UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COURT

Minutes of meeting held on 25 June 2002

Present: Rector (In the Chair), Principal, Councillor D Clyne, Mr D Cockburn, Dr A Dawson, Mr H Duncan, Dr H Fullerton, Professor G Graham, Mr J Grant, Dr P Kinnear, Mr J Leiper, Professor S Logan, Mr R McGregor, Miss M Main, Mr A Mair, Dr N Milne, Professor D Ogston, Dr G Roberts, Professor T Salmon, Professor J Sewel, Professor W Smith, Professor I Torrance, with Professor D Houlihan, Ms C Macaslan, Professor A Rodger, Professor P Sloane, Mr S Cannon, Ms I Bews, Mr A Donaldson, Mrs C Inglis, Dr P Murray, Mr B Purdon, and Mrs H Stephen (Clerk).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P Johnston, Dr M Mackie and Mrs A Skene.

MINUTES

227 The minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2002 were approved subject to minor textual amendments.

STATEMENT BY PRINCIPAL

228 The Principal paid tribute to members of Court retiring in 2001-02 and thanked them for their individual expertise which had greatly benefited the work of the Court. The Court agreed to record its gratitude to Professor Sloane, Dr Fullerton, Miss Main, Mrs Skene, Professor Ogston and Mr Grant.

229 The Principal noted that 2001-02 had been a positive year for the University, symbolised by the successful visit of the Scottish Parliament. The financial position was sound, major capital projects such as the IMS2 and Oceanlab were complete and the Pathfinder Initiative was proceeding, as were the integration of the fifth Faculty following the successful merger with the Aberdeen campus of the Northern College, and the reorganisation of other Faculties into Schools. The potential for greater collaboration with The Robert Gordon University was under consideration, and the first £40M million of the Sixth Century Campaign had been secured. There remained, however, major challenges ahead. Notwithstanding the achievements of the student recruitment campaign, there was concern about the student population reducing in future and there were particular difficulties in recruiting postgraduate research students. The positive outcome of the RAE placed the University within the core of UK research institutions, but there was still a long way to go in further improving research performance. Maintaining financial stability would require further budgetary restraint including serious cuts in support budgets. There also remained much to be done in the next phase of the Sixth Century Campaign.

STRATEGIC PLAN 2002-2006

230 Professor Sewel presented the final draft version of the Strategic Plan together with Financial Forecasts, Student Number Projections and the Estate Management Action. The final draft reflected input from relevant committees including the JPFEC and Senate. The Strategic plan met SHEFC requirements, indicated the extent to which the University had achieved its previous targets, and set new targets. A small number of amendments remained to be made to include reference to the outcome of the Court’s discussion of potential collaboration with The RGU, to the discussions held with the Scottish Agricultural College, and to the University’s commitment to work closely with local schools through the new S6 Enhancement Unit with a view to increasing the participation rate in higher education. Professor Sewel drew particular attention to the section on access, recruitment and retention and to the need to put considerable effort into the retention issue in the next year.
231  Dr Kinnear noted that while the Plan included reference to academic and academic-related staff issues, similar reference was not made to technical and secretarial staffing and he wished to draw the Court’s attention to the invaluable input which such staff made to the functioning of the University.

232  The Court approved the Strategic Plan 2002-2006, together with the supporting documentation, for submission to the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council.

ESTATE STRATEGY

233  Professor Sewel presented the final draft version of the Estate Strategy 2002-2007. The strategy document, the preparation of which had been deferred for eighteen months pending a decision on the proposed merger with Northern College, now mapped the way ahead for the whole University estate.

234  The Court approved the Estate Strategy 2002-2007 for submission to the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council.

235  Professor Sewel asked the Court to recognise the contribution of Mrs Schofield and Mr Donaldson in the preparation of the Strategic Plan and Estates Strategy respectively.

INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION: JOINT REPORT TO THE GOVERNING BODIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN AND THE ROBERT GORDON UNIVERSITY

236  The Principal commented that while he - and the Court – as yet had no position on the question of the desirability of merger with The Robert Gordon University, it was reasonable, in terms of the ability of the University to meet its wide responsibilities and in the light of the external environment in higher education that the potential for a local merger should be examined.

237  Professor Logan presented the Report which was an agreed joint position document between the two institutions. It reflected the outcome of analysis, undertaken with input from a range of external consultants, of the five main options of general collaboration, strategic alliance, federal structure, traditional merger, and new model merger. Cognisance had been taken of SHEFC guidelines on institutional collaboration, and a summary of the pros and cons of the five options was included in the report. The Report invited the two institutions to continue detailed discussions and analysis of whether a new model merger would be an appropriate way forward. The next phase would be carried out over the next twelve months with a view to a final report being submitted to the governing bodies in June 2003.

238  In discussion concerns were expressed that, in view of the differences in the two institutions’ RAE performances, a merger might be detrimental to the achievement of the University’s aspirations as a research institution. While it was acknowledged that a long-term view of the University’s interests should be taken and that the proposed further analysis should go ahead, it would be important to develop strategies to protect and secure those goals which the University regarded as important.

239  The need for full consultation of staff on a specific proposal setting out the results of a detailed analysis and the potential implications of a new model merger, was emphasised. It would be important to manage the process of further exploration of the issues well, lest the prospect of merger were to have adverse effects on staff recruitment and retention. It should be borne in mind that experience showed the number of successful mergers to be small, usually involving the merger of institutions of similar size and mission.

240  It was noted that the full consultants’ reports, which were reflected in the document, could be made available to any member of Court on request.
A number of members spoke in favour of greater collaboration, possibly merger, between the two universities. Such a development could be beneficial to the economy of North-East Scotland. The Business Committee of the General Council, while cautious about the pros and cons for merger, was also generally in favour of further examination of the issues. The factors on which the Student Association would judge any merger proposal would include the potential delivery of an improved educational experience for students and the provision of student support. Students would want to be fully involved in the discussions.

It was emphasised that the Report was the first stage of the project, seeking only the Court’s permission to go forward to the next phase, to be carried out over the next twelve months. This would seek to develop the vision for a ‘new model’ institution and to explore the academic case. Many of the concerns which had been expressed would be addressed in the next phase, from which a more detailed document would emerge and provide a basis for a consultation exercise.

It was accepted that Court should have an update on progress of the project at each Court meeting during the next session.

The Court approved the recommendation that the two Universities explore in detail the option of merger to establish a new model institution, engage a risk management study of the option, and consult widely with staff, students and other stakeholders.

**SENATE REPORT (12.6.02)**

*Formation of Schools*

Professor Sewel introduced a paper on the formation of Schools, on the basis of which the Senate had approved the recommendation that Schools be introduced in the three Faculties of Science & Engineering, Social Sciences & Law, and Arts & Divinity with effect from 1 August 2002. The titles had not all been finalised but there would be four Schools in Science & Engineering (Life Sciences; Engineering and Physical Sciences; Psychology, Computing Science and Mathematical Sciences; and Environment, Resources and Society), three in Social Sciences & Law (Law; Management and Economic Sciences; and Social Sciences and four in Arts & Divinity (Modern Languages, History and History of Art; English and Film Studies, and Divinity and Religious Studies and Philosophy).

In approving the move to Schools, the Senate had agreed to recommend to the Court that the appointment panel for Heads of School should include up to five rather than three representatives of the relevant Faculty Advisory Committees. This proposal was accepted.

A fundamental purpose in creating Schools was to improve the institution’s performance in the next Research Assessment Exercise or its equivalent, with as many staff submitted as possible and it was believed that Schools would provide the essential critical mass. On governance, the paper invited Court to confirm that Schools within the three Faculties would have departmental status for statutory purposes. Heads of School *ipso facto* would take on the powers currently exercised by Heads of Departments within these Faculties. For the time being Departments in statutory terms would remain within the Faculties of Medicine & Medical Sciences and Education.

The School structure would not be appropriate within the Faculty of Medicine & Medical Sciences with its matrix management and curriculum structures, and the structure of the Faculty of Education was constrained meantime by the requirement in the Merger Agreement for three departments.

It was important to proceed with implementing the School structure as soon as possible and to appoint Heads of Schools, who with their Deans would be required to prepare costed academic plans for approval by the JPFEC.
In discussion Dr Kinnear registered his regret that there had been an inadequate consultation period for staff to consider the fundamental change in structure involved in the introduction of Schools.

The Court, noting that the JPFEC had also confirmed its agreement, approved the proposals for the formation of Schools, as forwarded by the Senate.

**Status of Associate Student**

The Court formally approved the proposal, which the Senate and the JPFEC had agreed, to institute a status of ‘associate student’.

**Partnership Agreements**

The Court was informed that the Senate had agreed to Partnership Agreements, on the model previously agreed by the Senate and the Court with Banff & Buchan College, being signed with Waterford Institute of Technology, Elmwood College, Angus College and Sabhal Mor Ostaig College. The Agreements would be for five years in the first instance and would be subject to the same termination rights as agreed in the Banff & Buchan College Agreement.

The Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee had approved specifications for entry to a number of Degrees of the University, with advanced standing where appropriate, for students from the above institutions upon successful completion of specified National Diploma or Higher National Diploma programmes.

**Appointments to Committees**

The Court noted the Senate’s representation on Joint-Court Senate Committees and Committees of the Court for the academic year 2002/03.

**REPORTS BY COMMITTEES**

**Joint Planning, Finance & Estates Committee (11.6.02)**

Before introducing the Committee’s report Mr Mair on behalf of the lay Court members took the opportunity to congratulate the University on a year of substantial achievement in 2001-02. The Principal had already referred to a number of the successes which included a good financial outturn for the year, the RAE outcome, positive student recruitment, progress in capital projects and the high profile visit of the Scottish Parliament. He congratulated all staff in the considerable effort involved.

**The Library Project**

The Court received a paper, *The Library Project: Building Our Future*, seeking the Court’s informal blessing to the further exploration of plans for an extension to the Queen Mother Library, which would also function as a Humanities Research Centre (HRC). An informal presentation had also been made by Professor George Watson, who was taking forward the development of the project, to the Court prior to its meeting.

The Library/HRC project was believed to be vital to the humanities and essential to the institution’s future well-being as a research-led University. It would take advantage of the University’s special collections and enhance its research profile. Discussions were also continuing about the possibility of adding the Blairs Collection to the University’s holdings, on expiry of the current loan to the National Library. External capital funding would be sought for the project and no financial commitment was sought at this stage from the JPFEC and Court. It was intended that the costs of the further analysis would be met from Development Trust bequests.

The Court agreed to support the proposed further exploration of the plans on this basis.
The Court noted that another major project to be addressed over the next few years, which would similarly require support from external funding, would be the upgrading of recreational and athletic facilities. Such a project would be important in relation to student recruitment and the encouragement of existing students. An outline paper would be brought forward in due course.

The Court received a report on the work undertaken by the Risk Management Committee (RMC) since its first meeting in November 2001. The introduction of risk management processes was now a SHEFC condition of grant, and could be expected to prove beneficial to institutional management. The RMC, convened by the Senior Vice-Principal, had drawn up a Register of Strategic Risks which sought to identify those principal elements of strategic business risk, failure of which to understand or to manage would have a seriously adverse impact on the institution. It had established an Operational Risk Sub-Committee, convened by the Finance Director, to review operational (insurable) risk and its management, and had also drawn up a template for the assessment of risk in all major institutional projects.

The Court approved the Register of Strategic Risks and the Risk Assessment Template.

The Court approved a proposal that the Undergraduate Re-examination Fee, a decision on which the JPFEC had been previously deferred, remain unchanged in 2002-2003 at £15 per course.

The Court approved draft financial policies, which had been scrutinised by the Audit Committee: (i) Land and Building Depreciation; (ii) Expenses and Benefits Policy and (iii) Inventories and disposals, as set out in the Appendices to the principal copy of the minutes held in the Court Office.

Note by Clerk: The Expenses and Benefits Policy is available on the University website at www.abdn.ac.uk/finance/finregs.htr and in the Guidelines for members of the Court.

The Court received a paper reporting progress made over the period since January 2002 in the second phase of the four-phase Pathfinder Project, in relation to the University’s student residential estate.

The Court accepted the paper’s conclusion that consideration of all the issues had indicated that the maximum strategic advantage for the University would be secured by selecting Hillhead as the preferred site for student residential redevelopment in partnership with the private sector.

The Court also approved the recommendations on the next stages to proceed with the project, (i) the preparation of a staff communication and public relations strategy with the process of consultation to be undertaken in advance of any other aspects of the project, (ii) preparation of OJEC advertisements for the concept proposed, (iii) formal dialogue with the City Council Planning Authority over the draft planning development brief prepared for the Hillhead site, and (iv) in recognition of the strategic importance of the Dunbar Hall site, preparation of a Planning Development Brief to secure the principle of development density for the site in the broadest terms possible, to be agreed with the Council Planning authority before demolition of the existing building.

The Court agreed, due to timing issues, to delegate powers to Mr Mair, Mr Stevenson and the Principal to progress the recommendations.
The Court received a paper enclosing a summary of the business case for the proposed new Health Centre and setting out the timescale for its construction on the Sunnybank Road site of the Offshore Medical Support building which was being demolished.

The Court agreed to delegate powers to Mr Mair, Mr Stevenson and the Principal to approve on its behalf the award of the construction contract, subject to the business case criteria being met.

**Funding for Teaching: Initial Teacher Education Funded Numbers 2002-3**

The Court was informed that formal confirmation was awaited from SHEFC that there would be no financial clawback for over-recruitment to Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) Primary and Secondary courses in 2002-2003 as a consequence of the change in Scottish Executive guidance, forwarded to higher education institutions by the Funding Council. Representatives from the relevant institutions had met with the Scottish Executive on 17 June 2002 and it was hoped that the funding position would soon be clarified.

**Financial Reports**

The Court was informed that the management accounts for the nine months to 30 April 2002 showed a historical cost surplus of £3.158m against a budgeted surplus of £1.535m, and that it was anticipated that there would be a reduction in the present projected surplus in line with the forecast out-turn for the year.

**Budgets**

The Court was informed that the Committee had approved recommendations on the allocation of resources to Faculties and Support Services for 2002-03. The draft Faculty and Support Services budgets had been developed alongside detailed Faculty Plans covering the period 2002-03 to 2004-05. These reflected the University's draft Strategic Plan 2002-06. Account had been taken of the SHEFC funding letter of March 2002 and the need to generate historical cost surpluses as indicated to the Funding Council in the Strategic Plan Financial Forecasts (£3m in 2002-03).

**Capital Programme**

The Court received a summary of the Core Capital Programme for 2002-03 which the Committee had approved on the recommendation of its Capital Expenditure Subcommittee.

**Faculty of Education Relocation**

The Court noted that the Committee had received a paper on the Faculty of Education relocation project. The Project Board, convened by the Senior Vice-Principal, had established three Operational Teams to be led by Professors Rodger and Logan and Ms Macaslan respectively: (i) to oversee the decant of Agriculture and Forestry from the MacRobert Building, and the development of an academic plan, business case and evaluation of the estates implications, for Life Sciences; (ii) to consider the remaining decants from the MacRobert Building, relocation of Psychology and consequential effects on Kings College and Foresterhill space; and (iii) to look at issues surrounding the refurbishment of the MacRobert Building to make it fit for purpose, and the relocation of the Faculty.

The Court noted that an overriding consideration was the need to adhere to the Project Schedule, included with the paper, in order to comply with the conditions of the SHEFC Strategic Change Grant which would contribute to the costs of the relocation and consequential moves.
Review of CPD Provision

The Court noted that the Committee had considered a report of a review of the totality of the University's CPD activity, undertaken in accordance with a commitment in the Strategic Plan to do so once the merger with Northern College had been effected. The review had been high level and covered both strategy and structure with particular emphasis on central support provided by Prospect CPD, and the CPD provision within the Faculty of Education. The Committee had approved the report's recommendations: (i) central to which was the transfer of responsibility for policy development in relation to CPD to the Vice-Principal (Research & Commercialisation) and to the Research & Commercialisation Committee, and for the urgent development of; (ii) clear and accepted University strategies for CPD delivery and provision of a level of resource to Prospect CPD, appropriate to support this. These should be developed by the Vice-Principal (Research & Commercialisation) and the Research & Commercialisation Committee.

Earned Income Report

The Court noted that the Committee had also considered the Report of the Earned Income Group which had been established to develop strategies to increase earned income activities and to monitor progress. In addition to the University's main income from teaching and research, it was essential for the University to increase its third stream income. The Group had reached many of the same conclusions as the CPD Review, and had proposed that an institutional strategy for earned income activities be drawn up under the leadership of the Vice-Principal (Research and Commercialisation), taking into account the University's priorities on research.

Capital Expenditure Sub-Committee

The Court was informed that, in addition to the Capital Expenditure Sub-Committee recommendations on the Core Capital Programme 2002-03, the Estate Strategy, and the proposed Student Health Centre, the Committee had also approved recommendations on IT Infrastructure Projects and Project Boards.

From the Capital Programme 2003/04 onwards, the Information Management Committee (IMC) would prioritise IT infrastructure projects to the value of £650k and present the prioritised list to the Capital Expenditure Sub-Committee for information. If necessary, the IMC would submit its recommendations for the allocation of a further £100k for consideration by the Capital Expenditure Sub-Committee.

Project Boards, which had been established for strategic projects, would report to the Capital Expenditure Sub-Committee. Accordingly, following the completion of IMS 2, the Sub-Committee would receive direct reports on capital projects which were ongoing at Foresterhill. The Faculty of Education Relocation Board and its three teams would also report to the Sub-Committee.

In discussion, Mr Cockburn queried whether a decision had been taken on his request for student representation on the Capital Expenditure Sub-Committee. It was noted that no conclusion had yet been reached on the issue, which could have wider implications for the composition of the sub-committee. An alternative, however, might be student representation at project team level. Mr Cockburn indicated that he would be satisfied with such an outcome.

UASLAS

The Court was informed that the Committee had received for information a copy of the UASLAS Trustees’ 2000-01 Short Annual Report for members of the Scheme.

Papers for Information

The Court's attention was drawn to the following, most external, papers (copies of which are available to members of JPFEC and Court on request from the Court and Planning Office):
(i) Scottish Executive Budget Announcement for 2002-03: Universities Scotland Circular 31/02, 4 April 2002.
(ii) Postgraduate Applications for Entry Between August 2002 and December 2002, as at 1 May 2002: Memorandum from Ms Y Gordon, Postgraduate Registry.
(iv) Guardian League Table: Universities Scotland Circular 41/02, dated 25 April 2002.
(v) Primary Care Research Scheme: Call for Proposals: SHEFC Circular letter HE/24/02, dated 15 May 2002.

Nominating Committee

Vice- Principals, Provost and Deans

The Court approved the Committee’s recommendations that for session 2002-2003 (i) Professor Sewel, Professor Logan and Dr Roberts continue to occupy the three places on Court as Vice- Principals ex officis, and (ii) Professors Houlihan, MacGregor, Rodger and Ms Macaslan be invited to be in attendance at the Court.

General Council Assessors

The Court noted that, following the conclusion of Professor Ogston’s and Mrs Skene’s terms of office on 30 September 2002, there would be vacancies in two of the four General Council Assessors positions. In the General Council election procedure (as set out in University Ordinance 120) no nominations had been received by the 20 May 2002 closing date. The General Council would now invite nominations to the two vacancies with a view to the election of two Assessors to serve with effect from the Winter Meeting of the General Council in December 2002 for the remainder of the period to 30 September 2006.

Co-opted Members

The Court approved the Committee’s recommendation that Dr Mackie and Dr Milne be co-opted to the Court for a further 3-year term of office to 31 July 2005.

The Committee also had a number of lay names under consideration for co-option to the Court.

With regard to the place utilised to co-opt a non-academic member of the University staff (currently held by Miss Main) the Committee had agreed that a notice be circulated for the attention of all non-academic staff in the University, inviting expressions of interest in co-option to the vacancy. Responses would be considered by the Committee.

The Court approved the Committee’s recommendation that due to timing issues powers be delegated to the Senior Lay Member and the Principal to take forward one or more co-options to the Court, and appointments to Court Committees (see 299 below).

Staffing and Development Committee

Management Development for Heads of Schools

The Court approved the Staffing and Development Committee’s proposal that management development training be mandatory for newly appointed Heads of Schools.
Equal Opportunities Training

292 The Court approved the Committee’s proposal that from August 2003, all participants in selection committees must have undergone training in equal opportunities in recruitment and that the composition of selection committees must reflect a reasonable gender balance \( eg \) wherever possible, two female members should participate in full selection committees.

293 The Court noted the Committee’s report of ongoing work within Human Resources in a number of areas including the AUPHET Programme, the Career Development and Staff Appraisal Scheme, the Sickness Absence Policy, the Investors in People Award to Prospect CPD and the Careers Service, analysis of the pilot scheme in relation to the Working Time Directive Pilot Scheme for Clinical Academic Staff, Voluntary Severance Scheme Administration, Contract Research Staff Initiatives, Educational Staff Development and General Staff Development.

294 In response to questions from Miss Main, it was noted that following the decision to protect academic budgets, resulting in a high proportion of reductions falling on the service budgets, the voluntary severance scheme in the Administration (including the Office and DISS), funded by savings in 2001-02, was designed to reduce the wage bill in 2002-03. Efforts would be made to minimise the adverse impact on function. With regard to contract research staff, it was confirmed that there was now provision for three days’ training for such staff and courses were under development. The University was making significant progress, in advance of legislation expected in July, in pursuing initiatives to support and widen the experience of contract research staff.

FUTURE OF AURIS LTD

295 The Court considered a paper forwarded by JPFEC, setting out three options on the future of AURIS Ltd, involving (i) winding up the company, (ii) retaining arrangements similar to those currently in place with a full Board and (iii) moving to a holding company arrangement.

296 The Court noted that the JPFEC, on the recommendation of University senior management, had supported the third option, subject to an amendment to retain the freedom to appoint up to two lay members with relevant experience of small or venture capital companies to the reconstituted Board. In the JPFEC’s discussion the strategy adopted by Research and Innovation of co-ordinating external advisors and mentoring the set-up process for spinout companies was supported. The Committee had welcomed and encouraged extension of the use of external advisers on the Commercialisation Steering Group. The principle of the AURIS Board drawing upon relevant company management experience had also been supported. The Committee had agreed to recommend the holding company option to the Court.

297 The Court also noted that, subsequent to the meeting of the JPFEC, the Chairman of AURIS had provided a paper, from the Board to the University Court as principal shareholders in the company, which supported the second option.

298 Following discussion, the Court approved the JPFEC’s recommendation for the third option which provided for AURIS, with a reconstituted Board, to continue as a holding company, and for the University to seek to harness the skills and expertise of the private sector in the development of spinout companies. The Court, noting that the latter might be effected by recruiting individuals with experience of small or venture capital companies, agreed that further consideration be given to the appointment of up to two external members to the AURIS Board. It further agreed that the arrangement be reviewed in a year’s time.

COURT, COURT-SENATE COMMITTEES AND EDUCATIONAL AND OTHER OUTSIDE BODIES

299 The Court approved the Nominating Committee’s recommendations, as set out in the Appendix to this minute, for Court representation on Court Committees, and joint Court-
Senate Committees, for session 2002-03. The remaining vacancies would not be filled pending decisions on co-options to the Court.

300 The Court also approved the Committee’s recommendations that the appointments of existing representatives on educational and outside bodies be extended for 2002-3 or for a further term of office where specified, except for the changes in representation, as set out in the Appendix to this minute.

RESOLUTION NO 228 OF 2002
[DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF MUSIC (B Mus)]

301 The Court noted that the Business Committee of the General Council had approved the draft Resolution but had expressed concern that the degree title of B Mus might not be appropriate and had queried whether the title might be reviewed at a later date.

302 The Court approved the draft Resolution as set out in the appendix to this minute.

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES & LAW: APPOINTMENT OF DEAN

303 The Court ratified the appointment of Professor Bryan MacGregor, Department of Land Economy, as Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences & Law for three years with effect from 1 August 2002 to 31 July 2005.

PROMOTIONS

304 The Court approved recommendations for the promotion of academic and academic-related staff, as set out in the confidential appendix to this minute.

VACATION POWERS

305 The Court approved a proposal by the Principal that, in accordance with the Court’s customary procedure, for the period between its meetings on 25 June 2002 and 17 September 2002, authority to act on its behalf on any matter of particular urgency be delegated to a small committee composed of the Principal, the Senior Lay Member and/or the Senior Vice-Principal.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

306 The Court received a report from the Student Affairs Committee (5.6.02). The Committee had forwarded the Students’ Association Third Termly Report 2001-02, and recorded its strong appreciation of the enterprise shown by the Association in the range of activities described, commending in particular the outstanding sporting achievements of the students during the session.

HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2001-02

307 The Court received the Annual Report of the Health & Safety Committee for 2001-02.

DATES OF COURT MEETINGS

308 The Court noted the scheduled dates of Court during session 2002-03.

17 September 2002
5 November 2002
17 December 2002
11 February 2003
25 March 2003
27 May 2003
1 July 2003