

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 13 July 2015.

Present: Vice-Chancellor (Chair); the Master of Corpus Christi, the Mistress of Girton, the Master of Jesus, the Warden of Robinson; Professor Anderson, Professor Davis, Professor Karet; Dr Anthony, Mr Caddick, Dr Charles, Dr Good, Dr Holmes, Dr Hutchings, Dr Lingwood, Dr Padman; Mr Lewisohn, Mr Shakeshaft, Ms Weller; Ms Mensah; with the Registry, the Head of the Registry's Office, the University Draftsman, the Academic Secretary and 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 were received from Professor Dame Shirley Pearce and Mr Roemer. Dr Oosthuizen was on sabbatical leave.

The Senior Proctor was present.

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the new student members, Ms Mensah and (*in absentia*) Mr Roemer.

He further noted that it was the last meeting for the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Dr Lingwood. He thanked them for their exceptional contributions to the work of the Council and the wider University.

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

PART A: PRELIMINARY, LEGISLATIVE AND STRAIGHTFORWARD BUSINESS

123. Declarations of Interest

Dr Hutchings, as a member of the Postdocs of Cambridge Society declared an interest with regard to the matter recorded as minute 134 ('Postdoctoral Foundation'). Dr Charles, as a member of staff in University Information Services (UIS), declared an interest with regard to the matter recorded as minute 127(e) ('Twentieth Report of the Board of Scrutiny, 2014-15'). Dr Lingwood, as Director of the Institute of Continuing Education, declared an interest with regard to the matter recorded as minute 128 ('General Board minutes') which made reference to ICE's Annual Report. Otherwise, no personal or prejudicial interests were declared.

124. Minutes

It was noted that Mr Jones had requested specific reference to the Clarendon Fund be added to minute 118 ('Cambridge Assessment'). This amendment had been made; the unconfirmed minutes now under consideration therefore varied in this regard from those provided to the Council in Council Circular 15-2015. It was agreed that there should, in addition, be a minor amendment indicating that the Council had received the *unconfirmed*

minutes of the Audit Committee's meeting on 7 May 2015. Subject to these amendments, the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2015 were received and approved.

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

125. Procedure of the Council

(a) Arrangements for the chairing of agenda items

It was agreed that the Vice-Chancellor should chair the meeting for all of the items with the exception of the matter recorded as minute 136 ('The Vice-Chancellor's appraisal 2014-2015'). The Deputy Chair would take the chair for this item.

(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:

Circular	Issue	Approval
14/15	12 June	22 June
15/15	19 June	29 June
16/15	26 June	6 July
17/15	3 July	13 July

126. Vice-Chancellor's Report

(a) The Council was reminded that, at its meeting on 16 March 2015, it had been reported that complaints had been submitted to the Junior Proctor with regard to the election for President of the Graduate Union. The Junior Proctor had duly investigated these complaints and the result of the election had been announced. However, the successful candidate had since decided not to take up office. The University was working closely with the remaining charity trustees of the Graduate Union to determine next steps.

(b) The Vice-Chancellor had hosted the launch of the Research for Equitable Access and Learning (REAL) Centre on 16 June 2015 at which the keynote speaker was Julia Gillard.

(c) The ceremony for the conferment of Honorary Degrees had taken place on 17 June 2015.

(d) The Vice-Chancellor had attended the Glion Colloquium in Switzerland from 18-21 June 2015.

(e) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a meeting of the Tanner Trustees in Stanford on 21-22 June. He reported that there had been a substantive discussion about the prevalence of sexual harassment and misconduct on campus. There was a growing number of cases and legal action against universities. The University took its own responsibilities very seriously in this regard as evidenced by the recent addition of a specific provision

concerning harassment to the General Regulations for Discipline in the student disciplinary procedures.

(f) The Varsity Cricket Match had taken place on 27 June 2015.

(g) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a dinner about Polish-Ukrainian relations on 1 July 2015.

(h) The Vice-Chancellor had spoken at a breakfast event to launch his article for the Leadership Foundation on 'The personal and the political in leadership: a story of immigration, students and targets'.

(i) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a meeting of the Russell Group EU Advisory Board on 2 July 2015.

(j) The Vice-Chancellor had attended a Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership event in St James' Palace on the topic of: 'Rewiring the Economy: ten tasks, ten years, the future we want'.

(k) The Vice-Chancellor had delivered the welcome speech on 5 July 2015 for the Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning's Ignite Programme.

(l) The Vice-Chancellor had given a lecture at the China Executive Leadership Programme on 6 July 2015.

(m) The Vice-Chancellor had met the Minister of State for Universities and Science on 6 July 2015. The discussion had been wide-ranging across both Cambridge-specific and sector-wide issues as follows: access and widening participation; the abolition of AS levels; the role of universities in driving economic growth; inter-institutional research collaboration; the EU and UK Higher Education; selectivity and concentration of research funding. There had also been some discussion about the role of HEFCE as an interlocutor between Government and the sector. The Minister had indicated a commitment, as set out in the Government's election manifesto, to the introduction of a Teaching Excellence Framework. It would be important to ensure that such a framework did not focus only on processes and on metrics but, rather, took account of the wider student experience. In the meantime, the University would continue to monitor existing metrics such as NSS and PTES scores; student retention and progression; and graduate employability.

127. Council, legislative and comparable matters

(a) Council Work Plan 2014-15

The updated Work Plan was received.

(b) Business Committee

No meeting had been held on 6 July 2015.

(c) Council Strategic Meeting: 21 and 22 September 2015

A draft agenda for the Council's strategic meeting was received and, subject to a change to the timings to allow more time for the Vice-Chancellor's report, was approved. It was agreed that papers should be circulated as early as possible and that the reputation survey which the Office of External Affairs and Communications had commissioned from YouGov and which had been considered by the General Board at their meeting on 3 June 2015, should be included with the papers. It was further agreed that there should be some discussion about pensions, probably as part of the Vice-Chancellor's report.

(d) Standing Orders, Code of Practice, Statement of Primary Responsibilities and Statement of Corporate Governance

The Statement of Primary Responsibilities, the Code of Practice, the Council Standing Orders, and the Statement of Corporate Governance were received and re-adopted.

(e) Twentieth Report of the Board of Scrutiny, 2014-15

The Board's Twentieth Report to the Regent House was received. It was noted that it was the Council's usual practice to publish the Report to the Regent House for Discussion early in the Michaelmas Term. The Council would then receive and consider a draft Notice in response both to the Report itself and to the remarks in Discussion. As was customary, those best placed to reply to the various comments and recommendations in the Report would be invited to contribute to the draft Notice. The Director of UIS and the Information Services Committee would wish to consider and respond to the recommendations concerning IT and the UIS.

The Council approved the Report for early publication and Discussion in the Michaelmas term noting that there would be an opportunity to respond to the recommendations thereafter.

128. General Board

The minutes of the General Board's meeting held on 3 June 2015 were received.

PART B: MAIN BUSINESS

129. Agreement with the Office for Fair Access (OFFA)

The Council received documentation concerning recent correspondence and negotiations with OFFA about the University's Access Agreement for 2016-17. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) reported. He reminded the Council that the Access Agreement had been submitted in two stages: the first provided a narrative of the University's access processes and procedures; the second set out quantitative targets. OFFA had accepted the narrative submission but had rejected the quantitative targets. OFFA considered that the two admissions targets (61-64% of UK students admitted from UK state sector schools; 9-12% intake of UK resident students from POLAR3 quintiles 1 and 2) were insufficiently challenging. It had additionally requested that the retention target be expressed as an absolute figure rather than, as proposed by the University, being linked to the HESA benchmark.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Director of Undergraduate Recruitment had met with the Director of the Office for Fair Access on 7 July 2015. The discussion had focussed primarily on the two admissions targets. The Director of the Office for Fair Access reported that, on the basis of data which he had secured from UCAS, he considered that Cambridge could achieve a state sector target in the range from 66-71% and he therefore considered 66% to be a minimum. Similar data indicated that 13% was an appropriate target for POLAR 3, quintiles 1 and 2.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Director of Undergraduate Recruitment noted that the University's proposed targets were evidence-based and that this evidence was published and available for public scrutiny. The University could not adopt targets based on evidence which the Director of OFFA was unwilling to provide and which could not, therefore, be subject to appropriate interrogation and analysis. On the basis of the evidence available to the University, it would not be possible to increase the state sector target beyond 64% without adopting quotas or reducing admissions standards for certain categories of student. Neither approach would be acceptable to the University. If evidence became available to suggest that a target beyond 64% was possible, the University would, of course, review its target. Following a rigorous discussion, it had been agreed that the following targets be proposed to the Collegiate University: a state sector target of 62-64% with an aspiration to be at the top of this range by 2019-20; a POLAR3 quintile 1 and 2 target of 10-13% with again, an aspiration towards the top end of the range by 2019-20; a non-continuation target of 2.1%. It was noted that the OFFA's deadline for publication was imminent and the Council was therefore asked to approve these targets which remained challenging but which were realistic.

There had already been some preliminary discussion in the Collegiate University about what might constitute additional targets using data already gathered.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor further reported that a number of other Russell Group institutions had come under similar pressure from OFFA and that some had agreed to targets which might prove to be unrealistic. The Russell Group institutions were inevitably all seeking to recruit the same students from the target groups.

Had it not been possible to agree mutually acceptable targets with OFFA, it was likely that the University would have been denied permission to charge the higher rate of tuition fees. It was not clear what sanctions would apply in the case of HEIs which failed to meet their agreed targets.

It was possible that widening participation and the targets agreed with OFFA might be an element in the proposed Teaching Excellence Framework.

The Chair of the Colleges' Committee confirmed that the Colleges considered that the targets which had been agreed represented the best possible outcome.

The following is a summary of the points raised in the course of discussion:

- The Council commended the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Director of Undergraduate Recruitment and welcomed the outcome.
- It would be important to establish additional targets based on robust, objective evidence. The abolition of AS levels removed one such source of information.
- OFFA's focus was, primarily, on access rather than on progression thereafter. It was less interested, for example, in metrics regarding the academic performance of students from less advantaged and under-represented groups during their University career and in their subsequent employment. The University, however,

took seriously such metrics as an indicator of the ways in which a Cambridge education benefited graduates both personally and professionally and improved life chances.

- Consideration might be given to establishing targets relating to diversity, including BME students.

The Council, for its part, approved the targets as set out in the Access Agreement appendices.

Action: Director of Undergraduate Recruitment

130. North West Cambridge

The Finance Committee, at its meeting on 8 July 2015, had received a revised financial appraisal for Phase 1 of the project. This paper, with the unconfirmed minute of the Finance Committee's discussion, was received.

The Vice-Chancellor stressed the confidential nature of the materials presented to the Committee and stated that they should be treated as commercial in confidence so as not to expose the University to further risk and possible financial exposure before settlements had been reached with third parties.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) reported, reading from a script he had prepared for himself¹. The salient points which he made were that there continued to be good progress on-site. The topping-out ceremony for the primary school would take place on 14 July 2015 and work remained on schedule for a September opening. The school would make a positive social and intellectual contribution to the value of the project, and would also impact positively on property values.

Two thirds of the lot contracts had been procured at the prices originally predicted in the financial appraisal. £200m of contracts and 1000 people were now on site delivering a high quality product which would provide accommodation (including key worker housing) but which would also bring a good financial return in the long term.

Difficulties had arisen, however, with the financial projections for Phase 1. He had reported to the Council, at its meeting on 19 January 2015 and at every subsequent meeting, concerns about the delivery of the site-wide infrastructure.

There was an on-going dispute on the interpretation of part of the building contract with the site-wide infrastructure contractor. That dispute was subject to imminent adjudication but the financial consequences would remain unknown for some time. The performance of that contractor (especially in advance of an intervention by senior University representatives in February 2015) had been poor. Performance had now improved substantially and the implications for the schedule were improving.

There had been some delay to procurement for some of the lots because of late design changes which, because of the inflationary surge, had cost implications.

The range of financial implications from these and other factors outlined in the Finance Committee paper had become clear only in early July. The cost overrun for Phase 1 was

¹ The script and the Council minute were subsequently provided to the Syndicate as SWNWCE336. This paper is appended to the minutes for members of the Council and Officers with access to Council papers only.

currently forecast between £48.9m and £76.2m, with the most likely scenario indicating a £57.2m overspend. Key worker housing rent levels were fixed in relation to salary costs in an agreement with the local authority and could not be adjusted in the short-term to reflect fast-rising rent levels in the private sector.

As a result of all of these factors, the current financial appraisal for Phase 1 of the project breached some of the parameters set by the University.

There were options to reduce the scope of one or more of the lots which had not been procured, or indeed to postpone them until some future date. That would reduce the capital requirement in the short term, at the cost of long term income and housing provision. Those options would be explored as a matter of urgency in order that informed decisions could be made by the Finance Committee and the Council as soon as possible.

It was clear that, in the light of the situation regarding Phase 1, it would not be sensible to actively pursue Phase 2 at the current time and that any preparatory work and associated expenditure on Phase 2 should be halted.

He was of the view that there should be an urgent investigation into the sequence of events and causes that had led to the current situation without timely reporting to the Finance Committee and other University bodies. It would be important to review both the governance and management arrangements.

He therefore supported the conclusions reached by the Finance Committee and the actions that it had set out for endorsement by the Council.

The Vice-Chancellor expressed his deep disappointment at the project's performance. Any risk of the project impacting upon the University's continued ability to invest appropriately in the academic activities of the University would be unacceptable. He asked the Council to endorse the Finance Committee's recommendations. The following is a summary of the points raised in the course of discussion:

- It would be important to ensure that the revised costings were robust and that there were no other financial or other complications which had not been identified by or notified to the project team. As part of this process, it would be necessary to understand why information about emerging difficulties had not been escalated or reported appropriately.
- In response to a concern that key worker housing rent levels would be raised in the long term, it was noted that the provision of affordable housing remained an important element in the project. Key worker housing rent levels were fixed in relation to salary costs in an agreement with the local authority under the S.106 agreement and so were not susceptible to rising private sector rent levels.
- The investigation would focus both on financial controls and planning and wider issues around management and governance.
- It would be important to have significant external representation on the investigatory group, and, in particular, individuals with experience of large and complex projects of this kind. External scrutiny would be important, as would open and transparent reporting of the findings to the Regent House.
- Given the scale and ambition of the University's capital plan, it would be important to use the findings of the investigation to inform the way in which the University managed other projects.
- It would be important, while conducting the investigation and undertaking the options appraisal, to maintain momentum on site and with the construction work which was already well underway. There were likely otherwise to be both

financial and reputational implications.

The Senior Pro-Vice Chancellor reminded the Council of the strategic importance of the project for the University both in the short-term and for its long-term future and sustainability. The current forecast cost overrun for Phase 1 was serious and it would, as set out above, be important to understand how it had arisen; to review options for mitigating or reducing it; and to ensure that the governance and management structures were appropriate. However, if the current figures and projections were correct, there would not be a loss on the project as measured by the internal rate of return compared with the cost of borrowing.

In conclusion, the Council endorsed the recommendations of the Finance Committee.

131. University Finance

(a) Planning and Resources

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Resources Committee held on 24 June 2015 were received.

(b) Finance Committee

The Finance Committee had met on 8 July; the full minutes would be provided to the Council for discussion at its meeting on 21 September 2015.

The Finance Committee had considered and, subject to minor amendments, had agreed to recommend to Council the HEFCE financial forecasts which the University was required to submit to HEFCE by 31 July 2015. The Council received the financial forecasts.

The Director of Finance reported. The draft forecasts were prepared on a University Group ('Big U') basis. The Local Examinations Syndicate had met the previous week and had approved a revised budget with an additional £11m surplus; it was proposed that the draft document be revised to reflect this. It was agreed, in the context of the earlier discussion, that the narrative about the North West Cambridge project should be revised to report that the latest approved expenditure for the project was £320m and would be kept under review.

Subject to these amendments, the Council approved the financial forecasts for submission to HEFCE.

132. Audit

Audit Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2015 were received. Mr Lewisohn, as Chair of the Committee, reported. The Head of the University Research Office had given a useful and interesting presentation and had answered questions from the Committee.

133. Office of External Affairs and Communications

A presentation and a report from the Office of External Affairs and Communications (OEA&C) were received. The Director of External Affairs and Communications reported.

The Office used strategic communications across multiple channels to support the University in the delivery of its mission. OEA&C's work reflected the University's priorities and promoted the excellence, importance and global impact of its research and teaching. The office was structured across three key areas of activity: communication, public engagement and internal communications. The work of the office was both proactive and reactive. It had an important role to play in both promoting and protecting the reputation of the University through media handling and advice. This included matters relating to the undergraduate admissions process, access and widening participation. The office was working in close partnership with CUDAR with regard to the launch of the new Campaign.

The public affairs team supported the work of the University in informing and influencing key stakeholders and decision makers within the sector and externally locally, nationally and internationally. A cross-party engagement programme had been instigated during the election period and there had been an active briefing process with new and returning MPs thereafter. The POLIS election broadcast series was downloaded 110,000 times and was third in the iTunes top podcasts.

The digital team supported the University's web, digital and social media presence. This was increasingly important in terms of influence and reputation in a digitised and social media age and reinforced traditional print media communications.

The public engagement team delivered major public engagement events such as the Science Festival, the Festival of Ideas, Open Cambridge and the 'Cambridge at the Hay' Festival. The sheer volume of visitors and partners and sponsors for these events demonstrated their reach and impact. The team also worked with academic colleagues to demonstrate the importance and impact of the University's research activities.

The recently established internal communications team was working to support consistent, coherent and effective internal communications. An internal communications role would be piloted in the School of the Arts and Humanities to ensure a user focussed approach.

The brand team was responsible for managing and protecting the integrity of the University's brand and registered trademarks.

Research communications extended over a variety of print and digital media. *Research Horizons*, with a hard copy distribution of 45,000, was a useful mechanism for informing decision makers, policy formers and research funders in government and more widely about the breadth and impact of the University's research activity. A film about the University's use of animals in research had been viewed 10,000 times and had been commended for its transparent and open approach. The office also supported the dissemination of research activities to new audiences. The HIPHOP PSYCH initiative reached 1.3 million young people through social media channels.

The growth in social media had impacted significantly on the form and scale of the University's communications activities; it was now possible to reach larger and more diverse audiences. Audience share had increased across all social media channels. Short videos delivered through YouTube had proved to be a particularly powerful and popular communications tool.

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

- The range and quality of activities was commended and recognised to be an important element in the University's public face and reputation locally, nationally and internationally.
- The OEA&C worked closely with the University's International Strategy Office and the International Press Association in determining how best to engage with overseas audiences recognising the variety of social and other media. This included, for example, national public radio in the United States and Weibo in China. It was important that the University's brand and values were protected.
- It was important, in measuring the success of the OEA&C's activities, to establish impact, influence, engagement and reputation as well as reach. The office was in the process of reviewing its KPIs to ensure that they were sufficiently challenging and meaningful.

134. Postdoctoral Foundation

The Council, at its meeting on 12 May 2014, had agreed to establish a working group with the authority to develop a vision for a postdoctoral academy. A proposal by the working group for the establishment of a Postdoctoral Foundation was received.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Affairs) reported. Postdoctoral researchers had become the University's largest staff group in 2012. They were a vital element in the University's research success and sustainability across an increasing range of subjects. They were, however, a relatively new demographic and were largely excluded from many of the benefits and the governance arrangements of Collegiate Cambridge. The same was true in most research-intensive universities internationally.

The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPDA) had been established in 2013 to identify the needs of the postdoctoral community and address the gaps in support. It had already proved to be a successful initiative. The Mill Lane base (which would move to North West Cambridge in 2017) had hosted hundreds of events, both social and intellectual. Its volunteer-based partnership model was economic to run and generated significant social benefit. Departing postdoctoral researchers, from this year, would have access to many alumni benefits. Much of OPDA's activity was already being copied by institutions in LERU and Russell Group.

The working group (which he chaired and which included College and CUDAR representation) had been considering ways in which the OPDA model might be further developed. It had also been exploring the possibility of a graduate college in North West Cambridge; a paper would be brought back to the General Board and the Colleges during the Michaelmas Term.

The working group considered that there was the potential, in the longer term, for an independent institution with some of the properties of a conventional college but not necessarily bound by them or by any of the traditional terminology. In the short term, the working group had considered the arrangements for the appointment of a successor to Professor Abell, who had been appointed for an initial 3-year period but who would leave office in December 2015 to take up his post as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), and the associated governance structure. The working group proposed the establishment of a time-limited Postdoctoral Foundation Syndicate under Statute A VI; a Report to the University would be brought back in the Michaelmas Term. The establishment would be based on the current OPDA budget. It was further proposed that the new Director's post

would be advertised with an explicit remit to establish a group of senior colleagues to build the case for an independent foundation and to bring back proposals for suitable governance arrangements. It was recognised that the majority of postdoctoral researchers did not pursue an academic career; the governing body for such a foundation would therefore need to include fellows from a broad range of careers.

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

- It was noted that there was a concern that the proposed Postdoctoral Foundation would be seen as an alternative to better integration within the existing University structures and community, and that the Foundation's establishment would not directly address the issues that postdoctoral researchers faced.
- The proposal before the Council was broad brush. The Council was being asked to approve only the appointment of a successor Director of OPDA and to agree that a Report concerning the establishment of a time-limited Postdoctoral Foundation Syndicate could be brought back during Michaelmas Term. Assuming this approval, there would be a significant further job of work to be done in consulting postdoctoral researchers about the form which such a foundation might take; the issues which it might address; and the wider question of integration into Collegiate Cambridge. This would be done through the OPDA, the PdOC Society, the Newcomers and Visiting Scholars and through other postdoctoral groups and networks.
- It was intended that the Postdoctoral Foundation would complement the work already being done in a number of Colleges to integrate postdoctoral researchers into their activities. Colleges were encouraged to continue this activity. Realistically, however, the size of the cohort meant that it would never be possible to provide a College connection for all postdoctoral researchers.
- It was noted that the majority of postdoctoral researchers were not members of the Regent House and therefore would not have an automatic right to respond to proposals brought before the Regent House. Postdoctoral membership of the Regent House, including inconsistency across departments, was a separate matter and would be considered, *inter alia*, during the discussion about governance at the Council's September Strategic Meeting.

In conclusion, it was agreed that the process of appointing a Director of OPDA to succeed Professor Abell should start immediately. A Report concerning the proposed Postdoctoral Foundation Syndicate would be brought back in the Michaelmas Term.

Action: Dr Coupe

135. University employment Human Resources Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2015 were received.

PART C: RESERVED BUSINESS

136. The Vice-Chancellor's appraisal 2015

Officers other than the Registry withdrew.

The Deputy Chairman took the chair. The Chair of the Remuneration Committee, Ms Sara Weller, reported on the outcome of the appraisal of the Vice-Chancellor which had followed a similar pattern to the appraisal process of previous years, as approved by the Council. She noted that the objectives for the Vice-Chancellor for 2015/16 which had previously been provided to the Council had been amended slightly in the light of the feedback received so that Objective 5 now read: "Providing strategic oversight of the **new and evolving** Development Campaign". Ms Weller also read out the principal points of the letter that she intended to send to the Vice-Chancellor which had been agreed with the Remuneration Committee. The Council approved the outcomes of the appraisal and the specific points that were made noting the overwhelmingly positive regard in which the Vice-Chancellor was held.

In answer to a question, the Council was reminded that 2015 was not a year in which any recommendation about the Vice-Chancellor's salary would be made. The next opportunity to review his salary would fall in 2016.

Vice-Chancellor
21 September 2015