

Sidney Sussex College

The Minutes of the Annual Meeting of
COLLEGE COUNCIL
Held in the William Mong Hall
on Wednesday 29 June 2022 at 10am

In attendance:

Senior members

The Master, Vice-Master, Senior Tutor, Bursar
Dr Bordin, Dr Doran, Prof Eilstrup Sangiovanni, Dr Fulda, Dr Garcia-Mayoral, Dr
Groom, Dr Oner, Dr Ranasinghe, Dr Stasch

Student Representatives

Ms Mahmood

Also in attendance: Ms Adams (College Registrar from MT22)

UNRESERVED BUSINESS

1. INTRODUCTORY BUSINESS

1.1 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Prof Sepulchre, Prof Reynolds, Dr Sumnall,
Miss Kazani, Mr Lu, and Ms Horvat-Mineh

The Master reminded Council that this would be Ms Harkin's last meeting as
Registrar and welcomed Ms Adams who was in attendance as an observer.

1.2 Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved subject to item 2.2d being moved to reserved
business as item 6.1i.

1.3 Declaration of Interests

Dr Bordin and Dr Fulda declared an interest in item 2.1b. It was also noted
that other directly employed Fellows (The Senior Tutor, the Bursar and Dr
Groom) also had a direct interest in 2.1b where there was a discussion about
whether recommendations relating to pay should apply to all directly employed
Fellows

1.4 Confirmation of the minutes of the unreserved business of the Meeting of Council on 25 May 2022 (ACC.2022.06.29.1.4)

The minutes were confirmed

a) Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

There were no matters arising.

2. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

2.1 Master's Business

a) Inter-collegiate business

The Master outlined the following inter-collegiate business which had taken place since the last Council meeting:

Bursar Committee

- The PVC for Strategy and Planning had expressed concerns about the reduction in international student numbers; Sidney's Admissions Director was aware of this.
- A proposal for the latest inter-collegiate levies to contribute to central services had been discussed. It would mean a £156,000 contribution from Sidney, which is a 10% rise
- The pay and status of UG supervisors was also discussed and would be the subject of a later agenda item in today's meeting

Senior Tutors Committee

- The supervisors' campaign for better pay and status was discussed, in particular how the colleges might engage collectively
- A final decision re the format for UG admission interviews in 2022-23 had been made; they will be online apart from those conducted by Trinity College
- The consequences of the enhance bursary being offered by Trinity College to successful widening participation applicants had also been discussed.
- There had been an update on the Student Suicide Safety strategy which would be taken to the general board and then onto University Council

Colleges' Committee

- The levy for admissions testing was discussed, with the Committee agreeing that colleges could be invoiced for the full amount, but money wouldn't be handed over to Cambridge Assessment as they had doubled the amount they were charging and has also imposed a charge on applicants for attending a centre
- The Suicide Prevention and Safety strategy was endorsed, but with the caveat that although a policy had to be in place, there was a view that it could be improved.

University Council

- The Suicide Safety strategy had been discussed and was agreed to be implemented in October. Since there had been concern around its possible watering down, a review of the policy would take place at that point.

- The proposed reading week for students halfway through the term was discussed. The General board had endorsed the proposal as a way of relieving students of the pressure of their study workload, but the implications of this would mean lectures starting immediately at the start of the term and continuing to the end, as the term would not be extended. The proposal will go back to the working group to work on the detail before a vote at Regent House with a view to it being introduced from October 2023.

b) CTO Review – implications of recommendations
(ACC.2022.06.29.2.1b)

The Master introduced the discussion noting that the first part of the discussion would be open to all Council members but that there would be a subsequent closed session for members who were not conflicted.

The Master reported to Council the outcome of an orientation discussion among the Principal Officers. The intention behind that discussion was to identify issues raised by the report of the Working Group and to suggest to Council the next steps in drawing up proposed responses to the Review for discussion by Council.

In open discussion the following points were made:

- A view was expressed that, where possible, a paper should be circulated in advance when responding to a report's recommendations, so that Council members have a chance to reflect on the content before the meeting. In response to this point, the Vice Master took the opportunity to emphasise that the Principal Officers had been reminded that they are not a body or a committee with a constitutional status within College governance, so they did not want to pre-empt the discussion and decisions that it was appropriate for Council to take; instead they had had a detailed discussion about the recommendations and sought to offer an orientation to Council; it was this body which would properly determine in due course the way forward, and ultimately take the final decision on the review's recommendations.
- It was noted that the working group considered an overview of the existing CTO contract terms.
- The line management of CTOs was perceived to be unclear.
- Whilst it was desirable to have intercollegiate consensus on the matter, there was a concern that any attempt to decide the issue of trading rate for CTO teaching in Faculties between that Colleges and the University could take an inordinately long time; the Master suggested that if an individual faculty came up with a reasonable deal, the College did not need to wait for an intercollegiate decision.
- The applicability of recommended changes in salary progression to employees other than CTOs was raised on grounds of equity. There was a concern that wider application may delay the introduction of any new practices for CTO salary progression, noting that it had been questioned

recently whether staff policies necessarily applied to Fellows. The Bursar clarified that the applicability of staff policies to Fellows was due to be considered by Remuneration Committee but confirmed that general HR policies did apply to all staff, including employed Fellows (in the same way the University's HR policies did), unless individual contracts or specific College Statutes and Ordinances overrode this in relation to particular aspects or in particular situations.

In closed discussion (CTOs having left the meeting, as well as three other College employed members: the Bursar, Senior Tutor, and Dr Groom), the following points and decisions were made:

- It was difficult to make a decision about salary progression without knowing the full cost implications, but it was felt that out of fairness, if it was introduced, it should apply to all employed Fellows.
- Some members expressed support for the Bursar's view that any changes agreed for employed Fellows should also apply to staff, again out of fairness, but also in relation to the retention difficulties that College had been experiencing. It was noted that there was no representation of staff on Council so there should be consultation with them separately.
- The Master commented that discussion of salary progression for employed Fellows ideally should take place in MT22, and he hoped that it could be completed by the end of that term. The logical approach would be to apply the University spine points, although this probably would not be appropriate for lower paid employees.

Summary of Discussion of the Principal Recommendations and Agreed Next Steps

(i) Workload

The Principal Officers felt that flexibility in relation to workload distribution could be feasible. For instance, it could be possible to trade stint hours for university teaching but the trading rate between the University departments and Colleges needed to be established. Where the University was concerned, ideally there probably needed to be an intercollegiate agreement. The Master said that he and the Senior Tutor would explore the scope for a collegiate university approach to the issue of trading in their forthcoming meeting with the incoming University's PVC for Education; the Senior Tutor would also do the same at Senior Tutors Committee.

As a way forward it was **agreed** that the recommendation would be discussed by Education & Pastoral Care Committee and then by Finance & Needs Committee, including consideration of what would constitute an acceptable rate of exchange for Faculty teaching provided by CTOs. A proposal would be brought back to Council.

Action: Senior Tutor and Bursar

(ii) Titles

It was noted that 'College Teaching Officer' would remain the collective term but that recent changes to the titles of University Teaching Officers made it desirable to reconsider the current titles applicable to College Teaching Officers. However, the review recommendation was not felt to be the best designation, but one based on University Teaching Officer titles was preferred.

It was **agreed** that the titles of 'College Assistant Professor' and 'College Associate Professor' for CTO Level 1 and Level 2 respectively would be adopted to mirror the newly changed University titles. The new titles would be confirmed by letter.

Action: Bursar

A question was raised as to whether a revision of titles should also apply to Senior Research Fellows. It was **agreed** that this would be considered separately.

Action: Master

(iii) Salary progression

In responding to the Review's recommendation on pay progression, the Principal Officers felt it was important for there to be fairness in the approach taken, with any change for one group of employed fellows having implications for other employed fellows and indeed other employees of the College. There would also be a financial implication for the proposal of a spine point increment increase every two years.

Council was strongly of the view that CTOs should not be treated differently to other employed Fellows in this regard and there was sympathy for the Bursar's view that if adopted, it should also be applied to all staff who are within a pay range. Hence it was suggested that salary progression for staff should be looked at, but separately to Fellows, with the caveat that there was no representation of staff on Council so there should be consultation with them about this recommendation

It was **agreed that** the recommendation, broadened to include all employed Fellows and separately staff, and its financial implications would be considered by Finance & Needs Committee and then Remuneration Committee (employed Fellows) and HR Committee (staff) as appropriate.

Action: Bursar

It was **agreed** that clarification of CTO line management should be given.

Action: Master and Senior Tutor

The Principal Officers felt that the role of the proposed Academic Dean was already within the scope of the role of Vice-Master, and on these grounds did

not agree with this specific recommendation. It was **agreed** that the creation of the proposed role of Academic Dean would not be pursued.

(iv) What kind of CTOs?

The meeting discussed the Review's recommendations in respect of the type of CTO contracts to be offered in new appointments.

The recommendation on new CTO1 contracts to be clearly established as a five year fixed term appointment was **agreed** in principle.

Council did **not agree** with the recommendation that in the event of a CTO-2 leaving or retiring that a new appointment could be at CTO-2 level.

It was **agreed** that Education and Pastoral Care Committee and Finance & Needs Committee would consider the recommendations in detail and bring a proposal back to Council.

Action: Senior Tutor and Bursar

As for any changes to Terms and Conditions for current CTOs to reflect the outcomes of decisions, these would be confirmed, if appropriate, once the implementation of the review was complete.

(v) Relations with the faculties

The Principal Officers felt that in principle, it was feasible for CTOs to take on additional work at a University faculty and receive pay for this from the faculty, or alternatively to do a trade for the faculty work if it was to be taken on by reducing the College stint (see above for discussion and actions).

It was **agreed** that there should be an attempt to centrally negotiate a University trading rate with the College, but in the meantime, Education & Pastoral Care Committee and Finance & Needs would be asked to discuss what rates they would accept from the faculties.

Action: Senior Tutor and Bursar

(vi) Ancillary Benefits

The Principal Officers had no objection in principle to a payment in lieu of accommodation for new CTOs, but felt that in the interest of fairness, this should apply to all Fellows and not just CTOs. Council **agreed** with this view, noting however that there is a significant financial cost to this proposal unless costs could be recovered in other ways, for instance by charging Fellows at some level for College accommodation once an initial period was over. This would need very careful consideration given the financial position of the College.

It was **agreed** that a position paper would go to Finance & Needs Committee for discussion with the possibility of a proposal to Council. If this were to be taken further, it would need to be agreed by the Remuneration Committee.

Action: Bursar

The Principal Officers confirmed that there was no bar to CTOs applying for external research funding and noted that Council had approved a policy for this in the past ([ACC.150701.7.2c](#)).

(vii) Governance

The Principal Officers confirmed that there was no bar to CTOs serving on Finance & Needs Committee.

(viii) Fellowship

The Master noted that a proposal to look at the culture of the Fellowship would be considered in Governing Body in its meeting to follow.

Finally, Council **confirmed** it greatly valued the contribution of CTOs to the College and to the education and pastoral care of its students.

c) **Charity Code of Governance** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.1c)

The Bursar explained that John Young, who was leading the review, would appreciate feedback from Council before writing his report. It was acknowledged that there was a lot of detail in the desk assessment and that due to pressure of workload of Council members, feedback would be better collected by way of circulation prior to Mr John Young reviewing over the summer. The Bursar agreed to look into whether a direct line of communication could be set up between Council Members and Mr Young to collate feedback.

Action: Bursar

d) ****Consent to Regent House membership changes**

(ACC.2022.06.29.2.1d)

Council **agreed** to the proposed changes.

2.2 **Senior Tutor's Business**

a) **Education & Pastoral plans for 2022-23** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.2a)

The Senior Tutor spoke to his paper, emphasising the work relating to the development of the University's Suicide Safety strategy and the College's role in this.

b) **UCU/Supervisor contract and pay** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.2b)

The Senior Tutor outlined the current stage of the supervisors' campaign for formalised contracts and better pay. He noted that whilst there is an agreed inter-collegiate recharge rate for supervisions, that the College was not formally bound to use that in payment for supervisions. It was also noted that there was benefit for supervisors working for multiple Colleges though this

could require an intercollegiate framework in relation to supervisor contracts. He confirmed that the College had reached out to those who currently offer high levels of supervisions to Sidney students over several years to offer to formalise the arrangements.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- For some academics, supervisions were the only way to put teaching experience on their CV, and many would not want to formalise the arrangements, preferring the flexibility.
- One Council member was finding it hard to recruit PhD students to take on supervisions
- One Council member felt that Sidney should look at developing a mentoring role for PhD students and offering inhouse supervisory experience
- It was appreciated that diversity would be lost if the formalisation of arrangements led to a reduced number and consequent reduced diversity in the pool of supervisors.
- The supervision group size was a difficult one to solve but it was acknowledged that each course could have a different norm in terms of supervision group size
- There was an existential risk to the nature and benefits of the Cambridge education experience if the supervision element became unaffordable.

Action: Senior Tutor to feedback Council's views to the inter-collegiate Task and Finish Group

c) ****Academic Distinctions** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.2c)
Council **approved** the revisions to the recognition of academic distinctions.

d) Widening Participation Initiative: Proposal for mitigating conflict of loyalty

This item was moved to reserved business 6.1c.

2.3 Bursar's Business

a) **Budget for agreement** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.3a)

The Bursar noted that Council members had reviewed the draft College budget for 2022-23 at its last meeting. This paper was an update on that first draft and had been endorsed by the Finance and Needs Committee. The budget for 2022-23 was now estimated to be £1.5 million in deficit, which was similar to the expected outcome for the current year's budget. Some concern was expressed about the ongoing deficit levels. Council **endorsed** the new budget figures.

b) **Cyber-Incident Risk Management** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.3b)

The Bursar explained that it was important for Council to be aware of cybersecurity risk and the work being done to mitigate against this. She informed Council members that the recommendations coming out of the recent

cyber-incident risk workshop would be implemented, with a report back to IT Steering Committee and then Council in Michaelmas term.

i) ****Information Incident Management Policy**

(ACC.2022.06.29.3.10aⁱⁱ)

Council **approved** the policy.

c) ****Annual Permission for any two of Master, Vice-Master, Bursar and Senior Tutor to use College seal**
Council **approved** the annual permission.

d) ****Appointment of Messrs Peters, Elworthy and Moore (PEM) as Auditors for the Audit of the 2022-23 Accounts**
Council **approved** the appointment of PEM as auditors.

e) ****Appeals for Easter Term 2022** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.3e)
Council **approved** the recommendation.

2.4 **Development Director's Business**

The Development Director joined the meeting for this agenda item.

a) **Development & Membership Office – change of name**

(ACC.2022.06.29.2.4a)

The Development Director outlined the reason for the proposed change of name which the Development Committee had already endorsed. Council **approved** the proposed change of name to Development and Alumni Relations Office and confirmed that they were content with the proposed mission statement.

b) **Stewardship recommendations** (ACC.2022.06.29.2.4b)

The Development Director explained the three proposals, which had been endorsed by the Development Committee:

- The introduction of a permanent plaque within Sidney for donors of over £100,000, in order to visibly recognise their donation but also to show people that the College relies on philanthropy. Council **approved** the proposal, subject to review by Building and Environment Committee in terms of design and location. The detailed design and location proposal would be brought back to Council for final approval.
- The recognition of lower-level donors by way of an annual donor board. The intention would be to place this board where students could see it to encourage alumni giving. Council **approved** the proposal, subject to review by Building and Environment Committee in terms of construction and location.
- The introduction of a new tier of giving to incentivise those donors who fell within the £10,000-25,000 donation range to move up a level. The introduction of a new tier of lower-level benefits was intended to offer an incentive for these donors to increase their giving. The name for this

new tier still needed to be decided. Council **approved** the proposal in principle.

2.5 Steward's Business

There was no business.

2.6 Student Business

There was no business.

3. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

3.1 Chapel Committee

Council **noted** that the Chapel Committee minutes for Lent Term had been received but too late for circulation. They would be submitted to Council for the first meeting of Michaelmas Term. The Easter meeting of Chapel Committee has been postponed.

3.2 Environmental Sustainability working group

a) *Minutes of the meeting of 17 May 2022 (ACC.2022.06.29.3.2a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

3.3 HR Committee

a) *Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 19 May 2022
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.3a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

ii) **Annual Leave Policy (ACC.2022.06.29.3.3ai)
Council **approved** the policy

3.4 Buildings & Environment Committee

a) *Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 23 May 2022
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.4a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

i) ** Health & Safety Committee Terms of Reference
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.4ai)
Council **approved** the terms of reference and noted that the Committee would report directly to Council in future

3.5 Communications Working Group

a) * Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 25 May 2022
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.5a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

i) **Protocol for setting up and running College-affiliated social media pages and groups (ACC.2022.06.29.3.5ai)
Council **approved** the protocol

- ii) ****Appropriate use of social media guidelines**
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.5aii)

It was noted that a College member has expressed concern that they could be subject to disciplinary action if they brought Sidney into disrepute as a result of something they posted on social media. The Bursar noted that there was a distinction between posting as an individual and posting as if on behalf of the College.

Council **approved** the protocol.

3.6 Wellbeing Governance Board

- a) * Minutes of the meeting of 26 May 2022 (ACC.2022.06.29.3.6a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

3.7 Investment Committee

- a) *Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 1 June 2022
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.7a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

- i) ****Investment Policy** (ACC.2022.06.29.3.7ai)
Council **approved** the policy.

3.8 Library Committee

- a) *Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 7 June 2022
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.8a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

3.9 Finance & Needs Committee

- a) *Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 13 June 2022
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.9a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

3.10 IT Steering Group

- a) *Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 15 June 2022
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.10a)
Council **noted** the minutes.

- i) ****Defragmentation of IT across the collegiate university – Sidney’s response** (ACC.2022.06.29.3.10ai)
Council **approved** the response for submission to Office of Inter-collegiate Services.

- ii) ****Updated terms of Reference** (ACC.2022.06.29.3.10aiii)
Council **approved** the updated terms of reference

3.11 Remuneration & Benefits Committee

- a) ****2022-23 Fellows Allowances and Charges** (ACC.2022.06.29.3.11a)
Council **approved** the Fellows Allowances and Charges for 2022-23

b) ****2022-23 Fellows Catering Charges (ACC.2022.06.29.3.11b)**
Council **approved** the Fellows Catering Charges for 2022-23

c) ****2022-23 Fellows Accommodation Charges**
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.11c)
Council **approved** the Fellows Accommodation Charges for 2022-23

d) ****Fellows Handbook** (ACC.2022.06.29.3.11d)
Council **approved** the Fellows Handbook subject to updating the accommodation charges based on the approach approved by Finance and Needs Committee.

3.12 **Development Committee**

a) ***Unreserved minutes of the meeting of 17 June 2022**
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.12a)

Council **noted** the minutes.

3.13 **Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) working group**

a) **Report and Work Programme 2021-22**
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.13a)

The Vice-Master drew attention to the work done by the EDI working group and the work plan going forward. He informed Council that the work was now moving onto the implementation and monitoring phase, and that the group would need to decide on the methodologies to be employed for reviewing processes/activities and what the EDI priorities should be.

He asked Council if it thought that, going forward, the working group should be constituted as a Committee. He explained that there were advantages and disadvantages to this proposal. The working group format is more flexible in terms of membership, but a committee structure offered clearer mechanisms for setting agendas and reporting. In discussion, a member queried whether Council had sufficient information at this stage to judge whether the group would be better constituted as a Committee. The Master noted that terms of reference had yet to be drawn up and that these would be brought back to Council before a final decision was made.

In conclusion, Council **agreed** in principle with the recommendation that the working group should make the transition to be a committee of Council, subject to development and review of terms of reference, but that it should retain its current working group status for Michaelmas term.

b) ****Equality, Diversity, and Inclusivity (EDI) policy framework**
(ACC.2022.06.29.3.13b)

The Vice-Master explained that the EDI policy was set up as a framework rather than a detailed policy. It which sets out the proposed values and commitments of Sidney to equality, diversity, and inclusion.
Council **approved** the policy framework.

Council thanked the members of the EDI working group for their work to date.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

4.1 Any other business

The Master noted receipt of a further item of business from Dr Fulda which had been received by the Council Secretary that morning. It proposed a 'festival of ideas' initiative for Sidney. It was agreed that the paper would circulate electronically to Council members for them to comment upon once the Senior Tutor had a chance of discussing the proposal with Dr Fulda.

Action: Senior Tutor and Dr Fulda

4.2 Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 12 October 2022 at 2pm in the William Mong Hall