

The Higher Education Senior Staff Remuneration Code

June 2018

Introduction

1. Fair and appropriate remuneration is key to the success and development of the UK's HE sector, operating as it does in an intensively competitive global environment¹. To support members of governing bodies, this Higher Education Senior Staff Remuneration Code (the Remuneration Code) has been developed after wide consultation with CUC members and HE stakeholders. This Code will be reviewed every four years, in consultation with the sector.
2. The different regulatory frameworks of the HE sector within the UK mean that governing bodies will need to decide how best to use the Remuneration Code. Institutions are bound by the relevant accounts direction issued by their regulator. In addition, Welsh institutions have agreed to more extensive senior pay reporting and are working towards developing annual pay policy statements. In Scotland, institutions will use the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance², which indicates how institutions should meet the key principles of good practice in remuneration. They may choose to use the Remuneration Code as an additional source of accepted good practice. In England, in assessing compliance with conditions of registration, the Office for Students (OfS) may consider the provider's information about the pay of senior staff within its audited financial statements and whether the governing body publishes its written commitment to comply with this Code.
3. By visibly adopting the Remuneration Code, governing bodies demonstrate leadership and stewardship in relation to remuneration within their institutions, and in doing so help to protect institutional reputation and provide greater assurances to key stakeholders and partners, including the student community and wider society.
4. The use of this Code is voluntary, and it can be used by all HE providers. Some elements may not be appropriate for all providers, for example, those with an owner-manager who may take a dividend from the business. The Remuneration Code is therefore to be used on an 'apply or explain' basis. This means that institutions should either publicly state that they have abided by the minimum requirements of this Code, or should provide meaningful explanations for non-compliance and how their alternative arrangements meet its principles.
5. Throughout this Code the word 'must' identifies the CUC's view of the minimum requirements for an institution wishing to comply with it. Governing bodies are free to meet 'must' statements by the means and mechanisms appropriate to their own context. The Remuneration Code is supported by a set of explanatory notes which are designed to assist governing bodies in developing their own responses. The use of the word 'should' identifies good practice which institutions are encouraged to adopt.
6. The principles outlined in this Code apply to all remuneration decisions affecting the emoluments of the Vice-Chancellor and other senior post holders as prescribed in constitutional documents or by the governing body as being within the remit of the Remuneration Committee. In England, they also apply to senior staff as defined in the OfS accounts direction.

¹ The context the sector operates within is explored in greater detail at www.universitychairs.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/HE-Remuneration-Code-Context.pdf.

² www.scottishuniversitygovernance.ac.uk

The Remuneration Code

Elements of fair and appropriate remuneration

Fair and appropriate remuneration³ requires three key elements – namely that there is:

- I. a fair, appropriate and justifiable level of remuneration;
- II. procedural fairness; and
- III. transparency and accountability.

Each of these elements are underpinned by several supporting principles.

Element I - A fair, appropriate and justifiable level of remuneration

Remuneration starts with a clear understanding of the responsibilities, context and expected contribution of a role and the attributes required to undertake that role effectively. Fair and appropriate remuneration then recognises an individual's contribution to their institution's success in that role, and is sufficient to recruit, retain and motivate staff of appropriate calibre in the context of the market for that role, balanced with the need to demonstrate the achievement of value for money in the use of resources.

Principles

- a) Remuneration should take account of the context in which the institution operates.
- b) Remuneration must be linked to the value, based on a number of components, delivered by an individual acting within a role.
- c) Remuneration must consider matters of equality, diversity and inclusion with a view to ensuring that there are no biases pertaining to gender or other protected characteristics within the pay structure.
- d) Institutions should be clear about what they expect from staff, i.e. what is 'normal' and what is 'exceptional'. There should be a robust and consistent process for setting objectives and assessing an individual's contribution.
- e) Remuneration can vary according to individual performance.⁴
- f) Awards made in respect of annual bonus arrangements linked to the achievement of specific annual objectives should not be consolidated.
- g) From time to time the value of a role may need to be reviewed in light of changing conditions, sustained performance, experience etc.
- h) Non-achievement of an individual's expected contribution should have consequences.
- i) Any severance payments must be reasonable and justifiable.
- j) There should be a clear and justifiable rationale for the retention of any income generated by an individual from external bodies in a personal capacity.

³ Remuneration includes not only basic salary but also bonuses, expenses and other allowances, and the monetary value of benefits in kind including housing and cars, etc.

⁴ The decision to apply performance-related pay is for individual HEIs to make. Nothing in this Code is intended to imply that performance-related pay is a requirement for fair and appropriate remuneration.

The Remuneration Code

Element II – Procedural fairness

Procedural fairness requires remuneration to be set through a process that is based on competent people applying a consistent framework with independent decision making using appropriate evidence and assessing the value of roles, the context and individuals' performance in them.

Principles

- a) Senior post holder remuneration should be determined in the context of each institution's approach to rewarding all of its staff, and in particular, consideration should be given annually to the rate of increase of the average remuneration of all other staff.
- b) No individual can be involved in deciding his or her own remuneration.
- c) Remuneration Committees must be independent and competent.
- d) The head of the institution (HoI) must not be a member of the Remuneration Committee.
- e) Remuneration Committees, when considering HoI remuneration, must be chaired by a lay governor who is not Chair of the governing body.

Element III - Transparency and accountability

The process for setting remuneration must be transparent. For senior post holders there must be an institutional-level justification for remuneration that relates to the competitive environment, the value of the roles and institutional performance. The remuneration of the HoI must be separately justified, published and related to the remuneration of all staff within the organisation.

Principles

Each institution must publish a readily accessible annual statement, based on an annual report to its governing body, containing:

- a) a list of post holders within the remit of Remuneration Committee;
- b) its policy on the remuneration for post holders within the remit of Remuneration Committee;
- c) its choice of comparator institutions/organisations;
- d) its policy on income derived from external activities;
- e) the pay multiple of the HoI and the median earnings of the institution's whole workforce, illustrating how that multiple has changed over time and, if it is significantly above average, an explanation of why; and
- f) an explanation of any significant changes.

Explanatory notes

1. Institutions will be able to apply the above principles in a way that is appropriate to their circumstances. These notes do not expand the Remuneration Code, but are intended to assist institutions' discussions as to their use of it.
2. Remuneration must be linked to the value delivered by an individual acting within a role. The value of a role is based on a number of components and criteria for assessing the value of roles, which could include:
 - complexity (scale and range of decision making, collaboration and contact, time-critical activity);
 - impact (on students, research, finances and people, including employees, partners and citizens);
 - discretion (level of accountability, degree of autonomy and decision-making authority);
 - levels of experience;
 - knowledge and skills (including specialist skills) required;
 - reputation and academic/professional credibility needed for the role;
 - an ability to recruit and retain key staff; and
 - external comparisons.
3. To retain staff, Remuneration Committees need to consider market position – typically by looking at a set of comparator institutions/organisations. The choice of these comparators will usually be linked to institutional strategy. Comparator selection may depend on the type of post being filled – for example private and public sector comparisons are often used for professional services staff, whereas NHS and international HEI comparisons may be more appropriate for certain academic staff.
4. Institutions also need to reflect on what the consequences will be in instances where individuals do not deliver the expected contribution. Consequences for individuals will depend on the nature of the remuneration package offered, but might mean no uplift of basic pay, no participation in bonus payments⁵, or some form of performance management.
5. For institutions that use metric-driven performance assessments, a balance should be achieved between the achievement of institutions' long and short-term objectives and, for those that use them, the impact of team-based assessments.
6. In making severance payments, institutions must meet their contractual obligations and be able to explain the reasons for any payments made. HEIs will need to carefully consider any advice that is available from regulators, together with detailed CUC advice. Remuneration Committees have specific responsibilities in this area – in particular, ensuring that contracts agreed with senior post holders are fair, reasonable and justifiable and do not expose the institution to significant potential liabilities, for example by being able to explain notice periods of more than six months.
7. It is important for institutions that staff represent them on various bodies and boards and carry out academic and civic responsibilities at other organisations, e.g. non-executive director roles. There should be a clear and published policy on any such activity that generates additional income for the individual from the external body. Hols are generally unlikely to be able to retain significant sums, but any income they do retain needs to be disclosed and explained.
8. The approach to expenses can be a sensitive topic, and generally institutions should identify normal business costs separately and adopt a single published scheme that applies to all staff. Remuneration Committees should receive assurance that the scheme is operating effectively.

⁵ If available

9. Remuneration Committees must be comprised of people who are independent of the institution's management – primarily lay members of the governing body⁶. Membership must include the institution's Chair, but not the HoI⁷. Remuneration Committees should be able to engage external independent expertise if required.
10. Institutions must publish the multiple of the remuneration of the HoI and the median earnings of the institution's whole workforce annually. This should be accompanied by sufficient explanation and context to enable useful comparison. They may also wish to publish other multiples, such as the ratio of HoI salary to:
 - a) the median academic salary;
 - b) the median professorial salary; and
 - c) the median professional staff salary.

To assist with consistency and comparison, the definition for the multiple should be based on the methodology used by UCEA which is available from its website. Institutions will adopt a range for their chosen pay multiples that they regard as acceptable. The diversity of the sector means these ranges will differ between institutions. Institutions that position themselves in the highest quintile will need to be prepared to provide additional explanations to stakeholders and their regulators as to why this is desirable.

11. Each year, Remuneration Committees must produce an annual remuneration report to the governing body. That report will need to provide sufficient assurance to the governing body that the Remuneration Committee has effectively discharged its responsibilities.
12. The institution must also publish a readily available remuneration annual statement. This may be within the annual report and accounts (as an Annex or separate section), or it may be published as a standalone document. Ideally, the published annual statement will be the same as the annual remuneration report to the governing body. However, modifications may be necessary to preserve commercial confidentiality.

⁶ They may choose to co-opt additional external members with particular expertise.

⁷ The HoI may be invited to attend meetings but must not be present for discussions affecting him or her. Where the Remuneration Committee is responsible for all senior staff pay, including professors, it is very important that the HoI is present at meetings to discuss these staff and ensure that the Committee's decisions are well informed.