



COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 November 2021

Present: Sir Keith O'Nions (Chair), Dr Pearl Agyakwa, Vicky Bailey, Rachel Gomes, Ian Kenyon, Sonya Leydecker (until minute 3890), Professor Andy Long, Sherry Madera (until minute 3889), Piyali Mitra (until minute 3890), Professor Roshan das Nair, Richard Newsome (to minute 3890), Stephen Odell, Nora Senior (until minute 3885), George Sullivan, David Tilly, Professor Shearer West

Apologies: Lynette Eastman, Professor Jo Lymn, Chris Taylor

In attendance: Ravi Bhalla, Sally Blackamore (for minute 3880 and 3881), Jason Carter (for minute 3878), Laura Clayton (for minutes 3879, 3882 and 3883), Kylie Colvin (for minute 3872), Linda Goodacre (for minute 3884), Dr Paul Greatrix, Rowena Hall, Neil Hawthorne (for minute 3878), David Hill (for minute 3886), Ed Jones, PA Consulting (for minute 3886), Professor Sam Kingman (for minute 3878), Professor Sarah Metcalfe (for minute 3872), Margaret Monckton, Keji Mustapha, Andy Nolan (for minute 3884), Professor Jason Pandya-Wood (for minute 3872), Dr Nalayini Thambar (for minute 3887), Tim Watkinson, Duncan Young (for minute 3886)

3872 University of Nottingham, Malaysia – Strategy Development

- .1 Council participated in a workshop session led by the Interim Provost, UNM.
- .2 An analysis of the context of UNM in the areas of education, research and student experience was provided. A number of points were highlighted:
 - .1 UNM's market share was reducing as a result of new entrants to the Malaysian branch campus market.
 - .2 Investment in both IT and campus infrastructure was required. Capital expenditure had reduced significantly over the last five years and investment was required in student services and accommodation.
 - .3 The civic agenda required attention both in the local Semeniyh areas and the Selangor district in particular, following the establishment of two further foreign branch universities in the district.
- .3 An update was provided by the Director of Strategy and Business Transformation, UNM on the development of the campus strategy which was being conducted in collaboration with Council, UEB and other stakeholders. Council NOTED:
 - .1 As part of the education strategy, traditional degree programmes would continue to be delivered alongside an increase in non-traditional education which would include that co-designed and co-delivered with partners.

- .2 Applied translational research would be a focus of the research strategy.
- .3 To improve student experience, opportunities would be explored with commercial partnerships to expand food, beverage and accommodation offerings.
- .4 Council NOTED the progress made on strategic enablers including recruitment, the introduction of a revised governance structure, and the alignment of budget processes with strategic goals.
- .5 The Dean of Arts and Social Sciences outlined current tri-campus activity and strengths in ASEAN, with particular focus on Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore and the context for transnational education.
- .6 Members of Council considered the opportunities for the University in Malaysia and ASEAN and provided feedback including the following:
 - .1 A particular strength for the University was that successful research areas in Malaysia connected to environmental and climate issues.
 - .2 Existing partner relationships should be leveraged.
 - .3 Analysis of competitor success was key to developing the strategy.
 - .4 A target for market share should be determined.
 - .5 Opportunities to move staff and students between campuses should be strengthened.
- .7 Members thanked colleagues from UNM for their presentation and engagement.

STANDING ITEMS

3873 Welcome and Quoracy

- .1 The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.
- .2 Apologies were received from Lynette Eastman and Professor Jo Lymn. Chris Taylor was also not in attendance.
- .3 The Secretary confirmed that the meeting was quorate, but a number of Council members had to leave the meeting early. In order to achieve quoracy on an item towards the end of the meeting where Council approval was required, a number of the internal members present at the meeting would become observers and would not contribute to or vote on the relevant items. This corresponded to Minute 3890 where Professors Long and Gomes, and Dr Agyakwa would become observers.

3874 Declarations of Interest

There were no interests declared.

3875 Minutes

Council AGREED the minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2021 as a true and accurate record of the meeting and NOTED the Action Log (C/21/99).

3876 Chair's Business

- .1 The Chair reported that the Nominations Committee had approved Piyali Mitra to join Finance Committee. The Vice-Chair of Council would formally stand down from Finance Committee to facilitate Piyali Mitra to join, but would continue to attend meetings as an observer.
- .2 The Chair NOTED that there was no formal system for rotating Council members around Council's sub-committees and reminded Council members that they were able observe sub-committee meetings at any time.
- .3 A vote of thanks was given by the Chair and the members of Council to David Tilly, who was attending his last meeting as a member of Council. The Chair highlighted David's great support of the University over a number of years. A dinner would be held to say thank you to both David and former members of Council who had stepped down during or shortly before the COVID-19 pandemic.

3877 Vice-Chancellor's Update

- .1 Council NOTED the Vice-Chancellor's Update (paper C/21/109).
- .2 In response to a request to receive an update on the professorial pay banding scheme, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the introduction of the new banding approach continued. Professors had been asked to complete the required paperwork which would be mapped against University criteria by a staff committee and would result in a proposed allocation to one of the four pay bands. This work was intended to be completed before the end of the year, following which the relevant Head of School would review the assessment.
- .3 Any staff mapped to a higher band than their current salary would receive the pay increase from August 2022. Any staff member mapped to a lower band, expected to be a relatively small number, would receive four years' pay protection. It was hoped that any staff member in that position would be able to improve performance within the four-year period to reach the appropriate band for their current salary.
- .4 Virtually all Russell Group universities had reported a positive impact on gender pay gaps as a result of a banding approach to professorial pay.
- .5 Council NOTED that following the initial assessment, staff would only move down a pay band as a result of standard performance management processes. Council further NOTED the generous four years' pay protection which had not been seen elsewhere in the Russell Group.
- .6 The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that, in response to a letter signed by more than 200 professorial staff, further communications had been issued to address any misconceptions about the scheme.
- .7 Whilst welcoming the pay protection and acknowledging that additional communications had addressed misconceptions held about the scheme by some professorial staff, a Senate Council member suggested that there had not been

sufficient consultation on the scheme before it was introduced. Further they asked whether consideration could be given to delaying its implementation, particularly, as January and February was a busy period for research grant applications.

- .8 The Vice-Chancellor considered that there had been significant consultation on the scheme and confirmed that it had been planned to introduce it two years ago, but the activity had been suspended due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It was the Vice-Chancellor's view that professorial staff had commitments throughout the academic year and there was no time better than any other to introduce the scheme.
- .9 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed there had been consultation with all professors and level 6 research and teaching staff about the scheme, in particular on the criteria. Two thirds of professional staff responded and one third of level 6 staff. This had occurred pre-pandemic. Following the delay in implementation, nine meetings were held for professorial staff, (one per faculty with additional meetings). It was as a request of feedback received during those meetings that a number of revisions were made to the scheme.
- .10 There was a consensus amongst Council members that the format of the previous day's Council session had been of enormous value. The session had included a visit to the Faculty of Engineering where Council was joined by the Chair of the Office for Students, Lord Wharton. Following the visit Lord Wharton delivered a short address to Council members and engaged in discussion on higher education policy.
- .11 The Registrar reminded Council members that two further in-person meetings were planned for March and June 2022. The secretariat would welcome any suggestions for guest speakers or areas of the University that members wished to visit. An initial suggestion was that an in-person meeting might make a good opportunity to meet the Chancellor.
- .12 The Treasurer was keen that the policy areas discussed by the Chair of the Office for Students were addressed by the themes of the Council forward agenda plan
- .13 A Council member asked how the University might ensure that it stayed ahead of the priorities of the Office for Students. The Vice-Chancellor affirmed that the University was not, and would not become, complacent to the emerging approach of the Office for Students. In many respects, it had already considered and responded to issues now cited as the priorities of the Office for Students. An example was the University's consideration of a grade point average approach for degree classification. Four years ago, Senate had agreed to consider the approach, but there had been no appetite within the wider higher education sector for such a move.
- .14 In answer to a question from a Council member on how the University might position itself best to take advantage of the additional funding from government for research, the Vice-Chancellor observed that there would be significant competition to secure funding from non-university bodies that conducted research. Nevertheless, the Vice-Chancellor confirmed that she would be commissioning colleagues to look specifically at the issue raised.

- .1 Council RECEIVED paper C/21/107 and NOTED that there had been one staff RIDDOR reported since the last meeting.
- .2 The Director of Health and Safety provided an update on the current status of health and safety projects and the improvement plan. Council NOTED:
 - .1 A delay in the completion of the high and medium risk fire safety actions assigned to the Estates and Facilities Department.
 - .2 The compartmentation issues identified at Willoughby Hall and the commencement of remediation works. Necessary surveys had already been commenced on remaining halls. The surveys would be completed by Christmas.
 - .3 Progress on the implementation of the health and safety IT system.
- .3 The Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee was keen to understand the plans for health and safety assurance to return to business as usual and rely on existing reporting structures. The Director of Governance and Assurance confirmed that this was connected to the implementation of the IT system. Once in place, the data would be available to support regular reporting to Assurance Committee and Audit and Risk Committee.
- .4 The Chair of Health and Safety Committee confirmed that an effectiveness review of the Committee had been undertaken. Changes to the membership of the Committee, designed to ensure that the appropriate accountable individuals were in attendance, would be communicated later in the week. The Committee would operate with a more focused approach on receiving assurance and key topics would be considered on a rotational basis. The approach should ensure that deadlines were met and any issues were identified early.
- .5 Council also NOTED paper C/21/110, including minutes of the meetings of Health and Safety Committee held on 2 September 2021 and 2 November 2021.

3879 Castle Meadow Report

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED paper C/21/101.
- .2 Council had requested regular reporting on the progress of the strategy and delivery of the Castle Meadow Campus. The paper set out the first progress report and Council's feedback on its format was sought.
- .3 Council NOTED that:
 - .1 Work had begun on strategy development with input from external consultants to support the organisation of thoughts and bring perspectives from projects at other universities.
 - .2 An oversight group for the project workstreams, including academic, communications and engagement and ways of working streams, would be chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor.
 - .3 The PVC EDI would chair a staff and student consultative forum which would support staff and student engagement with the project.

- .4 An interim programme director would be appointed imminently to lead the Castle Meadow Castle programme.
- .5 Clear and measurable metrics aligned to strategy would be included in the detailed business cases for Digital Nottingham and the Business School.
- .4 Suggestions for further development of the format of the report included:
 - .1 A greater focus on messaging and communications activity.
 - .2 A high-level timeline for the programme from the current state to completion.
 - .3 Reference to capacity utilisation plans.

ACTION		Owner	Due
.5	To consider the feedback provided by Council members in the next iteration of the Castle Meadow update report.	Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change	31 January

FINANCE MATTERS

3880 Financial Performance

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED paper C/21/112.

3881 Global Review and Financial Statements

- .1 Council RECEIVED paper C/21/116.
- .2 The Chief Financial Officer reported that an earlier version of the draft Financial Statements had been received by Finance Committee which had approved the financial judgements used and the going concern rationale. The Audit and Risk Committee had considered the External Audit report and recommended approval to Council.
- .3 Council were advised that two accounting adjustments had been included in the draft Financial statement presented as part of the paper: the release of a research income provision (£1.1m) and a value adjustment to the private placement (£7.5m). There was one potential further adjustment, relating to the accounting for the Foundational IT provision, which was under review by the external auditors. If the auditors determined that the provision should not have been made, it would have to be removed from the 2020/2021 and previous years' accounts. Council NOTED that the provision had been previously agreed by the external auditors.
- .4 Frustration was expressed by a number of Council members including the Chair of Council and the Chair of Finance Committee in connection with the lateness of the changes made by the external auditors.
- .5 Council AGREED that the revised Financial Statements setting out the adjustments and including a narrative of the changes should be first circulated to the Chairs of Finance Committee and Audit and Risk Committee for their approval,

following which the Financial Statements, including any comments from the Chairs, should be circulated to Council for approval.

- .6 Subject to the approval of the revised Financial Statements by Council via circulation, it was AGREED that the Vice-Chancellor, Treasurer, and Chief Financial Officer be authorised to sign them and the Chair be authorised to sign the Letter of Representation.

ACTION		Owner	Due
.7	To circulate the completed Financial Statements to the Chairs of Finance Committee and Audit and Risk Committee before circulation to Council for approval.	Secretary	31 December 2021

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

3882 League Tables Analysis and Progress Update

- .1 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change delivered a presentation (paper C/21/102) which provided an update on the key university league tables used by external stakeholders, their methodology, and actions in train or planned, to improve University performance.
- .2 The presentation highlighted the relevance of league table position to the decision-making of home and international students. Council NOTED the relative decline in league table performance and the likely impact on international student recruitment.
- .3 The measures used to formulate the main league tables were outlined and current University performance against those criteria mapped. An assessment of where the KPIs in the University's Performance Framework and those at a strategic delivery plan level would align to the criteria within the league tables was provided.
- .4 Activities were underway or planned across the University to drive performance in league tables and included:
 - .1 A League Tables Working Group which was focused on ensuring that data for statutory returns was optimised.
 - .2 The Digital Intelligence strategy currently being scoped would include activity to understand how to improve the University's position.
- .5 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed that targets had been developed for improvement in league table position.
- .6 In response to a question from a Council member, it was confirmed that the budget model and investment approach for the improvement of staff student ratios was under development. An existing mechanism had been suspended as part of the emergency finance measures implemented during the pandemic. The new approach would align with the Performance Framework. A clear understanding was required as to how the investment would drive performance.
- .7 Council was keen to remain full sighted on the University's progress in improving league table position.

3883 Ambition and Performance Portfolio

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED paper C/21/103.
- .2 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor was sponsoring a portfolio of work, '*Ambition and Performance*' to be delivered within the next five years to enable the University to achieve the targets set out in its Performance Framework. Progress against the work would be reported to Council via the Performance Framework and additional reports on significant programmes of work.
- .3 Council was reminded of the measures contained within the Performance Framework which had been agreed some months previously. Targets to be included in the Performance Framework were in the final stages of development. University level targets had been cascaded to Faculties and Professional Services departments to secure local commitments to targets and ensure the overarching targets were achievable. An overview of the draft targets was provided.
- .4 Council NOTED that the activities within the Ambition and Performance portfolio were categorised under headings and included: the further development and implementation of the Performance Framework, work to improve league table performance, the development of the research strategy, a curriculum transformation programme, the introduction of a new model for the recruitment and support of Heads of School.
- .5 A portfolio of work, co-sponsored by the Registrar and the Chief Financial Officer, '*Strengthening the Foundations*' had been established and would be delivered within the next five years. The portfolio would enable the University to achieve the targets set out in its University Performance Framework through supporting professional services staff to partner with colleagues in the University. Progress would be reported to Council via Performance Framework and also additional reports on significant programmes of work.
- .6 Council NOTED the activities within the Strengthening the Foundations portfolio included organisation design, and digital and lean programmes.
- .7 Council was supportive of the template used to set out progress within each portfolio and suggested that more detail on the impact of specific investments on performance might be included. Council was keen to receive reporting on the early signals that the portfolio approach was impacting performance.
- .8 Council AGREED that a report on the progress of the University's KPIs against the five-year objectives set out in the Performance and Ambition and Strengthening the Foundations portfolios should be delivered to Council twice a year. It was further AGREED that Faculty Reports to Council should include similar reporting on performance.

.9	To schedule twice yearly reports on the Council forward plan.	Secretary	31 December 2021
----	---	-----------	------------------------

3884 Estate Development Forward Plan

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED paper C/21/104. Illustrations of the projects had been on display prior to the item for Council Members to view.
- .2 The Director of Sustainability provided an update on progress since the publication of the Estate Development Framework in June 2020 and an overview of future investments planned in the University estate.
- .3 Council NOTED that campus plans were being progressed and would be published in mid-2022 and would align with the plans for the Castle Meadow site.
- .4 The Students' Union Development Officer requested further information on the quality and capacity of student accommodation available at Sutton Bonington. The Director of Estates and Facilities confirmed that the accommodation was owned by a third party and the University was working with them to ensure that the standard improved. It was confirmed that there was sufficient accommodation for the April intake of Veterinary Science students.
- .5 In response to questions raised by Council members, it was confirmed that:
 - .1 The investment pipeline, including for estates projects, had been shared with Finance Committee. Investments were prioritised and business cases overseen by the relevant committee. The investment pipeline would be circulated to Council for information.
 - .2 Governance for the Castle Meadow campus programme would ensure interface between the major project strands within the programme.
 - .3 A disposal plan was being developed for the Kings Meadow campus.
- .6 The importance of the IT infrastructure to the Castle Meadow campus was discussed. The Director of Estates and Facilities considered that the campus would showcase how technology and infrastructure could work together to facilitate building intelligence.
- .7 Council NOTED that the Castle Meadow campus was likely to become listed, but the University would work closely with the listing officer as the listed aspects were determined. The site had planning consent for all the uses that the University required.
- .8 Council was keen to understand how communications with staff and students were balanced between the various large scale estates projects and ongoing remediation and maintenance works. Council NOTED that the campus planning groups had discussed both the large projects and investment in estates capital backlog. The Director of Communications and Advocacy assured Council that internal communications achieved the correct balance and ensured that there was no suggestion that maintenance and remediation programmes had been de-escalated.

.9	To circulate an investment pipeline paper to Council for information.	Secretary	31 January 2022
----	---	-----------	-----------------

- .1 The Vice- Chancellor introduced paper C/21/100 which set out her objectives looking forward to the next four years. The objectives had been devised in discussion with the Chair.
- .2 The three main objectives focused on setting the University up for future success and high performance, having a strong visionary forward programme for Castle Meadow and completing the transition for the UMN campus. These were supplemented by enabling and continuous improvement objectives. Council's feedback was welcomed before the objectives were finalised and published.
- .3 Council NOTED the qualitative and quantitative success measures.
- .4 The Vice-Chancellor identified the most significant risk to delivering her objectives as the exhaustion of staff impacting on their ability to engage with opportunities with the necessary energy. Other risks included the capacity of the leadership team to deliver the University's ambition, how effectively the University adapted to changes in government policy, geopolitical instability, and the local risk of the functionality of Campus Solution not improving with sufficient speed.
- .5 A Council member suggested that the different ways and speed with which staff would recover from the challenges of the pandemic was a risk for consideration.
- .6 It was suggested that something more explicit should be included on staff engagement. The DVC confirmed that staff engagement was included in the performance framework, but further consideration needed to be given as to how to measure it.
- .6. The Registrar confirmed that an item on Trusted and Sensitive Research was on the agenda for the March Council meeting.
- .7 Members recorded their thanks to the Vice-Chancellor for putting the objectives on record and the Vice-Chancellor thanked Council members for all their comments and suggestions.

3886 Foundational IT Business Case

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED paper C/21/115 which provided an overview of the Foundational IT Services Full Business Case, which recommended the appointment of CGI as the Digital Partner to the University for the provision of IT services governed by a framework agreement.
- .2 The CDO provided an overview of the context and purpose of the business case:
 - .1 The appointment of a digital partner to the University would be fundamental to enabling the provision of digital services which met the increasing demands and expectations of staff and students. Digital and technology capabilities would be key to underpinning student experience, education, research and professional capabilities and would have an essential role in risk reduction.
 - .2 The Digital Partner relationship would be governed by framework agreement and last for five to seven years. The framework work agreement would not provide any exclusivity for the partner save for the initial commitment for Phase 1 services: strategic advice and guidance, integration service, and managed print and network. Future services would be subject to further governance and business cases.

- .3 An outline of the development of the business case and the comprehensive governance and procurement processes was provided.
- .4 If approved by Council, the next steps would be to sign the framework agreement with CGI, complete the intelligent client function onboarding the CGI team, and put the contract for phase one in place.
- .5 The Chair of Finance Committee confirmed that:
 - .1 Finance Committee had considered a comprehensive paper pertaining to the proposed partnership and had challenged the presenting group to deliver a more succinct outline of the proposal.
 - .2 The approach set out in the business case, reflected the general move away from big capital IT projects towards smaller more phased approaches.
 - .3 Whilst the financial benefits of the project were hard to clearly identify, the disbenefits of not entering into such an arrangement would be significant in terms of the University's ability to deliver its ambitions.
 - .4 Finance Committee was broadly supportive of the direction of travel proposed in the paper.
- .6 In response to questions from Council members, the Chief Digital Officer confirmed that:
 - .1 The approach of using a framework agreement would see activity in some areas delivered solely by the Digital Partner and, in others, a blended approach between the Digital Partner and the University. The University would retain the ability to bring services back in-house if required.
 - .2 Lessons had been learnt from previous large scale IT projects delivered within the University previous. The key to ensuring a successful approach would be the management of both the relationship with the Digital Partner and the contract. Clarity on what was being purchased was vital.
 - 3. The proposed Digital Partner, CGI, was a well-established large company with global presence and experience of working across a range of industries including with higher education clients, although not to the scale that would be delivered at Nottingham.
- .7 A Council member, with significant experience of leading IT services, confirmed that the approach proposed was appropriate and a current industry standard model. Big outsourcing capital IT projects were seen as a high value and high risk model. The Council member reiterated the importance of establishing and managing the relationships with the Digital Partner.
- .8 The Chief Digital Officer confirmed that internal communications about the appointment would be managed carefully together with the Director of Communications and Advocacy, particularly given sensitivities connected to IT projects. It was likely that initial communications would be light as phase one projects would not impact staff immediately.
- .9 It was hoped that the University community would welcome the approach as there had been resistance to a previously proposed model to outsource many IT

services. The Chair NOTED that the issues of communication were for the executive leadership to manage given the points raised during the meeting.

- .10 Council approved the funding request as set out in the paper and further approved the University to enter into the framework agreement with CGI.

3887 Careers and Employability Service Update

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED paper C/21/105 supported by a presentation from the Director of Careers and Employability.
- .2 The presentation highlighted the way in which Careers and Employability services had been delivered to the University's students and graduates since the start of the pandemic in March 2020, including approaches that were being taken in the academic year 2021/22 to maintain high levels of student engagement and service delivery.
- .3 The University's Careers and Employability services would need to respond to the challenges of the changing approach of graduate employers, who were utilising online and direct approach to students, and to the potential of changing student behaviours which were anticipated to have less focus on the conventional approach to careers and new perspectives on life after University.
- .4 The University had adopted a whole institution approach to employability, whereby by engaging with education the student would develop skills required for employment. Professional competencies were being embedded in the curriculum.
- .5 The Director of Careers and Employability considered that Nottingham's students were well prepared and placed to enter the graduate job market.

COMMITTEE AND OTHER REPORTS

3888 Finance Committee

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED the minutes and report from the meeting of Finance Committee held on 9 November 2021 (paper C/21/114).

3889 Audit and Risk Committee

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED the minutes and report from the meeting of Audit and Risk Committee held on 15 November 2021 (paper C/21/118).
- .2 Council NOTED the Internal Audit Annual Report and Opinion 2020/21 and the Audit and Risk Committee Annual Report both included in the papers.
- .3 It was REPORTED that during the meeting on 15 November, the Audit and Risk Committee recommended approval to Council of the appointment of BDO as the external auditors, subject to receipt of a paper of additional paper outlining details including the tender process, the changing external audit market and pricing. The required information had been circulated to Audit and Risk Committee the previous day. Following final endorsement of the paper by Audit and Risk Committee, the proposal to appoint of BDO as external auditors would be circulated to Council for approval.

ANNUAL ITEMS FOR APPROVAL**3890 Prevent Annual Monitoring Return**

- .1 Council RECEIVED the Annual Report to Council on the Prevent Duty 2020/2021 (paper C/21/106) which was introduced by the Registrar.
- .2 Council NOTED that work continued to mitigate risks around meetings on campus and ensuring that all visitors were properly recorded.
- .3 The Students Union Development Officer stated their intention to abstain from the discussion and declined to support the report on the grounds that the University of Nottingham Islamic Society considered the Prevent duty to be discriminatory.
- .4 Council NOTED the report and AGREED the Accountability Statement and Data Return for signature by the Chair of Council before submission to the Office for Students.

3891 RESERVED**3892 Council Agenda Forward Plan**

- .1 Council RECEIVED and NOTED paper C/21/113.
- .2 Council members were keen that visits to sites across the University were included as part of in-person Council meetings, with opportunities to meet staff and students. A visit focused on the University's research activity connected to sustainability and net zero was suggested.
- .3 Council members were encouraged to make suggestions for guest speakers to attend Council meetings.
- .4 It was NOTED that a discussion related to the recommendations arising from the Senate Effectiveness Review could not take place at Council until Senate had approved the recommendations.

.ACTION		Owner	Due
.5	To update the Council Forward Plan with the suggestions made by Council members	Secretary	30 November