

COUNCIL

Minutes

| | |
|---------|--|
| Date | Wednesday 25 May 2016 |
| Time | 4.00pm |
| Venue | Council Chamber, Level 6 Matariki |
| Present | Dr John Wood (Chancellor from 4.27pm), Ms Sue McCormack (Pro-Chancellor)(Chair from 4pm to 4.24pm) Dr Rod Carr (Vice Chancellor) Mr James Addington, Mr Peter Ballantyne, Ms Catherine Drayton, Mr Bruce Gemmell, Mr Tony Hall, Professor Roger Nokes, Mr Warren Poh (until 5.43pm-e |

FACULTY/ COLLEGE
MERGER PROPOSAL

The Chancellor noted the papers that had been provided for Council's consideration:

- The proposal, which had been deferred to this meeting to allow further consultation, and management recommendation to Council that the proposal be approved.
- Advice from Emeritus Professor John Burrows and Robin Mann, independent governance advisors to Council, in response to the request from Council that they review the process followed (but not the actual proposal), ensure Council was fully compliant with its statutory obligations.
- The advice from the Academic Board including feedback from the Faculties, which indicated that the proposal had not been supported by the Academic Board at its meeting of 18 May 2016.

The Chancellor noted that it was clear that the Academic Board was divided on this issue but that only a limited number of Academic Board members had engaged in the process and margins of division were slim. The Council members were advised to consider the information and advice provided with open minds and to decide individually what weight to give the advice from the Academic Board.

The Deans had been invited to the meeting of Council to hear their views on the proposal, following on from the previous meeting when the PVCs had been invited to speak. Council could decide, after hearing the views of the Deans, to recommend to Council that the proposal be approved, or to recommend that the proposal be deferred to a future meeting of Council.

- The proposal provided no guarantees that PVCs would delegate academic matters
- The position of the PVC would be too powerful
- There were no sound reasons for the proposed change
- The language of the proposal did not provide clarity

Dr James, Professor Fee and Dr Mackie spoke in favour of the proposal on behalf of their Faculties. The reasons provided supporting the proposal included:

- The issues raised in earlier proposals around the retention of the Deans and student representation had been addressed in the final version
- Other concerns would be addressed in the implementation process
- Could not envisage already busy PVCs taking over the academic work of the Deans
- Strong Advisory Boards existed that had oversight of some professional degrees and this would not be affected by the change
- Better inclusion of general and professional staff within a single structure
- Academic, resourcing and financial considerations needed to be taken into account together.
- Provided for transparency of financial and strategic matters
- Better clarity for external stakeholders
- Would assist to build a constructive staff culture.

In questioning, the opposing Deans were asked to advise if it was the proposal or the fundamental principle of alignment they were opposed to. In response, all reiterated the loss of autonomy, dissolution of the Faculties and the desire to retain two separate bodies were major concerns.

The concern of the Law Faculty, expressed in written feedback in relation to legislative requirements, had been researched and the Vice-Chancellor was confident that the University would remain compliant if the proposal was accepted. The Chancellor emphasised that this was in fact a Council obligation rather than a management one. He stressed that Council was required to attest to UC's compliance with all legislation, thus providing an inbuilt safeguard.

The Deans were thanked for their input and the PVC's invited to the table to respond to final questions from Council, in response to which the following comments were made:

- The two key reasons for the proposal coming forward were noted:
 - To link up and clarify academic and financial leadership
 - To provide clarity around line management
- Accountability rested with PVCs
- The PVCs made an undertaking that the implementation

process would be inclusive and that all elements of proposal would be considered.

The Chancellor advised the meeting that were the resolution passed, the implementation of the changes would be management responsibility but that Council would expect to be kept fully informed and updated throughout the process.

The Chancellor ensured that all questions had been asked by the Council and comments provided before putting the resolution to the vote.

Moved

THAT: Council adopt the proposal to unite Colleges and Faculties

Carried

The vote was carried unanimously and the Chancellor acknowledged for providing a comprehensive opportunity for consideration of this matter.

FROM THE FINANCE,
PLANNING AND
RESOURCES
COMMITTEE

The Chair of the Finance, Planning and Resources Committee (FPRC), Ms Catherine Drayton, presented the reports from meeting of FPRC on 17 May 2016.

UCTF Quarterly Report to 31 March 2016

The report showed a satisfactory result had been achieved.

appeals taken to the Council Appeals Committee in 2015.

The Chancellor thanked Professor Heinemann for the report noted Council's appreciation for the delivery of the advice in such a comprehensive manner, making it so much easier for Council to exercise its legislative responsibilities. Council would look forward to receiving advice in this manner in future. The Chancellor added his thanks to Professor Heinemann and noted that Lea Resources would lead the process of the policy review.

Moved:

That: Council gratefully receive the report of the Academic Board Working Party on the Academic Implications of the UC Space Allocation Policy, and refer it to management for consideration and reporting back to Council through the Finance, Planning and Resources Committee before the end of the year.

Carried

PUBLIC EXCLUDED
MEETING

Moved

That: the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

Item

and that the UC Directors, the Head of Academic Services and the University Council Co-ordinator be permitted to remain at this meeting because of their knowledge of the various matters being discussed. This knowledge would be of assistance in relation to the matters discussed, and was relevant because of their involvement in the development of the reports to Council on these matters.

Carried

RETURN TO PUBLIC MEETING Members returned to public meeting at 6.44pm

GENERAL BUSINESS There were no items of general business.

The meeting closed at 6.45pm.

NEXT MEETING The next meeting is scheduled for 8.00pm on Wednesday 29 June 2016.

SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD: _____

DATE: _____