Summary of Business for
Council Effectiveness and Statutes Review
Project Board

Title	**Project manager's report**
Author/ Comments	Emm Johnstone (E) emm.johnstone@rhul.ac.uk
Date	8 February 2013
Status	For information
Document type	Project update
Summary	This paper outlines the progress of the project since the last board meeting, and outlines proposals for the structure of the next phase of work including expanding the scope of the project to consider academic governance. The implications of expanding the scope are considered in a revised programme plan and a revised risk register.
Previous consultation	10 January 2013
Resource implications	Additional time of the project team and of colleagues in other services, chiefly Communications, Academic Registry and the Secretariat
Risk analysis	See attached risk register
Effective date of introduction	Immediate
Recommendation	**The Project Board is asked to APPROVE the increase in project scope**

Council Effective and Statutes Review Project Board
Project manager's report

---

1. Benchmarking
All 16 universities supplied information to our benchmarking survey. The project team have visited the University of Sheffield to explore the process of implementing recommendations from their major effectiveness review of 2010, and plan to visit the University of Exeter to find out more about the operation of the dual assurance model in more detail. The University of Exeter operates no committees outside of full Council; the business traditionally overseen by committees charged with responsibility for finance, audit and compliance, and so on is all conducted through partnership working between members of the SMT with paired lay members. Clearly this is a radically different system of governance and there are many practical questions we feel it is worth seeking answers to, including how HEFCE is satisfied that this constitutes acceptable governance, and how the Council moved from the traditional committee system to the dual assurance system.

Through the benchmarking work it has become apparent that there are 5 universities conducting governance reviews in some depth this year, these being Durham, Exeter, Goldsmiths, Surrey, and Sheffield. The project team proposes to maintain contact with governance teams in each of these institutions through the lifetime of this project, for mutual interest.

While the benchmarking work is complete on the initial questions considered, there is scope to return to each of the participating universities to ask additional questions that arise, such as are observers allowed at meetings, and how recently and deeply has academic governance been reviewed. The project team will continue to use the full network of supportive comparator institutions as the project requires.

The Project Board is asked to approve the sharing of the benchmarking report, presented in CESPB/13/06, with the participating universities, with the UCU, and with the College more generally. The mechanism by which it might be shared with the College as a whole is treated in CESPB/13/09.

2. Council effectiveness survey
The survey was sent to all members of Council and of the College Executive. 27 responses were received and these have been seen only by Emm Johnstone and Christine Cartwright. Each survey was relabelled with a number to replace the name of the respondent. The survey answers were collated and the comments compared and combined where possible. A full report is presented as CESPB/13/07.

Most responses contained comments which were honest, evidenced, and to the point. In some cases additional points were raised which were not relevant to any of the questions asked in the surveys and these have been passed on to the appropriate teams. Despite the work of anonymising and combining comments, it is probably still possible to identify one member of Council who received extensive attention in the comments given by many respondents. For this reason the Project Board is asked to consider to what extent the comments made, as well as the raw scores, can be shared with Council more widely and in any published report of this exercise. The project team advise that Council may like to see two versions at its next meeting, one for its own information and consideration and the other to approve for publication.

3. Project scope

The Council effectiveness surveys made clear that there is considerable concern around the function of Academic Board and the links between it and Council. There has also been discussion in UCU mailing lists, triggered by the UCU's own governance review looking at our Council and Academic Board, over Academic Board's membership and business. The current terms of reference of Academic Board are out of alignment with the Statute specifying how it should be constituted. For all these reasons it is recommended that the Project Board consider expanding the scope of this review project to encompass academic governance.

In order to manage the work of phase two (Statute reform), it is proposed that four working groups be set up as follows, with a Governance Working Group to coordinate and communicate the work of the streams:

Group	Chair	Secretary	Function
Governance Working Group	Simon Higman	Emm Johnstone	To coordinate the work of the four streams and support the implementation of the priorities as decided by the project board
1. Statutes	Rachel Knight	Christine Cartwright	To prepare drafts of the new Statutes first as principles and then as full Statutes, taking legal advice as necessary
2. HR policies and processes	Katie Normington	Gemma Bailey	To prepare and agree HR policies and processes that cover grievances, disciplinary action, redundancy, etc. in order that these are all in place when Statute 25 is redrafted
3. Academic governance	Anna Sendall	Clare Munton	To consider the areas of responsibility of Academic Board and its schedule of delegations, in order to define the true purpose of Academic Board and thus define its proper size and membership
4. The 1985 Act	Rachel Knight	Hilary Baker (if required)	Will only constitute if required; initial scoping work coordinated by Rachel Knight with legal advice as required

Each of these workstreams will first identify its membership. It is expected, for example, that the Statutes workstream will require at a minimum a nominated person from the UCU, one or more members of academic staff, a member of non-academic staff, a student, and a member of Council (preferably with legal experience).

Each of these workstreams will consider and respond to the relevant contributions received through the consultation process outlined in CESPB/13/09.

Project Board is asked to **consider** the revised programme plan (CESPB/13/05a) and the revised risk register (CESPB/13/05b).

Project Board is asked to **approve** the expansion of project scope to encompass a review of academic governance.