

# Council

23/86 A meeting of the Council was held on Wednesday 22 November 2023 at 10.00 am in Room 201, Carrington Building, Whiteknights.

Present:       The President                               (in the Chair)  
                  The Vice Presidents               (Mr K. Corrigan and Mrs K. Owen)  
                  The Vice-Chancellor  
                  The Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
                  The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Dr C. Baylon)  
                  The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor E. McCrum)  
                  The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor D. Zaum)

Mr S. Alexander	Mr J. Jack
Mr S. Ali	Mr P. Milhofer
Professor E. Beleska- Spasova	Mrs S. Plank
Mrs S. Butler	Mr N. Richards
Professor R. Frazier	Dr C. Shaw
Professor J. Gibbins	Professor K. Strohfeldt
Mr E. Gregory	Dr J. Young

In attendance:

The Chief Strategy Officer and University Secretary  
The Director of Finance  
The Director of Quality Support and Development  
The Director of Research Services (for Minute 23/89 only).

Apologies had been received from Mr A. McCallum, Ms S. Maple and Ms S. Jordan.

## 23/87 President's opening remarks

The President thanked members for the discussion the previous evening, which would inform the further development of the University Strategy.

## 23/88 Disclosure of Interests (Item 2)

The Committee received and noted a paper from the University Secretary in regard to Disclosure of Interests.

## **Items for presentation and discussion**

### 23/89 Quality in Research: presentation from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the Director of Research Services (Item 3)

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the Director of Research Services (Dr A.-M. van Dodeweerd) gave a presentation on Quality in Research.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Dr van Dodeweerd outlined the scope of quality assurance in research, the roles and responsibilities of post-holders, and the role of the Committee for Open Research and Research Integrity (CORRI). They explained that the University's commitment to open research supported the assurance of the integrity of research. Research was governed by the University's Code of Good Practice in Research and by the national Concordat to Support Research Integrity (CSRI). While the CSRI did not have legal status, UKRI's processes effectively promoted compliance. In a recent self-assessment exercise, the University evidenced its strong performance against CSRI requirements. The University had improved its research integrity training over the past few years, and would next focus on issues relating to the misinterpretation of data, which was a common concern across the sector.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Dr van Dodeweerd noted that a Concordat for Environmental Sustainability in Research and Innovation would shortly be published, which addressed the sustainability of infrastructure, procurement, and travel, and set out expectations in relation *inter alia* to leadership, system change and reporting.

They also explained that funding bodies had a range of standard and specific requirements in relation to governance and quality, including provisions around legal compliance, institutional policies, and procedures for due diligence and safeguarding. In respect of 'trusted research' (research in sensitive areas with security dimensions), there were additional requirements around cybersecurity, export control and enhanced due diligence. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Dr van Dodeweerd explained UKRI's regime of reporting, review visits, and dipstick testing.

The President noted that these assurance processes provided the basis for the annual statements signed off by Council.

In response to questions, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor explained the process by which potential breaches of research integrity were investigated, and advised that, where an issue was identified, possible actions included a warning, the termination of employment, and retraction of the article. Such cases were reported to CORRI and were included, together with lessons learned, in the report on compliance with the CSRI submitted to Senate and Council.

In response to a question on recovery of research costs, Dr van Dodeweerd explained that cost recovery depended on the source of funding: in the case of charity-funded research, only direct costs were recovered, whereas 80% of costs were recovered for UKRI-funded research. Many research grants included an expectation of matched funding by the institution. The Director of Finance explained that overall an average of 70% of research costs were recovered, and that the shortfall was covered by other income, largely from international student fee income.

The Director of Finance advised that the University was relatively successful in controlling research costs, but the burden of external regulation was significant. The Vice-Chancellor indicated that UUK was exploring how efficiencies could be achieved in this regard, including the introduction of a central service to undertake due diligence procedures.

The Council thanked the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Dr van Dodeweerd for a very informative presentation.

#### 23/90 University of Reading Malaysia (Item 4)

The Council received an update from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International) (Dr Baylon) on the operation of the University of Reading Malaysia, its current performance and future options.

As context, Dr Baylon offered her initial evaluation of the University's international operations, based on observations from her first three months in post. She noted that the University had a significant presence and impact internationally, but equally had the potential and the opportunity to offer more. She indicated that the University's international work in some areas was not sufficiently joined up, that some capabilities could be enhanced, and that the University's reputation did not have the reach it should. She had identified her immediate challenges as:

- Driving student growth within sustainable parameters;
- Internationalisation on campus, ensuring student success and the quality of student experience for international students;
- Ensuring that our network of overseas operations is fully integrated, aligned, sustainable and acting as regional hubs;
- Developing comprehensive regional engagement strategies which build on the University's existing global footprint.

She highlighted the University's campuses in Malaysia and South Africa, the NUIST-Reading Academy, and smaller operations in Europe as valuable assets which offered rich opportunities not available to other universities. The University should develop comprehensive regional strategies, which would maximise the benefits for international operations and for the University as a whole.

Dr Baylon reported that the RUMAL Board was currently considering a range of options for University of Reading Malaysia's future. She outlined the history of University of Reading Malaysia (UoRM) and noted that the 'drag and drop' model of transnational education (which replicated a sub-set of provision from the UK campus with little contextual adaptation), though common at the time when UoRM was established, was no longer seen as optimal. A repositioning of UoRM would align with the University Strategy, possibly on a pattern such as:

- Community: UoRM would be better integrated into the University community with UoRM's disciplinary sections being fully part of Schools, underpinned by a strong sense of mutual belonging;

- Excellence: Teaching and learning at UoRM would be driven by innovation and tailored to local demand, raising the profile of both UoRM and the wider University;
- Sustainability: UoRM's original model had not been financially sustainable, but the campus was now making good progress to a break-even position. UoRM could also support the University's wider financial sustainability as a regional hub, supporting recruitment to the UK campus;
- Engaged University: UoRM's provision would be better adapted to regional demand and needs, contributing to the success of the Iskandar development.

Dr Baylon noted that a coherent regional strategy for south-east Asia, based on UoRM, could provide a model for other regional strategies.

Dr Baylon reported that the restructuring of UoRM in 2019 had had some success and that, notwithstanding the impacts of the Covid pandemic, its financial position was much improved. RUMAL would be considering three options for UoRM's future:

- a) [Redacted, Sec 43]
- b) [Redacted, Sec 43]
- c) [Redacted, Sec 43]

Dr Baylon advised that RUMAL wanted to understand Council's perspective on UoRM's future to inform its consideration of options and would wish to seek Council's support for its eventual decision.

In response to questions, Dr Baylon confirmed that RUMAL's decision would be informed by a market insight report, by discussions with UoRM and University staff, and by conversations with counterparts at other UK universities with campuses in Malaysia. She had been working with Finance to model the costs associated with each of the options. [Redacted, Sec 43]

In response to further questions, Dr Baylon acknowledged that the risks associated with delivering programmes through an international campus were greater than delivering in the UK, and that the commercial rationale for taking on greater risk was the prospect of greater returns. In this context, leveraging the Malaysian campus to serve as a gateway to the south-east Asia market was an important element in the strategy. She confirmed that UoRM delivered Henley programmes and that, while each School may have specific priorities, the priorities of Schools, UoRM and the University needed to be aligned. Dr Baylon reported that Schools had responded positively to the proposal for greater integration between UoRM and the University, although the implications of integration were not necessarily fully evident to Schools.

The Director of Finance reported that [Redacted, Sec 43]. The Vice-Chancellor recognised that a successful outcome for UoRM depended on appropriate leadership capacity and capability in the UK and in Malaysia. He confirmed that RUMAL would submit its recommendation to the University Executive Board (UEB) in the coming month or so, and that UEB, having considered RUMAL's recommendation, would submit a proposal to Council in March 2024. A paper on the University's strategic approach to its international teaching and learning activity, together with a recommendation

from UEB informed by the RUMAL Board, would be submitted to the Council at its March meeting.

### 23/91 Freedom of speech (Item 5)

The Council received the Annual Report on Freedom of Speech, together with a report from the Student Experience Committee on its discussion of freedom of speech.

The Vice-Chancellor explained that freedom of speech was a right both in UK common law and international law, while academic freedom was an employment right specific to academic staff, by which, in undertaking their academic activities, they could express any views within the law without placing at risk their employment or any of its benefits. The University's Royal Charter (paragraph 6.2) effectively extended the right of academic freedom to all categories of staff.

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the University, under his leadership, had been active in protecting and promoting freedom of speech and academic freedom. Last year, in the context of a controversy surrounding a research seminar on gender-critical and transgender issues, he had written a blog defending academic freedom and explaining why it was right that academics should be free to explore ideas which may make some people uncomfortable. He also referred to an incident where one of the Students' Union societies had issued and then withdrawn an invitation to an MP; the University had apologised to the MP and the society had reinstated the invitation for a more appropriate time. The Vice-Chancellor reported that, in the context of the current conflict between Israel and Palestinians, he and the RSU President had brought together students from both sides to discuss the conflict and had emphasised that the University and RSU were there to support all students, whatever their circumstances and whatever their views. The University sought to be an environment in which complex, sensitive and controversial issues could be discussed openly and respectfully.

The Vice-Chancellor had been invited to present on academic freedom and freedom of speech to parliamentarians, and the UUK had identified the University as one of the best examples where the community was encouraged to 'disagree well'. The University had encouraged the student debating society and valued its part in developing among students skills of reasoned discussion and challenge; the debating society was thriving and successful in national competitions. The Vice-Chancellor referred to a range of initiatives promoting academic freedom at other universities.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that Professor Arif Ahmad, the recently appointed Director for Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech in the Office for Students, was concerned about structures within higher education which restricted debate, discouraged dissenting arguments, and fostered a culture of self-censorship. The Vice-Chancellor referred to some sectoral schemes which inadvertently incentivised compliance with orthodoxies and discouraged dissent; notwithstanding potential adverse consequences, the University had maintained its independence and fostered pluralism.

In response to questions, the Vice-Chancellor expanded on the principle of academic freedom and freedom of speech within the law and their relationship to the Prevent duty. He also noted that, in applying its external speaker policy, the University had not excluded any speaker from the campus and had managed protests effectively. He also reported that students generally welcomed debate and wanted to be exposed to a range of different views. The University had to be vigilant that its recruitment processes promoted a plurality of intellectual positions among its staff.

The President, on behalf of Council, thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his active stance on academic freedom and freedom of speech, and for his clarity of thought, commitment and courage in upholding these principles.

**Resolved:**

“That the Annual Report on Freedom of Speech, now submitted, be received.”

**Items for approval**

23/92 Report of the Student Experience Committee (Item 6)

The Council received the Report of a meeting of the Student Experience Committee held on 2 November 2023, together with the University’s Annual Report on Sexual Misconduct and Harassment.

Mrs Owen, on behalf of the Committee, commended to Council the Annual Report on Sexual Misconduct and Harassment. The Committee believed that the Report was thorough and set out an appropriate plan of action. In response to a question, the Chief Strategy Officer and University Secretary confirmed that a high proportion of reported cases had resulted in no action due to lack of evidence, and indicated that, since this was the first time these data had been reported, it was difficult to judge whether this rate was normal, although colleagues in student services had advised that this was the sort of rate to be expected.

**Resolved:**

1. “That the Annual Report on Sexual Misconduct and Harassment, now submitted, be approved;
2. That the Report of the meeting of the Student Experience Committee, held on 2 November 2023, now submitted, be received.”

23/93 School of Humanities (Item 7)

The Council received a paper on a restructuring proposal in respect of the School of Humanities.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resource) (Professor Zaum) explained the background to the proposed closure of the School of Humanities and the incorporation of its constituent departments into other

Schools. He indicated that the proposal was not expected to entail any redundancies, but that it would reduce administrative overheads and costs. He reported that the Senate had supported the proposal. Mr Gregory, RSU President, expressed his confidence that the proposal would not adversely affect the student experience.

In response to questions, Professor Zaum indicated that the current proposal would not generate significant cashable savings, but would lead to efficiencies and create opportunities for growth. While the closure of a School might be seen as an opportunity to reduce the University's cost base, the University was adopting a more strategic approach to cost reduction across Schools and Directorates, which would shortly be set out in a paper to Council.

**Resolved:**

“That:

1. The Department of Classics be moved into the current School of Literature and Languages;
2. The Department of History be moved into the School of Literature and Languages;
3. The Department of Philosophy be moved into the current School of Politics, Economics and International Relations;
4. The School of Literature and Languages and the School of Politics, Economics and International Relations be renamed to reflect their constitutive disciplines, and responsibility for deciding the new names, following consultation, be delegated to the University Executive Board;
5. The School of Humanities be formally closed as of 1 January 2024;
6. The paper School of Humanities—Restructuring Proposal, now submitted, be received.”

23/94 Report of the Audit Committee (Item 8)

The Council received the Annual Report from the Chair of the Audit Committee (which included the Report from the Director of Internal Audit Services), the University's Financial Statements and the draft Letters of Support and the draft Letter of Representation.

Mr Milhofer, as Chair of the Audit Committee, reported that the external audit was further advanced than in previous years and was on the cusp of being signed off with an unqualified audit opinion and all going concern tests having been passed. Debates between Mazars and the University had related to areas of judgement, such as pension assets/liabilities and the valuation of investment properties.

Mr Milhofer noted that Internal Audit Services had raised issues around the most effective controls to manage the University's operations and strategic

planning, particularly in relation to approval of accommodation contracts and the operations of the University's subsidiaries. Progress had been made in relation to Value for Money.

The Director of Finance reminded Council that 2022/23 had been the final of the three years deemed to have been directly impacted by the Covid pandemic and that a deficit had been budgeted. The outcome had been a -£8.3m deficit, which also reflected the impact of inflation and some post-pandemic income growth. Cash generation from operations had been less than 1% against a KPI of 10%. Staff costs remained a concern: while staff numbers had been static, staff costs had increased and stood at 60.1% of income, reflecting the impact of inflation on pay settlements. The Investment Fund amounted to £300m and debt stood at £144.5m. The Director of Finance noted that the Universities Superannuation Scheme accounting in the 2022/23 financial year was based on the 2020 valuation, which would shortly be superseded by the more positive 2023 valuation. The University of Reading Employees' Pension Fund (UREPF) remained in surplus.

**Resolved:**

1. "That the Annual Report to the Council and Vice-Chancellor from the Audit Committee 2022/23, now submitted, be approved;
2. That the financial position of the University for 2022/23, the financial statements and the audit report, now submitted, be noted and approved for signature by the President, Vice-Chancellor and Director of Finance;
3. That the President and the Director of Finance be authorised to sign the Letters of Representation to Mazars and that the Vice-Chancellor, Director of Finance or Chief Strategy Officer and University Secretary as appropriate be authorised to sign the letters of support for the University's subsidiary companies."

23/95 Report of the Remuneration Committee (Item 9)

*Members of the University Executive Board and the Dean of Henley Business School recused themselves from the discussion of this item and withdrew from the meeting.*

The Council received the Report of a meeting of the Remuneration Committee held on 13 October 2023.

Mrs Owen, as Chair of the Committee, referred to a lack of clarity, under the current Committee arrangements, about where responsibility of oversight of staff experience lay, with Remuneration Committee and Appointments and Governance Committee dealing variously with staff-related issues. It was therefore proposed that the remit of the Remuneration Committee be expanded to include broad oversight of the staff experience, with a corresponding change of title to People and Remuneration Committee. A parallel proposal limited the remit of the Appointments and Governance Committee to appointments only, with a corresponding change of title to Appointments Committee. Governance was a responsibility which properly

sat with Council itself. The Council would work on governance matters through its committees and working groups or through involvement of individual lay members, as appropriate.

Mrs Owen reported that the Committee had reviewed the remuneration of the Vice-Chancellor and members of the University Executive Board (as detailed in the University's Annual Report). She reminded Council that the Vice-Chancellor, on his appointment, had requested a salary below the market rate and had since regularly declined increases in his salary. The Committee had prevailed on him last year to accept a salary increase in line with the increases for other staff. The Committee was mindful that the Vice-Chancellor's remuneration was anomalous in comparison with similar institutions and that remuneration below the market rate incurred some reputational risk for the University and might have implications for the eventual recruitment of a successor. The Committee welcomed the Vice-Chancellor's acceptance of a pay rise and reaffirmed the importance of the note on the Vice-Chancellor's principled stance in the Annual Report.

**Resolved:**

1. "That:

(a) The Appointments and Governance Committee be renamed the Appointments Committee;

(b) The Remuneration Committee be renamed the People and Remuneration Committee;

(c) The membership of both Committees, subject to (d) below, be:

A Vice-President of Council (Chair) (Kate Owen)  
Another Vice-President of Council (Kevin Corrigan)  
Two other lay members of Council (Sian Butler and Sue Maple)  
An elected member of Council (John Jack);

(d) The Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellor be members of the Appointments Committee, but in attendance at the People and Remuneration Committee;

(e) The President and the Director of HR be in attendance at both Committees;

(f) The draft terms of reference of the Appointments Committee and of the People and Remuneration Committee, now submitted, be approved;

(g) The People and Remuneration Committee be quorate if at least three members are present;

2. That the Report of the meeting of the Remuneration Committee, held on 13 October 2023, now submitted, be received."

*Members of the University Executive Board and the Dean of Henley Business School returned to the meeting.*

### 23/96 Report of the Appointments and Governance Committee (Item 10)

*Mr Alexander, Mr Jack, Professor Zaum and the Director of Finance recused themselves from the discussion of this item and withdrew from the meeting.*

The Council received a Report of the Appointments and Governance Committee.

The President reported that:

- Following a competitive internal recruitment exercise, it had been agreed to recommend that Professor Zaum be appointed as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resource) for a period of six years. Professor Zaum had been infilling the role on a temporary basis since the departure of Professor Mark Fellowes;
- Following Professor Zaum's appointment to his new substantive role, Professor Yaqoob would continue on a full-time basis her role as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) while remaining Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
- It had been agreed to recommend that Mr Grice, Director of Finance, be appointed as a member of the University Executive Board and as a University Officer;
- It had been agreed to recommend that Mr Alexander be appointed Chair of the Student Experience Committee, with Mrs Owen continuing as a member of the Committee for the remainder of the academic year.

The Committee thanked Mrs Owen for her outstanding leadership of the Student Experience Committee over the past six years.

#### **Resolved:**

1. "That Steve Alexander be appointed as Chair of the Student Experience Committee with immediate effect (with Kate Owen continuing as a member for the remainder of the academic year);
2. That Professor Dominik Zaum be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resource) for a period of six years;
3. That Andrew Grice, Director of Finance, be appointed to the University Executive Board and be a University Officer;
4. That John Jack be appointed to the People and Remuneration Committee and the Governance Committee for a period co-terminous with his membership of the Council;
5. That the Report of the meeting of the Appointments and Governance Committee, now submitted, be received."

*Mr Alexander, Mr Jack, Professor Zaum and the Director of Finance returned to the meeting.*

## **Items for report**

### 23/97 Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Item 11)

The Council received the Report of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor:

- (a) Noted the update on the University Strategy's KPIs and thanked Council for its discussion of the KPIs and prioritisation the previous evening;
- (b) [Redacted, Sec 43]

#### **Resolved:**

"That the Report of the Vice-Chancellor, now submitted, be received."

### 23/98 Report of the Scrutiny and Finance Committee (Item 12)

The Council received the Report of a meeting of the Scrutiny and Finance Committee held on 9 November 2023.

Mr Corrigan, as Chair of the Committee, noted that:

- (a) The shortfall against recruitment targets had led to a shortfall of £4.1m against budget, which, however, was offset by a £4m saving from the impending reduction in the employer contribution for the USS. The University was putting in place provisions to strengthen conversion of applications in the current recruitment round;
- (b) The Committee was developing a data dashboard which would assist Council to monitor the financial performance of the University. Council members were asked to suggest metrics for inclusion.

In response to questions, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resource) (Professor Zaum) explained that the University was implementing a co-ordinated set of initiatives to improve student recruitment, which focussed on:

- Driving growth [Redacted, Sec 43]
- Enabling growth [Redacted, Sec 43]
- Protecting the student experience [Redacted, Sec 43]

#### **Resolved:**

"That the Report of the Scrutiny and Finance Committee, held on 9 November 2023, now submitted be received."

### 23/99 Report of the Senate (Item 13)

The Council received the Report of a meeting of the Senate held on 1 November 2023.

Professor Frazier reported that, in addition to the matters included in the Report, Senate had discussed:

- Concerns about the impact of cost of living pressures on students;
- Implications of the recent rapid development of generative artificial intelligence for education and assessment;
- A draft Academic Career Framework, which set out the scope of activities under various academic roles to ensure that the contributions of staff are valued and to inform professional development review, promotion cases, and design of posts.

The Council agreed that it would be helpful if, in future, the Senate's Report to Council reflected more fully the range of Senate's business and the nature of the debates, and, equally, that Council's consideration of Senate's Reports could be reported back to Senate. On the former point, it was agreed that the minutes would be shared in full; and on the latter, the Vice-Chancellor agreed to provide a report to each Senate on Council's considerations of its reports.

**Resolved:**

"That the Report of the Senate, held on 1 November 2023, now submitted, be received."

23/100      Annual Report on Health and Safety Performance (Item 14)

The Council received the Annual Report on Health and Safety Performance.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor explained that the format of the Report had been revised to better reflect the activities and strategic priorities overseen by the University Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee. The Report had a stronger emphasis on the evaluation of performance, underpinned by newly developed KPIs. The Committee wished to set more ambitious KPIs in due course, but considered that, at this stage, more manageable KPIs would gain greater traction with Schools and Functions. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor advised that Schools and Functions were beginning to address the KPIs.

The Council found the Report helpful and commended its revised format, but suggested that the Report, rather than being submitted directly to Council, should be given prior consideration by one of Council's committees; the most appropriate committee or, given the range of the Report, committees might be determined in the exercise to map governance across the committees.

The Council noted that the Report included a report on the death of a student. The Council asked the Vice-Chancellor whether, in future, it should be notified immediately of the death of a student or other major incident.

The Council also asked that the Report include consideration of health and safety in all of the University's operations including its farms and its international campuses.

**Resolved:**

“That the Annual Report on Health and Safety, now submitted, be received.”

23/101 Suggested items for future Council meetings (Item 15)

The Council received an update on topics for discussion at future Council meetings. The President invited members to contact her or the Chief Strategy Officer and University Secretary if they wished to suggest further topics.

**Resolved:**

“That a paper on suggested topics for discussion by Council, now submitted, be received.”

**Items for note**

23/102 Minutes (23/64-23/85) of the meeting held on 28 September 2023 (Item 16)

Minutes (23/64-23/85) of the meeting of the Council held on 28 September 2023 were confirmed.

23/103 Matter arising on Minutes of meeting on 3 July 2023 (Item 17)

*Minute 23/55: Report of the Audit Committee—Corporate Risk Register and Annual Risk Management Report*

The Corporate Risk Register and Annual Risk Management Report had been received at the Council meeting on 3 July 2023, but subsequently, on the advice of Internal Audit, it had been decided that Council be asked also to approve the documents.

**Resolved:**

“That the Corporate Risk Register and the Annual Risk Management Report, received by Council on 3 July 2023, be approved.”

23/104 Decisions taken by the President on behalf of the Council (Item 18)

The Council noted that the President had approved the notification to the Office for Students of a reportable event. The notification related to a partner organisation which might no longer be able to support delivery of a University programme, and the consequent arrangements for supporting students to complete their studies.

23/105 Availability of Council papers (Item 19)

The Council received a note on the availability of Council papers.

23/106 Documents sealed and to be sealed (Item 20)

The Council received a list of documents sealed and to be sealed.

**Resolved:**

"That the Council approve the action taken by the Officers and Members in affixing the University Seal to documents sealed since the last Ordinary Meeting of the Council and authorise the Seal of the University to be affixed to the documents to be sealed as now reported."

23/107 Dates of meetings of the Council for the Session 2023/24 (Item 21)

Further meetings of the Council in the Session 2023/24 had been scheduled for:

Tuesday 23 January 2024, 12 noon-5.00 pm

Monday 11 March 2024, 12 noon-5.00 pm

Monday 1 July 2024, 12 noon-5.00 pm.

The President noted that various members would welcome the opportunity to have more extended discussion of some major themes of Council's business. Consideration would therefore be given to scheduling additional meetings or supplementing the formal meetings with less formal discussions.

23/108 Reflections on the meeting (Item 22)

Members reflected in small groups on the business and the nature of the discussions at the meeting.