

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 25 November 2013.

Present: Vice-Chancellor (Chair); the Master of Christ's, the Warden of Robinson, the Master of St Catharine's; Professor Gay, Professor Hopper, Professor Karet; Mr Caddick, Dr Cowley, Mr Du Quesnay, Dr Good, Dr Lingwood, Dr Oosthuizen, Dr Padman; Mr Lewisohn, Mr Shakeshaft; Mr Jones, Ms Old, Ms Osborn; with the Registry, the Head of the Registry's Office, the University Draftsman, the Academic Secretary, the Director of Finance; the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International Strategy) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research).

Apologies for absence were received from the Master of Jesus, Professor Donald, Dame Mavis McDonald and Professor Pearce. Dr Bampos is on sabbatical leave during Michaelmas Term.

The Director of External Affairs and Communications was present.

The Senior and Junior Proctors were present.

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the Master of St Catharine's to her first meeting.

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

PART A: PRELIMINARY, LEGISLATIVE AND STRAIGHTFORWARD BUSINESS

21. Declarations of Interest

Dr Cowley, as a University employee, declared an interest in the matter recorded as minute 25(b) ('Business Committee'). Otherwise, no personal or prejudicial interests were declared.

22. Minutes

The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2013 were received and approved.

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

23. Procedure of the Council

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

It was proposed that the Vice-Chancellor should chair the entire meeting. The Council approved this arrangement.

(b) Business starred as straightforward

The following items were unstarred for discussion: the Council Work Plan (minute 25(a) refers); and the Business Committee (minute 25(b) refers).

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

(c) Council Circulars

The Council noted the issue and approval of the following:

Circular	Issue	Approval
26/13	25 October	4 November
27/13	8 November	18 November
28/13	15 November	25 November

24. Vice-Chancellor's Report

- (a) The Vice-Chancellor had delivered the keynote address at a Royal Society event based upon 'Alfred Russell Wallace and his legacy' on 22 October 2013.
- (b) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a 'Faiths' event at Mansion House on 24 October 2013 hosted by the Lord Mayor of London.
- (c) The Vice-Chancellor gave out the awards at an Institute of Leadership and Management (ILM) ceremony on 25 October 2013.
- (d) The Vice-Chancellor had attended the official opening by the Minister of State for Universities and Science of the South Building in the Genome Campus in Hinxton.
- (e) The Vice-Chancellor chaired the annual Black History Month Lecture delivered by the solicitor Imran Khan on 29 October 2013.
- (f) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a meeting of the Russell Group on 31 October 2013. He reported on recent discussions about the regulatory framework for Higher Education in the context of proposed amendments to the student support regulations which would shortly be laid before parliament and in the absence of any legal instrument governing Higher Education. It was likely that the sector would, increasingly, include institutions which received no or vestigial HEFCE funding either because they were private providers or because they were primarily engaged in non-research activities. The regulatory role of the HEFCE was therefore diluted. There had been some discussion between Universities UK and the Regulatory Partnership Group about a proposal that increased regulatory powers of designation might, instead, be granted to the Secretary of State. It was important that the regulatory framework was proportionate and protected the sector's independence from government.
- (g) The Vice-Chancellor was one of the speakers at the launch of the Enterprise Tuesday seminar series managed and delivered by the Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning on 5 November 2013.

- (h) The Chancellor opened and the Vice-Chancellor closed the MRC Centenary Award Symposium on 6 November 2013.
- (i) A Vice-Chancellor's Circle event took place on 7 November 2013.
- (j) The Vice-Chancellor visited Seattle, San Diego, Boston and New York on University business between the 10 and 17 November 2013.
- (k) There had been widespread press coverage of police surveillance of student political activities. 130 senior members of the University had written to the Vice-Chancellor expressing their concern. The University had issued the following statement: 'The University champions academic freedom and debate. The Vice-Chancellor also notes the concerns of the letter's signatories that the right to peaceful protest and political and social campaigning be preserved and protected. He has already made these points to the police.' The Council agreed to support and adopt this statement. The Vice-Chancellor would write to the police authorities confirming the Council's position.
- (l) The Vice-Chancellor gave out the prizes at the Bridge the Gap prizegiving ceremony on 18 November 2013.
- (m) The Vice-Chancellor was a speaker at a UUK/Institut Français/DAAD event in London on 19 November 2013.
- (n) The Vice-Chancellor chaired the Laing O'Rourke Centre for Construction Engineering and Technology distinguished lecture on 19 November 2013.
- (o) The Vice-Chancellor met the Leader of the Opposition on 20 November 2013. Topics of discussion had included: undergraduate student fee levels; international competitiveness; access and widening participation; the importance of the Cambridge Cluster; the abolition of the AS-level; and current government immigration policy.
- (p) The Vice-Chancellor chaired a meeting of the Department for International Development's Research Advisory Group in Brussels on 21-22 November 2013.
- (q) The Vice-Chancellor congratulated Professor Val Gibson, *T*, Professor of High Energy Physics who had received the WISE Leader Award. The Award had been presented by HRH The Princess Royal at the WISE Awards event at the Science Museum on 14 November 2013.
- (r) The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) reported that the University's REF submission had been provided to the HEFCE on 21 November 2013. There was still the provision to make amendments until 12 noon on 29 November 2013. The submission would be subject to audit by the HEFCE throughout 2014. The results would be published in December 2014. It was intended that there would be a review of the University's preparations for REF2014 in order to inform planning for future exercises. It would be important not to lose institutional capacity or expertise. The Council recorded its gratitude to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor Leslie, the REF Operations Manager and his team in the Academic Division; colleagues in MISD and HR; and academic and administrative colleagues across the University who had devoted considerable time and effort to the submission.

25. Council, legislative and comparable matters

(a) Council Work Plan 2013-14

The updated Work Plan was received. It was agreed that it should be amended to include the Council's receipt and consideration, during Lent Term 2014, of the draft report of the working group established to review the University's governance arrangements.

(b) Business Committee

It was noted that no meeting had been held on 18 November 2013.

The Committee had agreed, by circulation, publication of a Notice about an increase to University stipends and salaries. The University was a part of a single national pay negotiating arrangement. The University and Colleges Employers Association periodically conducted a survey of institutions to establish the affordability of proposed pay increases. The University's response to these surveys was based on the Budget Report and took account of assumptions, *inter alia*, about pay awards. It did not make reference to any contingency funding which the University might hold. Concern was expressed over the long term effects of restricting annual academic and other pay increases to 1%. It was noted that this impacted particularly negatively on lower paid staff.

(c) The Council's Annual Report 2012-13 General Board report to the Council for 2012-13

A final revised draft of the Council's Annual Report was received. Also received was the General Board's Annual Report to the Council for 2012-13, for publication with the Council's Annual Report. The Council approved and signed the Annual Report.

Action: University Draftsman (publication)

(d) Board of Scrutiny

A draft Notice in reply to the Eighteenth Report of the Board, and Discussion of it, was received. Following discussion, the Council approved the Notice for publication.

Action: University Draftsman (publication)

(e) Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Stephen Hawking Professorship of Cosmology

The General Board, at its meeting on 6 November 2013, had received a draft Report on the establishment of a Stephen Hawking Professorship of Cosmology. The Council received a revised Report with supporting documentation which, it was reported orally at the meeting, had received a majority of the signatures of the members of the General Board. The Council also received the minute of the General Board's discussion. A draft timetable for consideration of the Report by the Regent House, including a ballot called by the Council, was also attached.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), as a member of the General Board, reported. The Council was not being asked to sign the Report but, rather, to approve it for publication. The Report related to a proposed donation of \$6m from the Avery-Tsui Foundation towards the establishment of a Stephen Hawking Professorship of Cosmology. In the first instance, the donation might be used, in accordance with the Deed agreement, to support

the employment of Professor Hawking for as long as he remained in post as a Director of Research. The late Dennis Avery (with whom the proposed benefaction was under discussion at the time of his death) was an alumnus of Trinity Hall and he and his wife, Sally Wong-Avery, were significant benefactors to the University and the Colleges. The donation represented a superb opportunity to celebrate Professor Hawking's scholarly and other achievements. The donation came in two sums. The first, of \$2m, would endow part of the costs of the new Professorship. The second, of \$4m, would be made through an independent charitable trust (The Dennis S Avery and Sally Tsui Wong-Avery Endowment Trust), and would provide an additional annual payment to the holder of the Professorship (termed the 'Crown Distribution') to enable the University to recruit internationally a person of the highest calibre.

The Trustees of the independent trust were three *ex officio* University appointees (being the Registrar, the Chair of the Audit Committee, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs)) and a nominee of the Avery-Tsui Foundation (Ms Natasha Wong). There had been concerns in some quarters about the extent to which the terms of the donation were at variance with the University's normal remuneration arrangements and, in particular, the means by which the stipend and any supplementary payments to the Professor would be determined. It was likely, therefore, that a ballot would be called when a Grace was promoted.

There had, since the General Board's meeting on 6 November 2013, been a first meeting of the Trust attended by the Attorney for the Foundation. This had been helpful in clarifying the expectation of the Foundation and the terms by which the Trust would operate to provide an annual sum to the Professor in addition to the stipend provided by the University, thereby relieving the University of the cost of all or much of any additional market pay or other supplementation that might be required to recruit and retain the Professor. The revisions to the Report were intended to provide reassurance that the remuneration structure would be consistent with (if not identical to) that for other professorial posts. It was accepted that the total salary might be above the professorial average in Cambridge which might cause some element of disquiet within the University; however it would be comparable with peer professorships. It would, therefore, allow the University (in accordance with the intention of the donors) to attract the strongest candidates to the post.

The Chair of the Audit Committee, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) and the Registrar, as Trustees, reported. The Trust would need to demonstrate public benefit. This meant, *inter alia*, that it could not make gratuitous payments; the additional payment should be sufficient only to allow the University to make appointments of the highest calibre.

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

- It would not be possible, once the Trust was established, for the Foundation to change its terms without the approval of the Board of Trustees.
- The Trust and the University were independent of each other but the Trust would be an exempt charity by virtue of being a linked charity to the University.
- It was likely that the Trust would decide that the Crown Distribution element of the salary would be paid directly to the Professor. This would considerably lower the risk of infringement of equal pay legislation. The Crown Distribution would cease at the point at which the professor reached the end of the tenure as Hawking Professor.

- The Trustees, at their next meeting, would determine the precise mechanisms by which they would arrive at their decision about the Crown Distribution element of the salary. There remained detailed work to be done in this and in other regards.

The Council approved publication of the Report. However, a decision on whether to call for a ballot would not be made by the Council until January, after the Discussion had taken place.

Action: University Draftsman (publication)

26. Membership of the Board of Scrutiny

Regulation 2 for the election of members of the Board of Scrutiny provides that, if at any election insufficient nominations are received to fill the vacant places in either class (c)(i) or class (c)(ii), the Council shall appoint as many members as may be necessary.

The Council noted that no person was nominated in the 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), during the Easter Term 2013. The Council, at that stage, had decided to re-open nominations rather than making an appointment. No nominations were received by the deadline of 12 noon on 8 November 2013. Members of the Council were invited to submit suggestions to the Registry or the Head of the Registry's Office; the matter would then be brought back to the Council at its meeting on 16 December 2013.

Action: Registry, Head of the Registry's Office

27. General Board

The minutes of the General Board's meeting on 9 October 2013 were received. The Board had received a revised version of the protocol for international agreements which they endorsed and approved for circulation to Schools, Faculties and Departments. The protocol was received with the papers.

PART B: MAIN BUSINESS

28. Financial statements and Annual Reports, 2012-13

The following documents were received:

- The draft Reports and Financial statements for 2012-13 for the University group ("Big U") together with a summary of consolidation and segmental analysis as submitted to the Finance Committee; and
- The Management Representation letter, for approval by the Council.
- The Annual Assurance return, for approval by the Council for submission to HEFCE as part of the annual accountability returns.

Associated papers received by the Audit Committee had been received for agenda item B4.

The Director of Finance reported. Iterations of the report and financial statements had been considered by the Business Sub-Committee at its meeting on 6 November 2013; by the Audit Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2013; and by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 20 November 2013. The External Auditor had been present for the discussion at both the Audit Committee and the Finance Committee meetings. The financial information was largely unchanged from previous iterations.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee reported that Committee's opinion that financial controls had been properly applied and that the Reports preceding the accounts were consistent.

These Finance and Audit Committees, for their part, had recommended that the Reports and Financial Statements for 2012-13 be approved for publication in the Reporter and for submission to the Higher Education Funding Council and that the Management Representation letter be approved.

The Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor noted that there was a surplus of £23m on the Group's continuing operations for the year ended 31 July 2013. However, the University's financial operations were finely balanced, generally at break-even or in deficit. There remained significant financial risks and uncertainties including: increasing demands in terms of the maintenance of the estate; the decreasing value, by inflation, of the £9,000 undergraduate tuition fee; the effects of possible pay inflation; and the potential loss of institution-specific high-cost distinctive provision from HEFCE. Further, the University's ambitions in terms of capital expenditure significantly outstripped the funds available. The positive outturn in the current financial year was supported by an exceptional result for the CUEF.

The following points were amongst those made in the course of a discussion about the detail of the financial reports:

- The endowment and investment income from the CUEF had been accounted for on an underlying income rather than a distribution basis; the difference, in terms of the bottom line, of the two accounting treatments was set out both in the narrative and the notes to the accounts.
- The overall increase in salary costs for the group as a whole could be accounted for both because of an increase in salary costs (through promotion and through progression through service and contribution points) and because of an overall growth in staff numbers. The transfer into the University of staff from CRUK and the MRC was significant in this regard.
- The University continued to recover monies from its Icelandic investments.

It was noted that the financial management information for the year ended 31 July 2013 would be published in the Reporter early in 2014.

The Council agreed:

- (i) to adopt, to authorise signature and to publish the financial statements and reports;
- (ii) to authorise signature of the Management Representation letter.
- (iii) To authorise signature of Part 2 of the Annual Assurance Return.

Action: Director of Finance, University Draftsman (publication)

29. Finance, Planning and Resources

(a) Planning and Resources

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Resources Committee held on 16 October 2013 were received together with the following papers:

(i) PRC 1467 setting out certain proposed fees for 2014-15 and an analysis of the costs of an undergraduate education (M 1569 refers)

The Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported. The average cost per student of an undergraduate education in 2011-12 had been calculated at £15.1K. This represented an increase of £300 over the 2010-11 calculation. The increase related to costs on the College side; University costs had remained static. A working group, including student representation, had been established to keep the model under review. Work was underway in the Colleges to provide a breakdown of College costs under the same headings as those used for University costs.

The Council approved the 2013-15 fee rates set out in Annex 1 of PRC1467 and the analysis in Annex 2 of the costs of an undergraduate education in 2012-13 to accompany the fees Notice.

(ii) PRC 1468 (revised) about the proposed Annual Sustainability Assurance Report (“ASSUR”) and including revised Sustainability Metrics (M 1570 refers).

The Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported. The HEFCE Financial Sustainability Strategy Group had recommended, in 2011, that each governing body should make a formal annual assessment of its sustainability on the basis of a set of metrics under the following general headings: teaching and learning and the student experience; research outputs and sustainability; financial performance for sustainability and financial health. The PRC had considered various iterations of draft metrics which were received by the Council at its meeting on 18 June 2012. HEFCE had now also issued advice concerning two mandatory metrics to be calculated as part of the process: earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortisation (EBITDA); which would, in turn, inform the margin for sustainability and investment (MSI). The sustainability metrics would provide useful quantitative data, particularly when considered longitudinally, which would inform financial and strategic decision-making.

The Council approved the inclusion of the Annual Sustainability Assurance Report in this year’s Annual Accountability Return and agreed that the metrics in Annex 2 of PRC1468 provided the Council with the necessary assurance with which to make an assessment of institutional sustainability.

Action: Mr Wilson

(b) Finance

The minutes of the meeting of the Finance Committee held on 20 November 2013 would be circulated to the Council for discussion at the meeting on 16 December 2013

After discussion, the Council approved the following documents (which had been considered by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 20 November 2013) and which formed part of the University’s annual accountability return to the HEFCE:

- The financial results for 2012-13 and an updated financial forecast for 2013-14;
- Commentary: an explanation of significant variances between the current and July 2013 submissions.

Action: Director of Finance

30. **Audit**

The minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 14 November 2013 were received. Papers were received as follows:

- (i) The External Auditor's Report to the Audit Committee (minute AUD.13.116(ii) referred);
- (ii) The Audit Committee Annual Report which includes, as Appendix A, the Internal Audit Annual Report (minute AUD.13.120 referred);
- (iii) The Value for Money Annual Report (minute AUD.13.125 referred);

The Chairman of the Audit Committee reported. The University had engaged in a number of material and wide-ranging activities over the past year, all of which had been scrutinised and tested as part of the internal audit process and through various other assurance mechanisms.

The Committee had noted that the audit process for Cambridge University Press had been significantly smoother than in previous years and had commended the CUP management both on system and process improvements and on changes to the culture of the organisation.

The Audit Committee, for its part, had agreed to recommend its submission to the Higher Education Funding Council with the audited financial statements.

It was noted, in the course of discussion, that the external auditors had included, as an appendix to their report, a paper entitled 'Fraud risks for Higher Education institutions'. The number of reportable instances within the University during the year ended 31 July 2013 was low, amounting to only two. It was reassuring that these instances had been identified through the existing systems of control. The external auditor had confirmed that the University's measures were appropriate. The introduction in 2012 of the University's 'Policy against Bribery and Corruption' had increased awareness of the issues. There was, however, no case for complacency.

The Council approved the circulated annual reports.

Action: Audit and Regulatory Compliance Officer;
Dr Coupe

31. **Review of Sport: consultative report**

A draft consultative report was received. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Strategy), who chairs the Review Committee, reported.

The Review Committee had been asked to review the governance and management of sport in the University. They had concluded that the current arrangements were not appropriate to the modern University's needs and now proposed a significantly different

framework. The Syndicate (and its predecessor bodies) and the associated regulation had been largely unchanged for a number of decades. Of particular concern was its isolation, both in reporting terms and in respect of its membership, from the major University strategic and decision-making bodies.

The formal role of the Syndicate, as set out in the Ordinances, was 'to advise the Council and the University about the policy, facilities, and arrangements for sport in the University'. The Review Committee, in the course of its deliberations, had found little evidence of the Syndicate providing, or being asked for, advice. In practice, its activities had focussed largely on student sport and, in particular, to distributing small grants to sports clubs, and to overseeing the physical facilities at Wilberforce Road, Fenners and West Cambridge. The Review Committee was of the view that the Sports Syndicate's current position that an activity could be recognized as a sport only if the Syndicate could afford to support it was untenable and unfair. There were practical and reputational risks associated with the sports clubs (both in terms of health and safety and other legislation; and financially) over which there was, in many cases, insufficient oversight or management. Further, the Syndicate's activities in terms of the registration of sports club duplicated or overlapped with the responsibilities of the Junior Proctor.

The current arrangements were particularly anachronistic in the context of the allocation of funding for sport. The annual Planning Round, covering both capital and recurrent expenditure, enabled the University to consider and balance competing demands on Chest funds from Schools, non-School and other institutions. The Syndicate had, over many years, failed to engage with this process and its reserves were therefore now virtually depleted. A short-term financial bail-out would be necessary if club support was to be maintained. There was no serious long-term capital plan. The Review Committee also considered that it was unacceptable that the Syndicate had virtually no oversight or control of the finances of the Department of Physical Education, and that the Department was so isolated from cognate and competing services within the University.

In effect, the current arrangements meant that there was no over-arching supervision of sport within the Collegiate University nor was there a strategic focus. Further, the Syndicate was not well placed to represent Cambridge sport to alumni and other interested parties.

The Review Committee therefore recommended that a Sports Committee should be established (as a joint committee of the Council and the General Board) and given overall responsibility for all aspects of University sport, including funding and organisation, and health and safety and reputational risks. It should be chaired *ex officio* by a senior University figure; the Review Committee proposed the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education). It should have a broadly representative membership and an appropriate sub-committee structure.

The Review Committee was of the view that the University should agree an overarching vision for sport (at all levels of engagement) which was consistent with the University's mission; a working draft vision was suggested within the report for consideration by the Council and, thereafter, by the proposed Sports Committee.

The Review Committee considered that students should be the primary focus for the University's investment in sport. However, maximum benefit from that investment would be realised only if consideration was given to the needs and participation of staff and the wider community. The Review Committee recommended that the current Department of Physical Education should be renamed the Sports Service and that it should be a part of the UAS, with the Director reporting for a transitional period to the Registry while a

permanent, optimum reporting structure was determined and implemented. The Review Committee considered that the Sports Service should provide administrative and infrastructural support to sports clubs and for team activities at every level.

The Review Committee had taken no view on the appropriate level of financial support for sport; that was for the proposed Sports Committee to consider and to bring forward submissions to the University through the usual financial and capital planning processes.

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

- It would be important, in order to maximize the potential for philanthropic funding for sport, to engage the Development and Alumni Relations Office with the work of the proposed Sports Committee. It was noted that the process of appointing a development officer with a focus on funding for sport was already underway.
- It would be important to consider the relationship between the Societies Syndicate and the proposed new Sports Committee. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) had attended a recent meeting of the Societies Syndicate to set out the Review Committee's recommendations. If the proposals in the current report were approved, it might be appropriate to undertake a similar review of the work of the Societies Syndicate.

The Council endorsed the draft vision for sport in the University as set out in the report and approved the consultative report for publication to the University and then a Discussion. A formal Report, taking into account the remarks made in Discussion, would be brought back to the Council for signature and publication during Lent Term 2014.

Action: Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs)
University Draftsman (publication)

32. North West Cambridge

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) reported. The negotiations with the Department for Education about the University's application to run a University Training School were at a sufficiently advanced stage to permit work to start on planning and design for the school. The University had been given Section 73 planning permission which would allow variation from the design parameters agreed in August 2012 thereby increasing flexibility on the development. There was agreement with the College Purchase Group over accommodation in Lot 4. There had been good progress in the negotiations with the College Rental Group over Lot 5.

33. University employment Human Resources Committee

The minutes of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on 24 October 2013 were received. It was agreed that the Report of the General Board on the establishment of the University Offices of Director and Assistant Director of Teaching should be brought back to the Council for discussion at its meeting on 16 December 2013. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) would be attending meetings of the Councils of the Schools in the meantime to explain the proposals.

Action: Head of the Registry's Office

**34. University Employment
Nominating Committee for the Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor**

A composite report from meetings of the Nominating Committee for the Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor on 21 October and 7 November 2013 was received.

The Registry reported. The Council, at its meeting on 23 September 2013, had received and considered recommendations from the Nominating Committee concerning, *inter alia*, the creation of the office of Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor. The Nominating Committee now brought back amended proposals taking into account the views expressed during the Council's discussion and following consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellors. The Committee now proposed that the maximum term of office for a Pro-Vice-Chancellor should, in exceptional circumstances, be extended from six to eight years in order to provide flexibility to respond to unforeseen circumstances or to ensure continuity. It was also proposed that, although there should be no separate office of Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, there should be the provision to confer the title of Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor on one of those appointed to the office with that individual taking responsibility for leading and co-ordinating the work of the team.

It was agreed, in the course of discussion, that the Report should set out examples of 'exceptional circumstances' in which an extension to the maximum term might be agreed. It was suggested that such an extension might be approved by means of a Notice and Grace; it was noted, however, that the Council was the body responsible for appointing Pro-Vice-Chancellors and, in the interests of consistency, it was therefore appropriate that the Council should approve any extension.

The Council approved, in principle, the proposals and authorised the preparation of a Report to the Regent House.

Action: Registry

Vice-Chancellor
16 December 2013