
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), Mr Shayne Te Aika.
Apologies	Mr Malcolm Peterson Scott, Dr John Wood (Chancellor) for lateness, Mr Jeff Field, Registrar and AVC.
In Attendance	Ms Jacqui Lyttle, Acting Registrar and University Council Secretary Dr Hamish Cochrane, DVC (Academic) Dr Andrew Bainbridge-Smith, Head of Academic Services Ms Alex Hanlon, Director, Learning Resources Mr Keith Longden, Chief Financial Officer Ms Raewyn Crowther, University Council Co-ordinator Ms Joanne Noble-Nesbitt, Erskine Programme Manager
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	Professor Nokes' conflict as a result of being an academic member of UC staff, in respect of the item on Faculty/College merger, was noted.
MINUTES	The minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2016 were approved.
MATTERS ARISING	There were no matters arising.
FROM THE CHANCELLOR	Chancellor's Meetings The schedule of meetings was noted. Council Work Plan 2016 An updated copy of the Work Plan was circulated to members and they were reminded that this was a dynamic document. Dr Carr commented that although the plan would change, efforts would be made to make agenda items for the month ahead as accurate as possible. The recent changes were highlighted and it was recommended that an Accommodation Update workshop be prioritised.

Correspondence from Minister Steven Joyce

The Pro-Chancellor reported that a complimentary letter had been received from Minister Steven Joyce. The Chancellor would respond to the letter indicating that an opportunity to meet with the Minister would be requested.

PVC Presentation – College of Education, Health and Human Development

Professor Gail Gillon, PVC Education, Health and Human Development, was welcomed to the meeting and provided Council with an overview of the College's recent successes and the challenges it was currently facing.

Points raised by Professor Gillon included:

- The strong emphasis within the College on preparing students for professions within the Education and Health sectors.
- A key focus was to increase student numbers despite decreasing enrolments into education nationally and an increase in competition from private education providers and polytechnics. Education was an extremely competitive area.
- The College was well positioned to increase its market share of enrolments in health courses.
- Efforts focused on promoting the student experience as well as demonstrating that the content of UC courses met employer needs.
- UC was the only university which could offer teaching at Masters levels across all three areas of teaching disciplines. The programmes were recognised as being exemplary.
- There had been an increase in the number of students enrolling into primary education and steady growth across Health Sciences. Challenges remained in a few areas though such as Early Childhood teaching, the Bachelor of Arts (Education) and Sport and Physical Education as student numbers had not increased. Efforts were being made to readdress the staff to student ratio.
- The College had a strong research strategy and wanted to increase research income. A promising start had been made with the acceptance of eight researchers being named on the Better Start Fund challenge leading the Literacy and Learning strand. An outcome of this would be increased opportunities for PhD's and research assistance.
- The College was the first to participate in an organisational cultural inventory to identify what is the ideal culture for the College. Ideas from a two day workshop with College leaders would be rolled out to staff at a series of staff forums.
- A plan had been developed to assist with the transition from Dovedale to Ilam. Staff would be invited to participate in workshops to promote new ways of working and teaching within the College.

In questioning, Professor Gillon:

- outlined that the College's marketing efforts focused on telling the stories of recent graduates so future students could clearly understand what it was like to study at UC.
- supported the suggestion to directly approach Ngai Tahu and other Māori Tribes for endorsement about the quality of UC's Education and Health Sciences programmes.
- highlighted that although the Government promoted teaching as a profession they were unable to endorse any particular universities.
- noted that growth areas included distance learning students and mature students.

Professor Gillon was thanked for her report.

The meeting was adjourned at 4.24pm on arrival of the Chancellor and resumed at 4.27pm with the Chancellor in the Chair.

FROM THE VICE- CHANCELLOR

Monthly Report

Dr Carr took his report as read and provided an update:

- A UC delegation had recently visited a number of academic institutions in the USA and the UK. The visits had all been positive and had provided an opportunity to pitch outreach programmes and discuss philanthropic support.
- Student recruitment was underway with a continued focus on reaching those whose study was interrupted by the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes.
- There would be limited amounts of accommodation available for Semester Two enrolments. Work was being undertaken to ensure that all new international students would be accommodated.
- The Craigieburn high country lease issue had been settled and the Flockhill tenants had advised they would be withdrawing their appeal to the High Court in favour of taking other approaches to reaching a resolution to the matter.

In discussion it was noted that:

- The University had elected not to submit an individual submission to the Productivity Commission. Consideration would be given to submitting a response to the findings of the Productivity Commission once their report had been issued in September.
- It was noted that some universities had submitted individual submissions in addition to the UNZ submission. The fact UC had not submitted was not perceived to be an issue as the Commission had indicated a willingness to engage and seek input throughout the review process.

Moved

THAT: *The Vice Chancellor's Report be noted.*

Carried

FACULTY/ COLLEGE MERGER PROPOSAL

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

- The proposal, which had been deferred to this meeting to allow further consultation, and management's recommendation to Council that the proposal be approved.
- Advice from Emeritus Professor John Burrows and Dr 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) to 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 their 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 the 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 for 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 listening to the Deans, whether they wished to direct further questions to the PVCs before making its final decision.

Dr Alison Griffith, Associate Dean (Undergraduate) of the Faculty of Arts, Dr Ross James, Dean of the Faculty of Commerce, Dr Julie Mackey, Academic Dean of the Faculty of Education, Professor Conan Fee, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Forestry, Professor Ursula Cheer, Dean of the Faculty of Law and Associate Professor Catherine Moran, Dean of the Faculty of Science were all invited to the table.

Each of the Deans recounted the process followed within their respective Faculty to reach their decision on the proposal. Three Faculties were in support (Education, Commerce and Engineering), while the Law and Arts Faculties were firmly against and the Science Faculty evenly split.

Dr Griffith, Associate Professor Catherine Moran and Professor Ursula Cheer spoke against the proposal on behalf of their Faculties. The reasons provided in opposition to the proposal included:

- Limiting the academic voice
- The proposal was seen as the dissolution of the Faculties rather than a merger with the Colleges
- The position of Dean was threatened

- 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 for 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, the 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 safe-guard.

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 the proposal would be considered.

The Chancellor advised the meeting that were the resolution to be passed, the implementation of the changes would be a 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 was 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 the meeting of FPRC on 17 May 2016.

UCTF Quarterly Report to 31 March 2016

The report showed a satisfactory result had been achieved.

Moved

THAT: Council note the UCTF Quarterly Report to 31 March 2016.

Carried

CAPEX Report to 31 March 2016

The summary report indicated there were no areas of concern. Major projects were not included in the report due to their commercial sensitivity.

Moved

THAT: Council note the CAPEX Quarterly Report to 31 March 2016

Carried

**FROM THE AUDIT AND
RISK COMMITTEE**

The Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee, Mr Peter Ballantyne, presented the items.

Appeals, Discipline and Grievances Report, 2015

The report indicated that complaints were being resolved prior to going through a formal process. The improved processes put in place, which provided for early intervention, clear advice and guidance within a clear informal process have resulted in there being no

appeals taken to the Council Appeals Committee in 2015.

Moved

THAT: Council note the Appeals, Discipline and Grievances 2015 report

Carried

Health and Safety Report

The report for Council noted the responsibilities under the new Health and Safety legislation and provided information on staff and student well-being and contractor performance indicators. Reporting variations between contractors were being addressed.

Moved

THAT: Council note the Health and Safety Report.

Carried

FROM THE ACADEMIC BOARD

Academic Board Report

Dr Hamish Cochrane, DVC (Academic), introduced Professor Matthew Turnbull who had chaired the meeting of the Academic Board on his behalf and invited him to present the report.

Professor Turnbull reported that the meeting of 18 May 2016 had considered two matters: the Faculty/College Merger and the report of the working party on Space Allocation. It had been an interesting meeting to chair and there had been a good exchange of views.

Moved:

That: Council note the Academic Board Report.

Carried

Academic Implications of the Space Allocation Policy

Professor Jack Heinemann, Co-ordinator of the Academic Board Working Party on the Academic Implications of the Space Allocation Policy, was invited to present his report. He advised that the Working Party had worked through the policy noting inconsistency between the underlying guidance and the policy. Space was an important issue as all academic activities needed space regardless of the method of delivery and the policy needed to deliver this.

He noted the significance of the report's appendices in understanding the issues, (these had been made available to members via the Council Sharepoint site).

In discussion it was noted:

- Recommendation 13 indicated that space cost savings be returned to that programme to ensure the desired outcomes were achieved. Alternative methods of delivery would require resourcing.
- How best to inform macro-level decisions
- The need to involve the people who use the space in the decisions.

The Chancellor thanked Professor Heinemann for the report and 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 Vice-Chancellor added his thanks to Professor Heinemann and noted that Learning 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 on Public Excluded Agenda	General Subject Matter	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
6.1	Emeritus Professor nomination	To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	7(a)
6.2	Canterbury Distinguished Professor nomination	To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	7(a)
7.1	Risk Report	To enable the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to members or officers or employees of the University. To avoid prejudice to measures protecting the health or safety of members of the public.	7(f)(i) 7(d)
7.2	GOG Quarterly Scorecard	To enable the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to members or officers or employees of the University.	7(f)(i)
8.1	UC Futures Update	To enable the University to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.	7(h)
8.2	Dovedale ELC Lease to UCSA	To enable the University to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. To enable the University to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).	7(h) 7(i)
8.3	2017 International Fees	To enable the University to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.	7(h)
8.4	2017 Scholarship Budget	To enable the University to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.	7(h)
8.5	Space Utilisation Report	To enable the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to members or officers or employees of the University.	7(f)(i)
8.6	Erskine Review	To maintain legal professional privilege	7(g)
8.7	Student Accommodation Update – Sonoda and CLV Stage 2	To enable the University to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).	7(i)
8.8	Student Enrolment Update	To enable the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to members or officers or employees of the University.	7(f)(i)
8.9	Financial Forecast Report	To enable the University to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.	7(h)

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 3.00pm on Wednesday 29 June 2016.

SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD: _____

DATE: _____