

University of Cambridge

COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on Monday 17 December 2012 at 10.15 am in the Council Room, The Old Schools.

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair); the Master of Christ's, Sir Christopher Hum, the Warden of Robinson College; Professor Abulafia, Professor Donald, Professor Hopper; Dr Bampos, Dr Barnes, Dr Cowley, Mr Dowling, Mr Du Quesnay, Dr Good, Dr Padman; Dr Lawrence, Dame Mavis McDonald (Deputy Chairman), Mr Shakeshaft; Mr Bell, Ms Old, Mr Wakeford; with the Registrary, the Head of the Registrary's Office, the University Draftsman, the Academic Secretary and the Director of Finance; the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs).

Apologies for absence were received from the Master of Fitzwilliam, Professor Gay, Dr Oosthuizen, Mr Casserley.

The Senior and Junior Proctors were present.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that Sir Christopher Hum, Professor Abulafia, Dr Barnes, Mr Dowling, Mr Casserley and Dr Lawrence would come to the end of their term of Council office on 31 December 2012. He thanked them for their effective and constructive participation in the Council's work and their active engagement with its wider activities.

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

PART A: PRELIMINARY, LEGISLATIVE AND STRAIGHTFORWARD BUSINESS

34. Declarations of Interest

Mr Dowling, as a member of the University Computing Service, declared an interest in minute 1488(b) (Data Centre) of the minutes of the Planning and Resources Committee's meeting on 28 November 2012. Dr Cowley, as a University Senior Lecturer on the top point of the pay scale, declared an interest in the matter recorded as minute 44 (Remuneration Committee). Otherwise, no personal or prejudicial interests were declared.

35. Minutes

The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2012 were received and approved.

Action: Personal Assistant to the Head of the Registrary's Office to web

36. Procedure of the Council

(a) Approval of arrangements for the chairing of agenda items

It was proposed that the Vice-Chancellor should chair the meeting with the exception of item C2 for which the Deputy Chairman would take the chair. The Council approved this arrangement.

(b) Business starred as straightforward

The Council approved matters for decision set out in the confirmed starred items.

(c) Council Circulars

The Council noted issue and approval of the following:

Circular	Issue	Approval
26/12	16 November	26 November
27/12	30 November	10 December
28/12	7 December	17 December

37. Vice-Chancellor's Report

(a) Mr Tim Knox, currently the Director of Sir John Soane's Museum in London, had been appointed to the Directorship of the Fitzwilliam Museum with effect from April 2013.

(b) The Duke and Duchess of Cambridge had visited the University on 28 November 2012.

(c) The Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International Strategy) met the Omani Ambassador on 5 December 2012.

(d) There had been a Vice-Chancellor's Circle event at the Fitzwilliam Museum on 5 December 2012.

(e) The Prime Minister had visited the Cancer Research Institute on 10 December 2012 to mark the announcement of a £100m project to map the DNA of patients with cancer and other rare diseases. There had been the opportunity to brief him on the extent and the breadth of the University's work in life sciences. The concentration of scientific and research expertise in Cambridge was significantly further advanced than that proposed for Tech City. It was noted that cancer was one of the University's strategic research themes. There had been a separate meeting with the Minister of State for Universities and Science.

(f) The Vice-Chancellor had addressed the All Party Parliamentary University Group on 11 December 2012. He had highlighted the relationship between Higher Education and business particularly in the context of the recent Wilson Report. He had emphasised the importance of EU research funding

(g) He had also discussed EU research funding during his presentation at the UUK members' group on 14 December 2012.

38. Council, legislative and comparable matters

(a) Council Work Plan 2010-11

The updated Work Plan was received. The Deputy Chair reported on the outcome of the survey which Dr Oosthuizen had conducted to establish the views of Council members about the arrangements for the September Strategic Meeting. By a small majority, respondents had indicated a preference for a residential meeting close to Cambridge. It had been agreed, if the meeting were to be held in Cambridge, that it would not be appropriate, primarily for reasons of cost, to make it residential. It was noted that there were very few local venues with meeting facilities sufficient to accommodate such a large number of attendees. Ickworth was no longer willing to take bookings for conference events of this kind. Further work would be done to explore alternative options. It was possible, however, that the Huntingdon Marriott would emerge again as the most convenient and practical venue.

(b) Business Committee

There had been no meeting of the Business Committee on 10 December 2012

(c) Membership of the Council from 1 January 2013

The following had been elected or re-elected for four years from 1 January 2013:

Class (a) (Heads of House)	Professor I H White, <i>JE</i> Professor A D Yates, <i>R</i>
Class (b) (Professors or Readers)	Professor A M Donald, <i>R</i> Professor F E Karet
Class (c) (other members of the Regent House)	The Revd J L Caddick, <i>EM</i> Dr D A Good, <i>K</i> Dr R J Lingwood, <i>HO</i> Dr R Padman, <i>N</i>

(d) Membership of Council committees and similar bodies, and the General Board, from 1 January 2013

The Advisory Committee on Committee Membership and External Nominations (ACCMEN) had met on 12 December 2012 to undertake the annual review of the membership of Council committees and similar bodies. A paper containing the Advisory Committee's recommendations had been circulated to the Council electronically. The Council approved the recommendations.

In the course of discussion, it was suggested that ACCMEN should consider reviewing the balance, on certain committees, between the various different categories of Council membership in order to ensure proper representation.

Action: Secretary to ACCMEN

39. General Board

The minutes of the General Board's meeting on 31 October 2012 were received.

PART B: MAIN BUSINESS

40. Finance, Planning and Resources (a) Planning and Resources

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Resources Committee held on 28 November 2012 were received. The Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported. Attention was particularly drawn to the following minutes:

1483: Medical Research Council (MRC) Unit integration

Heads of Terms had been agreed for the proposed integration of the MRC's Epidemiology Unit and the Cambridge Research Institute into the University's School of Clinical Medicine. The transfers could be achieved either cost neutrally or to the University's financial benefit. Significant assets would transfer and the University's REF position would be strengthened. The risks had been carefully calculated and, through successful negotiation, minimised. The Clinical School fully supported the transfer and believed that there was a strong academic case. There were benefits, in terms of national and international competitiveness, of expanding the Clinical School in this way. There were a number of other MRC units with which similar transfer arrangements were under discussion. The terms would need to be separately considered in each case to take account of the particular circumstances.

In the course of discussion, it was noted that the Research Councils were under significant pressure from central government to divest themselves of their research units. There were five major MRC units in Cambridge, all of which would be distributed in some way, either to the University or elsewhere; they would not remain as independent units in Cambridge. It was important that the process of integration was conducted at a measured pace in order that the impact on the University was incremental and positive.

1494: Cost of an undergraduate education

The Committee had received a revised method of calculating the cost of an undergraduate education which identified the direct costs as £14.8K. The methodology which had been used in 2011 had produced a figure of £17.1K. It was believed that this new methodology more accurately reflected the costs incurred by both the University and the Colleges. It inevitably did not include intangible costs associated with the collegiate and research-led nature of the University, such as the support for teaching provided by research staff. The methodology would be kept under review but, in the interests of consistency and comparability it was important, as far as was possible, that there were no further significant changes. The ongoing review would be undertaken by the Planning and Resource Allocation Office and the Fees Sub-Committee of the Bursars' Committee who would report annually through the PRC to the Council.

The following points were amongst those raised in the course of discussion:

- It would be important to be open and transparent in explaining to the University, and more widely, why the figure was lower than previously reported. It was agreed that the draft Notice which had been circulated for approval by the Business Committee should be amended accordingly. It was noted that work was underway to produce an accessible and straightforward breakdown of the costs for wider dissemination. It was suggested that this document might also usefully set out, in narrative form, some of the intangible costs which were not captured within the headline figure but

which, particularly in terms of College provision, contributed significantly to the unique educational and personal experience of Cambridge undergraduates. These intangibles were generally not properly understood either within or beyond the University.

- The reduction in the figure was, for the most part, a consequence of the revisions to the methodology and a better and more detailed understanding of the costs. However, it was important also to recognise that considerable effort had been expended in generating savings in order to ensure value for money.

Action: Draftsman (publication),
Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, PRAO

1488: West Cambridge Data Centre

Consideration had been given to the interim arrangements and temporary accommodation for the University Computing Service (UCS) and High Performance Computing Service (HPCS) during the period between the evacuation of the Arup Building and the completion of the new Data Centre. The Committee had approved a budget of £4m for the temporary moves required to facilitate works on the Arup building; it was not yet clear what proportion of that spend would represent sunk costs. It was noted, in this context, that the timetable for the development coincided with the High Performance Computing Service's cycle of equipment replacement. Work was underway to determine the respective costs of a permanent or a temporary fit-out of the Roger Needham building; it would be necessary to determine which solution offered better value for money in the medium to long term. Any delay in the redevelopment of the Arup building might jeopardize the associated donation income; temporary accommodation was therefore essential.

(b) Finance

The minutes of the meeting of the Finance Committee held on 21 November 2012 were received.

41. North West Cambridge

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional Affairs reported that a *placet* flysheet for the ballot on the Report seeking authority to commence development of University land at North West Cambridge had been signed, *inter alia*, by members of the Council, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, and the Heads of School. No *non placet* flysheet had been submitted. Voting papers would be distributed by 9 January 2013 with a deadline of 5pm on 24 January 2013 for their return. It was hoped that the ballot would attract a strong turnout.

42. University employment Human Resources Committee

The minutes of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on 15 November 2012 were received.

PART C: RESERVED BUSINESS

Officers apart from the Registry, the Head of the Registry's Office and the Academic Secretary withdrew.

43. Honorary Degrees Honorary Doctorates 2013 and 2014

A strictly confidential paper containing recommendations by the Honorary Degree Committee was received. The Council noted the arrangements for approval of nominations by vote set out on the back of the cover sheet and approved the nominations.

Action: Vice-Chancellor's Private Secretary

44. University Employment Remuneration Committee

The Deputy Chair (who chairs the Committee) took the chair.

A report from the meetings held on 22 October and 26 November 2012 was received. Attention was drawn particularly to the minute and the associated paper concerning applications by Pro-Vice-Chancellors for contribution awards within the biennial Professorial Pay Review.

The Deputy Chair reported. The Council, at its meeting on 22 October 2012, had considered an earlier proposal and had asked the Remuneration Committee to give further consideration to various points of principle and of process. The Committee had since consulted further on the matter and had taken legal advice. The paper now before the Council set out a proposed procedure for considering the award of contribution points only to those holding the office Pro-Vice-Chancellor. It was noted, in this context, that the Pro-Vice-Chancellors had not been advised of their eligibility for the current round of the Professorial Pay Review and had therefore missed the deadline. More generally, the Committee considered that Pro-Vice-Chancellors were currently particularly disadvantaged in the professorial pay review because the extent of their contractual engagement to the role (generally 80%) made it difficult for them to maintain a research and teaching profile comparable with that of other professors. However, the Committee considered that a similar case might be made for Heads of School and other academics in senior leadership position; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) and the Human Resources Committee had been asked to consider whether the current procedures for reward and promotion took account of such contributions.

It was proposed that applications through the biennial Professorial Pay Review from professors appointed to the office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor should first be considered by a review group which would consider the applicants' contributions in leadership and management and make recommendations in respect of those aspects of their duties. Those recommendations would then be considered by the Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Group which would also consider the applicants' teaching and research contributions. The Remuneration Committee considered that this proposed limited adaption of the provisions in the 2nd Joint Report on Pay and Grading, would offer greater transparency and rigour. It would enable an independent review of the leadership contribution of the applicant rather than relying solely on the views of the Vice-Chancellor. No changes were proposed to the existing bands nor to the other terms of the procedure.

The following points were amongst those raised in discussion:

- It was important, in order to be able to attract and recruit potential applicants to these vital, complex and accountable senior leadership roles, that the individuals concerned should not feel that they might be disadvantaged on their return to their underlying post because of the lack of opportunity for recognition. It was particularly noted that it was very difficult to maintain a research profile and to continue to attract research grants while holding such roles and, therefore, to reintegrate into an active and properly resourced research programme at the end of the period of office.
- The University benefited immeasurably from having individuals with an international research reputation in senior leadership roles. It would be unfortunate if only those who considered themselves to be at the end of their active research career were willing to be considered for such roles.
- It was important for the Pro-Vice-Chancellors to be recognised and to retain their status within their professorial peer group.
- It was unfortunate that the recommendations in the paper were restricted to the office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor and did not bring forward a proposed procedure for the award of contribution points for all of those in senior leadership and management roles. Such a procedure would need to be consistent with the provisions in the 2nd Joint Report or cogent arguments would be needed to amend them. It was suggested any proposed changes would need to be the subject of a Report to the Regent House.

In conclusion, the Council agreed not to approve the proposed procedure as set out in the circulated paper. Instead, it agreed:

- (i) to invite the Remuneration Committee to consider further the pay arrangements for Pro-Vice-Chancellors taking particular account of the need to consider how best to address the question of post-role reintegration into research;
- (ii) that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) and the Human Resources Committee should consider whether the current procedures for reward and promotion for Heads of School and other academics in senior leadership positions took sufficient account of their leadership and management contributions;
- (iii) to extend the deadline for the submission of applications in the current round of the Professorial Pay Review in order that the Pro-Vice-Chancellors could submit applications for consideration under the current procedures.

The Council also:

- (i) approved the Remuneration Committee's recommendation concerning the continuation of market supplements;
- (ii) endorsed the Committee's decisions concerning bonus payments in the Investment Office and the North West Cambridge Office.

Vice-Chancellor
21 January 2013

