UCL Council Effectiveness Review 2016

Introduction

This is the report of the Council Effectiveness Review Group (CERG), established by Council for the purpose of carrying out the periodic effectiveness review as required by the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) Code of Governance[1], published in 2014.

UCL last undertook an effectiveness review in 2010-11. In accordance with the recommendations of the (then) CUC Code of Governance, the next quinquennial review was scheduled for the academic year 2015-16. The 2014 revision of the Code recommends that this cycle be reduced to four years in future.

The Terms of Reference and membership of the CERG, as agreed by Council, are at Appendix 2. In summary, the CERG was asked to review UCL's adherence to the Higher Education Code of Governance (CUC 2014), and to report to the UCL Council on its effectiveness as well as that of its principal sub-committees. In light of the appointment of a new Chair in 2014/15 and the fact that the previous Review was conducted by an external body, it was agreed that this Review should be carried out by a sub-group of Council members and chaired by the Chair of Council.

The review took both a 'top down' approach, considering fundamental questions such as the size and composition of the Council membership, and a 'bottom up' approach considering feedback from its members and those regularly in attendance at meetings. The review group considered benchmarking information of comparator institutions, typically drawn from the Russell Group (Appendix 3), and reviewed a number of key documents, making recommendations for amendments where necessary. The review group also issued a detailed questionnaire to all members of Council and those regularly in attendance at meetings, and received feedback from a series of in-depth interviews with representative members of these groups. The issues addressed covered considerations of Council's culture, cohesion, commitment and overall effectiveness. Further detail on the process employed by the Review Group is at Appendix 4. The questions covered in the questionnaire and in-depth interviews are at Appendix 5. The structure of this report follows that of the questionnaire and is more detailed than that required by the CUC Code.

The Chair would like to thank the members of the CERG and the Council secretariat for the many hours they have contributed to the process. She believes it has been a useful learning experience for all concerned and hopes that Council will agree, in the spirit of continuous improvement, to the recommendations contained in this report.

---

[1]   http://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/publications/

Summary conclusion

Overall, the CERG finds the Council to be operating effectively. There are a number of points where the opinions of Council members differ, and these are noted in the body of the report. However, the aggregate opinion and benchmarking indicate that the Council is performing its role appropriately and effectively. Furthermore, the CERG concludes that a range of opinion is healthy in any board and that it is not unusual to have a situation where some members have opposing views. As a result of the Review a number of key points are noted and recommendations (in **bold text**) made in the relevant sections below.

Discussion and recommendations

Council remit: purpose, scope and responsibilities

1. Responses to the questionnaire in this respect were generally but not universally positive. Some respondents expressed a view that the role of Council members was not always properly understood. The CERG accordingly recommends that the annual briefing material be amended in order to provide additional clarification in a number of specific respects (Appendix 7), and that wider concerns in this area be addressed through enhanced induction and training of new members *[see paragraph 6 below]*.

2. The Terms of Reference of the CERG directed the review group to consider the effectiveness of Council's oversight of subsidiary companies and partnership activity in the light of the expectations of the CUC Code. The CERG noted that, since the CUC Code mapping was last provided to Council[2], UCL's new regulatory framework in respect of Academic Partnerships had been incorporated into chapter 7 of the Academic Manual. The Vice-Provost (Enterprise) is in the process of establishing a review of UCL's relationship with UCLC and UCLB with a view to reporting back to Council in the spring of 2017. Other subsidiary entities had been established for legal or tax reasons only and had no employees.

3. Council reviewed its Statement of Primary Responsibilities (SoPR) and carried out a mapping of UCL's practice against it (Appendix 8). This report documents the areas where CERG recommendations for change were thought warranted in order to ensure full compliance.

4. Recommendations for change:

   [a] **That the documents included in the annual briefing material be updated as at Appendix 7;**
   [b] **That the Vice-Provost (Enterprise) report to Council in Spring 2017 on the outcome of the review of subsidiary entities.**

---

[2]   An updated copy of the CUC Code mapping is at Appendix 9.

Strategy and Institutional Performance

5. CERG reviewed UCL's performance indicators in the form of the principal themes and key enablers of UCL2034, and the KPIs from the most recent ASSUR paper. CERG benchmarked these against those in use at Newcastle University. It was noted that a detailed discussion of UCL's KPIs and targets took place at the Away Day on 17 May.

Team effectiveness

6. Mindful of the divergent views expressed between the external, internal and student members in response to the questionnaire, the CERG agreed that it would be beneficial if a more structured induction programme were to be developed for new members, and increased efforts made to encourage members to take up the offer of relevant training opportunities. It was also recognised that 2014-15 had been unusual in that there were four new external Council members, including a new Chair, in addition to two new academic and two new student members *[see paragraph 17 below]*.

7. Induction of external members should include an introduction to UCL, and for internal members should reinforce the written material supplied on the role of Council as a unitary body without representational constituencies. A briefing on university finances would be of benefit to almost all new members. CERG noted the importance of avoiding undue front-loading of such training. The material provided to those standing for election to Council should be reviewed, specifically with a view to seeking to ensure that candidates avoid making unrealistic commitments during the election process. Council members further suggested that the Secretariat might seek to identify a single training event which all new members could be encouraged to attend; and that a rolling programme of faculty- or departmental-level engagement events be organised directly ahead of future meetings.

8. Noting that the volume of activity and the number of events at UCL means that external and internal members do not find themselves interacting outside Council meetings as frequently as might be expected at smaller institutions, CERG agreed that it would be beneficial if UCL were able to provide increased opportunities for interaction between external and internal members, particularly by ensuring invitations to relevant UCL events are sent to Council members. CERG recommends that the relevant members of staff be encouraged to consider Council members when drafting invitation lists to UCL events, and that the secretariat circulate invitations to the Chair or Vice-Chair to other members of Council where appropriate. In addition, the Chair would consult further on whether post-Council dinners should be reinstated and how best to satisfy the desire of external members to meet informally with the Provost. CERG notes Council's view that any such meetings should be used as an opportunity for (eg) briefings on matters of particular interest to external members, general contextual background on current issues at UCL and matters relevant to the public interest requirements of a university.

9. Recommendations for change:

   [c] That further consideration be given to increasing the opportunities available for interaction between external and internal members of Council outside the Council meetings themselves;
   [d] That the Chair consult further on the question of opportunities for external members to interact outside the Council meetings;

      [e]   **That a more structured induction programme for new members be developed in accordance with the outline at paragraph 7 above;**

      [f]   **That the wording of the election material issued to prospective candidates for election to Council be reviewed with a view to clarifying the nature, limitations and extent of the role.**

Meetings and papers

10. The questionnaire and interviews suggested a relatively high level of satisfaction in this area. CERG did not consider that the frequency or timing of Council meetings needed to be changed.

11. The CUC Code suggests that governing bodies might consider publishing the agendas and minutes of its meetings. Council already publishes its open minutes, and CERG noted a general sense from the benchmarking exercise that UCL tends to designate fewer matters confidential than many comparator institutions. The CERG does not recommend that Council publish its agendas, as it was felt that this would add little to the current arrangements.

12. The questionnaire had revealed divergent views on the suggestion that Council might periodically meet without the Vice-Provosts in attendance. It was noted that the FRC's UK Corporate Governance Code[3] (Sept 2014), states that 'The chairman should hold meetings with the non-executive directors without the executives present', although the CUC Code makes no such statement. In discussing the issue CERG was conscious of the advantages of having Vice-Provosts present to give expert input on matters relevant to their own brief, and the advantage to Vice-Provosts themselves of having an awareness of Council's concerns. However, there are some negative impacts of a large number of people in the room on the culture and cohesiveness of Council, as well as practical issues around running meetings. After further discussion with Council, CERG recommends that the standing request that Vice-Provosts attend every meeting of Council be continued, but that a short session for Council members only be introduced as standard practice at the end of every meeting.

13. CERG recommends that the possibility of reconfiguring the layout of the Council Room should be investigated so that the option of having Council members meet around a smaller table with others sitting at the side be available if and when appropriate.

14. In view of comments made by some members in response to the questionnaire, CERG discussed whether the Vice-Provost (Operations) should be required to give an annual report to Council. It was agreed that the remit of the Vice-Provost (Operations) was already regularly covered by the discussion of individual matters, such as Finance and External Communications, as they arose, but also that it was difficult for Council members to be certain that all appropriate matters were being picked up in this way. CERG therefore proposes that a briefing session be arranged ahead of a future Council meeting at which the Vice-Provost (Operations) can give an overview of the various strands of UCL's operations that report to him.

15. Recommendations for change:

      [g]   **That a short session for Council members only be introduced at the end of every meeting;**

---

[3] https://www.frc.org.uk/Our-Work/Codes-Standards/Corporate-governance/UK-Corporate-Governance-Code.aspx

[h] **That the possibility of reconfiguring the Council Room be investigated;**

[i] **That the Vice-Provost (Operations) be asked to deliver a briefing session, ahead of a future Council meeting, summarising the various strands of UCL's operations that report to him.**

Council composition

16. In light of responses from members, and considerations of practicality and external recommendations for good practice, the CERG recommends that no change be made at the current time in respect of the size or composition of Council (ie, the balance of external, internal and student members).

17. CERG recommends that increased efforts be made to stagger the appointment of new external members so far as is practicable. This is expected to result in the adjustment of standard terms of appointment (usually two terms of three years) for some members.

18. In discussions with Council members it was suggested that Nominations Committee might wish to consider incorporating an element of international membership amongst the external members, in view of the prominence of international issues in UCL2034.

    CERG discussed the elected membership of Council in the context of the need to seek to ensure a balance of skills, gender and background. A number of models were discussed in detail. In particular, Council would like at least one elected member from each School and, in accordance with its inclusion and diversity objectives, at least one-third of elected members to be from each gender. A proposal for achieving this is in Appendix 14, however, Council is open to considering other proposals from Academic Board. After further discussion with members of Council it is proposed that Academic Board be asked to consider appropriate mechanisms for addressing the issue, and that the position be reviewed in two years' time. Council would revisit the issue if insufficient progress was felt to have been made at that time.

19. In view of the changing balance of UCL's student body, particularly following the December 2014 merger with the Institute of Education, the CERG recommends to UCLU that the Postgraduate Students' Officer replace the Sustainability, Engagement and Operations Officer as one of the two student members of Council. It is proposed that this be introduced with effect from 2017-18 as the elections for 2016-17 have already taken place on the basis of existing role descriptions. As UCLU does not have a full-time sabbatical officer with a specifically undergraduate brief, CERG recommends that the Education and Campaigns Officer retain the second place on Council.

20. CERG discussed the issue of the election of members of SMT to Council in light of a recommendation by the 2006 Effectiveness Review that this not be permitted. CERG recommends that members of SMT not be permitted to stand for election to Council, and that existing members of Council appointed to SMT be encouraged to step down, although it was noted that in view of the wording of Statute 3 and the associated Regulation, this could not be required of them. CERG agreed however that UCL ought to have a stated procedure in place in the event of an elected member being absent from Council for a period including more than two consecutive meetings, whether this be by reason of appointment as Acting Dean, or otherwise because of maternity leave, overseas research, or some other reason. It was suggested that the appropriate action in such circumstances may be for the next placed person in the relevant

election to be invited to attend Council as a voting member, on a temporary basis. Proposed amendments to the Regulations in these respects are at Appendix 10.

21. Recommendations for change:

[j] **That UCLU be invited to consider the Postgraduate Students' Officer taking up one *ex officio* place on UCL Council in place of the Sustainability, Engagement and Operations Officer, with effect from 2017-18;**

[k] **That the Regulations for Management be amended to state that Senior Management Team members should not be permitted to stand for election to Council;**

[l] **That the Regulations for Management make provision for circumstances in which a Council member is not available for a period including more than two consecutive meetings, whatever the reason for absence;**

[m] **That the Nominations Committee be asked to look at the issue of the timing of the projected end of terms of appointment of external members.**

Evaluation of the Chair and Secretariat

22. The Survey and interviews indicated that members were satisfied with the performance of the Chair and the Secretariat. CERG reviewed the role descriptions of the Chair and Secretary, as agreed by Council in 2012-13. A number of amendments to these documents was agreed (Appendix 7, Annexe 1). It was further agreed that these documents should henceforth be made available on the Council web pages.

23. CERG noted that Council agendas had formerly included an annual invitation to confirm its satisfaction with the independence of the clerk, but took the view that in view of the content of the Secretary's role description there was little to be gained in reinstating this practice.

24. Recommendations for change:

[n] **That the role descriptions of the Chair and the Secretary be updated as at Appendix 7, Annexe 1;**

[o] **That the role descriptions of the Chair and the Secretary be made available on the Council web pages.**

Governance and committees

25. CERG noted that UCL had a number of institutional-level committees[4] with an ethical brief, and discussed the role and interrelationship of those bodies. CERG is generally satisfied that the current arrangements are appropriate, but recommends that two changes be made: that the Ethical Investment Review Committee be disestablished if UCL decides to move its investments into an ethical portfolio[5]; and that the Ethics Committee be reframed as a Task and Finish Group,

---

[4]   The bodies reviewed were: Ethics Committee; Ethical Investment Review Committee; Research Ethics Committee; Gift Acceptance Committee; Research Funding Ethics Committee.

[5]   It is expected that Council will be invited to consider a recommendation on this issue later in 2016. Several Council members suggested that, if UCL decides to proceed in this way, Council should consider whether UCL might not appear to be 'outsourcing' its ethical responsibilities in an inappropriate way. Such a change would also necessitate a review of the Investments Policy by Council and possibly an amendment of the Investments committee membership. The incorporation of a student observer on the Investments Committee was suggested.

in view of its specific responsibility for developing an Ethical Policy for UCL. This would in turn necessitate changing the reporting line of the Research Governance Committee (which currently reports to Academic Committee and Ethics Committee) to the Academic Committee alone.

26. CERG noted that in 2014 the Audit, Nominations, Remuneration and Finance Committees had been asked to institute an annual, light-touch 'self-review' process, reflecting a recommendation made in the HEFCE Assurance Review. The review group considers this a valuable exercise and recommends that the Academic Board and the standing committees of Council[6] also adopt this practice. The review group further recommends that the questions to be addressed in the annual self-review be amended and used as a standard template for all committees reporting to Council (Appendix 11).

27. The CERG recommends that the Human Resources Policy Committee be recategorised as an executive committee, reporting through the Provost to the Remuneration and Strategy Committee *(see Recommendation [w] regarding the renaming of this committee).*

28. CERG noted that the membership of the Finance Committee had been reduced ahead of the 2015-16 session, and that Council had welcomed the suggestion that its membership be reduced to 7 in due course *[Council Minute 54, 2014-15].* The CERG accordingly recommends that the appointed membership of Finance Committee be amended, with effect from 1 October 2016, to three external and two internal members, appointed by Council; and that from 1 October 2017 the external membership be reduced to two. Furthermore, from October 2017 the external and internal appointed membership should be drawn from Council.

29. The Nominations Committee was included in the review but the CERG makes no recommendations for change.

30. A number of proposed amendments to points of detail in the Regulations or in UCL's committee structure have arisen in recent months outside the Effectiveness Review process. The CERG accordingly makes the additional recommendations set out in Appendix 1.

31. At its meetings on 15 October and 26 November 2015 Council noted that the academic members of Council and the Secretary would meet to discuss UCL's academic governance arrangements, in particular the relationship between the Academic Board and the Academic Committee. The sub-group met on three occasions and the CERG received regular updates on its discussions. CERG asked that the sub-group submit its recommendations for inclusion in this report; these are set out in Appendix 11. Further discussion of these will take place between the Provost and the AB members of Council.

Recommendations for change:

[p] **That the Ethical Investment Review Committee be disestablished if UCL decides to move its investments into an ethical portfolio;**

[q] **That the Ethics Committee be reframed as a Task and Finish Group, and that the Research Governance Committee henceforth report to the Academic Committee only;**

---

6   *ie* the Academic Board, Academic Committee, Ethical Investment Review *Committee (but see recommendation [q]),* Ethics Committee *(but see recommendation [r]),* Honorary Degrees and Fellowships Committee, and the Human Resources Policy Committee.

[r]   That the annual self-review process be extended to all Council sub-committees;

[s]   That the questions to be addressed in the self-review process be amended as at Appendix 11;

[t]   That the membership of Finance Committee be reduced to eight from 1st October 2016 (Chair of Council; Provost; Treasurer; three external members appointed by Council; two internal staff members; plus student observer); and to seven from 1st October 2017 (ie by reducing the external membership to two); and that from October 2017 the appointed members be drawn exclusively from Council;

[u]   That the Honorary Degrees and Fellowships Committee external Council membership be reduced by one;

[v]   That the Human Resources Policy Committee be recategorised as an executive committee, reporting through the Provost to the Remuneration and Strategy Committee;

[w]   That the Remuneration and Strategy Committee be renamed 'Remuneration and Human Resources Strategy Committee'; the Vice-Chair of Council to be Chair of the committee *ex officio*; the Treasurer to be removed from the membership (but the Chair of Council to remain a member);

[x]   That the Regulations be amended to specify that the Chair of Council may choose to attend a meeting of any formal committee of Council;

[y]   To address a series of points of detail related to committees terms of reference and membership set out in Appendix 1.

Effectiveness reviews

32. CERG noted that the 2006 Effectiveness Review had made a number of other recommendations, in addition to that relating to the election of SMT members to Council *[paragraph 20 above],* which had been approved by Council and incorporated into the Council operations but subsequently discontinued. These included holding Council meetings in academic departments; receipt of written (rather than oral) reports on Provost's business; and the reconfirmation in-year of changes to the schedule of forward business. For the purposes of clarity in the formal record, the CERG recommends that any recommendations in the 2006 report which were subsequently discontinued, and which are not subject to recommendations in this report, be set aside. These recommendations are listed at Appendix 13.

Recommendations for change:

[z]   That, in line with the CUC Code, effectiveness reviews move from a five-year to a four-year cycle. Therefore, the next effectiveness review of the UCL Council will be in four years' time: 2020;

[aa]   That the recommendations of the 2006 effectiveness review which have not been incorporated in Regulations for Management or confirmed in this Review be set aside.

Conclusions

33. The Council Effectiveness Review Group, as constituted by Council on 15 October 2015, has carried out its work in accordance with its Terms of Reference. In the spirit of continuous improvement, there are a number of specific recommendations in this Report for changes which, if accepted by Council, can be formalised through amendments and/or additions to the

Regulations for Management. The overall conclusion of the CERG is that the Council operates effectively and in accordance with its Statement of Primary Responsibilities as well as the CUC Code of Governance. No changes in the UCL Statutes are therefore required.

Summary of Recommendations

[a]   That the documents included in the annual briefing material be updated as at <u>Appendix 7</u>;

[b]   That the Vice-Provost (Enterprise) report to Council in Spring 2017 on the outcome of the review of subsidiary entities;

[c]   That further consideration be given to increasing the opportunities available for interaction between external and internal members of Council outside the Council meetings themselves;

[d]   That the Chair consult further on the question of opportunities for external members to interact outside the Council meetings;

[e]   That a more structured induction programme for new members be developed in accordance with the outline at paragraph 7 above;

[f]   That the wording of the election material issued to prospective candidates for election to Council be reviewed with a view to clarifying the nature, limitations and extent of the role;

[g]   That a short session for Council members only be introduced at the end of every meeting;

[h]   That the possibility of reconfiguring the Council Room be investigated;

[i]   That the Vice-Provost (Operations) be asked to deliver a briefing session, ahead of a future Council meeting, summarising the various strands of UCL's operations that report to him;

[j]   That UCLU be invited to consider the Postgraduate Students' Officer taking up one *ex officio* place on UCL Council in place of the Sustainability, Engagement and Operations Officer, with effect from 2017-18;

[k]   That the Regulations for Management be amended to state that Senior Management Team members should not be permitted to stand for election to Council;

[l]   That the Regulations for Management make provision for circumstances in which a Council member is not available for a period including more than two consecutive meetings, whatever the reason for absence;

[m]   That the Nominations Committee be asked to look at the issue of the timing of the projected end of terms of appointment of external members;

[n]   That the role descriptions of the Chair and the Secretary be updated as at <u>Appendix 7, Annexe 1</u>;

[o]   That the role descriptions of the Chair and the Secretary be made available on the Council web pages;

[p]   That the Ethical Investment Review Committee be disestablished if UCL decides to move its investments into an ethical portfolio;

[q]   That the Ethics Committee be reframed as a Task and Finish Group, and that the Research Governance Committee henceforth report to the Academic Committee only;

[r]   That the annual self-review process be extended to all Council sub-committees;

[s]   That the questions to be addressed in the self-review process be amended as at <u>Appendix 10</u>;

[t]   That the membership of Finance Committee be reduced to eight from 1st October 2016 (Chair of Council; Provost; Treasurer; three external members appointed by Council; two internal staff members; plus student observer); and to seven from 1st October 2017 (ie by reducing the external membership to two); and that from October 2017 the appointed members be drawn exclusively from Council;

[u]   That the Honorary Degrees and Fellowships Committee external Council membership be reduced by one;

[v]   That the Human Resources Policy Committee be recategorised as an executive committee, reporting through the Provost to the Remuneration and Strategy Committee;

[w]   That the Remuneration and Strategy Committee be renamed 'Remuneration and Human Resources Strategy Committee'; the Vice-Chair of Council to be Chair of the committee *ex officio*; the Treasurer to be removed from the membership (but the Chair of Council to remain a member);

[x]   That the Regulations be amended to specify that the Chair of Council may choose to attend a meeting of any formal committee of Council;

[y]   That the points of detail relating to committees terms of reference and membership set out in <u>Appendix 1</u> be approved;

[z]   That, in line with the CUC Code, future effectiveness reviews move from a five-year to a four-year cycle. Therefore, the next effectiveness review of the UCL Council will be in four years' time: 2020;

[aa]   That the recommendations of the 2006 effectiveness review which have not been incorporated in Regulations for Management or confirmed in this Review be set aside.

Additional recommendations arising during the course of the Effectiveness Review process are at <u>Appendix 1</u>, and recommendations of the Council sub-group on academic governance issues are at <u>Appendix 12</u>.

Council Effectiveness Review Group, May 2016

During the course of the review a number of proposed amendments to points of detail in the Regulations or in UCL's committee structure have arisen. The CERG took the view that the neatest way of addressing these issues would be to include them in the recommendations of the review. These amendments are as follows:

[cc] *[at the request of the Vice-Provost (Education & Student Affairs)]* **That the constitution of the Library Committee be amended to permit a nominee to attend in place of the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Affairs);**

[dd] *[at the request of UCL Public and Cultural Engagement]* **That the Museums and Heritage Committee be reconstituted, but as an executive management committee, not a Council committee;**

[ee] *[at the request of the Equalities and Diversity Committee]* **That the Equalities and Diversity Committee (an academic committee) be renamed the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee;**

[ff] **That any remaining references to 'lay members' in the Regulations be amended to 'external members';**

[gg] **That in light of the incorporation of the Joint Staff Student Committee into the Student Experience Committee, the reference to the Joint Staff Student Committee at Regulation 4.11 be removed;**

[hh] **That for the avoidance of doubt the wording of Regulation for Management 2.4 be amended as follows:**
> **Any casual vacancy… shall be filled by a person ~~nominated~~ <u>elected</u> by the Professorial Members of the Academic Board from among their own number.'**

[ii] **That Regulation 10.4 be amended as follows, in order to more closely reflect the working of Regulation 10.3 that 'Heads of Departments shall be appointed by the President and Provost, under delegated authority from the Council…':**
> **<u>The Provost</u> ~~Council~~ may also, according to the above procedure for consultation, appoint, <u>under delegated authority from the Council</u>, ~~on the recommendation of the Provost,~~ an Acting Head of Department…'**

[jj] **That Regulation 10.4 be amended as follows:**
> **Deans of Faculties shall be appointed by the Council on the advice of the Provost. The Provost will make a recommendation on the appointment to Council on the advice of a committee set up to conduct the selection process and to report to the Provost, that committee to include ~~a selection of members of the Faculty~~ <u>appropriate academic colleagues and usually to be chaired by the relevant Vice-Provost.</u> A Dean shall be appointed for such period as the Council, on the advice of the Provost, shall determine. The appointment shall be renewable at the discretion of the Council, for such further period or periods as the Council on the advice of the Provost shall determine, provided that the staff of the Faculty shall first have been invited to convey their views to the Provost in writing, via the Secretary to Council.**

[kk] **That the Council Resolution of 18 June 2009** *[Council Minute 116a, 2008-09]* **to approve the constitution of a sub-committee of Council as described in the UCLU Constitution be reflected in the Regulations for Management as follows:**

In accordance with the constitution of UCL, Council has established an Appeal Body, as a sub-committee of Council, to which a UCLU Trustee removed from office in accordance with the procedures set out in the constitution shall be entitled to appeal the decision to remove them.

Academic Governance Working Group Recommendations

Introduction

At its meetings on 15 October and 26 November 2015 Council noted that the academic members of Council and the Secretary would meet to discuss UCL's academic governance arrangements, in particular the relationship between the Academic Board and the Academic Committee.

The sub-group met on three occasions and the Council Effectiveness Review Group received regular updates on its discussions. The group explored a range of issues, including the remit of Academic Committee (AC), the operation of delegations from Academic Board, the way in which Academic Board (AB) was represented in the UCL governance structure, comments from AB members on the changes to the regulations for management, particularly the opportunity for academic staff to have some involvement in appointment processes for heads of department and deans, and the academic promotions processes.

The working group noted that significant change to the constitution and remit of Academic Board was not desirable at the present time, therefore it identified a number of recommendations that were intended to improve the effectiveness and transparency of the academic governance framework.

Recommendations

The AGWG recommended that:

[a] The minutes of AC be included under the 'Quick Links' heading of the SRS webpage for AB, as well as circulated to AB members via SharePoint

[b] The minutes of AC be highlighted on AB meeting agendas as a paper to be received, as well as being documented in the Minutes. Members of AB should be reminded that they may identify matters from the AC minutes that they wish to discuss at AB, and that representatives of AB elected to AC may raise matters of mutual import for discussion at AB meetings.

[c] AC produce an annual executive summary of its use of powers delegated from AB to AC, to be presented at the first AB meeting of the new academic session.

[d] The membership of AC that is elected by AB be increased from 3 to 8 with one professor and one non-professorial member from each School where the non-professorial category can include Teaching Fellows.

[e] That a new Organogram of Governance be adopted that shows the statutory status of AB and Council along with communication lines from AC to AB identified. The Organogram would include UCL's formal committees and principal executive/management bodies as agreed for 2016/17, ideally presented with hyperlinks to formal committee webpages and other relevant information.

[f] The Regulations for Management at 2.12 should be amended for 2016/17 to make clear that AB is established through the Charter and Statutes, not the Council as currently inferred by its description as an academic committee of Council. For the remainder of 2015/16, a note should be added to Regulation for Management 2.12 to explain the error until such a time as the document is updated through the appropriate formal process.

[g] That AB rescinds its delegated power to the Academic Staff Appointments and Promotions Committee and instead delegates these powers to AC so that AC can make reports via the mechanisms identified above.

[h] That the next iteration of the Delegation Framework, for 2016/17, include more prominently the powers of AB and where they are delegated to other bodies.

[i] That the next iteration of the Delegation Framework, for 2016/17, include more prominently the authorities delegated to Faculty Tutors.

[j] To restore an anonymous consultation process in the appointment of Heads of Department (i.e. all members of the relevant department are consulted with the appropriate level of anonymity) and that comments are sent to the Dean instead of the Provost.

[k] Revisit the wording "senior" and "junior" in the context of appointments and promotions, mindful of different protected characteristics/groups.

[l] Establish how academic staff, other than managers, are involved in the promotions process and how the functions of the Academic Promotions Committee are discharged as this body did not appear to have met recently. In the light of this clarify how AB's role with respect to academic staff appointments and promotions can be discharged appropriately, reporting back to AB.