

University of Cambridge

COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held in the Council Room, The Old Schools, at 10.15 am on Monday 15 July 2013.

Present: Vice-Chancellor (Chairman); the Master of Christ's, the Master of Jesus, the Warden of Robinson; Professor Donald, Professor Gay, Professor Hopper, Professor Karet; Dr Bampos, Mr Caddick, Dr Cowley, Mr Du Quesnay, Dr Good (from the item recorded as minute 134) , Dr Lingwood, Dr Padman; Dame Mavis McDonald (Deputy Chairman), Professor Pearce, Mr Shakeshaft; Mr Jones, Ms Old, Ms Osborn; with the Registry, the Head of the Registry's Office, the University Draftsman, and the Academic Secretary, the Director of Finance; the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International Strategy).

Apologies for absence were received from the Master of Fitzwilliam and Mr Lewisohn. Dr Oosthuizen is on sabbatical leave during Easter Term.

The Senior and Junior Proctors were present.

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the student members of the Council for 2013-14, Mr Jones, Ms Old and Ms Osborn.

**UNRESERVED BUSINESS**

**PART A: PRELIMINARY, LEGISLATIVE AND STRAIGHTFORWARD BUSINESS**

**120. Declarations of Interest**

Professor Pearce, as a member of the Board of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) declared an interest in the matter recorded as minute 123(g) (HEFCE financial forecast). Otherwise, no personal or prejudicial interests were declared.

**121. Minutes**

The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2013 were received and approved.

**Action:** Personal Assistant to the Head of the Registry's Office to web.

**122. Procedure of the Council**

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

It was agreed that the Vice-Chancellor should chair the unreserved business and the Deputy Chair should chair the reserved business.

## **(b) Business starred as straightforward**

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

## **(c) Council Circulars**

The Council noted the issue and approval of the following:

<b>Circular</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Approval</b>
17/13	14 June	24 June
18/13	21 June	1 July
19/13	5 July	15 July

## **123. Vice-Chancellor's Report**

(a) The Grace concerning the recommendations in the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on IT infrastructure and support had been approved in its original form in the recent ballot. 1,018 valid votes were cast: 594 in favour of the Grace in its original form; 363 in favour of the amended Grace; and 61 against the Grace whether in its original or unamended form. The quota being 509, the unamended Grace had been approved on the first count.

(a) The Vice-Chancellor met Chuka Umunna, Shadow Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills on 17 June 2013.

(b) The Congregation for the Conferment of Honorary Degrees took place on 18 June 2013.

(c) The Ground-breaking Day for North West Cambridge took place on 20 June 2013.

(d) The Pilkington Teaching Prize ceremony and dinner took place on 20 June 2013.

(e) The Vice-Chancellor attended a meeting of the Tanner Trustees in Paris on 24/25 June 2013.

(f) The government's Spending Round announcement was made on the 26 June 2013. The Council received a UUK analytical briefing on the outturn for Higher Education. The Vice-Chancellor reported. The outcome for BIS was less unfavourable than for some other departments though the announcement only covered 2015-16 and BIS had not yet outlined how any cuts might be implemented. Following difficult and extended discussions, the government had conceded that the current budgets for the MRC and for medical education should not be moved into the Department of Health.

(g) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a meeting of the Russell Group in London on 27 June 2013. Principal items of business had included; the Spending Round announcement; and HEFCE's intention to consult on changes to the Financial Memorandum with higher education institutions. It would be important carefully to monitor the implications of such changes in the Financial Memorandum for the University and for the sector as a whole. Professor Pearce noted that the review was driven, in part, by the need to regulate alternative providers in order to safeguard the reputation of the sector as a whole.

(h) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a meeting of the Foundation for Science and Technology in Cardiff on 3 July 2013.

(i) There had been a meeting of the Alumni Advisory Board on 8 July 2013.

(j) Roger Mosey, currently Editorial Director of the BBC, had been elected to succeed Professor Richard Bowring as Master of Selwyn College with effect from 1 October 2013.

(k) The Office for Fair Access had approved the University's access agreement for 2014-15. It was noted that approval was required on an annual basis.

## **124. Council, legislative and comparable matters**

### **(a) Council Work Plan 2012-13**

The updated Work Plan was received.

### **(b) Business Committee**

No meeting was held on 8 July 2013.

### **(c) Standing Orders, Code of Practice, Statement of Primary Responsibilities and Statement of Corporate Governance**

A paper setting out the role of the Council and of individual Council members/trustees; the Statement of Primary Responsibilities; the Code of Practice; the Council Standing Orders; and the Statement of Corporate Governance were received. The Registry reported. The Working Group on Council Business had reviewed the Council's Standing Orders and other fundamental documents during the 2011-12 academical year and had brought back significantly revised materials which the Council, at its meeting on 22 October 2012, had approved for adoption from 1 January 2013. The circulated materials were unchanged. It was noted that HEFCE's Financial Memorandum and the Committee of University Chairs' (CUC) Governance Code of Practice would be subject to consultation and revision over the forthcoming year. It would be necessary, at that stage, to review and, as necessary, amend the Council's materials to ensure consistency with the revised HEFCE and CUC provisions.

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

- The CUC Governance Code of Practice was voluntary. As set out in the Corporate Governance Statement, the University chose to comply with most but not all of its provisions. It was agreed that paragraphs 9 and 10 of the paper setting out the role of the Council and the duties and responsibilities of its members might be amended more clearly to reflect this position.
- The Statement of Primary Responsibilities stated that the Council 'supports and advises the Vice-Chancellor, and through him or her, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors.' It was noted that the Council could also determine the duties of the Pro-Vice-Chancellors directly.
- Paragraph 5 of the statement on Corporate Governance stated that the 'Vice-Chancellor is, *de facto*, the principal academic and administrative officer of the University.' In fact, Statute D, VIII identified the Registry as the 'principal administrative officer of the University'.

- It was suggested that the Statement of Primary Responsibilities should make reference to the Council's responsibilities in respect of IT infrastructure and support after the establishment of the new Information Services Committee.
- It was noted, with reference to paragraphs 9.1.2 and 9.4 of the Standing Orders, that every effort should be made to publish materials to the intranet more promptly than at present.

It was agreed that the materials should be reviewed to take account of these comments. A revised version would be brought back to the Council in September for final approval and adoption.

**Action:** Registry,  
Head of the Registry's Office

#### **(d) Title and terms of reference of the Executive Committee**

In its Review of the Woolf Inquiry Report dated February 2013, the Audit Committee had recommended that the rôle of the Executive Committee should be expanded to act as an advisory body on questions relating to funding for University research and international activities (or for any other purpose), as well as for donations. The Executive Committee, at its meetings on 29 May and 21 June 2013, had discussed and agreed a revised title for the Committee in order to take account of this wider remit and had approved terms of reference. The Council received a paper proposing that the Executive Committee be renamed the Advisory Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs and setting out revised terms of reference.

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

- There were clear interrelationships between this paper and the paper on International Engagement which had been circulated with the General Board minutes. The International Agreements Protocol set out in the Handbook for International Engagements was designed to ensure the early involvement of the International Strategy Office and, as necessary, the new Advisory Committee. It was important to have in place systems which triggered early notice of new international engagements but which were not restrictive or inhibiting. Heads of Department had an important role to play in ensuring compliance with the Protocol.
- It was noted that one of the purposes of such a Committee was to advise and support the Vice-Chancellor. It might, therefore, be appropriate to review the chairing arrangements in due course.
- It was important to recognise that the Committee would not just consider prospective benefactions in excess of £1m; it would be called to advise upon smaller donations from particular sources which might give rise to significant public interest. This would include funding for studentships.

The Council approved the new name and the terms of reference as set out in the circulated papers.

#### **(e) Board of Scrutiny, Eighteenth Annual Report, 2012-13**

The Eighteenth Annual Report to the Regent House was received. The Council approved the Report for early publication and Discussion in the Michaelmas term.

**Action:** Draftsman (publication)

## 125. Future of the Cambridge Foundation

The Council received the minutes of the Cambridge Foundation's meeting on 20 June 2013 and associated papers. The Registry reported. The Cambridge Foundation had been established in the 1980s for two main reasons: to respond to a concern that fundraising success might, if the University received philanthropic funding directly, cause the UK government to reduce its block grant funding; to increase donor confidence in the stewardship of donation income through the establishment of a separate charity. Legislation now meant that the first concern was no longer relevant and there was confidence in the University's own stewardship arrangements. It was therefore considered that the Cambridge Foundation, in its current form, was no longer necessary. It was not, however, proposed that it be abolished; rather that the Declaration of Trust be modified on 31 July 2013 to enable the University to be appointed as the sole Trustee of the Foundation. It was further proposed that the University be appointed as sole Trustee of the Foundation from that same date. It was important that legacies for which the Cambridge Foundation was the named beneficiary could still be received by the Foundation. It was noted that the Council did not require formal permission to make the proposed changes from the other bodies (the British Academy, the Royal Society and the Confederation of British Industry) with the right to nominate Trustees to the Cambridge Foundation. It was necessary only to inform them of the changes.

The Council therefore agreed to:

- (i) approve the proposed modifications to the Declaration of Trust of the Cambridge Foundation;
- (ii) approve the appointment of the University as sole Trustee of the Cambridge Foundation; and
- (iii) authorise the confirmation of these approvals to the Chairman of the Trustees of the Cambridge Foundation in writing

**Action:** Registry, CUDO

## 126. Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 6 and 18 March 2013, on IT Infrastructure and Support: Establishment of a Transition Advisory Group

It had been agreed, at the Council's meeting on 17 June 2013, that a formal proposal for membership of the Transition Advisory Group would be brought back to the Council after the outcome of the ballot was known.

The Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported. As reported under minute 123(a) above, the Grace had been approved unamended by a significant majority. It was now, therefore, appropriate to establish a Transition Advisory Group to take forward the responsibilities assigned to it in the Joint Report and the other recommendations of the review panel. The existing governance and management arrangements (including the Information Strategy and Services Syndicate and the reporting lines of the Directors of UCS and MISD) would remain unchanged until the date of the initial merger of UCS and MISD on 31 March 2014 or as soon thereafter as a new Director was in post. The Council's Notice dated 20 May 2013 provided that the Transition Advisory Group would be chaired by a senior professor with significant experience and knowledge of academic computing and the provision of IT services. The implementation group's remit was to undertake advance planning; it would not have decision-making powers. It would be accountable to, and would interact extensively and consult fully with, the ISSS and, when established, with the ISC. It would work closely with the current Directors of MISD and UCS.

The Council, at its meeting on 18 February 2013, had given preliminary consideration and had raised no objection to the membership of the then proposed 'implementation group' as follows: the internal members of the Review Group (the Senior Pro-Vice Chancellor, Dr Padman, the Chair of the Information Strategy and Services Syndicate and the Head of the School of Technology) and the Registry. It was now proposed that the group be chaired by Professor Ian Leslie of the Computer Laboratory.

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

- There was no College representation on the Transition Advisory Group, notwithstanding the fact that the Colleges were significant users of IT services, systems and telephony systems and the proposed changes would, therefore, impact on the Colleges. However, there was significant College representation on the ISSS to which the Transition Advisory Group would be accountable. Further, members of the Transition Advisory Group were active in their Colleges as well as in the University.
- There was no representative from the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences on the proposed Transition Advisory Group. It was agreed that this was unfortunate given the very different and specific issues around IT infrastructure and, in particular, support in this area.

After discussion, the Council approved the proposed membership of the Transition Advisory Group as set out in the paper but agreed that the Group should have the power to co-opt additional members, in particular to take account of the concerns raised about representation from the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. A Notice setting out the new title of the group and its membership would be drafted for approval by the Business Committee for publication in the Reporter and distribution, in particular, to members of the UCS and MISD.

**Action:** Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor,  
Registry, University Draftsman

## **127. Membership of the Board of Scrutiny**

The Council, at its meeting on 17 June 2013, had noted that Regulation 2 for the election of members of the Board of Scrutiny provided that, if at any election insufficient nominations were received to fill the vacant places in either class (c)(i) or class (c)(ii), the Council should appoint as many members as may be necessary. No person had been nominated in the recent election for one member of the Board of Scrutiny in class (c)(i) (a person who has been a member of the Regent House for not more than ten years on 1 October 2013).

Members of the Council had been invited to submit suggestions to the Registry or the Head of the Registry's Office. The Council received brief biographies for two individuals whose names had been put forward and a paper setting out the membership of the Board of Scrutiny with effect from 1 October 2013. It was agreed that both individuals would, in different ways, have much to contribute to the Board's deliberations. However, it was felt that there was some awkwardness inherent in the Council making a direct appointment to the University's 'watchdog body'. It was therefore agreed that the Council would issue a 'notwithstanding' Grace which would allow the re-opening of nominations. The individuals whose names had been put forward would be invited to consider standing for election.

**Action:** University Draftsman

## **128. General Board**

The minutes of the General Board's meeting on 5 June 2013 were received together with the paper on International Engagement which the Board had received. The Council commended progress in the area of International Engagement.

### **PART B: MAIN BUSINESS**

## **129. Finance, Planning and Resources (a) Planning and Resources Committee**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Resources Committee held on 3 July 2013 were received.

The Council's attention was particularly drawn to the following minutes:

#### **1459: College Graduate Fee**

The Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported. The Committee had discussed a proposal for a consolidated, composite fee comprising both the University Composition Fee and the College Graduate Fee. The Committee had approved, in principle, the proposal that there should be a composite fee but had not approved the scheme as set out in PRC paper 1456. It would not now be possible to reach agreement in time to implement revised arrangements in 2014.

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

- The Research Councils' refusal to pay the graduate college fee (with the consequence that the University was meeting the shortfall) was only one of the drivers for change. It was also considered that a consolidated fee would be more transparent and attractive both to applicants and to benefactors wishing to fund graduate studentships.
- It would be important, for planning purposes, to reach agreement as soon as possible.
- There were opportunities for the University and the Colleges to engage more closely on the matter of graduate studentships.
- There had been no formal consultation with the Student Unions about the proposals. There was, however, student representation on the PRC.

The matter would be brought back to the Council in due course.

#### **1552: Capital Projects**

The Committee had considered a number of capital projects. The capital spending elements of the Spending Review announcement reaffirmed the government's commitment to matched funding; the University had recently made a successful application to the Research Partnership Investment Fund to support the construction of the Maxwell Centre on the West Cambridge site. It would be important that the University remained in a position to apply for such funds.

## **(b) Finance Committee**

The Finance Committee had met on 10 July. The minutes would be provided to the Council by means of a Council circular and received for discussion at the Council's meeting on 22 September 2013.

The Finance Committee had received and discussed the financial forecasts for 2013-14 to 2015-16 which the University was required to submit to HEFCE and, subject to a minor amendment, had agreed to recommend the proposals to Council. The forecasts were on a 'Big U' basis and were a consolidation of Little U, Cambridge University Press and Cambridge Assessment forecasts. The 'Little U' forecast was derived directly from the Budget Report approved by the Council at its meeting on 20 May 2013. It was noted that these forecasts were likely now to be of interest to Moody's as well as to the HEFCE.

The Council, for its part, approved the forecasts for submission to HEFCE subject to further minor amendments.

**Action:** Director of Finance

## **130. Audit Committee**

The minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 4 July 2013 together with the annual report and review of the University's Bribery and Corruption Policy were received.

The Registry reported. The meeting had, for the first time since January 2011, not been quorate; endorsement of the minutes would, therefore, be sought by circulation for subsequent confirmation at the next meeting. There had been an appointment to one of the current external vacancies on the Committee; two names were under consideration for the second.

## **131. Cambridge Assessment**

A report from Cambridge Assessment (CA) was received. Mr Lebus (Chief Executive of Cambridge Assessment and Chairman of OCR) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (Chair of the Local Examinations Syndicate) attended.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) reported that the Syndicate, following a discussion at which the Officers had not been present, had recorded its confidence in CA's Executive Board and Management.

Mr Lebus reported. CA's mission to 'promote educational excellence and extend the University's societal impact through the provision of high quality qualifications and other specialist education services' was fully aligned with the mission of the University. CA had extensive international reach and impacted upon a wide constituency. Its core activities included the operation and management of the University's three examination boards. Oxford, Cambridge and Royal Society of Arts (OCR) provided GCSEs and A levels to UK schools and colleges and vocational skills and employment qualifications to secondary and FE sectors. Cambridge International Examinations (CIE) was the world's largest provider of international schools qualifications and mirrored OCR's activities in an international context. Cambridge English Language Assessment was one of the world's two largest providers of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). CA employed approximately 2500 staff based primarily in Cambridge but also in Coventry and in regional and international offices. There were, in addition, about 30,000 examiners.



Qualifications were offered in 160 countries and there were net assets of £294m. Revenue for the 2012-13 financial year was forecast to be £316m, up from £302m in 2012. There was expected to be a trading surplus of 13%. The 2012 transfer to the University included a 'special' triennial transfer of £13.5m in addition to the normal transfer of 30% of the annual operating surplus. Capital expenditure was expected to rise from £22m in 2012-13 to £82m in 2013-14. This reflected expenditure on the transfer of land at Shaftesbury Avenue from CUP; new warehouse facilities; the North West Cambridge Data Centre; and an increased investment in technology and infrastructure.

Developments in the reporting period included new joint branding with CUP for Cambridge English and the establishment of an Admissions Testing Service. The turnaround time for the delivery of results had been reduced and there had been an increased frequency of sessions. Cambridge International Examinations had experienced an increased UK uptake of IGCSE and Pre-U. Some schools had entered students for both GCSEs and IGCSEs; it was possible that there would be some variation in the results which individual students achieved in the two qualifications. CIE had also increased contract work, including advising governments on curriculum reform. Uncertainties around major A Level and GCSE reforms had created challenges for OCR. The new syllabus would be taught for the first time in 2015 and first examined in 2017. Major syllabus changes potentially carried implications for market share. OCR was therefore reviewing and reconfiguring its activities, including developing new Skills and Employment qualifications.

The Syndicate had agreed an increase in the long term investment rate for technology from 6% to 7.5% of revenue per annum. CA's activities were heavily data intensive and IT was a crucial part of the Group infrastructure. A major programme was underway to renew the technology infrastructure. An increased use of on-line marking and Computer Based Testing, required a higher degree of system resilience. Consideration was being given to the options for increasing the provision of blended learning and on-line formative assessment, potentially in collaboration with CUP.

The Group operated in an increasingly demanding and complex regulatory regime. Ofqual had increased its focus on marking quality. There was some disparity of regulatory approach in relation to standards between the English, Welsh and Northern Irish regulatory authorities. As a provider of qualifications used for immigration purposes, there was also close interaction with the UKBA.

The market environment remained competitive. The educational landscape was changing rapidly with an increase in the digitisation and personalisation of both content and assessment. The industry was also subject to national and international educational and immigration policy volatility. There was, however, a continuing growth in demand for English language learning and international education and for specialist expertise to support educational reform programmes in developing countries. The exponential global growth in the middle classes provided significant opportunities for international education. In responding to this context, CA would: continue to invest in international growth; stabilise the UK general qualifications business; increase collaboration with CUP and build on the competitive advantage of the Cambridge brand; continue the programme to upgrade the IT systems; increase investment in technology; and work towards a single site operation co-located with CUP's Shaftesbury Road site. The future growth forecast remained strong.

The following points were amongst those raised in the course of discussion and in answer to questions:

- In the UK, the processes of teaching and examining had traditionally been kept separate. A more integrated learning, support and assessment model would require a different approach from Cambridge Assessment. It was noted that this second model was already widely accepted internationally. It would be important to have in place both the structures and the technology to be able to respond to these changes.
- It was hoped that planning permission for the major new development on the CUP site would be granted by the summer of 2014. It represented a valuable opportunity to consolidate all of CA's activities in one location and to facilitate expansion. There would be significant benefits both in terms of organisational effectiveness and as a result of co-location with CUP.

### **132. North West Cambridge Project**

In the absence of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs), the Registry reported.

Agreement had been reached with Natural England on the matter of the greater crested newts. It was hoped that any delays had been mitigated as far as possible.

There would be a further meeting with the Colleges' Rental Group in the autumn. Further work would be undertaken in the meantime. If resolution was impossible it was accepted that any decision not to proceed would be mutual and amicable.

There had been adverse responses from the planners about the current designs for Lot 2, which included some of the local shops and amenities in the Market Square. The planners were concerned to maintain the agreed parameter plan heights across the site. Consideration was therefore being given to alternative courses for the delivery of units on that Lot in order to minimise disruption to the delivery of Key Worker units within Phase 1. A report and recommendation would be made by the Project Executive to the Syndicate meeting on 22 July 2013.

### **133. University Employment Human Resources Committee**

There being no substantive matters for discussion, the meeting of the Human Resources Committee scheduled for 13 June 2013 had been cancelled and the business dealt with by circulation.

## **PART C: UNRESERVED PRINCIPAL BUSINESS**

### **134. Vice-Chancellor's Report 2012-13**

The Deputy Chairman took the chair. Officers other than the Registry, the Head of the Registry's Office and the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor withdrew.

The Vice-Chancellor reported. It had been a positive year. The University's relatively sound financial position was a solid foundation from which to determine future strategy

and direction. Good governance processes, robust planning procedures and tight budgetary constraint had delivered an improved financial outlook. It would be important to continue to diversify the University's income streams. Returns from the CUEF consistently outperformed the market. Income from research grants and contracts continued to grow, particularly from the EU and from UK Charities. Research Council income remained comparatively flat. Contributions to indirect costs remained disappointing. The Bond issue had been a significant success for the University. Investment in the Capital Programme was essential in order to maintain the University's international competitiveness.

#### (i) Education

The Quality Assurance Agency had confirmed that the University met UK expectations across four key indicators. It had also identified various examples of good practice. This successful outcome was a testament to the efforts of all of those in the University who had contributed to the preparation and review process. The University had committed to an annual increase of 2% in graduate student numbers. The paucity of research studentships for UK students presented a real challenge. By comparison with the University's results in the National Student Survey, the results in the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey were disappointing. Were these two sets of results to be combined, there would, potentially, be implications for the University's league table position for teaching quality. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) would be working with the Schools to ensure that the quality of the provision on postgraduate taught courses matched that on undergraduate courses.

#### (ii) Research

Preparations for the REF were ongoing and would make significant demands on both academic and administrative colleagues. A successful REF result was important to the University both financially and reputationally. The strategic research themes continued to have a significant beneficial impact. They had allowed the University to bid for funds which would otherwise have been inaccessible. There had been much work over the past year to incorporate the CRUK and MRC units; there were considerable benefits to the University but also challenges. It would be important to consider the institutional implications of increasing the number of research-only units within the University.

#### (iii) Engagement with industry

The relocation of AstraZeneca to Cambridge would provide significant opportunities for the University. It was also indicative of the powerful effect of the 'Cambridge phenomenon' and the attractiveness of the region as one of the country's few growth areas. The University was central to this success story. It was recognised, however, that AstraZeneca's development of space on the Biomedical Campus would have implications for the University's expansion on that site.

#### (iv) Political engagement

It was important for the University to engage fully with the political agenda on all sides nationally, in Europe and more widely. There were important areas of policy which the University had influenced over the past year.

#### (v) CUDO and philanthropy

The Collegiate University was entering a new age of perpetual fundraising. The process of establishing a Code of Practice for a Collaborative Fundraising Model for Collegiate Cambridge had been constructive and consensual and would form an excellent basis for future fundraising activities. There had been a significant restructure in CUDO over the past year in order to build organisational capacity and to improve the alignment with Collegiate Cambridge's strategic objectives and ambitions. Alison Traub had taken up the post of Executive Director of Development and Alumni Relations in June 2013. A series of underpinning appointments had now also been made. It was significant that, notwithstanding significant upheaval in CUDO and the fact that the University had not been in active campaign mode, the total projected funds raised through CUDO for the University (excluding the Colleges) for 2012-13 was in excess of £48m. The strategic meeting in September would be an early opportunity for members of the Council to consider and inform the emerging fundraising strategy.

#### (vi) International engagement

There had, as reported earlier in the meeting, been significant progress in determining the University's international engagement strategy and structures. There continued to be an important place for individual and local partnerships (provided these were properly managed); however, major funders were, increasingly, interested in institutional level international engagement.

In conclusion, the Vice-Chancellor suggested that the Council would wish to consider over the forthcoming year how large the University should aspire to be.

The following points were amongst those raised in the course of discussion and in answer to questions:

- It would be important to define the areas in which an increase in size might be considered. The incorporation of the CRUK and MRC units had already resulted in an expansion in absolute terms but there had been no effect on the majority of the University's core business. It would be important to consider the potential impact of growth in other regards or the development of significant new activities on the nature and culture of the Collegiate University.
- It would be important to continue to attract the highest quality staff and students at every level. Internationally competitive facilities and resources were significant in this regard; there were, however, also salary considerations. There was a question as to whether the 1% p.a. pay increase was sustainable.
- It was recognised that a growth in research student numbers would necessitate an increase both in staff numbers and in space if the quality of the provision was to be maintained.
- The Colleges continued to play a vital role in the quality of the student experience. They provided a unique environment and a human scale. Nevertheless, there remained concerns about the consistency of provision and resources across Colleges which would continue to be addressed.
- It would be important to facilitate a bottom-up discussion about the scale and nature of the Collegiate University.

It was agreed that the question of the size of the University should be taken forward during the forthcoming academical year. A scoping paper providing statistical information (including trends) across all of the University's activities and setting out key questions would be provided to the Council at its meeting on 20 January 2014. Members of the

Council might then be asked to take the lead on particular areas and activities at a substantive discussion of the matter at the spring strategic meeting on 17 March 2014.

## **PART D: RESERVED BUSINESS**

### **135. Feedback to the Vice-Chancellor**

The students left the meeting under the provisions of Statute K.20 (a). The Deputy Chair undertook to inform them orally outside the meeting of the principal outcomes of the appraisal once these had been agreed at the meeting by the other members of the Council.

The Deputy Chair reminded the Council briefly of the process undertaken to conduct the Vice-Chancellor's appraisal for 2012/13 and thanked its members, including the student members, and others who had contributed through the consultations undertaken by her and other members of the Remuneration Committee.

The Deputy Chair read out the proposed substance of her letter to the Vice-Chancellor summarising the outcomes of the appraisal as agreed by the Remuneration Committee and based on the consultations undertaken. With a minor change of emphasis, the Council agreed that it accurately reflected what it would wish her to convey to the Vice-Chancellor on its behalf.

The members of the Council wished to express unanimity in their admiration of the stamina, skill, and determination the Vice-Chancellor brought to his handling of the enormous range of issues with which he has to deal. They looked forward in the next academical year to engaging in strategic discussion of the opportunities and consequences for growth available to the collegiate University; recognising that these too will add to the pressure on the Vice-Chancellor and wished to assure him that all concerned stand ready to share the load whenever appropriate.

Vice-Chancellor  
23 September 2013

