

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 20 January 2014.

Present: Vice-Chancellor (Chair); the Master of Jesus, the Warden of Robinson; Professor Donald, Professor Karet; Mr Caddick, Dr Cowley, Mr Du Quesnay, Dr Good, Dr Lingwood, Dr Padman, Dr Oosthuizen; Mr Lewisohn, Dame Mavis McDonald, Professor Dame Shirley Pearce, Mr Shakeshaft; Mr Jones, Ms Osborn; with the Registry, the Head of the Registry's Office, the University Draftsman, the Academic Secretary, the Director of Finance; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International Strategy).

Apologies for absence were received from Professor Hopper, Dr Bampos and Ms Old.

The Master of Christ's and Professor Gay are on sabbatical leave. The Master of St Catharine's is a member of the Septemviri which is hearing a case; her membership of the Council is suspended until the conclusion of that case.

The Director of External Affairs and Communications was present.

The Senior and Junior Proctors were present.

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

PART A: PRELIMINARY, LEGISLATIVE AND STRAIGHTFORWARD BUSINESS

49. Declarations of Interest

It was agreed that, while holding an office in the University and Colleges Union (UCU) was a declarable interest with regard to the discussion about the HR Committee minutes (minute 60 refers), membership of UCU was not. No personal or prejudicial interests were declared.

50. Minutes

The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2013 were received and approved.

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

51. Procedure of the Council

(a) To approve arrangements for the charring of agenda items

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

(b) To approve confirmed 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:

Circular	Issue	Approval
31/13	13 December	23 December
32/13	20 December	2 January 2014 (exceptionally)

52. Vice-Chancellor's Report

(a) The Vice-Chancellor congratulated members of the University named in the recent New Year Honours list as follows:

Companion of Honour: Baroness Onora O'Neill of Bengarve
DBE: Professor Shirley Pearce
CBE Professor Ash Amin, Professor David Neal
OBE Emeritus Professor Juliet Compston,

(b) It was noted that HRH Prince William, Duke of Cambridge, would be following a 10-week bespoke programme of executive education organised by the Cambridge Programme for Sustainability Leadership (CPSL), beginning on Tuesday 7 January 2014 and ending in mid-March. HRH had been granted MA status as a visiting scholar, and CPSL would matriculate him as a member of the University, allowing him access to lectures if necessary. The programme did not lead to any qualification. The objective was to help provide The Duke with an understanding of contemporary issues affecting agricultural business and rural communities in the UK. Course leaders were Professors Gilligan (Plant Sciences), Adams (Geography) and Allmendinger (Land Economy), coordinated by Ms Courtice, Director of CPSL.

In the course of discussion, it was noted that the granting of MA status was not consistent with the University's position with regard to other bespoke courses.

(c) Dr Anthony Freeling would succeed Sarah Squire as President of Hughes Hall at the start of the new academical year.

(d) On 13 January 2014, the Vice-Chancellor had meetings with Liam Byrne, MP (Shadow Minister for Universities, Science and Skills), Patricia Hewitt (former Labour MP) and Tristram Hunt, MP (Shadow Secretary of State for Education). These meetings were part of an ongoing engagement with the political parties, particularly during the run-up to the General Election in 2015.

The discussion with Mr Byrne had covered a wide-ranging set of key issues for universities including: fees and funding; the graduate tax; the removal of the cap on student number at publicly-funded higher education institutions in England by 2015-16; and financial sustainability in the sector. The discussion with Ms Hewitt had focussed on synergies between the University's activities and interaction with India. The discussion with Mr Hunt had particularly addressed the importance of the University's outreach work in encouraging and enthusing younger students to continue into higher education.

(e) The Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, the Provost of UCL and the President of Imperial College had attended a policy discussion event in 10 Downing Street hosted by the Minister for Universities and Science on 15 January 2014. It was likely that there would be significant pressure on the budget for BIS: the ring fence around funding for science appeared to be secure but this would, inevitably, mean financial pressure elsewhere. The capital plan would be extended until 2021. The future role of the HEFCE and the effectiveness and value of the REF were also discussed.

(f) The Vice-Chancellor had hosted a dinner for City and County Council leaders on 16 January 2014. It was noted, in the course of discussion, that the local authorities were undertaking an 'open space' consultation. It was important that College capital developments were recognised as being an integral aspect in the delivery of the University's growth agenda, particularly with regard to graduate students.

(g) The Vice-Chancellor reported on current discussions about the proposed transfer of Papworth NHS Foundation Trust to the Cambridge Bio-Medical Campus. The transfer would be a vital and positive development both for reasons of academic and clinical research and in terms of patient care.

(h) The Vice-Chancellor congratulated Dame Ann Dowling who would become the first female president of the Royal Academy of Engineering in September 2014.

(i) Revd Dr Jeremy Morris, K would succeed Professor Martin Daunton as Master of Trinity Hall at the start of the new academical year

53. Council, legislative and comparable matters

(a) Council Work Plan 2013-14

The updated Work Plan was received.

(b) Business Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2014 were received, together with a paper listing the dates of Council, General Board and Finance Committee meetings for 2014-15 and provisional dates for 2015-16.

(c) Membership of Council committees

The minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Committee held on 9 December 2013, which included the Committee's recommendations relating to membership of Council committees, had been circulated to the Council in Circular 31/13 on 13 December and approved on 23 December 2013. They were received again for information.

54. Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Stephen Hawking Professorship of Cosmology

The Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Stephen Hawking Professorship of Cosmology had been discussed on 14 January 2014. The Council received a draft Notice in response to the remarks in Discussion and to promote a Grace to be determined by ballot. The Vice-Chancellor, in opening the discussion, noted that he

believed that the matter was now for the Regent House to decide and that he did not wish to express a personal view.

The following is a summary of the comments made in discussion:

- There continued to be some variation in the views of Council members about aspects of the Report and some points of detail. It was recognised that there was, inevitably, some risk in taking the Grace to ballot. It would be important to consider the extent of this risk and the implications (in terms of reputation and future fundraising) should the Grace not be approved.
- Some concern was expressed about the equal pay issues and the arrangements for determining salary particularly given the Crown distribution element. It was noted, however, that the Trustees (three of the four of which were *ex officio* University appointees) were obliged under the Trust Deed to pay only the minimum necessary to recruit or retain the Professor and that a mechanism had been established such that the salary levels for the Hawking Professor should not be significantly different from those of colleagues of comparable distinction. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) reported that the comparison would not be with colleagues internationally; rather it would be based on internal benchmarking and, in particular, the market level would be identified by comparison with the average of the salaries of the most senior established chairs in the School of the Physical Sciences. Dr Cowley noted that retention and recruitment payments should be made on the basis of external comparisons not internal comparisons; in his view the mechanism proposed was not consistent with the University's procedures since internal comparisons are accounted for through basic pay and contribution increments..
- The matter raised important and complex questions around philanthropic support for the University's academic activities. If the University was required to return the donation, it was likely that there would be implications for future fundraising activities. It was important, however, to strike a balance in this regard and to ensure that large-scale donors did not exert a disproportionate ongoing control over the University's use of the funds.
- It would be important to ensure that the case for the establishment of the Professorship on the terms set out in the Report was clearly articulated in flyers for the ballot and that the central arguments put forward by speakers in Discussion by those opposed to the proposal should be addressed.

In conclusion, it was agreed that it was appropriate now to give the Regent House to determine this important issue. The Council therefore approved the Notice and Grace for publication.

- **Action:** University Draftsman (publication)

55. Statutory provisions and regulations for nominations and election to the Chancellorship: proposed review

The Council, at its meeting on 18 March 2013, had established a working group, chaired by Sir Graeme Davies, to review the statutory provisions and regulations for nominations and election to the Chancellorship. A draft Report to the Senate was received.

The Head of the Registry's Office reported. The key changes proposed were: to reduce the size of the Nomination Board and increase proportionately Senate representation on the Board; while maintaining the existing arrangements for voting in person, to allow voting by any other method(s) which the Nomination Board determined before announcing an

actual or impending vacancy in the office of Chancellor; to allow the Nomination Board to put forward more than one nomination; to require the Nomination Board to publish all properly formulated nominations made by members of the Senate together with its own nomination(s); and to prevent a candidate withdrawing after the publication of nominations and to provide for the Commissary to determine whether an election should if a candidate died or became incapacitated in the course of an election.

In the course of discussion, it was suggested that the proposals might be amended: to require the Nomination Board to publish a Grace announcing the method(s) of voting; and to require that four of the Council members on the Board be elected by the Regent House. A revised Report would be brought back to the Council in due course.

Action: Head of the Registry's Office

56. Committee arrangements for Estate Strategy and Buildings

The Council received a paper setting out proposed revised arrangements for Estates Strategy and Buildings. The Registry reported.

At this stage, the Council was asked to consider the proposals in principle. A revised paper, taking account of the Council's views, would then be the subject of consultation with the Planning and Resources Committee and the Buildings Committee. Thereafter, a Report, setting out the consequential changes to existing ordinances and regulations, would be brought back to the Council for consideration in due course. The current committee arrangements had been implemented in 2004-5. There had, since that time been a significant increase in the University's capital activities; in particular, there were now a number of major developments in planning or discussion. Further, the development of the capital plan had facilitated a more strategic approach to the development of the University's estate and holdings. There was currently no forum in which to discuss wider estate strategy, as opposed to the design and construction of individual buildings. It was increasingly important to be able to take a co-ordinated view of developments across the University estate in order to maximise financial and procurement efficiencies; to manage the development programme; and to take account of overarching environmental, infrastructural and transport considerations. It would be important to ensure that there was a strategic approach to land acquisition and disposal. It was hoped that the new arrangements would minimise the redundancy, overlap and significant administrative overhead which existed within the current committee structure.

The following is a summary of the comments made in discussion:

- The principles of the proposals were welcomed. There had been considerable progress over recent years with regard to the Capital Plan and it was, therefore, timely to review the underpinning committee structures. An estates strategy was an important element in the delivery of the University's academic and educational mission.
- The expertise and experience of the external members of the Buildings Committee was recognised as a particular strength in the current system. It would be important to continue to make best use of this resource.
- It was important to take account of networking and related information services matters as part of the estates strategy.
- The needs of the end user and issues around life-time building maintenance would continue to be an important part of the planning process for individual buildings.

- There would, increasingly, be a case for constructing flexible buildings, sites and spaces which could be adapted to meet the changing needs of the University.
- An increasingly strategic approach to the development of the University's estate and holdings would strengthen the University's capacity to engage constructively and creatively with the local authorities.

Action: Registry (consultation with PRC and Buildings Committee)

57. General Board

The minutes of the General Board's meeting on 4 December 2013 were received. The Council's particular attention was drawn to the progress report on the University's REF submission. It was noted that there would be a wide-ranging review of the University's internal REF processes and preparations. In response to a question, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) reported that a template by which Schools might assess the Masters courses offered by their constituent institutions was under development.

PART B: MAIN BUSINESS

58. Finance, Planning and Resources

(a) Planning and Resources Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2013 were received. In the absence of the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Dr Cowley reported. The principal item of business had been the capital plan, which the Council would consider with the Finance Committee's minutes. The Committee had also agreed to recommend a new University Policy on Thermal Comfort to the Council. The Council received and approved the policy.

(b) Finance Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2014 were received. The Council's attention was drawn in particular to the discussions recorded under Minute 36 ('Capital Plan') and the associated paper.

The Registry reported. The proposal in the paper was for a one-off grant of c.£150m to the Capital Fund for exceptional capital expenditure to rationalise and renew the University's biofacilities both for regulatory reasons but also with a view to generating ongoing operational, maintenance and other efficiencies. The current estimated cost for phases 1 and 2 of this project (which was crucial to much of the University's research in the Clinical School and the School of Biological Sciences) was £150m. It was not a project which was susceptible to donor funding.

The Director of Finance reported. There were various financial assets held in reserves which were, if necessary, available for capital investment. The paper proposed that the University's own resources should be used to invest in future growth and support academic imperatives and, in effect, to turn financial assets into operational ones. The Finance Committee has supported the proposal and had asked him to undertake more detailed work to determine both the immediate and the long-term affordability of the proposal. A further paper would be brought back to the Finance Committee Business Sub-Committee at its meeting on 5 February 2014 and thereafter to the Finance Committee for approval at its meeting on 5 March 2014. He noted that the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor had

established an Advisory Group (comprising, for the most part, external members of the Finance Committee and the Council) to look at the University's longer-term estate strategy in the context of its broader financial position and ambitions. The first meeting of this Financial Strategy Advisory Group would take place on 3 February 2014.

In the absence of the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Mr Du Quesnay and Dr Lingwood, as members of the Committee, reported. The Finance Committee's support (in principle and subject to more detailed information) was based on two main considerations: the urgency of the biofacilities project and the unlikelihood of securing donation funding for these purposes; and the general financial position of the University. The Committee was also conscious of the importance of capital investment in the context of the University's competitive position both nationally and internationally.

The following is a summary of the comments made in discussion:

- While the current financial position and the recent return from the CUEF were both positive, it was important to be prudent and to consider the longer-term implications inherent in investing reserves in capital projects. In particular, it would be necessary to understand the extent of the recurrent income generated from those reserves. The competitor analysis was important, but it was for the University to determine what it could afford.
- The development of the Mill Lane/Old Press Site was expected to generate a substantial capital receipt for the University; the extent of that receipt, however, was currently unclear.
- It was, however, also important to consider what the University might lose (financially and competitively in terms of both teaching and research) if it did not invest its own resources in capital development.
- The options for partnership with other organisations for biofacilities had been explored and found not to be viable. It would, however, be important to have a robust business plan for the new facilities focussing, in particular, on efficiencies and effectiveness.
- The proposed revised arrangements for estate strategy and buildings, discussed earlier in the meeting, would be vital in ensuring that there was close oversight of the capital plan and of the likely future capital needs of the University. The Council also commended the establishment of the Financial Strategy Advisory Group.

Action: Director of Finance

59. North West Cambridge

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional Affairs reported that there continued to be good progress on the North West Cambridge Development.

60. University employment Human Resources Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2013 were received together with a paper concerning Trade Union recognition. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) reported.

There had, for a number of years, been an informal partnership working arrangement with the University and College Union (UCU). The UCU had submitted a formal request for

voluntary recognition to represent academic, academic-related and research staff. The Committee had noted particularly: the low percentage of membership of UCU in the relevant staff groups; the role of the Regent House; and UCU's membership of the Partnership Working Group alongside the other unions. It had decided not to recommend formal recognition of UCU. The Council approved the Committee's recommendation.

Vice-Chancellor
17 February 2014