

Minutes of the Imperial College Union
 Appointments & Remuneration Committee
 11 December 2013
 Room 6, 6.00pm

PRESENT:

Lay Trustee	Julia Higgins - Chair
Lay Trustee	Janet Rogan (JR)
Officer Trustee	David Goldsmith (DG) – arrived 6.30pm
Officer Trustee	Natalie Kempston (NK)
Council Chair	Richard Bennett (RB)
<u>Permanent Observers</u>	
Managing Director	Joseph Cooper (JC)
Governance & Administration Manager – Clerk	Rebecca Coxhead (RC)

1. **CHAIRS BUSINESS – none**

2. **DECLARATION OF CONFLICT – none**

The agenda was reordered at this point to discuss agenda item 4

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WORK PLAN

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by JC

NOTED:

- a) The term for George Palos ends on the 31 July 2014 which means that there needs to be a succession plan in place within the next few months.
- b) It was agreed that the Managing Director’s (MD) Personal Development Review (PDR) should be at the least biannually.
 - i. The most obvious times for these to take place would be January and July.
 - ii. The MD role was last reviewed 1.5 years ago when the pay was frozen for 2 years. This freeze comes to an end at the end of July 2014.
 - iii. JC has personally instigated a 360 appraisal that will be undertaken in the New Year.
 - iv. There is no fixed format for the MD appraisal; in the past the Trustee Board Chair (JH) and the President have used as guidance the same format as that used for appraising other Union staff
 - v. It was questioned where the appraisal paperwork is lodged and it is presumed this in a file with the President. RC and DG to investigate.

ACTION:

1. **RC and DG to investigate where the physical paperwork is held for the MD – appraisal etc.**

- vi. There is no formal process for the scrutiny of the MD. The MD presents the Operating Plan to each Trustee Board meeting and this is presumed to address the accountability question.
- vii. All staff have a biannual PDR. JC stated that he will bring a report on the PDR journey and where this is going.

ACTION:

2. JC to report back on the implementation of the PDR process.

- c) It was highlighted that sabbaticals don't have a PDR.
 - i. Council hold the sabbaticals to account by scrutinising their reports every month.
 - ii. Coaching or mentoring from previous sabbaticals was a possibility suggested. RC to investigate if previous sabbatical officers were willing and able to undertake this role.
 - iii. Goals are set during residential training that the sabbaticals attend in July/August.
 - iv. It was suggested that an appraisal could take place 3 months in to a sabbatical role.

ACTION:

3. RC to contact previous sabbaticals to see if they are willing and able to become mentors for current sabbaticals.

3. STUDENT TRUSTEE RECRUITMENT

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by JC

NOTED:

- a) Overall the number of applicants was not as high as hoped however the calibre of the applicants were high.
- b) 2 International students and 2 Postgraduate students were shortlisted and 1 of each has been recommended to be appointed.
- c) The process is that the recommendations now go to Trustee Board and are then ratified by Council.
- d) It was questioned if the students selected would complement the Board and add to the current dynamic.
 - i. It was indicated that at interview, those selected impressed the panel with how they stated how they would challenge the Board and how they could 'hit the ground running' with the current Board composition.
- e) It was queried if it was worth considering specifically encouraging female applicants.
 - i. The equal opportunity monitoring forms were not available so the panel members were unable to comment on the gender balance of applicants.
 - ii. JC stated he will circulate numbers to the committee.

ACTION:

1. JC to circulate the breakdown of female/male applicants.

- f) Interviews were approximately 50-60 minutes.
- g) Of the learning points outlined in the paper, the following were highlighted
 - i. One of the unsuccessful long list candidates suggested that it may be work pressures that contributed to the low number of applicants.

- ii. It is worth considering proactively advertising to females.
 - iii. On the whole, the time from applications opening until interviews was ok.
- h) The specification for candidates would change year on year due to the composition of the board which becomes known after elections- seeing what skills gaps exists then.
- i) One of the candidates is a PhD student who may be open to taking on a 2 year term.
 - i. It was suggested to defer the decision of length of term until the new trustees are in place on the Board.
 - ii. It was suggested that the Board itself should make the decision on the term of the appointed student trustees
- j) The committee confirmed that they were happy with the overall process for recruitment and selection.

RESOLVED:

- 1) To recommend to the Trustee Board to appoint the selected student trustees.**

5. SABBATICAL REMUNERATION

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by JC

NOTED:

- a) The assumption is that sabbaticals live in halls as it is a requirement of the role they are elected to.
 - i. It then becomes a benefit to live out of halls.
- b) The pay band for sabbaticals is 1b.5 and this has not changed for many years.
- c) There is a built in penalty for living out by the financial package being less than that of if sabbatical was in halls.
- d) It was agreed that the rules should that Council decides whether a sabbatical should be living out are no longer appropriate under the new governance structure. Living in or out should be a personal choice.
 - i. The request to live out should be made to the Appointments & Remuneration Committee.
- e) It was agreed that RC and JC will redraft the document and circulate to the committee for discussion and will be put on the agenda for the next meeting.

ACTION:

- 1. RC and JC to redraft the sabbatical accommodation policy and present back to the committee.**

Meeting closed 7.30pm