Governance

Unrestricted Minutes

University of Reading

Minutes 25/93 to 25/118

Council

25/93 A meeting of the Council was held at 5.00 pm Tuesday 18 November and 9.00 am Wednesday 18 November 2025 in Carrington 201, Whiteknights Campus.

Present at the meeting:

The President (Mrs Helen Gordon, In the Chair)
The Vice-Presidents (Mr Kevin Corrigan & Mrs Kate Owen)
The Vice-Chancellor (Professor Robert Van de Noort)
The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Professor Parveen Yaqoob)
The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Dr Caroline Baylon)
The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor Elizabeth McCrum)
The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor Dominik Zaum – Wednesday 19 November 2025 only)
Mr Steve Alexander
Mr Shamshad Ali
Mrs Sian Butler
Professor Elena Beleska-Spasova
Professor Richard Frazier
Professor Jon Gibbins
Ms Martina Hudson
Ms Tiam Koravand
Mr John Jack
Mr Jackie Liu
Mr Angus McCallum
Mrs Sue Maple
Mr Peter Milhofer
Mr Paul Milner
Ms Sally Peck (Tuesday 18 November 2025 only)
Mrs Sally Plank
Professor Katja Strohfeldt
Dr Janet Young

In attendance:
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor Peter Miskell)
The Chief Financial Officer (Mr Vin Wijeratne)
The Chief Operating Officer (Laura Clayton)
Ms Tasha Easton, Governance (minute secretary)
Ms Louise Sharman, Director of Governance

The President welcomed Laura Clayton to the meeting as the recently appointed Chief Operating Officer. The Council offered its best wishes to Dr Messer for his retirement and thanked him for his 34 years of service, his dedication to the University, and his input into Council meetings.

It was also noted that this was the last meeting for John Jack and the President thanked him for his service on Council. Council noted that elections had taken place, with Dr Michelle Sancho, Director of Wellbeing Services, elected to the role from January 2026. Council also noted Professor Katja Strohfeldt's term of office was due to end in February 2026. Professor Adrian Bell (Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Research, Henley Business School) would be her successor.

The President thanked colleagues for making arrangements for this meeting. She also thanked the hospitality staff involved in catering for the meeting and Council dinner which was much appreciated. The dinner gave members a chance to socialise and network, and consider the University Strategy.

The Council noted that the meeting was quorate.

25/94 President's opening remarks

The President noted that, given feedback received, she would consider how papers were prepared, in particular how items were ordered and what content should be in the background papers. She welcomed further feedback from members and asked them to contact her outside of the meeting with any suggestions or comments.

ACTION: The President of Council to consider paper preparation, ordering and background papers.

25/95 Vice-Chancellor's opening remarks

The Vice-Chancellor gave an update on several areas, as follows:

Sector context and government

- The White Paper on Post-16 Education and Skills: The government had published its White Paper on Post-16 Education and Skills on the 20 October 2025. It was not a 'typical' White Paper in the sense that this was not presented as a consultation document, rather it was an announcement of the statutory and non-statutory changes the government intended to take in the forthcoming years. The headlines were:
    1. Confirmation that tuition fees would rise with inflation for the next two years, with the intention that thereafter tuition fees would be linked, by statute, to inflation;
    2. Confirmation of the introduction of a new tax, the levy on international student fees. This was hypothecated to fund the (re-)introduction of parental income-contingent maintenance grants in subjects that aligned with the government's priorities;

- An explicit expectation that universities would drive economic growth at the local, regional and/or national level;
- An expectation that universities would 'specialize' in areas of strength and collaborate with each other to gain efficiencies and ensure that there will be sufficient and across-the-board high-level skills at the regional level to support economic growth;
- In terms of research, ensuring that 'Excellence' remained at the heart of the REF 2029 and UKRI grants to fund 80% of full Economic Costing (FEC), without the indication that this would be funded from additional allocations;
- A strengthening of the powers and role of the Office for Students (OfS), especially regarding the financial sustainability of the sector and tackling poor performance, with franchises singled out as an area of deep concern. Universities failing in delivering excellent education might be barred from raising their tuition fees and/or increasing their student numbers;
- The introduction of the Lifelong Learning Entitlement from January 2027, and the need for universities to recognise outcomes at levels 4 (part 1) and 5 (part 2), alongside the current level 6 (degree);
- An expectation that universities and further education providers would be working together to a greater extent than is currently the case.

- At first sight, the White Paper did little to alleviate the current financial challenges (e.g. the increase in tuition fees was netted off by the new levy on international student fees), nor did it offer a major systems reset. However, much would depend on the detail and the will of the government to prioritize reforms in the busy parliamentary timetable.
- The White Paper contained a number of contradictions/inconsistencies/tensions such as: the expectation to drive economic growth whilst specialising in a market economy; the requirements of OfS Condition B3 (continuation and progression) and allowing exit points for the Lifelong Learning Entitlement. Response amongst the sector to the Paper was mixed.
- For research, it was expected that the government would move to a new system where there were fewer, larger grants available and that opportunities would be in directed areas with the government deemed to be most beneficial to fund, rather than open areas of study. Changes around research were likely to be fast moving as there was no change in legislation required.
- The changes for the Russell Group were beneficial from a research point of view, as they would have less competition for large grants. Newer universities with low numbers of international students would find that the increase in tuition fees puts them on a good footing, whilst mid-range universities may have to compete to remain research intensive.

Mr Alexander asked what the impact of the levy would be if it were to come in from next year. The Vice-Chancellor reported that the University would be [redacted, section 43], but that longer term this could be beneficial. However, a future government might raise this levy further, the long-term consequences were unknown. He noted that if an equality impact assessment was undertaken, 96% of the levy would be paid by Black and Asian students.

Mr McCallum asked if the University was right to absorb this levy. He stated that whilst some universities would pass the levy onto their students, other universities would absorb this cost, like Reading. The Vice-Chancellor noted that some institutions granted a significant number of scholarships for international students. The introduction of the levy was currently written as being against the tuition fee before the scholarship was applied, rather than the net income. This might push some universities out of the international market. Mr Milhofer asked if universities could change their scholarships to fee reductions. It was noted that as recruitment for 2026 entry had already begun, it was too late in the cycle to change any marketing.

On the research side, Reading was probably in a favourable position, although thought would be needed as to what its specialisms were and where gaining funding would become more difficult. The University would encourage and facilitate more interdisciplinary research and foster this mindset in its academic staff. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor added that the REF had been paused whilst thought was being given to its shape, and that universities would learn more in January 2026. QR funding might also change as a result. This currently equated to £20M income for the University. There was likely to be a greater requirement to report how QR funding was spent. If it needed to be aligned to areas prioritised by government, this would be a significant change.

Mitigation areas:
The Vice-Chancellor referred to mitigation areas as previously seen by the Council:

- Global Sustainability Leaders Scholarships – [redacted, section 43]. This year scholars had been identified from existing offer holders, but marketing had now been embedded in recruitment campaigns to attract applicants from next year.

3. Learning and Engagement Analytics Project (LEAP) – The project had been delayed but was under development. Attendance monitoring had been delayed by one semester and Learning Analytics by a year. These systems would help to identify students at risk of withdrawing so that the University could offer support at an early stage.

- Savings in Schools – the voluntary redundancy schemes in selected departments had been completed and additional savings allocations were on track

4. Savings in Directorates – the Professional Services Programme was in the early stages and would be taken forward by the new Chief Operating Officer. Lessons would be learned from past projects that had not kept to time and budget to ensure that governance structures were improved.

- Henley – The partnership with Tianjin had been delayed by one year but would be better developed as a result.

- Internationalisation and Global Engagement – The regional hubs were in progress, and the Reading Global Academy (previously ISLI) had been launched.
  Work on the Global Rankings Strategy was in progress.

- It was noted that savings in Directorates was green on the RAG rating, and the President challenged that it should be amber. Ms Owen agreed and the Vice-Chancellor confirmed that he would update this.
- Ms Plank asked about the return that these mitigations areas were going to offer financially. The Chief Financial Officer confirmed that the University was investing £7m over the next 3 years to get a £10m recuring saving for the Professional Services Programme. Overall, the mitigations were due to realise an additional £50m income and £20m savings.

Top 10 strategic projects (non-mitigations)
The Vice-Chancellor presented a slide detailing work on:

- Strategy 2026 onwards
- Portfolio Review Pathway (PRP)
- Loddon Garden Village (LGV) (and TVSP extension) – planning application had been submitted
- ECMWF
- Natural History Museum (NHM)
- Royal Botanic Gardens Kew
- Royal Berkshire Hospital (RBH)
- Agri-Food Futures (AFF)
- Estates and Digital Strategies
- Academic Workload Model

The Vice-Chancellor noted the following in respect of the top 10 strategic projects:

- The systems put in place to ensure the Portfolio Review Pathway was manageable were continuing.
- The LGV planning application had now been submitted and published for public consultation. A letter from the Minister to the Planning Inspectors noted that the project was fully in line with the government's objectives. The overlap between the LGV planning application and the Local Plan Update was significant, although both would need to be approved separately.
- The buildings for ECMWF and NHM were on track, with ECMWF due to be completed at the end of 2025 and NHM at the end of 2027.
- [Redacted, section 43].
- [Redacted, section 43].
- Recruitment for senior positions for Agri-Food Futures Programme was in progress. The research platform/future farm should be considered alongside the Loddon Garden Village disposal. It was noted that, historically, the farm had not been included in the

University's net zero calculations, but the new farm would be expected to contribute to this.

- As previously discussed, the URS project had been paused whilst the University considered alternative funding options. However, it was noted that the University was committed to moving forward with plans for the building and that Chancellors was only a temporary option.
- A draft Academic Workload model would be piloted in Spring 2026.

Mr McCallum reported that a potential site for the hospital at Thames Valley Park had now gone and noted that the press had linked the LGV development to the University. He asked if the University had a watch on companies moving into the area in order to develop strategic partnerships. In addition, he asked about partnerships as part of the University's Strategy and how to build on these. The Vice-Chancellor agreed that key partnerships would be central to the Strategy and key to how the University differentiated itself. He agreed to ensure this was fed back into Strategy discussions.

Dr Young asked about whether, when the Estates Strategy was next reviewed, it could be considered as an Asset Management Strategy. The current Strategy was based on central funding, but the reality was that the University had valuable estate opportunities that might allow it to self-fund some of the estates development. It was agreed that Dr Young would speak to the Director of Estates outside of the meeting.

ACTION: Dr Young to speak to the Director of Estates about developing the University's assets to self-fund some of the estates development.

The President thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his detailed update. The Council welcomed the format of the presentation and encouraged a similar update at the start of each meeting of Council.

25/96 Disclosure of Interests

The Disclosure of Interests was received and noted. Members were asked to pass any updates to the Secretary.

25/97 Refreshing the University Strategy

The Council received a paper and presentation in respect of refreshing the University Strategy.

The paper set out the University Executive Board's (UEB) proposed approach for developing the next University Strategy, building on Council's endorsement of a refreshed strategic framework in November 2024. It outlined a long-term vision to 2040, structured around three strategic delivery phases, and sought Council's support on key decisions to enable the next stage of development.

The Council were reminded of the proposition, agreed in November 2024, that:

- The University would retain the core values of the current 2020–2026 strategy—Community, Excellence, Sustainability, and Engagement—whilst adopting a new aspirational mission
- Top 100 – aiming to become a globally recognised top 100 university by 2040
- [Redacted, section 43].
- The strategy would align investment in student recruitment, experience, academic excellence, and global engagement to support this ambition.

UEB proposed a 15-year strategy segmented into three operational phases:

1. [Redacted, section 43].
2. [Redacted, section 43].
3. [Redacted, section 43].

It was noted that the proposed approach took into account the UK Government's *Post-16 Education and Skills White Paper* (October 2025). The White Paper set out broad intentions of the current government. It had levers to enact some of these intentions more or less immediately, but many others would need legislation and would only be enacted in future years. The White Paper acknowledged the autonomous nature of universities; the University should define its own strategy, being cognisant of the White Paper and its future implementation.

The Council noted the proposed timeline.

Council was asked to discuss three key questions:

1. Strategy to 2040: Is Council content with a long-term strategy extending to 2040, structured in three delivery phases?
2. Definition of Sustainability: Does Council support a focused definition centred on Environmental Sustainability, rather than a broader SDG-based approach?
3. Balanced Rankings Approach: Is Council supportive of a strategy that balances ambitions across Global Rankings, National League Tables, and Global Sustainability Rankings?

The Vice-Chancellor gave an overview of the current thinking around the University Strategy:

- The University had had a poor recruitment round in September 2024 owing to competitive behaviours from higher-tariff institutions dropping entry requirements. In thinking about the new Strategy, it was worth assuming that this pattern of behaviour would continue. The University could either use this opportunity to refresh its thinking or to accept the situation and focus on tackling the deficit by cutting costs. The Vice-Chancellor encouraged Council to use this as an opportunity to rethink the University's ambitions.

- He noted the existing four values embedded in the current Strategy - Community, Excellence, Sustainability and Engagement. It would be worthwhile to retain these values in the new Strategy as they were well recognised amongst staff as shown in the latest results of the staff survey.
- Sustainability would cover both environmental and financial elements; recognising that sometimes there was a need to invest money upfront to meet these goals.
- The Vice-Chancellor referenced the aspiration of being in the top 100 universities, acknowledging that a lot of work remained to outline exactly what this would mean and what would be an appropriate timeframe to work to. [Redacted, section 43]. It was important to note that this would not be the University's specialisation but would be its differentiation.
- The University had invested in the Global Sustainability Leadership Scholarships Programme. More work would be undertaken with further marketing this coming year.

The Vice-Chancellor invited Council to offer its feedback and opinions on the direction of travel. The following questions and comments were raised on the three questions posed:

Being a global university

- The recruitment market was volatile, and it would be desirable to move to a more stable position. Thought would be needed around global dynamics and whether the University wanted to aim for global parity with other universities which were ranked highly internationally. This would require the University to make significant changes over the next few years at pace.

Timeframe

- The timeframe to 2040 was a long period, and Council needed to ensure it was comfortable with having a strategy of this length.
- It was considered a good idea to have a framework that looked this far ahead, although there was concern about remaining flexible to the changing global and national political situation, as well as any new direction that a future governing body might wish to take. Some members of the Council found the 2040 deadline a bold and brave ambition which could be broken down into smaller timeframes which could be delivered over time. Whilst a longer-term ambition was supported, Council was keen that the University move at pace to make changes and keep abreast with the ever-changing environment.
- It was considered that a strategic goal/aim could help galvanise an organisation but that this would need to be broken down into manageable chunks and that a financial plan to go alongside it would need to be considered.
- There was no specific delivery plan for the next 15 years, but the Vice-Chancellor expected Council to want to set KPIs to hold UEB to account. It was noted that KPIs could stifle the ability to switch direction but were good for accountability.

Top 100

- Attaining a position in the top 100 universities was not considered a metric but could be an overarching aim. There should be clear metrics that allowed Council to measure performance against this aim. The main elements measured that contributed to the rankings related to reputation and research impact (global citations). However, both required a long timeline to develop. Further consideration ought to be given about what was required to make the University the destination of choice rather than chasing rankings.
- There was concern that by focusing on rankings the University might not invest enough effort (or appear to) on teaching excellence and student experience. There needed to be a balance with continued investment in sustainability, student experience and satisfaction, student outcomes, graduate prospects, teaching resources, and SSRs.
- It would be useful to understand the analysis that led to 2040 as a date for this target.
- Whilst it was good to have a specific aim, it was important to think about language. Having a goal to be in the top 100 institutions was not a strategy, it was an aim. There was support for a 'north star' ambition as a guiding principle/goal.
- It was suggested that it would be helpful for the University to undertake some scenario planning as part of the Strategy considerations such as: changing demographics and how many would likely go to university, increases in commuter students, the ageing population, politics, and new technology including AI. This could test how the proposed Strategy would fit with these scenarios so that the position could be adjusted if needed in response to these changes. This would ensure the Strategy was resistant to external changes and could potentially even be a driver for change. The focus should be on what could be controlled. It was recognised that there were many external factors outside of the University's control.
- The Council queried how the University could achieve being in the top 100 universities suggesting that being a university of student choice would be better aim as the target of top 100 could be too specific.
- It was suggested that it would be beneficial to change the language to place students at the heart of the Strategy with the aim that being in the top 100 would follow.
- It was queried how the University could remain research intensive and still meet the government aims to be teaching and learning focused.
- League tables were always a measure of success but should not be an objective in and of themselves. Rankings were an outcome to measure success but should not be the underlying ambition. Attaining a good position in league tables should always be a goal of any university. It was noted that as most students still looked at league tables, it was important to think about this alongside what differentiated the University from others.
- It was suggested that having a big goal/aim was helpful, especially in a changing world. As this Strategy was developed, thought would be needed about the ability to change at pace so that there was still flex and agility within the plan.

Sustainability

- The University needed to focus on differentiation not specialisation. Each School would have Sustainability Scholars, as sustainability covered a wide range of subject disciplines. The Scholarships would ensure that students could be successful in whatever career they chose whilst still being sustainable leaders. This would be a USP for the University irrespective of what degree subject was taken.
- It was noted that one other HEI also focused on sustainability, but Reading was better placed. The University was currently 30th in the world for sustainability in the QS Rankings.
- It was acknowledged that the University was a leader in sustainability and it was right for it to be leading in it. Council queried whether sustainability was enough to differentiate the University. There would need to be clear link to the students the University hoped to attract and to the outcomes it hoped to achieve. It was questioned whether being a leader in sustainability was enough for students who currently placed Reading as insurance choice to make it their first choice.
- The Vice-Chancellor noted in the **Shaping sustainable futures: Students, universities and green skills report** that 48% of students reported considering sustainability as a criterion when applying for university. This seemed to reflect that this was increasingly important for universities to respond to.
- The language around sustainability needed further thought, as the idea of saving the planet might not appeal as much as creating a sustainable environment where human existence could align with the biosphere of the planet.
- Council queried how to embed sustainability into every degree programme. It was noted that some Schools and Departments had several relevant modules. [Redacted, section 43].
- [Redacted, section 43].
- It was queried why focus was not on the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and whether the University was diluting its aims by using its own definition. It was noted that it was not expected that all organisations would aim to meet all 17 SDGs, but rather focus on a smaller number to progress. The University was performing well against the SDGs and rankings were based on the top 3 that an organisation performed in, so they were still relevant. The University was well placed to focus on food, agriculture, equity and fairness as particular strengths and the University would continue to build on these key strengths to keep it competitive.
- It was suggested that the Strategy refer more to the University's heritage, in particular how agriculture was at its roots.

Students and employability

- From a student perspective, it was important that students understood how studying their degree could help change the world for the better, and how they could contribute to the community. Students wanted to enact change and make a difference. It was agreed it was worth getting the student perspective on what the value of a degree was and how this was likely to change in the future.

- It was noted that entry level jobs for students were disappearing and gaining relevant distinctive experience was becoming key to students.
- The Strategy should include input on employability and the views of employers; the types of employers that might be available and what types of jobs students were likely to get at the end of their degree. The Strategy could then focus on how it could differentiate students to help them gain jobs they aspired to.
- The Vice-Chancellor noted that he already did a lot of engagement with employers [redacted, section 43].
- There was also a rise in focus on team-based portfolio-based careers and around CPD.
- With the number of 18-year-olds dropping and an aging population, the University might need to consider its target market. The Vice-Chancellor reported that the government had already considered this with its lifelong learning entitlement previously but had not had much success.
- Whilst there were some new job markets available, there was also shrinkage in other fields and less graduate level entry jobs available. It was important to be aware where employment was expanding or shrinking. The scenario planning would help with this.

Other

- If the University was to take a position to aim for a 'North star', thought would be needed about what decisions would need to be made if Schools were not performing and how far the University was prepared to go in response to underperformance.
- Although students were the University's stakeholders, it was important not to forget about staff. To improve rankings and reputation, the research carried out by colleagues was vital. The University needed to attract the best young researchers and support them to develop their careers as well as ensuring retention of the best staff. It was noted that, whilst the University often got fellowships it was not always able to keep them. The steer towards sustainability was a direct result of the impact of Reading's research, and so the academic voice was important in any strategy discussions.

Next steps

- The Vice-Chancellor would come back to Council for further input at its next meeting on 20 January 2026 before undertaking any broader consultation and engagement, although this would be sought from staff, students and externals later in the Spring. For the January 2026 meeting, UEB would present a high-level strategy with a sense of the first phase and potential KPIs. It was important to create the strategy and KPIs concurrently, to ensure that targets were measurable and had appropriate ownership.
- After the engagement period, the Strategy would be firmed up, with an initial draft brought to Senate, Scrutiny and Finance Committee and Council in June 2026. By September 2026, it was expected that a final Strategy with associated KPIs would be put forward for approval, ready to be launched in the Autumn for the upcoming Open Days. UEB would also need to review existing sub-strategies that sat below the main University Strategy to ensure they were appropriate and aligned.

- There was already a lot of work going on as business as usual. The University was considering the types of students it had the impact of technology, the world of work, how the curriculum would need to change in response to AI (being less knowledge based and having a more competency-based education). These areas would sit under the Strategy.

Council commended UEB on the amount of work that had already been done towards developing the Strategy refresh.

Council paused its discussion and the Vice-Chancellor took time to reflect on all the comments received.

The meeting resumed on Wednesday 19th November 2026.

The Vice-Chancellor summarised the points made and suggested changes to the direction of the Strategy as follows:

1 – That the University aim to achieve attributes of a global top 100 Uni by 2040 (the exact date to be determined but around that time)

2 – [Redacted, section 43].

3 – That there be a balanced approach combining Global Rankings, National League Tables and Global Sustainability Rankings underpinning the new University Strategy.

Council was comfortable with this direction and asked that attributes of a top 100 University be defined in some way. Members were keen to be involved in the Strategy setting outside of formal meetings and were happy to input their expertise to help develop the plan further.

The President asked that if members had any further thoughts to feed these back outside of the meeting.

Resolved:

1. That the Council has received and discussed the refresh of the University Strategy having due regard to the presentation to be given at Council

Items for approval

25/98 The Professional Services Programme

Laura Clayton, the Chief Operating Officer, introduced herself to the Council and gave a verbal update on progress with the Professional Services Programme:

Purpose of the Professional Services

- To run the University, assist in student and staff recruitment, and manage the physical and digital estates.

- To help with the University's academic mission to transform itself and respond to the external environment.
- To support each other to change and be more flexible and develop new skills.

Strategy

- It was a volatile period for higher education and financial sustainability was a challenge.
- The development of the Strategy refresh was an opportunity to think about the breadth and depth of cover in the professional services and how these aligned with the Strategy, along with what capabilities were needed amongst staff and students.
- Consideration for the University's change portfolio was needed with 20-30% of what a change portfolio would look like already identified. It would be important to establish some benchmarks amongst professional services.

Role of Chief Operating Officer and the Programme

5. The Chief Operating Officer intended to create a taxonomy to identify what was BAU, what was a locally delivered project, what was a strategic project and what was transformational. Some areas that required development were obvious and there was a need to move forward with these at pace.

- The Chief Operating Officer believed that the benefit realisation for the Programme could be much greater, but that it may need to be over a longer period and require a larger investment. However, there were some benefits that could be realised more quickly.
- There needed to be a change to mindset, behaviour and culture across the whole institution and not just within Professional Services. The University had great strengths but there could be resistance to change. There were occasions when there was not the internal skillset to work with an external supplier, as had been seen recently for some of the digital projects. Thought was needed about how to retain staff knowledge whilst also updating the skills of the workforce.

The Chief Operational Officer would report back in January with a portfolio update and taxonomy, and then move to establishing RAG ratings.

The President thanked the Chief Operating Officer for her update and for the work she had put into this even before her appointment.

Resolved:

1. That the Council has received and noted the verbal update on the progress of the Professional Services Programme given by the new Chief Operating Officer

25/99 The Future of the Greenlands Campus

[Redacted, section 40]

At its meeting on the 25 September 2025 the Council had discussed a proposal in respect of establishing a Programme Board to consider the future of the Greenlands Campus (Minute 25/78). The Council had discussed the matter at some length and had requested that a more detailed proposal and scope be brought forward. The Chief Financial Officer presented to the Council a further paper that sought to address two points: (1) a financial overview of HBS, and also of the Greenlands campus (to prevent the two from being conflated), and (2) the proposed remit of a Programme Board to recommend the future of the Greenlands Campus.

Financial overview

It was noted that a deep dive on the performance of whole of HBS had not been undertaken. Instead, the overview referenced the 2024/25 financial performance and analysed the relative performance by location based on the current reporting convention and cost allocation principles at the University. [Redacted, section 43]. Referencing this position as an initial starting point, it was beneficial to overlay the income and expenditure of key other activities taking place at Greenlands for Campus Commerce, which included hotel, event and conferencing offerings and the site-specific Estate costs as a way to present a meaningful overview of the financial performance for the whole Greenlands site.

[Redacted, section 43].

[Redacted, section 43].

[Redacted, section 43], Council's approval was sought to establish a Programme Board to determine and recommend the best way forward for HBS and the Greenlands site.

Programme Board

It was proposed that the University establish a Programme Board with an appropriate scope and terms of reference to determine the future of the Greenlands site, that aligned to the delivery of a sustainable financial surplus, whilst supporting the Estate Strategy and the HBS Strategy.

It was proposed that the membership of the Programme Board included the necessary breadth of representation from across academic and professional services disciplines, and that those members possess the right skills, experience and knowledge required. The Programme Board would report on a regular basis to the UEB and to the Greenlands Trust Committee. Reporting to include progress against key milestones, key risks and mitigations, performance against budget, and any proposed changes in scope. The agreed project plan would help define the exact frequency of reporting and subsequent updates to Council.

It was proposed that the scope of the Programme Board comprise the following:

1. Govern and oversee a programme of activity to recommend the future of the Greenlands site, that aligns to the delivery of a sustainable financial surplus, whilst supporting the Estate Strategy and the HBS Strategy.
2. Clarify the existing usage of the site and identify the proposed future usage and needs of the campus should the new HBS strategy be implemented.

3. Review the options previously evaluated by the Greenlands Feasibility Group and outline the key reasons for them being considered as viable or otherwise.
4. Provide a detailed Options Appraisal based upon the following options:
    1. [Redacted, section 43].
    2. [Redacted, section 43].
    3. [Redacted, section 43].
    4. [Redacted, section 43].
    5. [Redacted, section 43].
5. Identify non-viable options as early as possible and only develop a few to full proposal.

The President acknowledged the urgency to review the Greenlands site but appreciated the new focus on the site as well as the HBS strategy in the revised paper.

The Vice-Chancellor outlined that the paper offered more detail than previously, and that delivery of Business Education elsewhere still appeared to be a viable option, [redacted, section 43]. The Programme Board would be needed as this was a complex subject and required detailed exploration. The Vice-Chancellor noted that Council was the Trustee of the Greenlands Trust, but he did not think there was a conflict as at this stage no proposals were being recommended, only an exploration into options.

The Chief Financial Officer added that the latest financial information associated with HBS had been included, with the first table outlining the 24-25 income into different components and the second table outlining the estates themes. The Chief Financial Officer had worked with the Dean of HBS to consider areas where there were plans for growth. He noted that there was a significant estate cost and there might be other opportunities to deliver this at less costs with a greater margin.

The President opened discussion up for wider comment and questions:

- Mr McCallum questioned whether all the options needed considering, [redacted, section 43]. The President shared her opinion that it was important to consider all of the options, even if these could be quickly ruled out to demonstrate that the University had been thorough in its consideration.
- Mr Milner welcomed the paper and the outlining of the finances [redacted, section 43]. He added that the revised paper included detail about what was best for HBS and was not just focused on the estate. [Redacted, section 43].
- Mr Milhofer remarked that the financial table was very helpful but highlighted how overheads get moved about and could distort the picture. He agreed that reducing options quite quickly is a good idea. He asked whether it was worth considering if a partner would help with the campus commerce side of the site.

- Professor Gibbins asked whether the Programme Board would benefit from an academic voice. It was noted that the Dean of HBS was involved and would act as a conduit for academics.
- Mr Alexander also welcomed some optionality but was cognisant that HBS was part of a global brand and this included the location of the campus. This needed to be thought about by the Programme Board.
- Ms Plank added that point 1 of the scope should be amended to say "Govern and oversee a programme of activity to recommend the future of the Greenlands site, that aligns to the delivery of a sustainable financial surplus, whilst supporting the Estate Strategy and the HBS Strategy *and the objects of the Trust".*
- The Dean of HBS was supportive and had worked closely with the Chief Financial Officer to input her views. She raised concerns about the size of the proposed Board, noting that where committees were large it could sometimes make it difficult to make decisions. It was also important to make sure that the objectives of the Trust were protected.

The Council approved the establishment of a Greenlands Programme Board with the associated Terms of Reference for the Board, noting that the objects of the Trust must be protected, [redacted, section 43], as part of the options appraisal. In addition, the membership should be reviewed to ensure it was the appropriate size.

The President gave an update on the Greenland Trust Committee. Although a suggestion had be made to draw the Chair from the lay membership of Council, it had been agreed to consider an external Chair. Potential names were being explored, and an interview process would lead to appointment of a suitable candidate.

Resolved:

1. That Council note the Financial Overview of the Greenlands campus.
2. That Council approve the establishment of a Greenlands Programme Board.
3. That Council approve the Terms of Reference for the Programme Board.

25/100 Financial Update

The Chief Financial Officer presented to the Council the 2024/25 Draft Year End Position and the 2025/26 Year to Date Actuals and Q1 Forecast Reporting Timeline.

[Redacted, section 43].

The Chief Financial Officer and the Director of Finance would look at putting appropriate controls and a revised forecasting process in place during 2025/26 to reduce the likelihood of such a material forecast variance situation arising again in the future. This included carrying out some existing annual financial updates more frequently. Further, the 2025/26 Budget would be reviewed in detail as part of the 2025/26 Q1 forecast process which would allow the University to provide a revised 2025/26 Budget baseline factoring in appropriate adjustment for 2024/25 operational variances (Vs Q3 Forecast), as well as reflect the impact by School of the latest 2025/26 student recruitment and continuation figures and the pay award.

For the annual accounts, 2024/25 the income grew to £363.6m, with expenditure of £377.1m, which was broadly in line with the University's position last year. [Redacted, section 43].

[Redacted, section 43].

There had been some prior year adjustments which included a readjustment of the Greenlands Trust which had been moved to a permanent endowment and the reserves for the Research Endowment Trust had been amended so that some of them were restricted. Both of these adjustments had been picked up by the auditors and corrected.

The President thanked the Chief Financial Officer for his update and reported that the briefing to Council members at year end had been appreciated. She opened discussion up for wider comment and questions:

- Mr Ali remarked that it was an excellent paper which explained the situation well.
- Mr Milhofer echoed this and asked if items guaranteed should be in the baseline figure. The Chief Financial Officer was scrutinising the current forecast process to try and put in appropriate processes to ensure greater scrutiny.

Council noted the position for the annual accounts 2024/25.

The Chief Financial Officer outlined the Q1 position, which had been produced much earlier than usual, although there were still elements to address. UEB would be carrying out a deep dive of individual areas as well as a collective position in order to approve the forecast.

It was noted that when Council approved the budget in July 2025, Council had been uncomfortable with the proposed deficit of £33.3m. The review of the forecast outlined that the income aligned with expectations but there might be some opportunity to improve the expenditure position by £5-7m. This would reduce the potential deficit to £26.2-28.3m. The detail behind this still needed to be worked through and a further update would be provided to Council in due course.

The President thanked the Chief Financial Officer and UEB for the work it was doing on this and looked forward to an update in due course.

Resolved:

1. That the Council has received and noted the verbal update by the Chief Financial Officer

25/101 Report of the Senate

Council received the report of the meeting of the Senate held on 19 November 2025.

Council was asked to:

a) Approve the Annual Report for the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers

b) Approve the Annual Report on Harassment and Sexual Misconduct 2024/25

c) Approve amendments to Ordinances A9 (Officers) and B3 (Non-academic Officers) to reflect staffing changes (to change ‘Chief Strategy Officer and University Secretary’ to ‘Chief Operating Officer’)

d) Note that the Senate received the UBTLSE report on Quality Assurance and Standards in Education, and agreed that the report provided assurance on matters of quality and standards in education

e) Note that Senate also received a presentation on AI in Research (Minutes attached as background papers)

Annual Report for the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor reported that the report was submitted to UUK every year and was helpful to understand the position of the doctoral research colleagues. Council approved the annual report for the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers.

Annual Report on Harassment and Sexual Misconduct 2024/25

Mr McCallum noted that 43% of staff did not feel able to report harassment. Even though this aligned with benchmark figures, he found this an uncomfortable figure. It was noted that the report covered a lot on the process of reporting and it would be useful to see more on areas reported and how people felt after an investigation had taken place.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor agreed to provide an analysis of Report and Support to date as granular analysis of this had not yet been carried out, noting that this was only one channel as staff and students have other methods they could use to report.

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the University had started to offer investigation training, to all staff who would be involved in running an investigation. The President asked if the University followed up with staff/students after an investigation to determine how satisfied they were with the resolution of their complaint. It was noted this was not current procedure. However, students did have the option to refer to the Office of Independent Adjudicators (OIA) if they were not happy with the outcome of their complaint.

Ms Hudson noted that it was not always possible to change the culture to encourage students to report, particularly around sexual violence. However, support still needed to be offered, and empathy shown.

Ms Butler noted that although an increase in numbers reporting incidents could seem like a growing concern, it just made the position more transparent. She noted that for harassment and bullying it was quite difficult to move this to a disciplinary process. It was important to think about what outcomes could be put in place to appease staff and offer closure.

Ms Koravand added that there was an issue with people using banter or jokes without realising that this could be construed as bulling or harassment. It was sometimes unclear where the line was between what was and was not acceptable, or how to encourage people to call out unsuitable behaviour.

Professor Gibbins added that academic tutors were often the first point of call for students and needed better training on what was reasonable support to give and how to signpost students to more support if they needed it.

Professor McCrum responded that there were some changes outlined in the paper to address both points. There would be a single source of information, compulsory training for students at enrolment and training targeted at those in key staffing roles.

Professor Frazier asked how these processes impacted staff, not just students. He noted that the staff engagement survey contained data about staff reluctance to report. He asked how those in line management roles could address this.

Council approved the Annual Report on Harassment and Sexual Misconduct 2024/25

Council approved the amendment to Ordinances A9 and B3.

Resolved:

1. That Council approve:

- The Annual Concordat to Support the Career Development of Staff in Research
- The Annual Report on sexual misconduct and harassment
- Minor amendments to Ordinances A9 (Officers) and B3 (Non-academic officers) to reflect staffing changes from 'Chief Strategy Officer and University Secretary' to 'Chief Operating Officer'

AND

2. Note the remainder of the report

25/102 Report of the Appointments Committee

The Council received the report of the Appointments Committee held on 14 October 2025. The Council was asked to approve:

(a) That a third role of Vice-President be established, with effect no later than 1 August 2026. Detail on the process for appointment would be agreed in Spring 2026, following completion of the appraisal process and publication of the CUC Code.

(b) In order to maintain the number of Vice-Presidents at three, a replacement be sought for Kate Owen as Vice-President, starting no later than 1 August 2027, and with a recruitment process commencing by December 2026.

(c) That Steve Alexander be appointed to the Audit Committee with immediate effect to 31 July 2028.

(d) That Professor Parveen Yaqoob appointment as Deputy Vice-Chancellor be extended for one final term to 31 July 2027.

Ms Owen outlined a summary of the discussions but asked that if anyone wanted specific details, they were welcome to contact her directly.

The Appointments Committee had undergone a long discussion about the future of council and had proposed a third Vice President. Lay members were advised to raise this at their annual appraisal if they were interested in this role before a formal recruitment process was launched.

Council approved the appointment of Mr Alexander to Audit Committee.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor recused herself from this item and left the room.

Council agreed to approve the appointment of Professor Parveen Yaqoob as DVC for a further period to 31 July 2027.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor rejoined the meeting.

Resolved:

1. That Council approve the recommendations in respect of:

- The appointment of a third Vice-President role, and the replacement of Kate Owen at the end of her term of office
- the appointment of Steve Alexander to Audit Committee with immediate effect, and
- Professor Parveen Yaqoob as Deputy Vice-Chancellor for a final term to 31 July 2027

25/103 Report of the Audit Committee

The Council received the Annual Report from the Chair of Audit Committee, the Financial Statements, Letters of Support and Representation.

The Chair of the Audit Committee reported that the audit is complete and there was a good working process with external auditors. He noted that the auditor completion memo could be found in the background papers and highlighted it to Council. This contained positive feedback on the control environment and useful information on the sector and the Post-16 Education and Skills White Paper.

He noted that it would be useful for Council members to read the front part of the financial statements as well as the remuneration report. He noted there was a new disclosure of environmental performance and whilst this stated there was 'limited assurance' this result was acceptable.

Mr Corrigan asked for an update on how a governing body should be thinking about fraud and the risks around this. Mr Milhofer was considering this and how it could be worked in future audits. There was an audit carried out on agents used but it did not touch on this point as it was not in scope. It was noted that the University had a responsibility for detecting fraud carried out by its suppliers.

The President thanked Mr Milhofer and the Audit Committee for its annual report, which was helpful and clear. The Council approved the annual report and financial statements, as well as the attached letters.

The Chair of the Audit Committee gave an update to the Council on the appointment of the Internal Auditors. Council was reminded that a review had been undertaken during Summer 2025. This included discussions with the Chair of the Audit Committee and the University's external audit provider, as well as consideration of sector trends and reports. The in-house team were also involved in this review and their views sought and considered. The Audit Committee has been consulted at each stage of the process for their input and support. Working with the Chair of the Audit Committee, the following options were identified and explored:

- Retain a fully internal team – this had been discounted. The University did not have a fully internal model now, given the need to bring in external support for specialist areas including technical/digital. It would not be possible to recruit all these skills to the University, and this reflected some of the University's biggest risks and audit needs. It would also place the University as an outlier, as the majority of institutions no longer had fully internal teams, owing to the changing risk profile and requirements on higher education.
- Place more provision externally. This included exploration of both a fully external and a hybrid model, which could include using HE or other shared services provision.

Over the Summer, working with procurement, market testing had been undertaken as to what service providers would be able to deliver, including whether this would be as a fully outsourced or hybrid model. Whilst providers were able to offer a hybrid model, following review of the responses it was agreed that a fully outsourced model would provide the best assurance, service and value for money for the University. Additionally, the University's approach to risk had significantly matured in recent years, meaning that there was a much clearer understanding of key institutional risks and the extent to which these deviate from the University's agreed risk appetite. This meant that the University would be capable now of working with an external provider who was not as deeply embedded as the internal team to audit known and emerging risk areas.

It was noted that the tender was a closed process to [nine] potential suppliers, agreed with the Chair of the Audit Committee, comprising large, medium and small firms and one University shared service provider. The panel conducting the procurement comprised:

Peter Milhofer, lay member of Council and Chair of the Audit Committee

Steve Alexander, lay member of Council and Chair of Student Experience

Dominik Zaum, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resource)

Vin Wijeratne, Chief Financial Officer

Julie Rowe, Chief Legal Officer and Director of University Corporate Services

Louise Sharman, Director of Governance

Claire Milham, Assistant Director of Procurement

Responses had been received from eight potential providers and the procurement panel met on 22 October 2025 to review and assess responses, looking at both quality submissions and price. The top three scoring potential providers had been invited to an interview with the panel on 11 November 2025. Following interviews the Audit Committee had recommended to the Council that [Redacted, section 43] be appointed.

[Redacted, section 43].

Mr Jacks noted that there was not much of a financial saving and asked if the move was a clear benefit to the University. It was reported that there was flexibility with an outsourced team as the University controlled when it wanted audits conducted across the year. The University could choose to reduce or increase audits at any time, which it was unable to do with a permanent staff. All three firms interviewed referred to where they could add value and challenge how the University might do things better.

Mr Liu enquired if [redacted, section 43] was contracted to any other at the University but was informed that it was not.

The President remarked that the process appeared to have been well handled – the impact on staff had been acknowledged, the change was necessary for the organisation, and she trusted that the matter would be handled sensitively.

[Redacted, section 43].

Council noted the annual report of the Chair of the Audit Committee.

Resolved:

1. That the annual report and financial statements, as well as the attached letters be approved
2. That, the annual report of the Chair of the Audit Committee be noted
3. That, a fully external Internal Audit provider be appointed subject to the proposed provider being notified to Council following the conclusion of the procurement process

25/104 Report of the Scrutiny and Finance Committee

The Council received the Report of the Scrutiny and Finance Committee held on 31 October 2025.

SSL Backlot

The Council was asked to consider a recommendation in respect of disposal of a plot of land. The proposal had been shared with University Executive Board, Scrutiny and Finance Committee, and Investments and Development Committee. It was confirmed that the land was wholly owned by the University.

The request was to recommend to the Council:

- Sale of a long lease over the “Backlot” sites to Shinfield Studios Ltd for a capital premium that was supported by an independent valuation and subject to a peppercorn rent.
- The title to the land be registered to the University of Reading rather than a Trust or wholly owned subsidiary.

It was noted that in August 2023, the Commercial Advisory Group had considered an outline proposal for the acquisition by long lease of Parcel 2 by Shinfield Studios (SSL). The site was important to SSL as it enabled them to carry out open air filming. SSL had long expressed a desire to acquire a long leasehold interest in the site but due to personnel changes on both sides, variable market conditions and the need to secure longer term funding, there had been a delay in reaching a point at which SSL were in a position to transact. SSL currently occupied Parcels 2 and 3 under two coterminous five-year leases expiring in February 2029 at [Redacted, section 43], respectively.

SSL submitted a temporary planning application for "the proposed erection of a temporary Film Studio Backlot" in September 2022, which was approved until April 2026 by the Local Planning Authority subject to the completion of a S.106 agreement. The Planning Statement defined a backlot as "an area behind or adjoining a film studio containing temporary exterior buildings for outdoor scenes suiting temporary set construction in filmmaking or productions."

[Redacted, section 43].

The proposed terms were:

- [Redacted, section 43]
- [Redacted, section 43].
- [Redacted, section 43].
- [Redacted, section 43].
- [Redacted, section 43].
- [Redacted, section 43].

The Chief Financial Officer noted that the University had received independent valuations on the site, and that the premiums were in keeping with market value; [Redacted, section 43].

The Vice-Chancellor added that this deal had been discussed for the last 2 years and the University was keen to move forward with a deal, [Redacted, section 43].

The Chair of Scrutiny and Finance Committee reported that this paper had been seen by the Committee which would give a receipt [redacted, section 43]. The Committee had referred it to Investments and Development Committee so that it could be scrutinised by those with property expertise, but as no challenge had been raised, Scrutiny and Finance Committee was content to approve it.

Mr Milhofer asked for clarity about where the proceeds of the sale would go. This was not an investment asset so it should not be thought of as income but as an improvement to the University's bottom line. It was asked to ensure that disposal proposals were clear about where proceeds of a sale would be directed.

Council approved the disposal of the SSL Backlot.

HRMS Project

In respect of the HRMS Project it was noted that, as agreed at the last meeting of the Council, a subset of Council (the President, the Vice-President (Mr Corrigan), the Chair of the Audit Committee (Mr Milhofer) and an informed member of Council (Mr McCallum)) had met to consider this proposal on behalf of Council and had presented the Chief Information Officer with further questions, which he had addressed. This included a question about what the governance and appropriate controls would be and if there was the relevant expertise on the project committee. The report captured the financial consequences. [Redacted, section 43]. The auditors were comfortable with this approach and the only adjustment to the accounts would relate to HRMS.

The Sub-Group had agreed that the University should remain with Midland (Option 3).

The President reported that the sub-group had agreed to continue with the incumbent supplier to get the upgrade carried out. [Redacted, section 43]. It was noted that there would be a significant lessons learned exercise once the project was successfully completed. The President assured Council that the sub-group would continue to monitor this situation and that a more detailed report would come to Council in due course.

Professor Strohfeldt noted that it highlighted how closely the digital strategy and funding for these programmes needed to be monitored.

The Chair of Scrutiny and Finance Committee added that the minutes had been included in background reading to give a sense of the discussion that had taken place and to attempt to provide Council with a framework of information around the University's finances that was more digestible than the current information. He noted that there was useful information in the TRAC costing report and Scrutiny and Finance Committee was giving thoughts as to the best way to elevate this to Council to better understand the University's position.

Resolved:

1. That Council approve the recommendation for the disposal of the site known as the SSL Backlot
2. That Council note that the proposal in respect of the HRMS project, namely to pursue Option 3 has been agreed by a delegated subset of Council and endorsed by Scrutiny and Finance Committee
3. That Council otherwise note the report.

25/105 Report of the NIRD Trust Committee

The Council received a and approved a Report from the NIRD Trust Committee held on 6 November 2025.

The Council approved the audited accounts of the NIRD Trust and the allocation to the University of a cash settlement.

Resolved:

That Council acting in its capacity as NIRD Trustee:

1. approve the audited accounts of the NIRD Trust; and
2. approve the allocation to the University of a cash settlement of [redacted, section 43] from the NIRD Trust, to reimburse 97% of costs incurred in the year to 31 July 2025 by the University in relation to Loddon Garden Village.

Items for Report

25/106 Report of the Vice-Chancellor

The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that he did not have any information to add to his written report other than highlighting the report on KPIs, which would be the penultimate update on this.

Resolved:

1. That the Report of the Vice-Chancellor, so submitted, be received.

25/107 Report of the Student Experience Committee

The Council received the Report of the Student Experience Committee held on 23 October 2025. The Chair of the Student Experience Committee reported that there had been a good Q&A session on the Global Sustainability Leaders Scholarships and noted that it would be useful for Council to get an update on this at some point. The President of the Students' Union also led a discussion around integration of access and different demographics, including the mindsets of those coming to university. A project on Working Class staff and students had been identified for the centenary, which would include barriers for working class students and what stops them from progression, how to address the mindset and finance challenges they have. It was noted that the younger generation needed strong figureheads and there were conversations with Careers about creating working class networks.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor added that it was not always obvious what working class meant, especially for international students.

Resolved:

1. That the report of the Student Experience Committee, so submitted, be received

25/108 Report of the People and Remuneration Committee

The Council received the Report of the People and Remuneration Committee held on 14 October 2025.

The Chair of the People and Remuneration Committee (Ms Owen) reported that the Committee had reviewed the results of the staff survey and intended to do more work on this at its next meeting. Ms Owen and the President of Council had met with the Unions yesterday to ensure they were engaging at all levels. It was noted that there was excellent work on EDI and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor had made remarkable progress in this area.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, the Chief Strategy Officer and University Secretary, the Chief Financial Officer and the Dean of the Henley Business School left the meeting at this stage whilst remuneration was discussed.

Council agreed to support the remunerations detailed in the report.

The Vice-Chancellor left the room whilst remuneration for his role was discussed.

Council agreed that a pay increase for the Vice-Chancellor was appropriate, and to delegate to the President of Council and the Chair of Remuneration Committee to determine an appropriate increase.

Resolved:

1. That the report of the People and Remuneration Committee, so submitted, be received

25/109 Report of the Investments and Development Committee

The Council received the Report of the Investments and Development Committee held on 2 October 2025.

The Chair of the Investments and Development Committee noted that the overall performance was acceptable although liquidity was a concern. Work around modelling would be essential as there was lots of movement in and out of the portfolio. The Chief Financial Officer was developing a Reserves Policy to use as a framework to help with future developments.

Resolved:

1. That the report of the Investments and Development Committee, so submitted, be received

25/110 Suggested Agenda Items for Council in 2025-26

It was noted that any suggested items for discussion at future Council meetings should be provided to the President of the Council or to the Secretary.

Resolved:

1. ‘That the paper on suggested items for future Council meetings, so submitted, be received.’

Items for note

25/111 Minutes (25/73 - 25/92) of the meeting held on 25 September 2025
Minutes (25/73 – 25/92) of the meeting held on 25 September 2025 were confirmed as a correct record.

25/112 Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda, if any
There were no matters arising.

25/113 Decisions taken by the President on behalf of the Council

The Council noted that there was nothing to report on this occasion.

25/114 Annual Freedom of Speech
Council received the annual freedom of speech report.

Mr McCallum noted that in a paper by Open Democracy, it quoted 43% of academics did not feel that they have academic freedom. He asked how the University could ensure it was not restricting research as academic freedom was a condition of registration. It was reported that academics often impose a level of self-censorship due to concerns around their careers. It was important that the University promoted academic freedom within the bounds of the law and supported its academics.

Resolved:
1. That the Annual Freedom of Speech Report so submitted, be noted

25/115 Documents sealed and to be sealed
The Council received a list of documents sealed and to be sealed.

25/116 Any Other Business
It was noted that there would be a number of events in the following year to celebrate the University's Centenary and Council members were encouraged to attend where possible, in particular Court on 17 March and the Community Festival on 16 May.

25/117 Dates of meetings of the Council in Session 2025-26

The remaining meetings of the Council for the Session 2025-26 had been scheduled for:

- Tuesday 20 January 2026 10.00am
- Monday 9 March 2026 10.00am
- Wednesday 1 July 2026 10.00am

25/118 President to lead on brief reflections on the meeting of Council that has just concluded

Members reflected in small groups on the business and nature of the discussions of the meeting, whether Council had the right information, heard the right voices, and whether the Council did justice to the major issues discussed.