Remuneration Code Consultation

CUC Remuneration Code

Consultation Submission Form

Determining the remuneration of senior post holders in higher education is the responsibility of governing bodies and their remuneration committees.

Most members of these bodies are unpaid, independent volunteers, with a wide experience of other walks of life and a sincere commitment to the long-term sustainability of their institution.

They are making difficult judgments with integrity, to the best of their ability; they serve out of a desire to perform public service.

We believe that most of their decisions result in institutional leaders being given appropriate remuneration for what is a complex, demanding and ever more challenging role.

At the same time, the CUC has recognized that we can do more to explain the decisions we have made and ensure that the appropriate governance arrangements are in place – with that in mind we have produced this draft guidance on remuneration for senior post holders.

We are keen to ensure that this guidance is owned by the sector and helps us to strike the right balance between demonstrating that we use the resources at our disposal wisely whilst at the same time ensuring that we can recruit and retain the very best staff – to continue to serve the interests of our students and our communities.

We have therefore decided to consult as widely as possible on this draft. I urge all members of the CUC and anyone else with an interest in the reputation of the UK HE sector to comment on the draft.

Chris Sayers
Chair, CUC

---

1. Name (required)

2. Contact Email (required)

3. In what capacity are you responding to this consultation? (required)

- Member of CUC
- Publically funded higher education provider
- Alternative higher education provider (with designated courses)
- Alternative higher education provider (no designated courses)
- Further education college
- Body representing students in higher education
- Representative organisation, business or trade body
- Central/local government, agency or body
- Individual
- Trade union or staff association
- Charity or social enterprise
- Other

3a. If you selected other, or if you are responding from another type of organisation please specify.

4. Please state your location outside England (if applicable)

- Wales
- Scotland
- Northern Ireland
- Other

4a. If you selected Other, please specify.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements and provide an explanation in the comments box. There is no word limit on responses.

5. The overall approach set out in the guidance reasonable.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No opinion

5a. Comments:

6. These proposals will lead to more transparent explanations of senior post holder remuneration being provided to the public.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

6a. Comments:

7. These proposals will improve the linkage between the remuneration of senior post holders and other staff within institutions.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

7a. Comments:

8. These proposals will improve the governance of senior post holder remuneration.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

8a. Comments:

9. This guidance will assist institutions in demonstrating the value for money secured from the funds at their disposal.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

9a. Comments:

10. This code makes it clear that it is independent members of the governing body who are accountable for the remuneration of senior post holders.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

10a. Comments:

11. The preamble gives sufficient context to ensure that those reading the code understand the nature of the task in determining remuneration within HE.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

11a. Comments:

12. The code uses the notion of 3 elements required for fair and appropriate remuneration - a fair and appropriate level; procedural fairness; and transparency and accountability. Do you agree with these?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree

- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

12a. Comments:

13. Are there any other elements that should be explored? Please explain.

14. Element 1 is a reasonable statement of what a fair and appropriate level might mean.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

14a. Comments:

15. The set of principles that underpin Element 1 are reasonable.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

15a. Comments:

15b. Are there any other principles that should be included for Element 1? Please explain.

16. Element 2 is a reasonable statement of what procedural fairness might mean.

- ☐ Strongly Agree

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

16a. Comments:

17. The set of principles that underpin Element 2 are reasonable.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

17a. Comments:

17b. Are there any other principles that should be included for Element 2? Please explain.

18. Element 3 is a reasonable statement of what transparency and accountability might mean.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

18a. Comments:

19. The set of principles that underpin Element 3 are reasonable.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

19a. Comments:

19b. Are there any other principles that should be included for Element 3? Please explain.

20. The explanatory notes are useful.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

20a. Comments:

21. There are some explanatory notes that are problematic.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

21a. Comments:

22. There are principles that need further explanatory comment.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

22a. Comments:

23. I believe that this code will help to improve public confidence in the role of remuneration committees in HE.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ No opinion

23a. Comments:

24. Please make any additional comments about this draft code here.