

<b>Meeting</b>	Council Meeting
<b>Date</b>	21 April 2015
<b>Present</b>	David Balmforth (President) – Chairman Sir John Armitt, Tim Broyd, Keith Clarke, Adrian Coy, Steve Fox, Robert Mair (Vice Presidents), Geoff French (Immediate Past President) Steve Barker, John Beck, Alan Bromage, Richard Burleigh, Mike Chater, Kyle Clough, Jenny Cooke, Richard Dew, Martin Dixon, Richard Fish, Richard Giffen, Bill Grose, Stephen Hague, Alistair Hitchcock, Phil Holmes, Ronnie Hunter, David Johns, C M Lee, Frank Marples, Ed McCann, Emer Murnaghan, Geoff Ogden, Stephen Orr, David Porter, Neil Sandberg, Anusha Shah, Jane Smallman, Ken Smith, Tim Warren
<b>Presenters</b>	Adrian Malone (Group Head of Knowledge Management and Collaboration, Atkins), Simon Swaby (Site Agent, Balfour Beatty), Paul Westbury (Group Technical Director, Laing O'Rourke), Debbie Carlton (Director, Dynamic Knowledge), Mike Dilke (Director, Relaxback), Observers - Mark Hansford (Editor NCE), Kate Ison (Media Relations Manager), Philippa Jefferis, Michelle Roche (President's Apprentices)
<b>Apologies</b>	Zara Lamont (Vice President), Steve Balliston, Claire Gott, Laura Graham, Peter Hallsworth, Jeni Nelson, Gareth Walker
<b>Secretariat</b>	Nick Baveystock (Director General and Secretary), Sandy Pfeifer, (Group Finance Director), Chris Gibson (Executive Director Knowledge and Managing Director TTL) Nathan Baker (Director Engineering Knowledge), Andrew Crudgington (Director External Affairs and Strategy), David Tullett (Group Head of Human Resources), Steve Feeley (Director of Membership Recruitment), Wendy Blundell (Director of UK Regions), John Laverty (Head of Education & Inspiration), Pat Marsh (Governance Manager and Council Officer), James Taylor (Council Administration Executive)

## 11597 Welcome

- 1 The President welcomed Council members, presenters and observers. The President then asked members to declare any conflicts of interest they had over any of the item(s) on the agenda. He noted that there were no declarations.
- 2 The President noted that this was the second of the new format Council meetings. He reminded members that, at ASM14, Council had been of the view that their role was to focus on the strategic, rather than the tactical and operational, with Executive Board doing more to manage day to day business. With this in mind, the discussion session had deliberately been moved forward as Executive Board felt that using Council to discuss serious strategic issues was important and they should not feel constrained by time when doing so. The meeting would therefore be in three sections. The first section would be the strategic discussion element on making knowledge relevant, with presentations from three of the guests before syndicate discussion. The second section would be a confidential section in which the Director General would present his report and update the Council on progress against BP15 objectives. The third section would be open, covering more routine Council business: Council would be asked to select the 2015/16 Vice Presidents; hear a presentation on the ICE's Future Cities work; take a decision on the future of the ICE Flat; and receive a report on Broadening Membership. One item of Any Other Business had been raised by Frank Marples, who had requested that the Assessing Competence to Practice Civil Engineering: the Educational Base paper C/25/2015 was brought forward

to Part 1.

#### 11598 Resolution of Condolence

- 1 The Council AGREED a resolution of condolence proposed by the President in respect of the death of a former Vice President

**Harry Leslie Yeadon BSc FEng FICE**  
**1922-2015**

#### Expert Business

#### 11599 Relevance: Making Knowledge Relevant

- 1 The President advised that the discussion should debate the needs of the outside world, rather than the internal mechanics of the ICE. This was about making us relevant in the modern world and how ICE can help people to deliver more in the workplace and have a more rewarding career. Groups needed to focus upon the needs of the guest (or, in the case of the ICE focused table, the ICE itself) and answer the questions posed from the perspective of their guest. A timeline of the actions required needed to be challenging and resources also needed to be identified.
- 2 The Director Engineering Knowledge gave a presentation, a copy of which is attached at **Appendix B**, in which he highlighted the four questions to be addressed in the group discussions:
  - What does the ICE want to be? (How will we be relevant to practitioners?)
  - Who are we targeting?
  - What are the boundaries?
  - What are the three key areas ICE need to work on, identifying issues, risks and mitigations?

Adrian Malone gave a presentation which focussed on organisational knowledge needs. He highlighted that, with technology having an increasingly social dimension, ICE should facilitate greater collaboration using virtual tools to ensure that a broader and deeper but time-sensitive research function was available to its members.

Council then received a presentation from Simon Swaby, a copy of which is at **Appendix C**. He focussed on knowledge needs from a graduate and student perspective, explaining his engagement with learning in terms of employers' and employees' expectations, knowledge and support (inside and outside of work) and how that knowledge was presented.

Finally, Paul Westbury gave a presentation which focussed on employer and business needs. He suggested that engineers after becoming chartered could be classified as either 'I-shaped' people – deep specialists who know everything in a topic or 'T-shaped' people – who have some specialism which grounded them and made them legitimate and credible but they have also have much broader experience – the reality was the world needed both. He noted that the ICE did not deliver for him 'T-shaped' people that he desperately needed. The ICE was a leading global player with global gravitas and the challenge was how ICE can use its strength and influence to integrate engineering to lay the foundations for the next generation of leaders.

- 3 Following syndicate discussions and brief feedback, the President thanked the presenters and noted that the Executive Board would use the outputs from the discussions to inform ICE delivery.

**CONFIDENTIAL ITEM IN CAMERA** (minuted separately)**11600 Director General's Report**

- 1 A confidential minute is attached.

**Part 1 – Items for discussion****11601 Minutes**

- 1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2014 were approved.

**11602 Matters Arising**

- 1 All matters were on the agenda or ongoing.

**11603 Election of Vice Presidents 2015/2016**

- 1 The President presented paper C/16/2015. It was noted that, at its meeting on 9 December 2014, Council had elected Sir John Armitt as President for the 2015/2016 session. The Selection Panel had met on 24 February 2015; the two Council members who attended the meeting were: Bill Grose and Emer Murnaghan. Emer Murnaghan reported that a series of meetings had been held and the discussions had been open, honest, frank and challenging. She confirmed that the selection process had been carried out in a transparent and accountable manner and congratulated the President on a very good procedure and outcome.
- 2 The Council, with one abstention (Frank Marples):
  - a) ELECTED Professor Timothy William Broyd, Professor Robert Mair, Keith Edward Frank Clarke, Adrian Charles Coy, Stephen Charles Fox and Zara Yvonne Lamont to continue as Vice Presidents for the 2015/2016 session;
  - b) AGREED, as required in By-Law 59, that based on seniority Timothy William Broyd should be President in 2016/17, subject to annual re-election by Council;
  - c) ELECTED Andrew Wyllie as succeeding Vice President from November 2015, to be President in 2018/19 subject to annual re-election by Council.

**11604 Shaping the World Cities Programme and Congress**

- 1 The Vice President Learned Society presented paper C/17/2015, proposing a Shaping the World Cities programme which would leverage previous work done by the ICE on resilience, sustainability and decarbonisation. The proposed work was timely: more than \$30trillion dollars had now been allocated for investment in urban infrastructure worldwide, with more than 200 conferences taking place annually on development of cities. With the advent of more than 60% of the world's population living in urban environments, the risk of not innovating was actually greater than maintaining the status quo – business as usual compounded the problems that were faced. At present there was not a progressive standard applied to addressing climate change events, a fact which has been recognised by the insurance industry, leading to current risk profiles no longer applying. Any real infrastructure work must now be about designing progressive systems which were organic, rather than discrete projects that result in a city being built – there was a need to change the question, adapting to climate change and mitigating its effects rather than building again what had been built previously.

In terms of wider engagement, dialogue with the World Bank had established that funders had huge amounts of money available to mitigate climate change. The Met Office was keen to be involved – it could provide the most reliable data, but had previously been unsuccessful in its attempts to communicate ideas to a wider audience, which is where the ICE, as a driver of infrastructure systems,

could assist.

If ICE wanted to shape the world, it should focus on 1% of the world's population. More work was being conducted on mega cities than elsewhere, whilst it was the case that medium sized cities had under developed management structures but were building at a rate greater than any other urban environments. It was possible to cluster such cities with similar characteristics, as all would need to be more carbon efficient over the next ten years. The proposal of a four year programme would give the mayors that were to be targeted a value proposition that would signpost access to funding, promote use of local design supply chains and encourage investment in a different kind of city infrastructure systems. The proposed activity would fulfil the core business of Shaping the World, as well as promulgating the Institution's charitable objects – it would as a result also be attractive to potential members who would expect ICE to take a lead in this area.

Whilst there would always be the risk that nobody would attend the congress, the real risk was that the Institution failed to hold its nerve having agreed to take the programme forward. The discussions that would stem from the programme would happen in any event, regardless of whether ICE was involved – this was an opportunity to drive the agenda forward and demonstrate real thought leadership. The President agreed that the project was not without risk, nor could it be – the challenge was to find a way to mitigate that risk effectively.

- 2 Tim Warren believed this to be a pertinent piece of work, but sought assurance that the references made to carbon reduction, the 200 city mayors and the potential involvement of the World Bank and other funders in the programme were all interrelated – that the funding would be forthcoming. VP Learned Society responded that the cities that were to be targeted were currently being identified, based on United Nations data, but it was an extremely complex process. Funding needed to be taken seriously – it was clear that the money was available, but the offering that was made must be demonstrably “easy” to deliver, rather than merely being the “correct” action to take.
- 3 John Beck saw Shaping the World as an opportunity for ICE, as it related to a lot of what the Institution was about and would offer a platform to show real leadership, given our credibility with UK government and internationally. The disparity in infrastructure spending between London and the South East and the rest of England demonstrated that greater interconnectivity was required, both in this country and around the world, to counteract the risk-adverse nature of governments. He concluded that the risks inherent in taking the programme forward were worth taking.
- 4 Anusha Shah agreed that this was an excellent initiative and that the research that had already been carried out was laudable, but asked how the next steps would be taken, particularly those in relation to fundraising. Richard Dew added that he was concerned about a potential £3m risk to the Institution if funding did not materialise, given the recent hard work that had taken place to return reserves levels to their target figure. VP Learned Society stated that the risk would never be more than a figure of £300k at any particular point, because of the way in which fundraising would be taken forward, resembling the way that a ‘start up’ company was begun, with an idea being formed and systems then being developed to make it happen. Some funds had already been raised without any concerted effort; one risk would be related to booking venues, which could be in the region of £1m. The Director General added that a sensible contingency plan must be in place should product development not meet the

C/31/2015

timings for booking a congress venue and that the Executive Board should oversee the programme on behalf of Council. The President added that the governance of the programme by the Shaping the World Programme Board was contained within the recommendations in the paper being considered today.

- 5 VP Learned Society noted that programme development benefits would be useful to the Institution as a learned society even if the project was not taken to its conclusion. The programme would be structured to ensure benefits were realised all the way through the four year timescale. The President agreed, noting that the programme's usable tools and standards that would be developed were considerable benefits in addition to the Congress event planned for late 2016.
- 6 Jenny Cooke requested that the programme addressed all social parts of infrastructure, as well as the technical – why people use transport in the way that they do and how to manage down water usage, for example. VP Learned Society responded that social inclusion was material for governments, but that this programme would be neutral on issues such as price structures. However, mapping interfaces between systems such as transport and local health services, whilst not providing answers, would signpost those at a local level towards potential solutions.
- 7 Alistair Hitchcock stated that he was in no doubt that this was something that the Institution should be doing. He requested further clarification on what funding was already available, how it was to be allocated in terms of this programme but also other proposed activities, and also how this would act as a driver for further fundraising. The Director General reported that £1.1m was in the fund, with £350k already committed to do the work required on the Lower Library to transform it into a proper exhibition space. Other funding was being brought in; leveraging of the fund had been conducted very successfully by VP Learned Society for the initial work that had taken place.
- 8 Stephen Hague asked whether there was merit in mitigating the risk by doing the work in two tranches, with around 100 cities being identified for each tranche. VP Learned Society explained that the figure of 200 cities was decided upon as one that would attract interest at a United Nations level – 100 cities or less it would not be such an exciting proposition. The greater the ambition, the more credibility that the programme would attract. Other risk mitigation activity included attempting to find other events which Shaping the World would complement – ICE's attendance at the upcoming Beijing conference had been occasioned because of this current engagement.
- 9 CM Lee queried the uniqueness of the offering that the Shaping the World programme presented, given that summits such as the one later in 2015 in Paris and elsewhere on similar topics were also planned. VP Learned Society responded that the uniqueness was that this approach would begin with an examination of infrastructure systems and work up, rather than looking at city profiles and working down – our research had established that work being done elsewhere was focused on city models.
- 10 Steve Barker believed that the analogy of this work and the way to handle the inception of a 'start up' company was exactly the right approach – a robust implementation plan, with clear milestones which could adapt to changing circumstances, was vital. A full business case needed to be made.
- 11 Jane Smallman asked whether ICE would step in to fund the programme in the event that fundraising was unsuccessful, or whether it would be handled in a different way. Keith Clarke replied that, if we were not able to attract interest from investment banks, management consultants, the UN and similar

C/31/2015

organisations, then we will have misjudged current thinking and it would not be worthwhile continuing. However, if a decision was made not to proceed, interesting definitions of “infrastructure” and “interfaces” were products that could be used in future initiatives. The President reiterated that one of the decisions to be made at this meeting was to delegate to the Executive Board management of the decision of whether to proceed through the lifetime of the project.

- 12 Neil Sandberg stated that he would be surprised if similar conversations were not taking place in other countries and so this work needed to be collaborative with those other initiatives – not least in order that we can gain access to their activity. VP Learned Society reported that, in terms of international interest, United States institutions were behind on current thinking, Middle Eastern governments had expressed interest and China even more so because of their climate change challenges. Within the UK, a number of organisations: the Met Office, the British Standards Institution and various universities were keen to be involved; financial, insurance and actuarial institutions had also shown interest.
- 13 The Council, with one abstention (Frank Marples):
- (i) APPROVED the programme;
  - (ii) DELEGATED authority to manage the programme to the Shaping the World Board, with progress against milestones reported to the Executive Board.

#### 11605 ICE Flat

- 1 The Director General introduced paper C/18/2015, which detailed options for the future use of the ICE flat. He had been asked to examine the issue during 2014 – two papers had now been considered by the Executive Board on the matter. The flat had recently been valued at approximately £1.2m, which represented a significant capital asset to the Institution. The flat was used on average only about 50 nights per year, with the management fee and associated costs on the flat running to more than £12k annually. He noted that if the money that had been spent buying the flat had been put into an investment portfolio ICE would have made 11.6% as opposed to the 9.6% made in the appreciation of the asset. Based on a start figure of £1.3m (initial valuation last year) over the next 10 years ICE would retain the following cash sums:

Option 1 – Sell or rent flat and use hotel accommodation : £1.28m

Option 2 – Sell flat and rent/lease back: £1.04m

Option 3 – Sell flat and create alternative in OGGs: £1.07m

Option 4 – Retain flat with existing use: nil

Finally, the Director General reported that the IET had sold their flat for the same reasons articulated in the paper and the IMechE had created alternative accommodation in their building. He stressed that it would be important that the sale was made at the right time, to maximise the return.

- 2 Richard Dew asked whether Capital Gains Tax (CGT) would be payable on such a disbursal. The Group Finance Director confirmed that CGT would not be payable, because of the Institution’s charitable status. Frank Marples asked whether, with property prices in London rising at current rates, whether a rental to a third party resulting in a 3% yield was a preferable option, as it would provide a significant income stream. The Director General reported that the Executive Board had considered this option and had questioned whether tying up more than £1m in property in this way was appropriate, given the Institution’s charitable status. The Group Finance Director added that the

C/31/2015

Institution's Investment Panel might also take the view that the property was a surplus asset and that placing such a large investment in one asset class might not be appropriate.

- 3 With two abstentions, Council APPROVED the sale of the ICE flat and AGREED the funds generated should be put into the ICE's unrestricted funds.

### 11606 Broadening Membership

- 1 The Vice President Membership presented paper C/19/2015 which summarised progress on the 'Broadening Membership' strategy. He stressed that the paper was concerned with broadening membership rather than decoupling, as in the future the Institution might create additional grades for people working in the built environment who were not eligible to become chartered civil engineers. The paper stated that "ICE's role in identifying who is competent to practice civil engineering can be complementary to its ambition to build a broader community of built environment professionals" which he felt encapsulated this point well.

In terms of the programme of work, information gathering was taking place using external consultants who were talking to potential future ICE members and a number of workshop sessions had also been conducted, the results of which would inform a paper to Council in July. Future business planning work in this area would seek to lessen a 'silo' mentality within the Institution, seeking to join up knowledge and professionalism. Stakeholder engagement was key – identifying the right people to contact, nationally and internationally and ensuring that the benefits of membership were communicated effectively. Some of the work might lead to changes to governance structures such as the creation of chapters in order to create a community of built environment professionals. It was assumed that definitions such as 'Civil Engineer' adopted by Council in 2007 would remain unchanged.

- 2 Jenny Cooke asked what a chapter structure might look like. VP Membership explained that the current arrangements for expert panels and associated societies were not attractive to outsiders. He gave the example of medical royal colleges, which have gravitas and are well respected – becoming chair of the ICE chapter on Asset Management (for example) may be an attractive proposition. He noted that changes in current organisational structures would be required to accommodate this shift.
- 3 CM Lee asked about stakeholder engagement more broadly, with current members and in particular with those who were overseas. VP Membership agreed that there was a need to engage with current members as well as those who might join in the future and chiefly in areas such as Hong Kong, where the value ascribed to membership was particularly high – the pace of change in terms of information production was such that it was now necessary to consider what ICE should look like in twenty years' time as well as the current situation.
- 4 Frank Marples asked for further clarification on what "decoupling" meant. VP Membership explained that ICE had a membership body function as well as a standards setting role. The question to be considered was about how to attract those from allied professions and how they would be categorised in terms of membership grades. Previous attempts to address the point had not been successful – for example, the 'companion' grade had not attracted a great deal of interest since its introduction.
- 5 Frank Marples also asked how consideration of widening membership and/or the introduction of corporate members was reconciled with the Institution's charitable status. The Group Finance Director confirmed that the charitable objects of the ICE, as articulated in the Royal Charter, would encompass

C/31/2015

such additions without the need for any amendment. The Director General added that other professional engineering institutions had already created different forms of corporate membership.

- 6 John Beck stated that built environment employees joined the Institution that was most relevant to them and so the balance needed was to ensure that allied professionals were not dissuaded from joining because of ICE not accommodating different paths to membership, whilst still safeguarding the standards over which the Institution had stewardship.
- 7 Tim Warren said that there was a need to articulate the value offer to potential members. VP Membership agreed, reiterating that prospective members were currently being asked what they would find of value; value proposition work was also being done as part of ongoing business planning.
- 8 Council NOTED progress and that a paper containing more detailed proposals would be brought to the Council meeting in July when the results from the research programme had been received.

#### 11607 Any Other Business

- 1 **Assessing Competence to Practice Civil Engineering: the Educational Base** – at the request of Frank Marples, paper C/25/2015 was brought forward from Part 2.
- 2 VP Membership reported that this question had been considered for some time. Frank Marples had brought a paper to Council in April 2014, since when his concerns had been explored with engagement with the Engineering Council (EC) together with an in-depth review of ICE's processes.

Council was regularly asked to take a 'helicopter' view of the way the Institution was operating, which included the question of broadening membership. Looking beyond the qualification role of ICE, having a learned society and public voice role in the business plan benefited the rich community of civil engineers. The majority of members came through the traditional route of having a civil engineering degree and a civil engineering qualification; others came in with a different kind of degree and thus took a different path, including the Technical Report route, with assessment of different qualifications to see if they met ICE requirements. Those standards were the same for everyone; they were largely determined by the Engineering Council, with whom ICE is compliant in terms of its processes. There were three stages to Professional Review: attainment of academic qualifications, followed by a period of work-based training and then a Professional Review by the candidate's peers which examined a number of competences and attributes such as independent judgement, management and leadership, engineering knowledge and its application, knowledge of health and safety and communication.

Civil engineering qualifications approved by the JBM were assessed at the Professional Review stage, without differentiation according to their level, the awarding institution, or whether a candidate needed further training following an initial unsuccessful application. The method of judging someone coming into civil engineering from a different academic background but with excellent work-based training was through an individual assessment by the Academic Qualifications Panel (AQP), which was made up principally of civil engineering lecturers from JBM-accredited universities, who arguably could be said to have a vested interest in making sure candidates met the same academic criteria as current students. A set of guidance notes assisted in that process and two assessors considered every application – if there was any disagreement between the assessors, it was referred to a full meeting of the panel. Applicants who took this route studied hard to demonstrate their competence – if the AQP

C/31/2015

determined that they had fallen short, further study was recommended. A process change would make it more difficult for people who were really making a contribution, as well as devaluing the qualifications of those who had already successfully taken this route and were performing with high levels of achievement in the industry.

VP Membership concluded by reporting that the EC's interim review panel, on a recent visit to the Institution, had identified five strengths, one of which was AQP processes for cognate degree holders. This good practice had been taken away for dissemination to other institutions.

- 3 Frank Marples believed that, as experienced engineers, Council would know that compliance with procedure did not necessarily mean compliance with the specification. He had sat on AQP for three years and come to the conclusion that it was not operating in accordance with the requirements. He agreed with VP Membership that during the visits from the EC they had indicated that the process in place was a good idea, in particular the decision matrix, however, they hadn't audited the decision matrix against the specification i.e. UKSPEC – in other words, they may have audited the process, but they did not check the process against that specification.

Frank Marples went on to say that Section C of the paper indicated a loss of income from treating all applicants equally and section D indicated that, on the grounds of gender and ethnicity, we should use different standards for holders of cognate degrees. In his opinion, it was a case of being more concerned about increased subscription revenue than quality of candidates. He had written to the EC's Chief Executive, as well as the former ICE Director Membership and Vice President Membership, referencing the handout notes he had provided to Council at the meeting. Not one of those correspondents had been able to rebut any of the points that he had made in the notes.

Frank Marples stated that the UKSPEC in relation to Education said that "Knowledge and understanding are important components of professional competence" and also that "the following qualifications exemplify the required knowledge and understanding for Chartered Engineers" – it then listed the two qualifications. The EC Registration Code of Practice said that "an applicant without the exemplifying academic qualifications must demonstrate the same level of underpinning knowledge and understanding as that set by the standard for applicants with exemplifying qualifications." Taking the definition of 'knowledge and understanding' from the Accreditation of Higher Education Programmes (AHEP), we see they must have "essential facts, concepts, theories and principles of their engineering discipline, and its underpinning science and mathematics" within that knowledge. There was also the option of the Technical Report Route (TRR), which paper presented here for approval implied was somewhat easier. It said in clause 40 that the TRR "shall demonstrate that they have the engineering or ICT knowledge and understanding necessary to underpin the UKSPEC...competences for the category of registration sought, to the same level as their peers who have followed the exemplifying academic pathways". Looking at the specific clause in UKSPEC where it stated "the same level of knowledge and understanding"; the definition from AHEP of knowledge and understanding as a general learning outcome said that the level was defined as 'Masters Level'; knowledge was further defined as "information that can be recalled", with understanding defined, as discussed earlier, as "the capacity to use concepts creatively...in problem solving, in design, in explanations..." That translated the UKSPEC requirements as shown in the next paragraph of the notes provided today.

Frank Marples suggested that this indicated that everyone who aspired to become a chartered civil engineer should have in their education base the knowledge and understanding and the same engineering principles as those who had an accredited degree. He asked Council to reject the paper and, in so doing, reiterate the commitment they made 12 months ago in agreeing with the paper he submitted at that meeting.

- 4 Stephen Hague reported that he had been requested to draw Council's attention to a situation whereby two students with cognate degrees had been assessed by the AQP and had been told they needed to carry out further study to meet the required standard. He was therefore not entirely sure that Frank Marples' view was current, whatever it might have been when he was a member of the AQP. The problem for the two students was not that they needed to top up their knowledge – it was more a question of where to source their top up knowledge. It had been suggested that one way for the ICE to assist would be to work with organisations such as the Open University, to introduce a modular top up course, which would meet the academic requirements through distance learning. VP Membership agreed the suggestion was a good example of where elements of ICE work could be pieced together to enhance the knowledge offer put forward, linking such courses with AQP's requirements. The points demonstrated that the considerable work young people put into this route to meet the requirements of membership – to demonstrate the same level of understanding as was expected of everyone. The Director General agreed that it was a great idea, which would be picked up by the Director Engineering Knowledge as part of ICE's whole lifelong learning package.
- 5 Alan Bromage stated that he was all for broadening the membership. He hoped that anyone who put themselves forward for membership with a cognate degree had some experience that made it relevant. He was however concerned that some people did not have relevant experience and was not convinced that ICE had a uniformity of approach – more clarity was needed to ensure that candidates did have the experience to back up their qualification, and that nobody achieved membership without it. The gold standard must be preserved. VP Membership responded that it had to be taken as read – one thing that had not been picked out in earlier debates on this topic was to remind members unfamiliar with the routes to membership what the process was. Every applicant's academic qualifications were looked at to ensure that they were compliant – if there was any doubt, they were referred to AQP. That might include an overseas applicant who had not taken a JBM accredited course or was not subject to a mutual exemption agreement; it might also include cognate degree holders with a science-based degree that was not civil engineering. All such cases need to be looked at individually. AQP does not only examine qualifications – it looks at courses the applicant has studied, the topics covered in each year of their degree and the level achieved in each year, before reaching a conclusion on what that contributes towards achieving that level of required academic knowledge. If gaps were identified, other learning such as company training and management qualifications, for example, were considered as part of the whole picture. That was what the EC sought, as the basis of ICE's registration with them, which was periodically reviewed by them and also closely monitored in-house by an audit panel. Having scrutinised the process over the last 18 months, he was quite satisfied that the right processes were applied in dealing with cognate degrees, as part of the general picture.
- 6 Frank Marples stated that, when he had been a member of AQP, using the same decision matrix, holders of UK non-accredited degrees had been required to complete three papers, in geotechnics, hydraulics and structures. One candidate had a BSc in Food Science and an MSc in Environmental

Engineering – they were not required to do anything further, which was, in his view, not equitable.

- 7 Council AGREED (with three votes against and one abstention) that the current academic assessment framework was fit for purpose and met the guiding principles of the Institution's Royal Charter.

**11608 Date of next meeting**

- 1 Tuesday 21 July 2015 at 13.30 at ICE.

**Part 2 – Items for clearance without discussion**

**11609 2014 Annual Report & Accounts (C/20/2015)**

- 1 The Council APPROVED the 2014 Annual Report and Accounts.

**11610 Investment Panel Annual Report (C/21/2015)**

- 1 The Council NOTED the Investment Panel Annual Report for 2014.

**11611 Audit Committee Report to Council (C/22/2015)**

- 1 The Council NOTED the annual report from the Audit Committee.

**11612 Membership Subscriptions and Fees 2016 (C/23/2015)**

- 1 The Council NOTED the proposed programme of work on membership pricing and APPROVED the proposals for fees and subscriptions.

**11613 2016 Programme of Works OGS (C/24/2015)**

- 1 The Council NOTED the proposed programme of major expenditure on OGS in 2016.

**11614 Demographics Discussion – plan of action (C/26/2015)**

- 1 The Council NOTED the plan of action.

**11615 World Federation of Engineering Organisations (WFEO) Panel Chairmanship (C/27/2015)**

- 1 The Council NOTED progress to date.

**11616 Council and Executive Board meetings (C/28/2015)**

- 1 1) The Council AGREED that it should maintain the December 2014 format with meetings in December, April and July and the ASM in October.  
 2) The Council AGREED that BoardPad should be used to implement out of committee approvals.  
 3) The Council AGREED that paper distribution of documents for Council cease and that all dissemination should be done digitally using BoardPad.  
 4) The Council NOTED that the frequency of future Executive Board meetings should remain unchanged.

**11617 New Year's Honours 2015 (C/29/2015)**

- 1 The Council NOTED the names of recipients.

**11618 Election to Council 2015 (C/30/2015)**

- 1 The Council APPROVED the list of candidates and the appointment of the proposed scrutineers.

**Council Meeting 21 April 2015 - Outstanding Action List**

Date	Minute	Subject	Action required	Responsibility	Due date
21 April 2015	11599	Relevance: Making Knowledge Relevant	Part 2 Paper to Council summarising discussions	Director Engineering Knowledge	21 July 2015
21 April 2015	11606	Broadening Membership	Part 1 Paper to Council	VP Membership	21 July 2015