the implications for the UCL proposal and whether it could satisfy the space requirements of ULU's sports and societies.

- 0145 A member of the Collegiate Council felt that the UCL proposal was attractive in many respects, but there remained a lack of detail about, amongst other things, charges for services and access arrangements. There was some concern that guarantees and assurances on these aspects of the UCL proposal might prove complex both to formalise and maintain.
- 0146 In view of the level of ambiguity about whether ULU's ability to undertake its core activities was inextricably linked with the future ownership of the building, and given some of the more general concerns about the UCL proposal outlined above, the Collegiate Council concluded that the original decision, as reviewed by the Board of Trustees, to grant a five-year lease to ULU, with a review after three years, was appropriate in the present circumstances. All other things being equal, it would ensure ULU's short to medium term future, whilst at the same time, allowing further discussions to take place regarding the longer term future use of the Building.

AGREED

- 0147 (i) That the University should retain ULU as one of its key activities and that it should comprise those elements as outlined in the Heads of Colleges Committee Review of ULU, namely Representative Sport, Societies, *London Student* and a Representative Function (President and Vice-President).
- (ii) That the specificity of the Colleges' requirements of ULU had not changed since the recommendations of the Heads of Colleges Committee Review of ULU were approved by the University Council in March 2008.
- (iii) To endorse the original decision, as reviewed by the Board of Trustees, to grant a five-year lease to ULU, with a review after three years, as this would, all other things being equal, secure ULU's short to medium term future, whilst at the same time, allowing further discussions to take place regarding the longer term future use of the building.

Honorary Degrees

- 0148 The Collegiate Council received a confidential report by the Vice-Chancellor on Honorary Degrees (**CC020**). Members were asked to note details of nominations for four honorary degrees at the Foundation Day Ceremony 2009 which had been received following the circulation of the papers for the meeting (confidential tabled paper, Annex **CC020B/1**) as well as an email which contained another nomination. It was noted that following the previous meeting, a further two nominations for Honorary Degrees at the Foundation Day Ceremony 2009 had been received. It was agreed that the Vice-Chancellor would form a small working group of Heads of Colleges to consider all nominations, as well as the other names retained by the Honorary Degrees Committee for future consideration (Appendix **CC020B**), with a view to making recommendations to the Collegiate Council at its next meeting.

0149 The Collegiate Council noted that the previous Ordinance 24 of the University allowed for the central University (Academic Bodies) to award up to two Honorary Degrees annually. The External System and the School of Advanced Study had both received approval for the award of Honorary Degrees in recent years and in order to facilitate the award of Honorary Degrees to nominees of the University of London Institute in Paris, the Collegiate Council agreed to authorise the bringing forward of up to three nominations annually by the Central Academic Bodies.

0151 The Collegiate Council noted that the List of Honorary Graduates of the University and the Colleges had been updated since the previous meeting to include all those persons receiving an Honorary Degree in 2009 (Appendix **CC020C**). It was agreed that it would be informative to include a separate list of recipients of College Honorary Degrees (Institute of Education, King's College London, London School of Economics and Political Science, and UCL), even though these awards did not prevent the award of a University Honorary Degree.

AGREED

- 0152 (i) That the Vice-Chancellor would form a small working group of Heads of Colleges to consider all nominations for Honorary Degrees at the 2009 Foundation Day Ceremony, as well as the other names retained by the Honorary Degrees Committee for future consideration (Appendix **CC020B**), with a view to presenting final recommendations for the Collegiate Council to consider at its next meeting.
- (ii) That Regulation 2, *University of London Honorary Degrees*, be amended to allow the Central Academic Bodies of the University to bring forward up to three nominations annually.
- (iii) That the List of Honorary Graduates of the University and of the Colleges (Appendix **CC020C**) should be updated to include all those awarded College Honorary Degrees.

Reports from Central Academic Bodies and Activities

School of Advanced Study

0153 The Collegiate Council received and noted a report by the Vice-Chancellor, as Chairman of the Board of the School of Advanced Study, on developments within the School, including those issues discussed by the Board at its meeting on 24 October 2008 (**CC021**).

External System

0154 The Collegiate Council received and noted a report by the Vice-Chancellor, as Chairman of the Board of the External System, on developments within the External System and the External and Internal Student Administration,

including those issues discussed at the Board's meeting on 4 November 2008 (CC022).

University of London Institute in Paris

0155 The Collegiate Council received and noted a report by the Vice-Chancellor, as Chairman of the University of London Institute in Paris (ULIP), on issues discussed by the Board of ULIP at its meeting on 30 October 2008 (CC023).

The University Marine Biological Station, Millport

0156 The Collegiate Council received and noted a report by the Vice-Chancellor, as Chairman of the Board of the University Marine Biological Station, on issues discussed by the Board at its meeting on 22 October 2008 (CC024).

The Careers Group

0157 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Chairman of the Board of the Careers Group, Professor Latchman, on issues discussed by the Board at its meeting on 30 October 2008 (CC025). Professor Latchman reminded members that the meeting had been inquorate and he requested that Colleges ensure the nomination of appropriate representatives to the Board who would be able to attend meetings on a regular basis.

Academic Promotions and Titles Committee

0158 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Director of Human Resources on the Academic Promotions and Titles Committee (APTC) (CC026). It was noted that, at its meeting on 24 November 2008, the Board of Trustees had approved the terms of reference, constitution and membership of the APTC. However, the Board of Trustees had noted that the Collegiate Council would be required to approve the first term of reference of the APTC which stated: 'To establish procedures on behalf of the Collegiate Council for the appointment and promotion of Professors and Readers employed or to be employed by the University, in accordance with Ordinance 4.' The Collegiate Council approved this term of reference, subject to the addition of a footnote to explain that the Committee had no authority in respect of staff of the Colleges.

AGREED

- 0159 (i) To delegate to the APTC, the establishment of procedures for the appointment and promotion of Professors and Readers employed or to be employed by the University.
- (ii) Term of reference 1 of the APTC, subject to the addition of a footnote to explain that the Committee had no authority in respect of staff of the Colleges.

University Quality Overview Report

0160 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Head of the Academic Office on the University Quality Overview Report (**CC027**). A copy of the University Quality Overview Report in respect of foundation, first, taught postgraduate degrees and diplomas, for examinations and reviews undertaken in 2006-07 was noted at Appendix **CC027A**. The Report had been considered by the Quality Practitioners Forum on 3 November 2008

AGREED

- 0161 (i) To endorse the University Quality Overview Report on foundation, first, taught postgraduate degrees and diplomas at Appendix **CC027A**.
- (ii) That the University Quality Overview Report should be forwarded to Colleges, the School of Advanced Study, and the External System.
- (iii) That the Colleges, the School of Advanced Study and the External System should consider the issues identified in the University Quality Overview Report and, if appropriate, report back to the Quality Practitioners Forum.
- (iv) That the Collegiate Council would indicate any particular activities related to quality assurance and enhancement, and/or the regulation of awards, for report in the next Annual Report exercise.

Annual Report of the Academic Trust Funds Committee

0162 The Collegiate Council received and noted the Annual Report of the Academic Trust Funds Committee, including details of awards made in 2007-08 (**CC028**).

Award of Degrees and Diplomas

0163 The Collegiate Council received and noted a report by the Vice-Chancellor on the award of degrees and diplomas (**CC029**).

Dates of Meetings 2008-09

0164 The Collegiate Council noted the following dates of meetings:
Friday, 20 February 2009 at 8.30am
Friday, 1 May 2009 at 8.30am
Friday, 3 July 2009 at 8.30am

Note The following minutes are exempt from disclosure according to the meaning of part II of the Freedom of Information Act 2000:

CCM 0127 and CCM 0150