

**UNAPPROVED COUNCIL MINUTES  
MEETING HELD ON 22<sup>nd</sup> MAY 2026, 9AM  
FSQ108, Bayes, Finsbury Square**

| Members             |                                               | Meeting 1<br>12.09.25 | Meeting 2<br>10.10.25 | Meeting 3<br>27.11.25 | Meeting 4<br>26.02.26 | Meeting 5<br>27.03.26 | Meeting 6<br>22.05.26 | Meeting 7<br>02.07.26 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Independent Members | Professor Ian Jacobs (Chair)                  | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Professor Sir Anthony Finkelstein (President) | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | A                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Godfrey Allen                              | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Professor Bob Allison                         | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Mark Evans                                 | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Adrienne Fresko                            | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Josh Joshi                                 | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | A                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Max Khan                                   | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | A                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Rachel Lock                                | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Mark Lowcock                               | ✓                     | A                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | A                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Catherine McGuinness                       | ✓                     | A                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Julia Palca                                | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Anant Prakash                              | ✓                     | ✓                     | A                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | A                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Damian Reid                                | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Christine Swabey                           | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Sandra Ashton                              | A                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Ana-Maria Barrow                           | ✓                     | A                     | A                     | A                     | A                     | A                     |                       |
|                     | Professor Jon Friedland                       | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | A                     | A                     | N/M                   |                       |
|                     | Professor Elisabeth Hill                      | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Mr Nasir Mohammed                             | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Professor Rich Payne                          | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |
|                     | Ms Helen Watson                               | A                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     | ✓                     |                       |

**Key:** ✓ In Attendance A Apologies P Part Attendance N/M Not a Member S Sabbatical

| In Attendance               | Reason and Meeting Section                            |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Professor Natalie Armstrong | Executive Dean, School of Health and Medical Sciences |
| Mr Dominic Davis            | Director of Strategy, Planning and Performance        |
| Dr William Jordan           | University Secretary                                  |
| Ms Sarah Lawton             | Senior Governance Officer                             |
| Ms Jots Sehmbi              | Chief Information Officer [for Item 11]               |
| Professor Andre Spicer      | Executive Dean, Bayes Business School                 |
| Mr Matthew Swales           | Chief Financial Officer                               |

**MINUTES SECTION A – OPEN FOR PUBLICATION**

**Part One – Preliminary Items**

- Apologies for Absence**  
Council noted apologies from the President, Max Khan, Mark Lowcock and Anant Prakash.
- Quorum**  
The meeting was quorate.
- Highlighted Items**  
Council **agreed** the highlighted items.
- Conflicts of Interest**  
Adrienne Fresko noted (in relation to Item 18) that she had served on the Governing Body of the University of Sussex. Catherine McGuinness noted that her son had been accepted for a PGT course in Journalism at the University.
- Minutes**  
The minutes of the meetings held on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2026 were approved.

## 6. **Matters Arising**

Council noted the actions arising from past meetings.

### Matter Arising 6: Merger Benefits Realisation Framework – Recognition Agreement

If changes are agreed to the current recognition agreement with Trade Unions, proposed new arrangements will return to Council for approval as the recognition of Trade Unions is a matter for Council determination under Ordinance B.1.

## 7. **Items Specially Brought Forward by the Chair**

### **Julia Palca [The Chair reserved this item until the business meeting had concluded]**

The Chair noted that this was Julia's final Council meeting. Julia was going to take up the position of Chair at the Court of the University of Westminster and the Chair noted that it was excellent to know that Julia was remaining in the sector. The Chair thanked Julia for her years of dedication to the University, both to legacy City and to City St George's where she had been an exemplary Chair and Council Member. The Chair noted her extraordinary contributions as follows:

- Julia had led the appointment process of Professor Anthony Finkelstein as President who has also since made great contributions to the University.
- Julia had steered the University through the complexities of the merger. Through this process Julia also had a positive impact on the sector.
- Following the merger, Julia had agreed to stay on and support the Chair, as joint Deputy Chair for two years.

The DP&P, on behalf of the executive, noted the focussed and positive way in which Julia had steered Council, the executive and wider community through the merger.

The Dean of Bayes noted Julia's principled and pragmatic approach to the Business School's name change and thanked her personally for playing a part in his appointment.

Independent Council members noted that Julia was gifted at challenging colleagues in a supportive way and demonstrated integrity and collegiality, making a mark on the entire sector.

For their support, Julia thanked the Chair, the University Secretary, the President, fellow Council members, the Deans, the Governance Team and all the SU Presidents since she joined Council.

Julia recommended one final action to Council, which was to ensure that the University's values could be readily located on its website. She had recently trawled the website and had not located the University's values. **[Action]**

### **Anant Prakash**

The Chair informed Council that, with regret, owing to his extremely busy work schedule, Anant would be standing down from Council. The Chair thanked Anant for his valuable contributions to the University and especially for the time and expertise he shared during the merger process which played a significant role in the ultimate success of the merger. The Chair hoped that Anant might rejoin Council at an appropriate time in the future. The Governance Team would invite Anant to the November dinner to ensure he was given a proper farewell.

### **Christine Swabey**

The Chair informed Council that after three years as Chair at legacy St George's and assisting as Deputy Chair at City St George's, the July Council meeting would be Christine's last. Farewells would be reserved until July.

### **Sandra Ashton**

The Chair informed Council that Sandra had decided to leave the University on 29<sup>th</sup> May and this would be her last meeting as a Council Member. Sandra had made a huge contribution to both legacy St George's and City St George's having served as a Council member for both. Sandra represented the University and its staff well and provided valuable input during the merger process. Council would miss her thoughtful approach and contributions and wished her well for the future.

### **Rich Payne**

The Chair noted that the July meeting would be Rich's last. The President had nominated candidates from the Shadow Leadership Board, to fill the two staff Council member vacancies, who will be interviewed by CGNC.

### **Council Vacancies**

Following the departure of Julia, Anant and Christine, there would be three vacancies on Council. The recruitment process would be taken forward with the assistance of Ben Tucker at Minerva. The Chair of CGNC asked Council members to contact her if they knew anyone who might be appointable. **[Action]**

### **Finance Seminar: BDO Report on Financial Sustainability**

The Chair of FinCo suggested that a seminar be arranged to which all Council members would be invited in due course. **[Action]**

### **Senate**

Mark Evans had attended the May meeting of Senate and suggested that Council might particularly note the following points he had taken from the meeting:

- Senate members would like to have more of a connection with Council and more engagement with the development of strategy at the University.
- Senate had approved the new integrated and unified Admissions Policy which was a very positive development.
- Elected Senators had suggested that there had been late and insufficient engagement by the Executive with the Trade Unions concerning the REF Code of Practice.

The DP&P noted that:

- The 'late' engagement with the REF Code of Practice with the Trade Unions had been wholly due to challenges in setting up a meeting, not least since the Trade Unions were prioritising PSTOM matters at the same time and did not reflect any desire on the part of the Executive not to engage constructively on this issue.
- While the 'strategic proposition' agreed by Council last November had not yet been disseminated to staff at the University or to members of Senate, this reflected the reality that the President was currently redrafting the longer 'strategic narrative' discussed by Council earlier in 2025, in the light of discussions at the Council Away Day and sectoral developments. The new version of the 'strategic narrative' would be considered by SaDCo.

The Chair noted that moving forward there will be a formal process in place for Senate to report to Council on the matters delegated to Senate by Council.

## **8. Calendar**

Council members noted the calendar.

## **9. President's Report**

Council noted the report from the President which included updates from the Vice-Presidents and the Executive Deans. The Deputy President & Provost presented this item on behalf of the President who was unable to attend the meeting. In discussion the following points were noted:

- The report underscored the focus of SLT on strategic matters and highlighted the work being undertaken to think more about collaboration and engagement.
- Last week King's and Cranfield had announced their merger which highlighted the changes starting now to take place more widely in the sector. As with the merger between City and SGUL, there was little overlap between the academic offerings of Cranfield and King's. It might be anticipated that CSG should consider the potential for this merged university to position management courses in London and CSG would consider how to pre-empt this potential.
- The DP&P assured Council that CSG continued to work towards making the most of the merger benefits.
- Delays in the next promotion round for academic staff posed a significant cultural risk to the University. The new promotions policy, which would provide a single policy across all campuses, align academic promotions more clearly with strategy and strive to provide a more equitable transparent approach had led to a delay in the annual timeline for applications for promotion. This was causing disquiet among some academic staff who had been preparing for this year's round.
- The review was being carried out in consultation with all Schools.
- It was noted that various universities had frozen their promotions processes because of financial pressures.
- The update on student numbers in the report highlighted that while applications to the University were down, offer acceptances were at similar levels to last year. The DSPPU noted that the wording presented in the President's report might be misleading. The DSSPU assured Council that the situation was not alarming, the numbers were broadly positive, and the situation was being carefully monitored.

- The Vice-President Research & Innovation recruitment process was underway and it was anticipated that interviews would take place mid to late July. The Chair of Council would be on the interview panel.

#### 10. **SU President's Report**

Council considered the report which gave a full account of the events and campaigns being taken forward by the Students' Union. In discussion the following points were noted:

- In early May the Student Pantry had launched at Clerkenwell. This was initially funded by the President's Fund and it was intended that continued funding would be derived from monthly donations from the university's senior staff.
- Officers were running a series of sessions in collaboration with Professor Baba Sheba using virtual reality headsets. The purpose of the project is to support student and staff wellbeing with a 7-minute VR reset.
- Officers took a proposal to SLT on introducing a free printing allowance for students across all sites. The offer would replace the free printing offer at Tooting to ensure all students can benefit.
- Officers had proposed the introduction of flexible graduation payment plans to support affordability and access. From next year, students will be able to pay for graduation costs in instalments via providers such as Klarna or PayPal.
- The Union shop and café launched at the beginning of May, creating a visible, accessible space for students to connect, alongside a sustainable income stream to reinvest in Union services. The Union is grateful for the support from EEF and the wider SLT in enabling this to happen.
- The Advice and Support service continued to experience consistently high demand, managing approximately 60–100+ cases per month, with peaks aligned to assessment and results periods. SHMS represented 47% of advice cases thus far and the SU President noted that he believed that because of GDPR implications, he was unable to delve into further details of the cases. The Executive Dean, SHMS would be following this up outside the meeting. **[Action]**
- There was a connection between many of the issues reported via the Student Voice. The use of digital tools and how programmes were delivered could effectively solve multiple problems.
- The new SU representatives had been announced and they would take up their posts in August. The SU President was reminded that at a previous Council meeting he committed to taking the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training and he was asked at this meeting to liaise with the SU CEO to ensure that the incoming elected SU representatives undertake the training. The SU needed to demonstrate to the rest of the student community that they take these matters seriously.
- Even though the 18% election turn-out was the second highest historically, it might have been higher had the cyber incident not occurred, which had led to a pause in the election process.
- Termly informal Council/Student sessions would be organised on both campuses in the next academic year to address the student feedback that they would like Council to be more visible to "humanise the governance of the University." **[Action]**

#### 11. **Tooting Cyber Incident**

Council noted the report and in discussion with the CIO the following points were noted:

- The report provided an overview of a cyber incident experienced at the Tooting campus on 11<sup>th</sup> March and the steps taken to contain the incident and restore services.
- The University was on a good stable path to recovery.
- Student learning was prioritised in the first instance and work to reestablish other services (e.g. student records and timetabling) was progressing well.
- The University was swift to contain the incident and to date there was no evidence of data exfiltration and there had been no other attacks or incidents of malicious activity.
- The direction the University was moving in with regard to recovery was aligned with the future work which had already been planned. Whilst recovery was challenging, every step was moving towards the work which would have been carried out as part of the planned upgrade to IT services at Tooting.
- IT defences at Clerkenwell were robust but cyber security threats were ever evolving and the University kept up by continuous investment. It would be impossible to state that the University was protected from every threat, but keeping up was the best defence.
- Instant responses to such incidents and the human factor were very important and continuous training was also essential.

- The Chair of ARC reminded Council that ARC had oversight of the Cyber Security red risk, and that, even so, the incident had still occurred. ARC would consider what questions Council should be asking in this domain moving forward and feedback to Council. **[Action]**
- Cyber security would remain high on the Risk Register and even after the upgrading work was completed but in all probability as an 'amber' risk. The CIO noted that an IT training refresh campaign had just been launched. Overall, the approach was to keep pace with new threats to mitigate against the strategic risk of cyber security.
- In relation to financial control, the CFO noted that there had been a rapid response to isolate CSG's systems and as a result the finance system was taken offline on 11<sup>th</sup> March, with no access since then. Significant work was underway to bring it back online and system testing was due to take place in due course. As Payroll was on the cloud it remained unaffected. Procurement had all been absorbed into the Clerkenwell procurement team. Exceptional payments could still be made to creditors where necessary, but with some lack of management control.
- The CFO confirmed that the legacy City insurance cover had been extended at the time of the merger, increasing the cover to £2M. Making a claim was challenging but the Finance Team was working through the issues.
- There were issues to address in relation to the message to be communicated to staff that the Tooting site was not on a par in terms of IT systems. Wording such as "bringing the systems up to the standard of Clerkenwell" had a negative impact on Tooting staff. The communications could perhaps better present the IT improvements now being made as being a benefit of the merger.
- The Executive Dean SHMS was grateful for support she had received from SLT in running the Tooting Staff Townhall. Although staff wanted answers which could not all currently be provided, they had appreciated the opportunity to raise their concerns.
- The DP&P highlighted that there was a potential academic impact on the institution because of the incident impacting on quality assurance – impacting both teaching and research. This was being worked through and managed by the Executive and that work would be reported in due course to Senate and Council.
- Council was grateful for the paper, which inspired confidence, and also for the quality of the response to the incident by the Executive.

## 12. **2025/26 Revised Financial Forecast**

Council considered the revised Financial Forecast 2025/26 and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The paper presented the detailed results of the 2025/26 Revised Forecast (RFC) exercise, comprising a detailed projection of income and expenditure budgets to the end of the financial year.
- The RFC projected a deficit of £0.7m after a £4.1m release of central contingency. This compared to the £2.2m target deficit for the financial year as established by the Joint Financial Plan.
- Net adverse variance - excluding that contingency release - since Mid-Year Forecast (MYF) - was £4.1m, consisting of:
  - Net overperformance in operating activity of £1.9m.
  - Overperformance against collective vacancy savings targets of £1.8m.
  - Crystallisation of identified risks relating to other discrete savings targets for the year (Academic Workforce Planning, PSTOM, and local targets agreed with Bayes) totalling £7.8m.
  - Liquidity and covenant headroom remain well above target.
- £2.6m contingency remained to offset any new pressures emerging over the remainder of the year.
- OfS had now acknowledged the rationale behind the University's response to its proposals to clawback £1.5m of funding, but the issue was not yet resolved; and this issue remained pending. It seemed unlikely to be resolved this financial year.
- The Tooting finances had been up to date before the cyber incident and no adverse events were anticipated to arise while finances could not be monitored in the usual way.
- In response to the cyber incident some goodwill payments had been made to students.
- The Chair of FinCo noted that the workforce savings target had not been reached and suggested that thought should be given to what savings can realistically be achieved in the next financial year.

### **Decision**

Council **approved** the Revised Forecast, including release of £4.1m of central contingency as recommended by Finance Committee.

### **13. Tooting Oracle Project Business Case**

Council considered the business case and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The Tooting Oracle Project follows on from the People & Finance (P&F) Programme that delivered the new Oracle Fusion system for the Clerkenwell campus in November 2025. Its aim is to migrate the HR and finance data from Tooting's legacy systems onto the new Oracle Fusion system.
- Doing so will enable integrated and consistent ways of working across the university in relation to HR and Finance operations, provide a single source of truth for HR and Finance data and facilitate further technological integration across the wider university.
- The business case sets out the case for investment based on a go-live date of 04 November 2026 and a budget of £9.925m.
- In future it would be helpful for business cases to be clearer than the present case in relation to (i) opportunity costs and (ii) the cashable benefits (if any) to be achieved as a result of the proposed expenditure. **[Action]**

### **Decision**

Council **approved** the Tooting Oracle Project Business Case.

### **14. Transformation Board Report**

Council noted the report and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The report provided Council with a summary of progress on the Professional Services Target Operating Model (PSTOM); City St George's Post-Merger Integration programme; and portfolio of strategic change projects.
- Significant progress has been made in the integration and redesign of Professional Services across CSG. Overall, the programme is rated AMBER: timescales are on track but the scale of the programme and capacity required, especially from the HR Change function, remained a significant pressure on the organisation.
- New operating structures would be confirmed following consultation with staff and Trade Unions for all in-scope Services by the end of academic year 2025/26, bar IT, the timeline for which has been affected by the need to deploy a significant proportion of resource on the cyber incident in Tooting.
- New effective service designs were delivering on the design principles including budget reduction, consistency of roles and role titles, application of job families – and meeting CSGUL and TU expectations of fair and inclusive processes. A PSTOM report would be presented to Council in the next academic year. **[Action]**
- Radiography would be working as a single integrated programme at the University from 2026/27.
- An academic policy review following merger, to integrate academic policies, had taken place and the outcomes had been approved by Senate; now a non-academic policy review was under way to ensure that the policies from both legacy institutions were integrated.
- Other areas would move to BAU in tranches following integration; and by next summer ideally most activities would be fully integrated.
- A further Transformation Board Report would be presented to Council in July.

### **15. Strategy Performance Measures**

Council noted the paper and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The paper reviewed each performance area, providing the latest update on performance and the trend of performance in those relevant areas; before proposing refreshed measures aligned to the priorities of the refreshed strategy.
- The Chair noted that the new draft CUC Code of Governance requires Councils to undertake regular high-quality reporting against agreed priorities and success measures and to monitor leading as well as lagging indicators of performance. Timely and proportionate action should be taken where performance materially diverges from plan or where risks crystallise. Forward performance measures for the University strategy should be considered in the light of that new framework.

- The SUMS/GGI report also recommended that the strategy should be translated into outcome measures aligned with executive portfolios and quarterly strategy reviews should be established.
- The Chair of RemCo confirmed with the DSPPU that the slides developed for RemCo to link organisational performance to individual performance would be updated in the light of the new proposals in the paper. **[Action]**
- SaDCo would consider the paper in more detail at its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> June, but initial observations included the following points:
  - The meaning of the phrase ‘opposite of an ivory tower’ with the associated performance measure of ‘having more than 35k students’ should be considered further. Were all Universities with more than 35k students ‘the opposite of an ivory tower’?
  - It seemed unlikely that the NSS could be the only measure of student satisfaction agreed by Council. Leading measures, including those derived from SU initiatives, should also be presented to Council for approval. There should also be explicit measures of teaching quality.
  - Generally, many of the measures were ‘satisficing’ (satisfying external regulatory requirements) whereas Council might prefer outcomes to be stretching and ambitious and measure progress against other institutions in the sector.
  - Further work was required on the outcome measures that would enable Council to gauge the extent to which the University was ‘a great place to work.’
  - It would be helpful to clarify the nature of ‘partnership education’ and the extent of the University’s engagement in this.
- The Chair of SaDCo would further discuss with the DP&P the issues surrounding academic outcome measures and the responsibilities of Senate and how they related to the responsibility of Council in this area. **[Action]**
- Council supported the overall approach proposed and further detailed consideration of an updated paper would take place at SaDCo in June and potentially at Council in July.

#### 16. **Draft CUC Code of Governance**

Council noted the new draft CUC Code of Governance and areas in which current practice at the University did not comply with the new draft Code. In discussion the following points were noted:

- The paper set out areas, to note, in which the University would seem, on an initial reading, not to comply with the provisions of the new draft Code – which now contains provisions which Universities must follow as well as provisions which they should follow (on a comply or explain basis).
- The paper also identified areas in which there is overlap between the provisions in the new Code which might require action from the University and the recommendations set out in the SUMS/GGI review of Council effectiveness.
- Council noted areas where the university was not currently compliant e.g., successor planning for Senior Executive roles, annual review of board member’s performance, production of a publishable ongoing action plan. There was also much about academic assurance and risk which was not currently in place and which must be addressed.
- The CUC planned to adopt the new code at its Plenary on 27<sup>th</sup> May.
- Following detailed consideration at a special meeting of CGNC, a full analysis of what was required for compliance with the new Code will be presented to Council in July. **[Action]**

#### 17. **SUMS/GGI Major Recommendations: The Next Steps**

Council noted the paper and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The paper provided an overview of issues arising from discussions to date of each of the major recommendations of the SUMS/GGI report and of the ‘supporting’ recommendations which link to and support those five ‘major’ recommendations.
- The paper also sets out a way forward, agreed by CGNC, for responding to the ‘supporting’ recommendations that were not closely linked to any of the five ‘main’ recommendations.
- An Appendix to the paper set out the five major recommendations alongside the set of ‘supporting’ recommendations that support them. It also lists the ‘other’ or ‘free-standing’ recommendations in the review, which do not directly support the five major recommendations but are clearly in need of consideration and response by CGNC and Council.
- The recommendations would be further considered (initially in relation to those which link to the new CUC code) at ARC, SaDCo and RemCo. Following those discussions, CGNC would present proposals for a way forward to Council in July. **[Action]**

**18. Legal Update: summary of Lieven J's judgment in the case of R (University of Sussex) v Office for Students [2026] EWHC 984 (Admin)**

Council noted the report which was written by the University of Sussexes lawyers and in discussion the following points were noted:

- The High Court had quashed a £585,000 fine imposed by the Office for Students (OfS), ruling the regulator's decision-making process was heavily flawed by errors of law, regulatory overreach, and procedural bias. It was found that the OfS adopted an improper, rigid view of free speech and misunderstood the threshold for academic freedom, while also demonstrating a "closed mind" during the investigation.
- The findings of the case did not reflect well on the OfS' handling of the issue.
- Two independent members of Council had been involved in various ways in consideration of what occurred at Sussex and both noted that the Council of the University had only been alerted to the very serious Freedom of Speech issues that had arisen at the University very late in the day and when the situation was beyond repair by the governing body.
- The General Counsel would bring this topic back to Council in the next academic year for further discussion. **[Action]**

**19. Policy Affairs Update**

Council noted the update and in discussion the following points were noted:

- This regular paper provided an update on recent developments in national policy, legislation and regulation.
- In the absence of any major announcements or shifts in direction since the March update, this briefing highlighted the most notable sector-wide developments and publications relevant to the current policy and regulatory landscape.
- The University should not lose sight of policies which relate to overseas students coming to study at CSG.
- It had been disappointing that the recent King's speech made no reference to HE.
- It would be helpful at a future meeting to consider what a change in Government might mean for universities. **[Action]**
- Council members were informed that they could sign up to Wonkhe ("home of the HE debate") using their CSG emails if interested in doing so.
- Although these updates were not specific to CSG, Council members found them very useful and requested that they continue in the same format.

**20. CGNC Matters**

**20.1 Reappointment of Council Members**

Council **approved** the reappointments of Professor Bob Allison and Rachel Lock for further terms of three years as recommended by CGNC.

**20.2 Ordinance Revisions (B1 and D2)**

Council considered the paper which set out two proposed sets of changes to the University's Ordinances, which CGNC has recommended to Council for approval. The following points were noted:

- Proposals for the text of the 'guiding principles' section of Ordinance B.1, Authority Delegated to the Vice-Chancellor and President: This text was provided by the President in response to the recommendations in the SUMS/GGI report. The text was recommended by CGNC to Council for approval.
- The text of the "general principles" section of Ordinance B.1 was subject to further amendment, including in relation to the provisions relating to the approval of spin-out companies, which are being further considered, following points made in discussion of the Ordinance at the March meeting of Council.
- Proposals to amend the 'transitional provisions' section of Ordinance D.2, Council Members: The transitional provisions in the Statutes, which enabled the University to appoint additional members of Council for a period of two years following merger, ceased to have effect from 31<sup>st</sup> August 2026; and it was proposed to remove the reference in the Ordinance to that provision now. It was also proposed that the transitional provisions in the Ordinance remain in force.
- The numbering of sub-bullet points in Ordinance D.2 should be corrected so that the numbering of points was consecutive.

## **Decisions**

Council **approved** the proposed amendments to Ordinances B.1 and D.2.

### **21. Minutes**

Council noted the minutes of the following meetings:

- 21.1 Senate, 10<sup>th</sup> December 2025
- 21.2 Finance Committee, 5<sup>th</sup> March 2026
- 21.3 Audit & Risk Committee, 9<sup>th</sup> March 2026
- 21.4 Remuneration Committee, 12<sup>th</sup> March 2026

### **22. Estates and Property Project Report**

Council noted the report which had been considered at SaDCo.

### **23. FOI Review**

Council **agreed** that no changes were required.

### **24. Date of Next Meeting**

Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> July at 9am.

### **25. There was a discussion between the independent Members of Council without staff and student members present.**

Professor Ian Jacobs  
Chair of Council  
May 2026