

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 14 April 2014.

Present: Vice-Chancellor (Chair); the Master of St Catharine's, the Master of Jesus, the Warden of Robinson; Professor Donald, Professor Hopper, Professor Karet; Dr Bampos, 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 Old, Ms Osborn; with the Registrary, the Head of the Registrary's Office, the University Draftsman and the Director of Finance; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs).

Apologies for absence were received from the Master of Christ's.

Professor Gay is on sabbatical leave.

The Senior and Junior Proctors were present.

**UNRESERVED BUSINESS**

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

**85. Declarations of Interest**

Mr Lewisohn and Mr Shakeshaft, as external members of the Council whose first terms of office would end on 31 December 2014, declared an interest in respect of the discussion about the recommendations of the Nominating Committee for external members of the Council (minute 89 refers). No other personal or prejudicial interests were declared.

**86. Minutes**

The unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2014 were received and approved.

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

**87. Procedure of the Council**

**(a) Arrangements for the chairing of agenda items**

It was proposed that the Vice-Chancellor should chair the entire regular meeting. 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 the issue and approval of the following:

<b>Circular</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Approval</b>
8/14	14 March	24 March
9/14	21 March	31 March
10/14	4 April	14 April

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

(a) The Science Festival took place from 10-23 March 2014.

(b) The Guild of Benefactors' Ceremony took place on 19 March 2014.

(c) The Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor visited the Language Science Strategic Research Initiative in the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics and the Cambridge Programme for Sustainability Leadership on 20 March 2014.

(d) The Vice-Chancellor chaired the Annual Disability Lecture on 20 March 2014.

(e) The Vice-Chancellor attended an 'Ideas to Reality' event at the Hauser Forum on 26 March 2014.

(f) The Vice-Chancellor attended the Henley Boat Races on 30 March 2014.

(g) The Vice-Chancellor met Matthew Hancock, Minister for Skills, on 31 March 2014.

(h) The Vice-Chancellor spoke at a 'Jobs and Skills Summit' at the Institute for Public Policy Research on 1 April 2014.

(i) The Vice-Chancellor visited Hong Kong from 8-14 April 2014.

(j) The Vice-Chancellor reported that there was increasing political interest in Higher Education as the parties discussed their manifestos for the next General Election. The University engaged equally with all of the major parties.

(k) The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) reported on the recent confirmation of Cambridge's City Deal Status. The City Deal scheme had been launched by the Government in 2011. The scheme sought to promote economic growth by giving England's cities new powers and freedoms. City Deals were agreements with government which gave the city powers in respect of: decisions which affected their local area; the growth of local businesses; the creation of economic growth; the expenditure of public monies.

The first round targeted the eight largest cities in England outside London. The second round was initially intended to target the 20 next largest cities, thereby excluding Cambridge. Following extensive lobbying by the local authorities and the University, the Government had agreed to permit Cambridge to bid because the growth per head of population was amongst the largest in the country. It was clear to Government, and to the

local authorities that the economic success of Cambridge was primarily due to the presence of both Universities, and to the technological and scientific cluster which had spun out from, or been attracted by, the University of Cambridge. The University's active engagement from the outset significantly enhanced the credibility of the bid nationally and had demonstrated the extent of the University's commitment to local partners. Details of the agreement remained under negotiation. It was anticipated that a formal agreement would be signed in the course of the year.

The case to government was predicated on the need, if the unprecedented economic growth was to continue, for a significant investment in housing and transport infrastructure in the Greater Cambridge area. Major housing developments would benefit the city only if transport into and around the city was improved. A Greater Cambridge Growth Board would be established to manage the investment in a coherent and coordinated way. It would comprise: the leaders of the City Council, the County Council and the South Cambridgeshire District Council; the Chair of the Local Enterprise Partnership; and the Vice Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, represented by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs). Other important stakeholders, including Anglia Ruskin, would be consulted by means of an Advisory Board. It was, effectively, an initial step towards a unitary local authority, which was likely to bring major long term benefits.

The Government had made available £20m p.a. for 5 years from 2015 to be invested in transport infrastructure with the provision for borrowing ahead. Up to a further £400m would be made available over 10–15 years if this initial investment generated significant additional growth and housing. The Cambridge local plan aimed to build over 33,000 homes within commuting distance of the University by 2031.

From a University perspective, the infrastructure improvements were necessary in order to facilitate the development of West Cambridge. There was also a need for staff housing. The University might also participate in an apprenticeship scheme which would benefit technical and estates staffing. It was also an opportunity for the University to contribute to the local debate and decision-making.

No University resources or assets had been committed to the City Deal, other than further to develop West Cambridge when infrastructure improvements allowed. Future consideration might also be given to investing University capital in affordable housing schemes beyond North West Cambridge.

The City Deal was supported by all of the mainstream national and local political parties, and major local businesses so was not unduly susceptible in the event of a change in local or national government after the next election.

The Council welcomed the report and noted its appreciation of the significant efforts of those involved in negotiating this successful outcome to the bid.

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

### **(a) Council Work Plan 2013-14**

The updated Work Plan was received.

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

No meeting had been held on 7 April 2014.

### **(c) Strategic Meeting**

The notes of the spring strategic meeting had been circulated in Circular 10/14 and were recirculated for discussion. The minutes were approved subject to a minor amendment to the report of the discussion about research and enterprise to make it clear that increasing the number of graduate students *on taught courses* would have an impact on the teaching load of academic staff.

The Deputy Chair reported. The revised format for the meeting (and, in particular, the opportunity for small group discussion) had appeared to be generally well received. A paper setting out the issues which might be taken forward for further and more detailed discussion at the Council's September strategic meeting would be brought back for consideration at the meeting on 12 May 2014. It was intended that the discussion at the strategic meeting in September would also be informed by a report from the Financial Strategy Advisory Group.

In the course of discussion it was agreed that it would be important to draw together inter-related and inter-dependent issues from across the four themes.

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

### **(d) September meeting and strategic meeting**

It was noted that the Council's September meeting would be held in the William Mong Hall at Sidney Sussex College on the morning of 22 September to be followed by lunch and the first part of the September strategic meeting in the afternoon. The day would conclude with dinner in the Old Library. The strategic meeting would continue at Sidney on the morning of 23 September, finishing at noon or thereabouts. It would not, on this occasion, be a residential meeting.

### **(e) External members of the Council: Nominating Committee**

The Nominating Committee had met on 17 March 2014. The minutes, together with draft Graces concerning reappointments, were received. It was noted that the minutes were in error in omitting Dr Lingwood as one of those present at the meeting.

Professor Dame Shirley Pearce, as chair of the Nominating Committee reported. The Committee had paid tribute to the tremendous contribution which Dame Mavis McDonald had made to the work of the University and the Council, particularly as its Deputy Chair. The Nominating Committee had invited Mr Lewisohn and Mr Shakeshaft to attend its next meeting to elicit their views of the personal and professional skills and experience which might be sought in identifying a new external member of the Council to replace Dame Mavis. The Nominating Committee would bring forward a nomination to fill the vacancy in due course.

The Council approved for publication the draft Graces for the reappointment of Mr Lewisohn and Mr Shakeshaft for a further four years.

**Action:** Draftsman (publication)

## **90. Committee arrangements for Estate Strategy and Buildings**

The Council, at its meeting on 20 January 2014, had received a paper setting out proposed revised arrangements for Estates Strategy and Buildings. The Planning and Resources Committee, the Buildings Committee and the Chief Executives of Cambridge Assessment and Cambridge University Press had all been consulted and had approved the proposals. The Council approved for publication a Report setting out the revised committee arrangements.

**Action:** Draftsman (publication)

## **91. General Board**

It was noted that the minutes of the General Board's meeting on 5 March 2014 would be approved by the Board at their meeting on 30 April 2014 and provided to the Council at the meeting on 12 May 2014.

## **PART B: MAIN BUSINESS**

## **92. University Finance Planning and Resources Committee**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Resources Committee held on 26 March 2014 were received together with associated documentation.

The Director of Finance reported on the Allocations and Budget Report for 2014-15. The Council had received the first draft Budget with the key assumptions at its meeting on 17 March 2014. The budget and plan had been considered by the Finance Committee Business Sub-Committee at its meeting on 2 March 2013 and by the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC) at its meeting on 26 March 2014. It would be further considered by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 30 April 2014. The Council would be asked to sign the Report at its meeting on 12 May 2014 for publication to the Regent House.

The numbers were largely unchanged from those provided to the Council at its last meeting. Table 3 now reflected the reduction in funding announced in the recent HEFCE letter. The small surplus for 2014-15 was largely in line with the forecast position in the 2013 Budget Report. There was a forecast return to surplus in all years of the planning period. However, the long-term financial target of a surplus of 2-3% of Chest income had not been achieved and remained challenging. The forecast Chest surpluses were sensitive to variations in the principal assumptions, including pay award of 1% in each year. There was a small separate contingency partly to cushion any increase above this figure. The plan included an assumption of a 2% increase in USS employer costs from August 2015 and for an increase in employers' National Insurance costs because of the abolition of the Second State Pension from April 2016. The transfers from Cambridge Assessment and CUP primarily supported the capital investment programme and therefore did not have an impact on the recurrent Chest budget.

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

- The reduction in unrestricted funding for capital expenditure was a real threat to research infrastructure and development in Cambridge and across the sector more widely. The Vice-Chancellor repeatedly raised concerns with government about sustainability in this regard.
- The University was now in a position to respond quickly to calls for bids for capital funding from schemes such as the UK Research Partnership Investment Fund (RPIF) and has been successful in the last round of bids. However, there was significant competition for these funds and it was necessary to leverage private co-investment of at least £2 for every £1 of public funds.
- It was noted that the remit of the HEFCE Catalyst Fund was broadly construed but included the provision of large grants to effect strategic change where more than one Higher Education institution was involved and support for institutions in financial difficulties. It was not a significant sum of money.
- There was no plan, at present, to take on further borrowing in support of the capital plan.

The Council received First-Stage Reports of the Council on the construction of a new building and refurbishment works for the Cambridge Judge Business School and on the re-provision and rationalisation of facilities covered by the University's Home Office Establishment Licence.

In the course of discussion, it was noted that the construction of a new building and refurbishment works for the Cambridge Judge Business School (JBS) was part of an agreed redevelopment of the site. The approval for the development was based on a proper scrutiny of the case. There would be University support for the project in the form of a loan repayable over a ten year period, which had been agreed by the Finance Committee on the basis of a business case from JBS. The JBS Development Officer would work with CUDAR on fundraising for the development. The work would support JBS's undergraduate and MPhil teaching as well as its Executive Education. It was important that Executive Education activities across the University were properly co-ordinated through the Board of Executive and Professional Education.

The Council approved for publication the two First-Stage Reports.

**Action:** Draftsman (publication)

### **93. The Higher Education Funding Council for England's (HEFCE) annual assessment of institutional risk**

Based on accountability returns submitted for 2012-13, HEFCE's overall assessment was that the University was 'not at higher risk' and that it was meeting its accountability obligations. The Chief Executive's letter to the Vice-Chancellor was formally received, as required by HEFCE. It was noted that 'not at higher risk' was the highest available rating.

### **94. Access Agreement with the Office for Fair Access (OFFA): 2015-16**

The Council received the draft Access Agreement with the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) for 2015-16. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) reported. The University was required to submit an annual Access Agreement to OFFA. The circulated document had been reviewed and approved by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the University

and Colleges Joint Committee. The document was largely unchanged since 2014-15; in particular the key targets remained the same. The University maintained its focus on delivering financial support through bursary provision, notwithstanding pressure from OFFA to divert money from bursaries into widening participation activities. The bursary scheme had a role to play in attracting students to the University; more importantly, however, it provided financial support to enable students with less means fully to participate in the wider student experience. This was, in itself, an important element in social mobility and widening participation. However, the funds released by the termination of the National Scholarship Scheme, for which the University was required to provide matching funding, would be used for widening participation activities.

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

- Students had been involved in the drafting of the Access Agreement through their membership of the various bodies responsible for its production.
- The University remained concerned about the impact of the reform of the 'A' level system (and, in particular, the abolition of AS levels) on access and widening participation. This concern had been expressed to the Department of Education.

## **95. Proposed Review of Student Disciplinary Procedures**

The Registry reported. There had recently been two cases which had identified difficulties at the interface between the disciplinary procedures and the complaints procedures. It was therefore proposed that there be a review of student disciplinary procedures (i.e. those within the jurisdiction of the Court of Discipline) to consider, in particular, the management of cases which invoked both the disciplinary and complaints procedures and the role and responsibilities of those involved in advising on and presenting cases to the Court.

In the course of discussion, it was noted that the review would focus primarily on the interface between the student disciplinary and complaints procedures. However, the committee might, in the course of its work, identify other aspects of the disciplinary processes which might merit review. It would be appropriate for the review committee to consult the Proctors.

It was noted that the General Board had also considered and approve the proposal. The Council approved the terms of reference and membership of the proposed review committee.

## **96. North West Cambridge**

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional Affairs reported. There continued to be good progress with the North West Cambridge development both in terms of construction work on site and with obtaining planning consents. It was intended that there should be a major report to the Finance Committee in July, by which time there would be a clearer understanding both of the capital receipt income and construction costs. A paper setting out a vision for a postdoctoral academy and a College dimension on the site would be presented to the Council at its next meeting. The contract had been agreed with the supermarket provider. The project team was now fully accommodated at Gravel Hill Farm; it was hoped that there would be an opportunity for the Council to visit the site in due course.

**97. University employment**  
**(a) Human Resources Committee**

It was noted that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2014 would be provided to the Council at its meeting on 12 May 2014 after they had been considered by the General Board. .

**(b) Septemviri**

Professor Sir John Baker, who was Chair of the Septemviri during a recent case, had written to the Registry suggesting, *inter alia*, that the Septemviri was inappropriate as a forum for hearing appeals against failure to confirm an appointment at the end of a probationary period. The letter had been considered by the General Board at its meeting on 5 March 2014. Professor Sir John Baker's letter and the minute of the General Board's discussion were received, together with a proposal for a review.

The Registry reported. The scope of the proposed review was limited and it was intended that the work would be completed by the end of the Easter Term.

**(c) Nominating Committee for the Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor**

The Council, at its meeting on 25 November 2013, had received and approved in principle proposals for changes to the provisions concerning the appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors. A draft Report and the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on 19 March 2014 were received. The Registry reported. The only substantive change to the proposals since they were last considered by the Council was that the post of Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor should be advertised and filled in advance of the other three Pro-Vice-Chancellorships. This would allow the new Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor to be involved in the filling of the remaining three posts. It was also proposed that, on this occasion, the person appointed as Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor should continue to hold the planning and resources portfolio.

In the course of discussion, it was agreed that the stipend for the post should be set out in a Report, following referral to the Remuneration Committee in the first instance which would make a recommendation to the Council. However, the current Report was approved for immediate publication and Discussion.

**Action:** Registry, Draftsman (publication)

Vice-Chancellor  
12 May 2014