

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6236

WEDNESDAY 28 SEPTEMBER 2011

VOL CXLII No 1

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	2
Election to the Chancellorship: Notice	2
Election to the Chancellorship – closure of Senate-House Yard, 14 and 15 October 2011: Notice	5
Notice of a Discussion on Tuesday, 11 October 2011	5
Notice of benefactions	6
Sir Robert Rede's Lecture: Notice	6
Election to the Council: Notice	6
Review of Cambridge Enterprise: Notice	7
University Combination Room: Notice	7
Notice by the Editor of the <i>Reporter</i>	7
Lecture-list 2011–12: Notice	7

Class-lists, etc.

Approved for degrees, diplomas, and certificates	7
Graces	
Graces submitted to the Regent House on 28 September 2011	17
Acta	
Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 3 August 2011	19
Graces 6–13 of 26 May 2011: result of ballot	19
<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Fly-sheets reprinted	21
Report of Discussion	25



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

1 October, *Saturday*. Michaelmas Term begins. Congregation of the Regent House at 9.30 a.m.: Vice-Chancellor's Address, Election and Admission of the Proctors, and Admission to Degrees *in absentia* (see *Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 1110).

4 October, *Tuesday*. Full Term begins.

11 October, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House (see below).

Discussions at 2 p.m.

11 October

25 October

8 November

22 November

6 December

Congregations

1 October, *Saturday at 9.30 a.m.*

22 October, *Saturday at 11 a.m.*

26 November, *Saturday at 2 p.m.*

Election to the Chancellorship: Notice

The Vice-Chancellor has previously given notice (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 946) that an election would take place on Friday, 14 October and Saturday, 15 October 2011 for the office of Chancellor. This Notice sets out more detailed arrangements for voting, and is supplemented by information available at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/chancellorship/>.

In accordance with Regulations 6 and 7 for the election (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2011, p. 106), if a candidate formally withdraws from the election before 7 October 2011, the days for voting will be rescinded and nominations re-opened. A further Notice will therefore be published on 12 October 2011 confirming whether the election will proceed.

The candidates

Mr Abdul Arain

Mr Brian Blessed

Mr Michael Mansfield

The Lord Sainsbury of Turville, *K*

In accordance with the regulations for the Chancellorship (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2011, p. 105), Lord Sainsbury was nominated by the Nomination Board, and Mr Arain, Mr Blessed, and Mr Mansfield were each nominated by at least 50 people whose membership of the Senate has been verified. The membership of the Board, and the names of the nominators, are reproduced at the end of this Notice.

The Vice-Chancellor now gives notice of the following arrangements for voting.

The electorate

Only members of the Senate of the University are eligible to vote. The Senate comprises:

- all current members of the Regent House regardless of degrees held
- all graduates of the University who have taken the Cambridge M.A. or any other Cambridge Masters Degree (for example the LL.M., M.Phil., M.Sci., M.Eng., M.Res., or M.B.A.), a Cambridge Doctorate, or the Cambridge B.D. Degree.

The Roll of the Regent House is published once a year; for the purposes of this election, the Roll as published on 5 November 2010 applies (*Reporter* Special No 5, Friday, 5 November 2010, available online at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2010-11/special/05/section2.shtml>).

Voting

The election will take place in the Senate-House in Cambridge on Friday, 14 and Saturday, 15 October 2011 from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. on each day (see *Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 1046). Where necessary, to allow for all persons who were present before 8 p.m. to cast their vote, the returning officer may announce an extension to these hours. In accordance with Statute A, Chapter 1, Section 1, **votes must be cast in person**. Votes will be counted under the University's regulations for the Single Transferable Vote.

Gowns

Members of the Senate must wear gowns in the Senate-House. The University will make gowns available on the day to members of the Senate who do not have them, but those who do possess the gown of their Cambridge Masters or Doctoral Degree will save time if they bring it. Doctors wear black gowns, not scarlet.

Identification

The University holds lists of those qualified to vote. On entering the Senate-House, voters will be asked to state their name, College, and qualifying degree with year of admission to that degree, or identify themselves as a member of the Regent House. Once eligibility has been established, voters will be given a ballot paper. Voters do not need to bring degree certificates. Those voting should be prepared to show evidence of identity, preferably photographic, if asked to do so.

NOMINATORS

Nominators of Lord Sainsbury of Turville:

Lord Sainsbury of Turville was nominated by the Nomination Board, a standing body which comprises sixteen members of the Senate appointed by the Senate, in addition to the members of the University Council. The membership of the Nomination Board was:

The University Council

The Vice-Chancellor (chair)
 Professor M. J. Daunton, *TH*
 Professor R. D. Lethbridge, *F*
 Sir Christopher Hum, *CAI*
 Professor F. P. Kelly, *CHR*
 Professor D. S. H. Abulafia, *CAI*
 Professor N. J. Gay, *CHR*
 Professor Dame Athene Donald, *R*
 Professor A. Hopper, *CC*
 Dr R. J. Barnes, *EM*
 Dr N. Bampos, *TH*
 Mr R. J. Dowling, *SID*
 Dr S. J. Cowley, *SE*
 Dr D. A. Good, *K*
 Mr I. M. Le M. Du Quesnay, *N*
 Dr R. Padman, *N*
 Dr S. M. Oosthuizen, *W*
 Dr V. V. Lawrence (external member of the Council)
 Mr D. Casserley, *JE* (external member of the Council)
 Dame Mavis McDonald (external member of the Council)
 Mr J. Shakeshaft, *T* (external member of the Council)
 *Mr A. Andrews, *SID*
 *Mr R. Mansigani, *R*
 *Mr S. Wakeford, *TH*

*student members, attending the Board for unreserved business only

Members of the Senate appointed by the Senate to the Nomination Board

Baroness Mallalieu, *N*
 Professor Sir Tom Blundell, *SID*
 Dame Mary Arden, *G*
 Dr Nidhi Singal, *HH*
 Professor Dame Jocelyn Bell Burnell, *NH*
 Professor Sir Martin Harris, *CLH*
 Professor Sir Graeme Davies, *CTH*
 Mr Benjamin Parker, *JN*
 Professor Barry Everitt, *DOW*
 Professor Helen Cooper, *M*
 Dr Richard Samworth, *JN*
 Professor Lionel Bently, *EM*
 Sir David Walker, *Q*
 Professor Susan Rankin, *EM*
 Dr Julia Gog, *Q*
 Professor Sir Peter Williams, *T*

Nominators of Mr Abdul Arain:

R. J. ALLISON
 M. AMRANI
 ROBERT BAILEY-KING
 K. K. BALAN
 MARTIN BALLARD
 D. A. R. BANHAM
 E. BARANOVA
 D. BARTON
 DUNCAN BELL
 J. BICKLEY
 D. M. BLAKE

M. BOLSTER
 KILIAN BOURKE
 K. BOYLE
 JANE BROOKS
 ANDREW BROWN
 M. R. BROWN
 CATHERINE BULL
 WOODY CAAN
 DANIEL CARTER
 NICHOLAS CLEWS
 H. L. CLUCAS

CLARE COPEMAN
 F. O. H. COULSON
 P. D. STRACHAN COWIE
 A. P. CRACKNELL
 VICTORIA CRIBB
 J. DAVY
 ROGER DOWN
 C. DOWNHAM
 J. M. EADES
 N. W. EADES
 CAROLE E. EASON

F. R. EDGAR
CHRISTOPHER EVANS
PAUL GAZZOLI
A. GIBSON
S. GILL
S. GILLET
NICOLA GLEGG
J. P. GOODLIFFE
M. GRAHAM
JULIA GROSSE
P. HALL
W. A. C. HALLIWELL
V. HARRIS
J. D. HAYWARD
RICHARD HIGGINSON
P. M. HOUGHTON
JOHN HURSEY
H. IQBAL
T. JAFRI
S. JAMES
CHARLES JONES
A. KEEFE
JASON J. A. KING

J. A. C. KNIGHT
CAROL ANNE LALL
C. J. LEONARDI
C. J. T. LEWIS
L. P. M. LLOYD-EVANS
M. V. LUCAS-SMITH
ALASDAIR MCCLENAHAN
N. E. MCLEAN
JENNY MANDER
ROGER W. MARCUSON
T. A. G. MARCUSON
MICHAEL SACHS MORRIS
VERA LEONIE MORRIS
D. J. PADFIELD
K. PATEL
I. PEANO
V. PHILLIPS
A. C. PORTER
HARRY POTTER
J. K. PRESTON
DAVID REW
MAIRI RYAN
JILL SHIELDS

D. G. SIMON
A. M. D. SKINNER
P. M. SORGO
DAVID SPIEGELHALTER
SHARATH SRINIVASAN
CRISPIN TAYLOR
ANN THOMPSON
MICHAEL TRAYNOR
M. TREHERNE
V. TREHERNE
S. G. TUNNICLIFFE WILSON
PETER VAREY
T. J. C. WARD
DAVID WHEELER
GERARD B. WILCOX
STEPHEN W. WILLIAMSON
NICHOLAS WOOD
EMMA YAP
JOHN YOUNGMAN
A. M. ZALIN
M. ZAMAN

Nominators of Mr Brian Blessed:

P. ADSLEY
M. ARMSTRONG
M. A. AZEEM
IAN BALL
G. DAVID BLUNT
MARTIN BONNER
N. BOOTH
ALEX BRETT
ANTONY BURNHAM
A. S. CORIO
C. M. CROWE
S. D. J. CROWE
JAMES DIBB-SIMKIN
M. G. W. EVANS
S. A. FRANKLAND
Z. R. HAYWARD
A. H. M. HUGHES
W. J. L. IRWIN
RICHARD JOHNSON
JOE JORDAN
PETER KAY

S. J. KIMBERLEY
MIKEY LEAR
T. J. R. MACDONALD
S. H. MANSFIELD
A. M. MANSFIELD
LAURIE J. MARKS
V. C. MAY
GARY MCDOWELL
STUART MOORE
E. L. MURPHY
RUPERT MYERS
N. MYLER
M. NEKY
LOUISA NYE
B. PARKER
STEPHEN PARKINSON
L. E. PEARCE
N. R. PLUMMER
PAUL POWLESLAND
N. W. PRICE
BEN RAWLINGS

D. REES
C. ROGERS
KEIR A. SHEILS
C. SMITH
ROBERT SPARKES
JONATHAN STURGEON
SETH ALEXANDER THÉVOZ
GWAWR THOMAS
A. J. THOMPSON HOSKINS
C. D. THOMPSON-WALSH
M. THOMSON
KENRICK TURNER
H. P. VANN
M. C. VERNON
GEORGE WALKDEN
A. WELCH
JANE WILLIAMS
GUY WILLIS
W. R. WYKEHAM
BEN WYNNE
K. YEARSLEY

Nominators of Mr Michael Mansfield:

D. A. AINSCOUGH
ANDREW C. AITCHISON
JAMES K. AITKEN
L. ASHE
METE ATATURE
HILARY BAGSHAW
TARAK BARKAWI
M. B. BECKLES

GWYNNETH BELL
DEBORAH BOWMAN
ELIZABETH BOYLE
NUZHAT BUKHARI
E BUTTERWORTH
J. CHAMARETTE
J. CHISHOLM
U. CILINGIR

J. C. COOK
S. K. CRANGLE
DEVON CURTIS
MARK R. DARLOW
HUGH DAVIES
PETER DE BOLLA
N. R. M. DE LANGE
I. N. DIVANNA

ELIZABETH EGER	MARY KENDALL	MICHAEL RICE
B. ETHERINGTON	SIMON KEYNES	R. J. E. RILEY
GEORGINA EVANS	A. KING	MATTEO RIZZO
R. W. FARNDALE	LAWRENCE KING	IAN ROBERTS
A. FAUVERGE	L. A. KIRKLEY	M. S. RODRIGUES ALVES DE MAGALHÃES
L. J. FLYNN	S. D. LADKIN	ELIZABETH ASHMAN ROWE
C. GAGNE	M. R. LAVEN	YVONNE SALMON
S. GARRIGAN	A. N. LEDGEWAY	J. SCOTT-WARREN
SIMON J. GATHERCOLE	M. LEGGATT	A. STEWART-WALLACE
V. A. C. GATRELL	MARSHA LEVINE	E. STRIETMAN
LORAINÉ GELSTHORPE	M. M. G. LISBOA	K. M. SUTHERLAND
M. S. GOLDING	R. LOVE	S. R. S. SZRETER
PRIYAMVADA GOPAL	RAPHAEL LYNE	TRUDI TATE
R. GORDON	I. W. MACKAY	N. TAYLOR
M. J. GWIAZDA	WILLIAM MCEVOY	DAVID TROTTER
N. G. HAMMOND	L. C. MCMAHON	S. G. TUNNICLIFFE WILSON
NICHOLAS HARRISON	SHONA MCNEIL WATSON	KATE TUNSTALL
RONALD S. HAYNES	TORSTEN MEISSNER	L. M. UREN
DAVID HILLMAN	SUBHA MUKHERJI	ISOBEL URQUHART
E. W. HOLBERTON	KAMAL MUNIR	M. A. VAUGHAN
ROBIN HOLLOWAY	JOHN NAUGHTON	A. C. VINE
S. HOUGHTON-WALKER	MÁIRE NÍ MHAONAIGH	JAKE WADHAM
M. HREBENIAK	D. S. NOWELL-SMITH	A. WAGNER
E. L. HUNTER	CATHERINE PACKHAM	C. G. WARNES
MICHAEL HURLEY	I. K. PATTERSON	L. A. WATERS
ANNE JACKSON	N. J. R. PATTISON	RUTH WATSON
MARY L. JACOBUS	BARBARA PLACIDO	J. L. WATUMULL
S. P. JARVIS	A. E. POGONOWSKI	D. WHITLEY
KATE M. JEARY	J. H. PRYNNE	NICOLETTE ZEEMAN
HENRI JOHNSTON	BEN RAMM	ANDREW ZURCHER
TOM JONES	ALASTAIR READ	

Election to the Chancellorship – closure of Senate-House Yard, 14 and 15 October 2011: Notice

The Returning Officer appointed for the election gives notice that only members of the Senate attending in order to vote and persons specially authorized by the Returning Officer will be allowed access to the Yard through the South-East Gate on these two days. Access to the University Offices for staff and visitors will be via Trinity Lane and access for the Combination Room only will be via Senate-House Passage and the North Gate.

Notice of a Discussion on Tuesday, 11 October 2011

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2011, p. 107) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House, on Tuesday, 11 October 2011, at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Report of the Council, dated 27 June 2011, on the construction of Phase 1 of the University Sports Centre on the West Cambridge Site (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 994)
2. Report of the General Board, dated 6 July 2011, on the establishment of a Professorship of Medical Genetics and Genomic Medicine (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 997)
3. Report of the General Board, dated 6 July 2011, on the re-establishment of the Charles Darwin Professorship of Animal Embryology (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 998)
4. Report of the Board of Graduate Studies, dated 7 June 2011, on future arrangements for central consideration of Graduate Student matters (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 998)
5. Sixteenth Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 24 June 2011 (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 1061).

Notice of benefactions

26 September 2011

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that he has received with gratitude the following benefactions:

- (a) a generous benefaction of £4m, pledged under the Gift Aid Scheme, from an anonymous donor to establish a fund, to be called the Keynes Fund for Applied Economics, for the promotion of innovative research and teaching that will help meet the need for practical solutions to economic problems
- (b) a benefaction of £23,500 from the trustees of the Max Perutz Fund out of donations made at the time of the retirement from his post at the MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology of Dr Fred Sanger, OM, CH, CBE, FRS. The benefaction is in recognition of the many years that Dr Sanger was associated with the Department of Biochemistry. The donations are to support attendance at conferences by young scientists.

The Council are submitting Graces to the Regent House (Graces 2 and 3, pp. 17–18) for the approval of regulations to govern the benefactions.

Sir Robert Rede's Lecture: Notice

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that the 2012 Rede Lecture will be delivered by Lord Turner of Ecchinswell, *CAI*, Chairman of the Financial Services Authority. Lord Turner will lecture in the Senate-House at 5.30 p.m. on Thursday, 16 February 2012. Senior members of the University attending the Lecture should wear gowns. Further details will be announced later.

Election to the Council: Notice

26 September 2011

Bye-election of a member in class (a) (Heads of Colleges)

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that an election is to be held of one person to serve as a member of the Council in class (a) (Heads of Colleges) until 31 December 2012, in place of the Master of Trinity Hall, who has resigned with effect from 30 September 2011.

The Council is the principal executive and policy-making body of the University. It has general responsibility for the administration of the University, for defining its mission, for the planning of its work, and for the management of its resources. The responsibilities of the Council mean that the members of the Council are the Charity trustees of the University, as defined in the Charities Act 1993. In other words, the members of the Council are the persons having the general control and management of the administration of the Charity. The Council deals with relations between the University and the Colleges, and conducts negotiations with outside bodies on many matters (other than those relating directly to the educational and research programmes of the University which are dealt with on its behalf by the General Board of the Faculties). It is responsible for the appointment or nomination of certain members of internal and external bodies, and for many student matters (excluding the selection of entrants, which is a College concern). Further information about the Council is available to members of the University on the Council website (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/committee/council/>).

In order to be eligible, a candidate for election must be nominated on a paper sent to the Vice-Chancellor at the Old Schools so as to be received not later than noon on **Friday, 14 October 2011**. The paper must contain (a) a statement signed by two members of the Regent House, nominating the candidate for election and specifying the class in which he or she is nominated, and (b) a statement signed by the candidate certifying that he or she consents to be so nominated. The candidate is also required to provide a statement of her or his *curriculum vitae* by the same date (see below). No one may be nominated for election in more than one class. The Council has agreed to make known its view that two periods of four years should normally be regarded as the maximum length of continuous service for elected members.

The Vice-Chancellor would be obliged if nominations could be delivered to the Registry in the Old Schools during office hours. Envelopes should be clearly marked as Nomination papers. Nomination papers may also be faxed to 01223 332332 or scanned (showing signatures) and sent by email to registry@admin.cam.ac.uk. Nominations will be published on the Senate-House Noticeboard as they are received; the complete list of nominations will be published in the *Reporter* on Wednesday, 19 October.

In accordance with the regulations governing the election (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2011, p. 114), each person nominated for election is required to send to the Registry, not later than noon on Friday, 14 October, a statement of her or his *curriculum vitae* for distribution to members of the Regent House with the voting papers. It is suggested that such a statement should be of not more than 500 words in length, and that it should cover the following points:

- the candidate's present position in the University
- previous posts held, whether in Cambridge or in other universities or outside the university system, with dates
- a note of the candidate's particular interests within the field of University business.

The election will be conducted by postal ballot, under the Single Transferable Vote regulations. Voting papers will be distributed, together with the statements provided by candidates, on or before **Monday, 24 October 2011**. The last date for the return of voting papers will be **Thursday, 3 November 2011**.

The Vice-Chancellor has appointed the Administrative Secretary as Deputy Returning Officer.

Review of Cambridge Enterprise: Notice

1 August 2011

The Council, at its meeting on 18 July, received the report of the committee undertaking a review of Cambridge Enterprise (see *Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 169) and the comments of the Finance Committee on the report and its recommendations. It has agreed that the report, together with the Finance Committee's comments, should be published on the Council website for the information of the University (<http://raven.intranet.admin.cam.ac.uk/committee/council/default.aspx>, go to the 'related documents' box).

The Council wishes to record its recognition and appreciation of the achievements of Cambridge Enterprise, under the leadership of Ms Willey, over the past five years.

University Combination Room: Notice

The Committee of the University Combination Room gives notice that the Combination Room will re-open at 10 a.m. on Monday, 3 October 2011, for the use of current members and retired members of the Regent House. Visiting academics may also be authorized to have access to the Combination Room, on nomination by their College or Department. The Combination Room will be open from Monday to Friday, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Information about how to access the Combination Room is available at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/combinationroom/>.

Notice by the Editor of the *Reporter*

The *Cambridge University Reporter* appears each Wednesday during Term. Special Numbers are also published from time to time.

Editorial

Notices for publication in the *Reporter* should be sent to the Editor, *Cambridge University Reporter*, University Offices, The Old Schools, Cambridge, CB2 1TN (tel. 01223 332305, fax 01223 332332, email reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk). Copy, preferably in electronic form, should be sent as early as possible in the week before publication; short notices will be accepted up to **4 p.m. on Wednesday** for publication the following Wednesday. Inclusion is subject to availability of space.

Internet

In response to the Data Protection Act 1998, certain material published in the online *Reporter* (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/>) will be restricted to those with internet access on the University of Cambridge network (i.e. the 'cam.ac.uk' domain).

Lecture-list 2011–12: Notice

The lecture-list for 2011–12 is now available at <http://timetables.caret.cam.ac.uk>. Courses are listed by Faculty, with drop-down boxes for each course providing either a link to a departmental website where the relevant timetable can be accessed, or a calendar version of the timetable which can be viewed either as a report or as a weekly timetable.

Please note that there will no longer be a Special *Reporter* issue dedicated to this information.

GRACES

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 28 September 2011

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, unless they are withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2011, p. 107), will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 7 October 2011.

1. That, on the nomination of the Council, Dr Rosamund E. Thornton, of Emmanuel College, be appointed University Advocate for four years from 1 October 2011.
2. That a Keynes Fund for Applied Economics be established in the University, to be governed by the following regulations:¹

KEYNES FUND FOR APPLIED ECONOMICS

1. The sums received by the University from an anonymous donor, and other sums received for the same purpose, shall form a fund called the Keynes Fund for Applied Economics.
2. The Managers of the Fund shall be:
 - (a) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research as Chairman;

¹ See the Vice-Chancellor's Notice on p. 6.

- (b) the Chairman of the Faculty Board of Economics;
- (c) two persons appointed by the Faculty Board of Economics, one of whom shall also serve as the Director of the Fund;
- (d) one person appointed by the General Board on the nomination of the donor, or such a person as the donor may appoint as her or his successor;
- (e) a Manager of the Cambridge Endowment for Research in Finance (in class (d) of the regulations for that Fund);
- (f) one suitably qualified person who is not employed by the University, appointed by the General Board;
- (g) one person co-opted by the other Managers.

If one of the named posts is vacant or its tenure has expired, the General Board shall appoint one or more additional Managers to ensure that there are always eight Managers. Managers in classes (c), (f), and (g) shall be appointed for periods of five years at a time.

3. The income of the Fund shall be used to enable the Faculty of Economics to build on the legacy of J. M. Keynes in promoting innovative research and teaching that will help meet the need for practical solutions to economic problems including by way of funding seminars, lectures, Visiting Fellowship programmes, post-doctoral Fellowships, and Studentships.

4. No business shall be transacted at any meeting of the Managers unless at least five members are present.

5. Any unexpended income in a financial year shall either be added to the capital of the Fund or accumulated for use as income in any one or more subsequent years, as the Managers may determine.

6. The Fund shall be administered by the Managers in accordance with the provisions of the agreement with the donor dated 26 May 2011.

3. That a Dr F. Sanger Fund be established in the University, to be governed by the following regulations:

DR F. SANGER FUND

1. The sum of £23,500 received by the University from the trustees of the Max Perutz Fund out of donations made at the time of Dr Fred Sanger's retirement from his post at the MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology to support attendance at conferences by young scientists shall form a fund called the Dr F. Sanger Fund. This benefaction is in recognition of the many years that Dr Sanger was associated with the Department of Biochemistry.

2. The Managers of the Fund shall be the Head of the Department of Biochemistry, the Administrative Officer of the Department of Biochemistry, and the Chairman of the Postgraduate Committee in the Department.

3. The income of the Fund shall be used to offer financial support to Graduate Students in the Department to assist with travel to scientific conferences, if they have no other funding for this purpose from any Studentship, Scholarship, or other source. To be eligible for support from the Fund, students must be presenting a poster or giving a talk at the conference. Graduate Students in the first year of their studies will not be eligible.

4. Any unexpended income in a financial year shall be either added to the capital of the Fund or accumulated for use as income in future years, as the Managers may determine.

4. That the fees for overseas students for the Ed.D. and Eng.D. Degrees in the Table of fees be amended so as to read:²

Qualification	Annual fee (£)					
	2011–12			2012–13		
	Overseas students	Overseas students who commenced on or before 2010–11	Overseas students who commenced in 2011–12	Overseas students who commenced in or before 2010–11	Overseas students who commenced in 2011–12	Overseas students who commence in 2012–13
Ed.D. Degree (five-year part-time course)	6,450	6,762	7,098	7,086	7,437	7,806
Eng.D. Degree	14,073	14,748	15,480	15,456	16,224	17,028

² *Statutes and Ordinances*, 2011, p. 160. The fees listed for these degrees did not reflect the variation in increment for continuing overseas students announced in the Council's Notice of 26 April 2011 (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 687).

ACTA**Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 3 August 2011**

All the Graces submitted to the Regent House on 3 August 2011 (*Reporter*, 2010–11, pp. 1151–52) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 12 August 2011.

Graces 6–13 of 26 May 2011: result of ballot

12 August 2011

The results of the postal ballot held between 11 July and 12 August 2011 are as follows:

Grace 6

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

Number of valid votes: 995

Since the STV regulations are being used on this occasion to ascertain which single option commands the greatest support, the quota (i.e. the number of votes required to guarantee overall support for any one option to the exclusion of the others) is 498.

<i>Option</i>	<i>First count</i>
(a) In favour of Grace 6 unamended	109
(b) In favour of Grace 6 in the form of Amendment 1	191
(c) In favour of Grace 6 in the form of Amendment 3	37
(d) Against Grace 6 in any form, whether as originally proposed or in amended form	658
Total	<hr style="border-top: 1px solid black; border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 3px; width: 100%;"/> 995

The Grace is therefore rejected.

Grace 7

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

Number of valid votes: 986

Since the STV regulations are being used on this occasion to ascertain which single option commands the greatest support, the quota (i.e. the number of votes required to guarantee overall support for any one option to the exclusion of the others) is 493.

<i>Option</i>	<i>First count</i>
(e) In favour of Grace 7 unamended	108
(f) In favour of Grace 7 in the form of Amendment 2	197
(g) In favour of Grace 7 in the form of Amendment 4	45
(h) Against Grace 7 in any form, whether as originally proposed or in amended form	636
Total	<hr style="border-top: 1px solid black; border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 3px; width: 100%;"/> 986

The Grace is therefore rejected.

Grace 8

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	289
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	726

The Grace is therefore rejected.

Grace 9

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	317
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	694

The Grace is therefore rejected.

Grace 10

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	246
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	798

The Grace is therefore rejected.

Grace 11

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	258
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	757

The Grace is therefore rejected.

Grace 12

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	262
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	750

The Grace is therefore rejected.

Grace 13

The results of the voting on this Grace were counted as Grace 12 was rejected. The results are as follows:

In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	909
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	98

The Grace is therefore approved.

J. W. NICHOLLS, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

Fly-sheets reprinted

The following fly-sheets, etc., are reprinted in accordance with the Council's Notice on Discussions and Fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2011, p. 112).

Flysheet for Graces 6, 7, 8, and 9 of 26 May 2011

Graces 6, 7, 8, and 9 (labelled A, B, C, and D in the Council's Report), initiated by members of the Regent House, are concerned with the levels of funding that the collegiate University will provide for student bursaries, fee waivers, and widening participation. At the time that these Graces were proposed, the Council had not completed its deliberations concerning the University's Access agreement in which these sums are specified. In consequence the Graces have in part been overtaken by events. In particular the Cambridge Bursary Scheme option that the Council selected permits payments either as fee waivers or as maintenance bursaries as a matter for individual student choice. This choice has widely been welcomed across the University, but would be inconsistent with Graces 8 and 9 (C and D).

The spending proposed by the Council under these headings matches the highest levels expected by OFFA. It represents about a third of the fee income above the base level of £6,000 per student that the University expects to receive under the new fee arrangements and it exceeds the sum presently spent for these purposes. There was extensive consultation with the intercollegiate bodies and others before the Council made its decision. In the context of the University's financial position, with a cumulative Chest deficit of £36m anticipated over the next four years, larger amounts of Chest funding cannot be afforded without damage to the student experience and to the wider educational mission of the University.

Increased expenditure on individual items of the University budget cannot be considered in isolation as Graces 6 and 7 (A and B) propose because compensating reductions in expenditure will be needed elsewhere. The Allocations Report provides an appropriate opportunity for the Regent House to support, or otherwise, the budget as a whole.

For these reasons we urge the Regent House to support the recommendation of the Council and the General Board by voting non placet to Graces 6, 7, 8, and 9 (Graces A, B, C, and D in the Council's Report).

DAVID ABULAFIA	SIMON FRANKLIN	C. L. PRATT
A. J. BADGER	ANDREW GAMBLE	J. RALLISON
JENNIFER C. BARNES	MOIRA GARDINER	MARTIN REES
RICHARD BARNES	DAVID GOOD	G. A. REID
MASSIMO BEBER	P. N. HARTLE	RICHARD ROEBUCK
VERONICA BENNETT	DONALD HEARN	J. K. M. SANDERS
R. J. BOWRING	R. M. HENDERSON	M. J. SEWELL
NICHOLAS BOYLE	P. P. HOBDBAY	PATRICK SISSONS
PETER BRINDLE	ANDY HOPPER	SARAH SQUIRE
WILLIAM BROWN	CHRISTOPHER HUM	SIMON SUMMERS
CAROLINE BURT	PHILIP JOHNSTON	NEIL TAYLOR
H. A. CHASE	FRANK KELLY	JEAN THOMAS
DAVID J. CHIVERS	J. P. LUZIO	R. THOMPSON
SARAH COAKLEY	LESLEY J. MACVINISH	M. J. TILBY
M. J. DAUNTON	ROBERT MAIR	DAVID WALLACE
RICHARD DEARLOVE	STUART MARTIN	ANDREW WALLACE-HADRILL
N. J. A. DOWNER	JAMES M. R. MATHESON	I. H. WHITE
I. M. LE M. DU QUESNAY	MAVIS McDONALD	PAUL WINGFIELD
RICHARD EVANS	S. J. MORRIS	C. WOODFORD
BARRY EVERITT	R. PADMAN	MARK WORMALD
PATRICIA FARA	G. T. PARKS	S. J. YOUNG

Flysheet for Grace 10 of 26 May 2011

Grace 10 (labelled E in the Council's Report) requires the University to set internally a higher figure than 61–63% for the proportion of UK undergraduates it aspires to be able to admit from state schools or colleges.

We oppose this proposal. Responsibility for undergraduate admissions rests with the Colleges. The target of 61–63% for state school admissions was reached after extensive discussion by the Admissions Forum and other intercollegiate bodies. It forms part of Cambridge's access proposal to OFFA, and is based on evidence of the numbers of suitably qualified potential applicants from state and independent schools in the UK. The unanimous Admissions Forum view is that a higher target could be achieved only by use of quotas and this is opposed by the Forum as a threat to maintaining the quality of undergraduate admissions. The 61–63% target will be difficult to reach and the Senior Tutors' Committee is putting in place additional measures designed to achieve it.

The setting of a new target would be damaging both because it would appear duplicitous to have different internal and external targets and because it would undermine the rationale for the evidence-based figure that Cambridge has adopted in its OFFA agreement. We support the strenuous efforts of Colleges and Departments to widen participation. A higher aspirational target that is felt to be beyond reach could prove counter-productive to those efforts.

We urge the Regent House to support the recommendation of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, the General Board, and the Council by voting non placet to Grace 10 (Grace E in the Council Report).

DAVID ABULAFIA	PATRICIA FARA	G. T. PARKS
A. J. BADGER	M. J. FRANKLIN	B. POST
JENNIFER C. BARNES	SIMON FRANKLIN	C. L. PRATT
RICHARD BARNES	ANDREW GAMBLE	J. RALLISON
MASSIMO BEBER	MOIRA GARDINER	G. A. REID
A. G. BELL	DAVID GOOD	RICHARD ROEBUCK
VERONICA BENNETT	P. N. HARTLE	J. K. M. SANDERS
R. J. BOWRING	DONALD HEARN	M. J. SEWELL
NICHOLAS BOYLE	R. M. HENDERSON	PATRICK SISSONS
PETER BRINDLE	P. P. HOBDAV	SARAH SQUIRE
WILLIAM BROWN	PATRICIA HODGSON	SIMON SUMMERS
CAROLINE BURT	ANDY HOPPER	NEIL TAYLOR
H. A. CHASE	CHRISTOPHER HUM	JEAN THOMAS
DAVID J. CHIVERS	PHILIP JOHNSTON	R. THOMPSON
SARAH COAKLEY	N. G. JONES	M. J. TILBY
STEPHEN J. COWLEY	FRANK KELLY	DAVID WALLACE
M. J. DAUNTON	J. P. LUZIO	ANDREW WALLACE-HADRILL
RICHARD DEARLOVE	LESLEY J. MACVINISH	I. H. WHITE
ADRIAN K. DIXON	ROBERT MAIR	PAUL WINGFIELD
N. J. A. DOWNER	STUART MARTIN	C. WOODFORD
I. M. LE M. DU QUESNAY	JAMES M. R. MATHESON	MARK WORMALD
RICHARD EVANS	MAVIS McDONALD	S. J. YOUNG
BARRY EVERITT	R. PADMAN	

Flysheet for Graces 11, 12, and 13 of 26 May 2011

The initiated Graces 11 and 12 (labelled F and G in the Council's Report) each contain two elements. Both re-open the question of the fee to be charged to students who start their undergraduate course in 2012, and both request more detailed justification for the level of fee to be charged in 2012 and thereafter.

In our view, the £9,000 fee for 2012 has already been settled (subject to approval by OFFA) by a decisive vote of the Regent House and we do not think that the matter should be revisited. As discussed in the earlier Council Report, this income is vital to the future financial health of the University and even with this level of fee the budget report shows a cumulative £36m Chest deficit over the next four years. A lower fee would inevitably result in damaging cuts. A great deal of information has already been provided to the University showing that when both University and College elements are taken into account a fee of £9,000 represents only about half the annual cost of an average undergraduate course. This is too wide a gap to be explained by accounting detail; it is difficult to see what further information could usefully be provided. **We therefore urge that the Regent House supports the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the General Board, and the Council by voting non placet to Graces 11 and 12 (F and G in the Council's Report),** thereby confirming the decision that it has already reached by ballot that a £9,000 fee should be charged in 2012.

The Council has itself proposed Grace 13 (Grace H in the Council's Report) that provides that the level of the undergraduate fee will be determined annually by Grace. Financial information about the cost of an undergraduate education will, as this year, be provided by both the University and the Colleges in a Report to the Regent House. This proposal will provide the information needed to inform the setting of fees. **We therefore recommend that the Regent House should vote placet to Grace 13 (Grace H in the Council's Report).**

DAVID ABULAFIA	VERONICA BENNETT	CAROLINE BURT
A. J. BADGER	R. J. BOWRING	H. A. CHASE
JENNIFER C. BARNES	NICHOLAS BOYLE	DAVID J. CHIVERS
RICHARD BARNES	PETER BRINDLE	SARAH COAKLEY
MASSIMO BEBER	WILLIAM BROWN	M. J. DAUNTON

RICHARD DEARLOVE	CHRISTOPHER HUM	J. K. M. SANDERS
ADRIAN K. DIXON	PHILIP JOHNSTON	M. J. SEWELL
N. J. A. DOWNER	FRANK KELLY	PATRICK SISSONS
I. M. LE M. DU QUESNAY	J. P. LUZIO	SARAH SQUIRE
RICHARD EVANS	LESLEY J. MACVINISH	SIMON SUMMERS
BARRY EVERITT	ROBERT MAIR	NEIL TAYLOR
PATRICIA FARA	STUART MARTIN	JEAN THOMAS
SIMON FRANKLIN	JAMES M. R. MATHESON	R. THOMPSON
ANDREW GAMBLE	MAVIS McDONALD	M. J. TILBY
MOIRA GARDINER	S. J. MORRIS	DAVID WALLACE
DAVID GOOD	R. PADMAN	ANDREW WALLACE-HADRILL
P. N. HARTLE	G. T. PARKS	I. H. WHITE
DONALD HEARN	C. L. PRATT	PAUL WINGFIELD
R. M. HENDERSON	J. RALLISON	C. WOODFORD
P. P. HOBDDAY	MARTIN REES	MARK WORMALD
PATRICIA HODGSON	G. A. REID	S. J. YOUNG
ANDY HOPPER	RICHARD ROEBUCK	

Flysheet on Graces 6–9 and 11–13 of 26 May 2011

Graces 6–9 concern expenditure on Widening Participation (WP), including student bursaries and fee waivers. Graces 11–13 concern the level of fee charged to Home/EU undergraduate students, how that fee is set, and how it is justified. Taken together, the Graces potentially affect the University's finances.

At a time when the governments of our major international competitors are investing in higher education, our government has cut the overall higher education budget by over 40%, with far higher cuts in the budgets for teaching and capital expenditure. This is in addition to the large teaching cuts, particularly for Oxbridge, imposed by the previous administration. As a result the University's finances are under severe pressure.

The recent Allocations Report on the University's budget (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 764) has been drawn up using best estimates of the likely effect of these government cuts. The budget is based on further reductions in University general expenditure (after accounting for inflation), a Home/EU fee of £9,000 in 2012/13 (with inflationary increases after that) and expenditure on WP increasing to £9.5m in 2014/15. However, even with a £9,000 fee, albeit somewhat alleviated by an expenditure on WP that is at the upper end of the levels suggested by the OFFA (and, as far as can be estimated, in-line with the percentage spend of other Russell-Group universities), the projected cumulative total University deficit over the next four years is £23.6m, while the projected cumulative Chest deficit is £36.4m. The University cannot run a deficit indefinitely, and these projected deficits would be even larger if the recent rounds of savings, that include scores of 'frozen' posts, had not been implemented. It is not until 2014/15 that the University's annual budget is predicted to return to surplus, and even then it is not clear that there will be scope for filling all the frozen posts.

We believe that the proposed budget strikes a judicious balance between an increased level of Home/EU fee, increased expenditure on WP, and further reductions in expenditure on administration, teaching, and research. For this reason we ask you to vote **non-placet to Graces 6 and 7** (both of which would further increase expenditure on WP) by placing the figure '1' in the 'against' box. We also ask you to vote **non-placet to Grace 8** (since the Grace on the Allocations Report effectively achieves the aim of this Grace), and **non-placet to Grace 9** (since the Allocations Report is the appropriate mechanism for balancing expenditure between competing claims).

We welcome Grace 13. This would require that the Home/EU undergraduate fee be set annually by Grace (as are other fees), and that the recommendation for the fee be accompanied by an analysis of the costs of an undergraduate education. Grace 12 requests that the fee be set annually: this is addressed in Grace 13 (although by Notice rather than Report). Graces 11 and 12 request that a financial case be provided for charging the proposed level of fee: this too is addressed in Grace 13. In addition, Graces 11 and 12 would re-open the level of fee to be charged in 2012–13. This fee was settled by ballot last term, and we see no reason to return to this issue. For these reasons we ask you to vote **non-placet to Graces 11 and 12**, but to **vote placet to Grace 13**.

N. BAMPOS	STEPHEN EGMEN	R. R. HORGAN
RICHARD BARNES	C. F. FORSYTH	T. W. KÖRNER
COLM-CILLE CAULFIELD	NICHOLAS J. GAY	J. R. LISTER
STEPHEN J. COWLEY	RAYMOND E. GOLDSTEIN	JEROME NEUFELD
R. J. DOWLING	E. J. HINCH	R. J. STIBBS
K. EDGCOMBE	N. J. HOLMES	R. D. H. WALKER

Student Flysheet on Graces 6 & 7

Context

Whatever the Government claims about including measures of progressiveness and affordability in its new funding system, **potential applicants to university have a natural, emotional fear of debt**. This is especially true of the poorest in our society: the prospective students most likely to be put off from applying to university under the new fee regime. We fear the trebling of tuition fees to £9,000 will have a disastrous effect on universities' attempts to widen participation: nowhere is this more true than at Cambridge and Oxford, each with their own historical challenges in attracting applicants from the poorest backgrounds.

The trebling of fees will generate for the University an extra £64m per annum. Even accounting for the massive cuts to the HEFCE Teaching Grant, Cambridge will still be better off by more than £12m every single year. As the Government is cutting funding for widening participation efforts, it is crucial that we in Cambridge make a reasonable effort to offset some of the damage that increased tuition fees will do to our aim of attracting the best young minds, irrespective of their financial background.

Purpose

These two initiated graces propose that the University increase the amount it commits to widening participation from the notional £10 million currently proposed by an extra £4 million or £2 million respectively. Whilst allocating £10 million can be presented so as to claim the University is spending more than we are at present, **when cuts to nationally funded programmes such as AimHigher are taken into account there will actually be less spent on widening participation in Cambridge than previously**. An extra £2 million would in effect allow us to maintain the status quo; an extra £4 million would allow us to make the positive statement about widening participation that the new fees landscape requires.

Comparison with other universities

Oxford, the university in the most comparable financial position to our own (and with similar undergraduate numbers), has recognised that they will have to increase their spending on widening participation in a way that our University has not. Oxford proposes to spend an equivalent of £13 million on a combination of bursaries, fee waivers and widening participation activities to attempt to offset the damage that the new fees will do. Even other Russell Group universities which do not share our particular historical challenges in widening participation, such as Birmingham and Leeds (who have also been forced to charge £9,000 tuition fees by the Government's enormous cuts to higher education funding), propose to spend headline figures of £12 million and £16 million respectively.

The need for increasing widening participation funding

Cambridge rightly aspires to remain pre-eminent not only nationally but globally, and to achieve this we must be seen to be leading the UK HE sector in reducing the damage that £9,000 tuition fees will do (as £14m would allow). We must certainly not reduce the amount spent on widening participation in Cambridge (as the present £10m would cause). The increased spend we are proposing will come from the additional income gained from the increase in student fees. If we are to continue to be one of the world's best universities, we need to continue to attract the best minds in the country, and we can only do this if we attract the poorest students as well as the richest.

In the £9,000 fee landscape, widening participation will remain difficult for the foreseeable future. However as we begin charging £9,000, we will experience perhaps the most challenging year of all. This will be compounded by the cut of the AimHigher and the Excellence East programmes as well as the HEFCE widening participation stream, which channelled millions of pounds into activities in the University, Colleges and Departments. We remain appalled that the University has **failed to investigate exactly how much money we will be losing from these programmes**.

In light of these challenges, we need to commit to a diverse package of measures. Though we were enormously relieved that initial plans to slash maintenance bursaries in half were retreated from, we know that generous maintenance bursaries will not be enough in the year and years ahead, although they remain the most important single part of any package for the poorest students while they are at Cambridge. To properly tackle this challenge, we need the package that £12m–£14m would allow.

Spending £14 million would allow us to keep the Cambridge Bursary at current levels, and it would also allow us to offer a waiver of up to £3,000 to more of our poorer students (all those with a family income of under £25,000, in addition to the £6,000 fee waiver proposed for just a tiny selection of the very poorest first-years under the current system) and invest £1.5 million to make up for the cuts to widening participation funding sources. £12m would allow us to go a considerable distance towards this. In either case, Cambridge could once again – as we currently can – advertise ourselves as having the most generous financial support package in the country for the poorest students. From our long experience of running student-led outreach activities, we know that this claim is one of the most invaluable tools we have in encouraging applications to Cambridge.

The financial case

The University's approach has been to work out how much they think they can afford to spend on widening participation and propose to spend that amount. What we have done is work out how much it costs to attempt to offset the damage to widening participation that £9,000 fees will do, and show that these plans are affordable.

The table below is based on the University's own estimate of our financial position in the coming years. Without any extra spending on widening participation, by the time all students are charged £9,000 tuition fees the University will be £12.2m a year better off than it is today, *including* the currently proposed £10m spend, as a *direct result* of charging undergraduates the highest level of fee legally possible. What these graces propose is that we spend an extra £4 million (a third of Cambridge's profits from fee income) or at least an extra £2m (a sixth) of this additional money and use it to support our widening participation efforts.

Financial position of the University¹:

	Fee income (£m)	HEFCE T Grant (£m)	Total Funding (£m)	Change on 10–11 (£m)
2010–11	36.2	60.4	98.9	0
All students charged £9k fees	99.7	13.5	113.2	12.2

For more information (including details of our budget modelling), visit the CUSU website: www.cusu.cam.ac.uk/universityfinances.

Conclusion

We are not claiming that all widening participation money is always spent in the best possible way by the University, and where it can be used more efficiently it most certainly should be. However, this cannot be an excuse for Cambridge to shirk the necessity of its investment in widening participation, especially at such a critical time for its success.

The Old Schools' own figures show that the University will be better off by £12.2 million from changes to teaching funding with the introduction of £9,000 fees. Though the next couple of years will be financially difficult for the University, this will be counteracted in the next few years by the additional income we will make from the new fee regime. What we are requesting would not cause Cambridge to live 'beyond its means' – rather, it is both financially viable and utterly necessary that we increase the amount of money we spend on widening participation if we want to continue to attract the best and the brightest.

We also ask that you vote for the amendments to Graces 6 and 7, as these will ensure that the Old Schools **actually** increases its expenditure on widening participation, from central funding.

Signed by the following sabbatical officers and members of the central bodies:

HARRIET FLOWER	ROSIE O'NEILL	GERARD TULLY
RUTH GRAHAM	TOM PARRY-JONES	SAM WAKEFORD
MARIA HELMLING	SARAH PETERS-HARRISON	MORGAN WILD
ANDY MCGOWAN	TAZ RAZUL	ALEX WOOD
RAHUL MANSIGANI		

¹ Figures based on paper 'Financial Impact – Home/EU Undergraduate and PGCE Students: Funding Flow' presented to Working Group on Fees and Bursaries; includes the University's current proposed bursary/WP spend. Report of Discussion

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 6 September 2011

A special Discussion was held in the Senate-House. The Vice-Chancellor was presiding, with the Registrar's deputy, the Senior Proctor, a Pro-Proctor, and twelve other persons present.

The following topic was discussed:

The conclusion of consultation on the Government's Higher Education White Paper (Reporter, 2010–11, p. 987).

Professor D. M. THOMPSON (Emeritus Professor of Modern Church History):

Vice-Chancellor, it is a sound principle that if people are to be put in the driving seat, they should know how to drive; otherwise they are expected to have L-plates on their vehicle. In this White Paper, we are presented with a kaleidoscope of images, including more level playing-

fields than I judge previous administrations to have closed in schools, but the underlying content from the point of view of a university education as hitherto understood is scandalously thread-bare. Moreover, the confusion between the appropriate use of 'will' and 'shall' in the first person singular or plural is manifest in a document which one might have expected to be an advertisement for literacy. (If any are inclined to give the authors the benefit of the doubt on this point, let them examine paragraph 6.16, where 'will' is used for the first person and third person in nearly consecutive sentences with the clear implication that the intended sense is the same.)

However, there is not enough time today to scoff; it is more important to address some of the issues the White Paper raises for the University, and the particular Faculties within it. I wish to speak from my perspective as Chair of the Governing Council of the Cambridge Theological Federation with particular reference to some of its implications for training for the ministry of the Churches in this country, and indeed further afield. It may not be generally realized in the University that in Cambridge we have the largest group of students training for the Christian

ministry in England and Wales, and probably in the UK, a very significant proportion of whom undertake courses through the Faculty of Divinity. (Others take courses validated by Anglia Ruskin University.)

For these students, the kind of economic analysis offered in chapter 1 of the White Paper, which assumes that the motivation for attending university is to improve one's economic chances, is totally inapplicable. It is the Churches and the wider communities in which the students will serve who are the beneficiaries of their education; and since the White Paper makes it clear that the community as a whole is now abdicating all responsibility for payment for their courses, this financial burden will now fall directly on the Churches. The level of fees will be tripled (both here and at Anglia Ruskin), and since the ELQ provisions of the last government made many such students ineligible for loans, the sums will have to be paid up-front. Doubtless there will be some – perhaps many – among us, who will have no qualms about this and may even be glad; I do not wish to enter that discussion now. But the policy and its consequences are not easily compatible with the recognition by both the present and the previous governments of the role of clergy and ministers, both Christian and those of other faiths, in building community cohesion in problematic urban situations, and the similar recognition at a local level of the significance of this in planning for new housing developments.

There are two technical questions related to this, which it might be helpful for the University to investigate, though I do not hold out much hope. One arises from the discussion of what are called 'bespoke employer closed courses' in chapter 3 of the White Paper, where I wonder whether the B.Th. Degree might qualify under this heading and therefore be exempt from current entrant controls. This will obviously not save the Churches any money, but it might have advantages for the University. I don't know. The other comes in the Consultation Document on the new Regulatory Framework, where there is reference to 'teaching funding for those areas and activities deemed to be high cost and/or public policy priorities' (paragraph 3.2.9). Obviously teaching funding has been abolished for all humanities subjects in general; but how does one explore the possibility of broadening the definition of 'public policy priorities' – particularly, for example, in the light of this summer's riots in several English cities?

The fundamental point I want to make is this. Although I accept the necessity for higher student fees as a defensive reaction on the part of universities to governments, both past and present, which seem to be fundamentally anti-intellectual in their policy pronouncements, I would warn against our simply relapsing into the pre-1919 mode of financial hand-to-mouth existence that characterized the early twentieth-century University. In relation to students from the Theological Federation in particular, we could do more to minimize the internal fee burden, which our current structures create in requiring all candidates for University degrees to be members of a Cambridge College as well as their Theological College. I hope too that it will be possible for such students to be eligible, if they are reading for Cambridge degrees, for such University bursary funding as might be made available.

But we need also to take a longer view. When the previous government announced its new policy on Equivalent and Lower Qualifications four or five years ago, I wrote a Risk Analysis for the Faculty Board of Divinity, in which I set out what I judged to be plausible consequential reductions in student numbers both for the

Tripes and the B.Th. – 10% in the Tripes and over 50% in the B.Th. – pointing out both the consequences for the reduction of academic staff and the entering of a downward academic spiral as the range of options in the Tripes had to be contracted, reducing their attractiveness to students who had no intention of entering the Christian ministry, leading to further contraction, etc. Some of my colleagues seemed to be surprised by my paper, perhaps particularly because as a Faculty we have probably done more than any other humanities Faculty in the last twenty years to raise outside funding for new posts. I pay tribute to the work done in the Central Administration to ease the direct burden which was then anticipated, whilst also noting that we are only just entering the period when those changes become effective. The scope of what the Theological Colleges can do in bringing international students to this country from Africa has already been affected by the immigration policies of the last and present governments, which are a direct threat to our status as an international university. I wonder how many other Faculties are doing a similar risk analysis in relation to the ways in which they in particular may be affected. Although we can all take pride in being judged the best university in the world, as suggested by the latest QS rankings, we are bound to wonder how long this can last under the increasingly tightening noose being drawn around our neck by hostile government policy.

I have spoken about the needs of a particular area of the University's life; it may be unique, as all subject specialisms are, but it is not alone. I urge the Council and the General Board to produce a far-reaching plan to address the new situation in which we find ourselves, rather than responding only to the Government. I judge that this would require at least a Special Committee of both the Council and the Board; in former times it would have been thought worthy of a Syndicate. The Regent House would welcome some assurance that those charged with the direction of our affairs will not be content with re-arranging the deckchairs.

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History):

Mr Vice-Chancellor, BIS is certainly keeping higher education busy this summer. On 4 August, on the heels of the White Paper of 28 July, appeared a 'technical consultation'. Any response to the White Paper must now take that document into consideration. For here, in some detail, are the plans for the implementation in new legislation of a new overarching structure.

Cambridge's first concern in its response to these two documents must be to protect its future autonomy. It will wish to remain free to be itself. But I hope it will also give a thought to the wider 'sector', for Oxford and Cambridge surely have a duty to use their strong position and high reputation in the defence of that wider good, when they publicly state a view on the broad changes of principle and practice being proposed. It is not putting it too strongly to suggest that the shifting of the tectonic plates now proposed in these two consultations will imperil the essential defence institutional autonomy provides against state micro-management of higher education.

I believe that HEFCE is handling its discussion with BIS and the Minister and the Secretary of State robustly and using its best endeavours to defend institutional autonomy (on which academic freedom ultimately depends). But academe must add its voice.

Presumptions relied on in the White Paper seem often to depend on anecdotal evidence. I have heard it admitted in defence of particular White Paper proposals that they have

been based on a chance remark in an office in Whitehall about something a student son or daughter or neighbour's child had grumblingly complained about in his or her 'student experience'. Another anecdote relayed in an office at BIS on another day might have thrown up quite different anxieties to be reflected in forthcoming legislation.

One of the proposals is to move to a 'risk-based' quality assurance régime, in which trusted institutions would be visited less frequently ('risk-based approaches are intended to enable lighter touch arrangements for high-performing providers and proportionate monitoring', 2.2.1). David Willetts mentioned in my hearing at the Westminster Education Forum Keynote Seminar on 26 July that this notion that some institutions can be trusted more than others had been prompted by Cambridge. Cambridge (who, on what authority?) had written to complain that it scarcely needed QAA institutional audit visits as often as lesser institutions might. A number of 'recommendations for action' were made when Cambridge was last audited.¹ So Cambridge was evidently not found to be above reproach that time. Yet a major policy-shift rests on the accident of a well-timed letter which was, it seems, not followed up by a civil servant checking the evidence and saying 'No, Minister'.

Defending institutional autonomy does not mean freeing institutions from accountability. Institutional autonomy has flourished in a climate of civilized conversation with the 'sector bodies'. This has been the customary way, with the sector bodies, including HEFCE, using a light touch, working *with* miscreant institutions to get them to do better, put right their mistakes, and ensure they do not make them again. When the QAA made its recommendations for improvement, Cambridge set about responding to them and putting right what needed to be put right.

The assumption of the White Paper and the 'technical consultation' is that higher education 'providers' will behave properly only under threat; that if they get something wrong they should be punished. This is a radical change, which could end this civilized and respectful practice.

HEFCE's new sanctions

HEFCE's existing 'condition of grant' sanction, rarely used and rarely needing to be used, will be of little use in a future where the block grant for teaching is disappearing (and remember the White Paper Plan is to get rid of what remains as fast as possible). So the new idea is to bring to heel unsatisfactory 'providers':

- by removing their students' right to access a loan;
- by taking away their 'designation' for that purpose;
- by fining them or making them pay compensation or naming and shaming them, or even, ultimately, removing their degree-awarding powers (yes, even Cambridge's 800-year-old powers, so do watch out).²

The 'provider' is usually wrong and should be punished

The proposed move to 'punishment mode' fails to allow for a well-established pattern of institutional response, which the QAA described in 2008 as 'gold-plating'.³ Institutions typically armour-plate themselves against potential sanctions, adding to their own administrative load and appointing extra managers to cope with it. I am sure some members of the UAS will admit privately to recognizing this response. The sight of a new HEFCE turned regulator is likely to prompt a massive rise in pre-emptive defensive activity. That will divert administrative thinking from learning lessons and changing the culture. It

will be costly and burdensome and in the future those costs will have to come out of student fees.

It is of course possible that the attempt to enlarge the 'sector' to include, on a 'level playing field' and entering through a 'single gateway', further education colleges, small colleges, specialist and non-specialist; private provider, for-profit and not-for-profit; and entities such as EDEXCEL which do not teach but merely assess, will indeed bring with it a higher risk of institutional misbehaviour as BIS appears to think. But if the Government seriously wants this adventure into the unknown to succeed it should surely be aiming to help these ingenué educators learn how to 'provide' higher education. It is not going to be easy for a HEFCE set up as regulator on a punitive basis to foster in institutions a culture of listening to concerns in the expectation that they may prove to be helpful. Culture-change is always up-hill work. This will turn it into the task of Sisyphus (if that analogy will mean anything in a humanities-free future).

In a well-run sector, 'providers' would be glad to hear suggestions for improvement and would warm to them and respond positively. In practice, they tend to treat the raising of concerns as an attack on the institution and a personal attack on institutional managers. (Those who speak in this house should always remember how lucky they are to be able to express their views as strongly as they like without fear of reprisal.)

Let me give some brief examples from my case-work experience across the UK. 'Upward' appraisal of line-managers by those being managed is typically conducted, where it is conducted at all, by way of anonymous comment rather than the frank face-to-face process which takes place in ordinary appraisal. The underlings say they need protection from the reprisal they fear if critical comment can be laid at their personal doors.

Whistleblowers seeking to draw attention to misconduct in research often find themselves the subject of disciplinary processes. Short-term contract scientists and doctoral students are particularly vulnerable to consequences which can include the end of their research careers.

Elsewhere than here, I have known concerns raised internally under the Public Interest Disclosure procedure, or with the QAA under its causes for concern procedure, to lead directly to the suspension of the person raising concerns and the initiation of a disciplinary process leading to dismissal for 'damaging the institution's reputation'.

So why do I want to defend this imperfect system? I want it to change. Of course I do. But I want it to change from within and not under a rain of regulatory blows.

The new proposals (Technical Consultation 1.3) suggest that it is intended to make the raising of concerns about systemic problems and the making of disclosures still more difficult for those who spot them from below. The White Paper seeks to 'engage' students and encourage their 'feedback' and also their complaints if they are not satisfied (3.1). It supports the idea of Student Charters and envisages their becoming 'mandatory' (3.4). A Charter is expected to include information for students on 'what to do if expected standards are not met' (3.4), which will also encourage complaints from students. But these personal complaints are not necessarily going to identify 'systemic concerns'. Those are apparently expected to be spotted in future by HEFCE hovering above (Technical Consultation 1.3) or consulting with 'stakeholders' (1.3.3), not raised by those who actually work in institutions and have noticed something worrying.

HEFCE's new duty

Another presumption in the White Paper and the Technical Consultation is that higher education is conducted solely for the good of students, and the student (being in future just a customer), is always right. A duty is to be imposed on HEFCE to work on this presumption by promoting (or 'championing') 'the student interest' (elsewhere the 'collective student interest'), where appropriate through 'promoting effective competition' (Technical Consultation, 1.3).

Leaving to one side the important question of the research activities of universities and the multitude of collaborative activities in which they now engage at the instigation of a succession of recent governments, let me finally try to grasp this nettle.

The student is always right

It may not be politically correct to say so, but can I suggest that statistics indicate that student complaints are not always justified? Of the complaints reaching the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) which were found to be eligible, the OIA reported that in the last year:

20 per cent of Formal Decisions were either Justified (6 per cent) or Partly Justified (14 per cent) and 53 per cent were found to be Not Justified.⁴

Nor can it be taken for granted that student complaints are well-founded at the earliest stage, that is, when a 'provider' receives them.

Student priorities and perceptions will be affected by the fact that students are new to being students and many are very young (though not in some post-1992 institutions where 40% of the intake belongs to that class pretty much ignored in the White Paper and the Technical Consultation alike, who apply as mature students). Student expectations and declarations that they are disappointed will be influenced by international differences of cultural expectation and by what they are led to expect in the institution's literature. The number of complaints is likely to grow spectacularly in the new world BIS plans to create and under this new 'duty' the legislation will impose on HEFCE.

Again this is likely to prove a perverse incentive to institutions to concentrate on staying out of trouble rather than challenging their students to learn in a manner appropriate to an undergraduate, with its unavoidable struggles and discomforts and painful self-discipline. What they should be doing about those complaints is appointing someone to make an early assessment, carry out a 'reality check', and then using mediation with an open-minded willingness to learn lessons. How will the dark shadow of a hovering HEFCE turned regulator encourage this sort of culture-change?

So may I suggest that Cambridge should be sending BIS back to its drawing board, getting it to check its facts before relying on office gossip and above all urge it to take its time about changing the legislative framework to give effect to these new radical assumptions. For the only urgency arises from the removal of most of the block grant with its 'conditions' of grant, and its replacement with a vast taxpayer burden on the student loan book (preparatory of course to selling that off to some giant loan shark).

¹ <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/Reports/Pages/inst-audit-University-of-Cambridge-03.aspx>

² HEFCE's ability to require the repayment of grant has been a necessary sanction for the control of public expenditure. . . . Because HEFCE will be paying out very much less grant and will be regulating providers that do not receive grant at all, withdrawal

of grant will be a much less credible financial sanction in future. We have considered what alternatives are available. . . . we are proposing an alternative ability to fine providers if conditions of designation . . . In extreme circumstances we think HEFCE should have the ability to suspend or remove a provider's designation for student support or HEFCE teaching grant. Providers would have an ultimate right of appeal to the Secretary of State against the suspension or removal of designation' (1.2.2). (<http://c561635.r35.cf2.rackcdn.com/11-1114-new-regulatory-framework-higher-education-consultation.pdf>)

³ <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=401579> and see too <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Partners/PSRBs/Documents/PSRBJun08.pdf>

⁴ http://www.oiahe.org.uk/media/30016/press_notice_oia_annual_report_2010.pdf

Dr S. J. COWLEY (Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics):

Vice-Chancellor, the James MacTaggart Memorial Lecture at the Edinburgh International Television Festival is one of the premier media studies lectures. This year it was given by Google's executive chairman, Dr Eric Schmidt. His lecture ranged far and wide, and included comments on the British education system. He advocated bringing 'arts and science back together'; he noted that while photography, TV, and computers were all British inventions, none of the world's leading exponents in these subjects 'are from the UK'; he observed that 'the UK has stopped nurturing its polymaths. There's been a drift to the humanities – engineering and science aren't championed. Even worse, both sides seem to denigrate the other'.

His proposal for change was to 'start at the beginning with education'. He identified a need to 'reignite children's passion for science, engineering and maths' (although he possibly overlooked the 'Brian Cox' effect). He was 'flabbergasted to learn that computer science isn't taught as standard in UK schools'. At college level he emphasized that 'the UK needs to provide more encouragement and opportunity for people to study science and engineering', noting that in June, President Obama announced a programme to train 10,000 more engineers a year. His summary was that 'if the UK's creative businesses want to thrive in the digital future, you need people who understand all facets of it integrated from the very beginning'.

Against this challenge, how does the White Paper stand up? Does it provide encouragement, or the reverse, to study STEM?

I have not followed the White-Paper debate as closely as I should have done, but it seems to me that one of the untouchables, at least as far as the Russell Group universities are concerned, has been differential subject fees for Home students. My thesis is that such fees are inevitable, and that this is going to be even worse news for STEM than for many arts subjects.

Of course some universities are intending to introduce differential subject fees for Home students, and almost all universities have them for overseas students. If you include College fees (which are a variable feast), overseas fees in Cambridge are about £17,400 for most arts subjects and mathematics, £23,600 for STE, and £34,200 for medicine. (For completeness, architecture, geography, and music come in at £21,100.) I presume that this reflects costs, and I observe that for all subjects it's far more than the flat-rate £9,000 that the University will charge Home students from 2012.

How much does the HEFCE think it costs to educate a Home undergraduate? The HEFCE splits subjects into four bands: bands D, C, B, and A. D includes most of the arts and humanities; C includes architecture, geography, mathematics, modern languages, and IT; B is STE

(excluding IT); and A is medicine. In 2010–11,¹ the HEFCE seemed to believe that universities could educate students in bands D, C, B, and A for £5,931, £7,116, £8,697, and £17,784 respectively.² These figures really need to be adjusted for inflation. Unfortunately, from 1 August 2011, UUK is no longer producing the Higher Education Pay and Prices Index, and previous years have been withdrawn from the website (one wonders why). However, RPI was 5% in July 2011 (even CPI was 4.4%, for those who have been following the pension debate), and shows no sign of going down. It would not seem unreasonable to inflate the 2010–11 figures by 10% in order to estimate costs in 2012–13: and then you get £6,524, £7,828, £9,567, and £19,562. Note: they are all above £6,000.

At HMG's behest, the HEFCE is zeroing funds for bands D and C, and has initially proposed a premium above band C of £1,500 for STE (that compares with my estimate of £1,739), and £10,000 for medicine (instead of £11,734). To stand still compared with 2010–11, universities such as Cambridge would have to charge £7,828 in mathematics, £8,067 in STE, and £9,562 in medicine. But this is before student support. HMG expects us to spend about a third of any fees above £6,000 on student support. This means that the stand-still costs would be £8,742 in mathematics, £9,041 in STE, and £11,343 in medicine. For the purposes of my argument, and given that we can charge no more than £9,000, let's round all three to £9,000.

At this point of course somebody calls foul. Band D costs are only £6,786, and Cambridge will be charging £9,000. Surely this difference will make up for the loss of income for STE and medicine, and possibly also the lost funding for historic buildings, etc. And in some sense they might be right. Cambridge's costs are so far above what the HEFCE thinks they should be, that even at a fee of £9,000, College and University endowments are still subsidizing arts and humanities students, and so it is possibly not unreasonable for Cambridge to charge a flat undergraduate fee (with the bottom line being that a greater share of the endowment will end up subsidizing STE and medicine students).

But what about other universities? Should we, as part of the wider academic community, not be concerned about the state of HE in the UK as a whole? Many other universities do not have endowments, or have far smaller ones than us. What will the money men be saying there? Are they going to run STE and medicine courses at an even greater potential loss? More importantly, what will the money women be saying in the private universities that HMG seems so keen to attract into the market? The White Paper states (see para 6.13) that only 'not-for-profit institutions will, additionally, be able to access grants from HEFCE to fund those additional costs and public policy priorities that cannot be met by graduate contributions alone'. Private universities seem to be precluded from STE. So what will they concentrate on? Well, the obvious subjects seem to be law and business studies. What fees will they charge? Well, my guess is £6,000 or thereabouts (and a conversation I had at the weekend with somebody who is in a position to know suggests that this is not unreasonable).

So what choice will students have? In a couple of years' time, you will probably be able to pay £18,000 in fees to get a three-year law or business degree. Alternatively, you will have to pay £36,000 in fees, i.e. double, to get a four-year STE degree. What is the public perception? Who is paid better? Lawyers or scientists? Businessmen or

engineers? What will students, particularly risk-adverse students, choose?

I return to Dr Schmidt's quote: 'the UK needs to provide more encouragement and opportunity for people to study science and engineering'. Fat chance. The last Tory government dismantled much of manufacturing industry, but at least continued to educate those who might at some stage rebuild it, or ensure that the UK's creative businesses thrive. The coalition has clearly decided that there is no need to continue to fund such education at a level that makes it attractive to Home students. Is it time for us to advise our children to turn out the lights and leave the country?

¹ I have deliberately chosen 2010–11 rather than 2011–12, for which Her Majesty's Government (HMG), through the HEFCE, has imposed cuts before inflation ranging from 3.9% for arts and humanities to 6.0% for medicine.

² These figures are calculated from standard resource plus the student-fee income above the assumed student-fee income.

Mr G. H. TULLY (CUSU President and student member of the Council):

Vice-Chancellor, the point that higher education policy, under this Government, has been enacted with dizzying incompetence has been made many times. However, in light of the proposals we are discussing today, it is worth making again. Clearly, the approach to higher education policy that was followed and is being followed by this Government is deeply objectionable. Dealing such a hugely damaging blow to the funding of our universities is completely unacceptable on its own terms, but dealing such a blow without an accompanying White Paper is not just bad policy. It is frankly stupid policy.

Yet after such protracted delay in devising their grand vision for the future of higher education, we might have hoped, however naively, that Government had realized it was quickly destroying a HE system it did not understand and that they might somehow find a way to pull back from the brink.

That hope has not been fulfilled. Though the White Paper contains a litany of ill-thought-out proposals, I will limit my remarks to two of the Government's purported aims in higher education policy, and how its attempts to introduce a market into higher education fundamentally undermine them.

Let me begin by addressing the White Paper's implication for widening participation. Government, even as it was tripling tuition fees, has always assured us that access to higher education was at the core of its approach. Indeed, the White Paper argues that in order 'to help them identify individuals with the greatest potential, institutions may sometimes want to use contextual data . . . about applicants'. I agree, as the University does, that central to a fair admissions policy is looking at an individual's whole potential, rather than just their A-Level grades.

However, the proposal to remove all 65,000 students achieving AAB or above from universities' core allocation of students is designed to give an active incentive to top universities to recruit as many of these students as possible, using A-Level grades as their sole measure. But that creates an active disincentive for universities to use contextual data. It encourages universities to ignore the student from a poorer background on ABB in favour of the student with AAB, who looks better on paper, but may not be better overall. You can either have, it seems to me, a widening participation agenda and a fair and sensible admissions policy, or you can have unrestrained competition between

top universities for students solely on the basis of A-Level grades. You cannot have both.

Moving on to a second objective of Government's HE policy, David Willetts has often, albeit more hesitantly, spoken of his commitment to research. Certainly, the research budget has been more protected than the teaching budget, though it too will experience difficult and counterproductive cuts. We understand all too well that research is, alongside teaching, the lifeblood of any serious academic institution, and we are dismayed the Government has also chosen to ignore this important area of HE policy.

The second margin: the Government's plan to introduce 20,000 students, to be competed for on the basis of price, will have deeply damaging consequences for research. The second margin is designed so that existing universities will compete for these students with private providers. Yet most existing universities have a significant research focus, even if they are not as research-intensive as the Russell Group. It is very hard to believe that new, private providers will have any such research function. By fostering such a market in which the basis of competition is solely upon undergraduate teaching, this White Paper will distort the market significantly against research. I believe the point we should be making to Government is that the undergraduate education area is not an isolated area, but that research and teaching are fundamentally integrated and interlinked within a university, and to hurt one is to hurt the other.

It seems unlikely that these points will impact Cambridge, at least directly. However, the academic health of Cambridge as a world-leading centre of teaching, learning, and research is also dependent on the health of the higher education sector at large. This is our opportunity, as a community of academics and students who understand how higher education works much better than our present Government does, to inform Government policy. I would strongly encourage other members of Council to raise these criticisms, and the criticisms that others have made, in formulating our final response.

I will end by briefly commenting on the supposed positive elements that Government expect to see as a result of a consumer-driven market in higher education. Students, it is hoped, will assess the quality of courses on offer to them, in much the same way as you might buy a new sofa or a fridge. And this will, magically, drive up the quality of our courses.

But a degree is not a product that can be bought or sold in this way. Students have wildly different motivations in choosing a university and choosing a degree, not all of which bear that much relation to the quality of the course. And what students want from their course varies dramatically from beginning to end, as a result of learning, teaching, and intellectual effort. It is this misguided reliance on the consumerization of higher education that undermines the White Paper's entire argument. The student is not a consumer, a degree is not a product, and higher education is not and never can be a market.

Mr M. A. WILD (CUSU Education Officer and student member of the Council):

Vice-Chancellor, I would like to touch on how the White Paper addresses, or indeed fails to address, postgraduate students. Given the Government's unilateral focus on undergraduate education, it is perhaps unsurprising that a White Paper titled 'Students at the Heart of the System' should tackle only undergraduate students; containing as it does only three, scant references to postgraduate student policy.

One reference is to the possibility of extending the National Student Survey to postgraduate taught courses which, whilst modestly valuable, is hardly a great contribution to higher education policy.

A second reference notes that we do not have the necessary data about the social background of postgraduates to confirm our suspicions that there are financial barriers which prevent some people from undertaking postgraduate study. Yet it makes no meaningful commitment to collect such data.

The White Paper's final reference simply notes their decision to reduce postgraduate taught funding from 2012-13 in line with their reforms to funding for undergraduate education. However, while at least for undergraduate students, Government has proposed an alternative funding mechanism, unfair and damaging to students though it is, no such funding replacement will exist for postgraduate students.

Perhaps, given Government's sustained attacks on both the funding and the structure of undergraduate education in the past year, postgraduate students should be relieved to have been let off so lightly. But it is untenable that postgraduate education, and particularly access to postgraduate education, continues to be so ignored, as it has been by successive governments.

In terms of social mobility and social justice, access to a first degree must always take first priority – for CUSU, for the University and the Colleges, and for Government. Access to a first degree is a transformational experience for students from the least advantaged backgrounds, and there is little point campaigning for access to a second or a third degree if students cannot even access a first.

However, access to postgraduate education is still an issue which we cannot just allow Government to ignore. Thirty per cent of postgraduate researchers receive no support towards tuition fees or living costs nationwide. Sixty per cent of taught postgraduates likewise receive no support¹ – a proportion which we should expect to substantially increase once the cuts to PGT funding hit. Postgraduate education increasingly regulates access to many professions and highly skilled jobs,² as well as, of course, access to further participation in the academic community. As funding, particularly for Master's courses, becomes increasingly sparse, access to postgraduate education is not determined solely by academic merit, but also by ability to pay.

Postgraduate funding, and postgraduate policy in general, are issues that have been ignored by Government for too long. There may be relatively little we can do on a local level for some of these issues, constrained by limited resources as we are. But there is a national policy debate to be had about how many postgraduate students the sector should have, to what extent they should be funded, the mechanism for that funding, and whether these should be publicly-funded spaces or supported by a postgraduate loans system.

I would urge the other members of Council to express our strong dismay at the White Paper's ignoring of postgraduate education and that the questions and issues surrounding postgraduate funding and policy should be seriously considered by Government.

¹ <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/corporate/docs/p/10-704-one-step-beyond-postgraduate-education.pdf>

² <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/corporate/migrated/publications/p/panel-fair-access-to-professions-final-report-21july09.pdf>

VICE-CHANCELLOR:

Thank you very much indeed to those of you who have made the effort to come and to give their comments.

I would just remind people that the forum remains open¹ so that people who wish to make their views known,

friends, colleagues, and others who want the Council to take other views into account, should please utilize that means as well.

¹ <https://forum.cam.ac.uk/>

University Offices: useful web addresses

Index of administrative services and information: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/audience/>

Statutes and Ordinances: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/>

Information Compliance (includes Data Protection and Freedom of Information): <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/information/>

Centre for Personal and Professional Development Programme: <http://www.training.cam.ac.uk/cppd/theme>

Information on Copyright Licensing: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/legal/copyright/>

Data Protection Act 1998: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/information/dpa/>

Value for Money: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/secretariat/vfm/>

University Committees: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/committee/>

HE Access Funds and Financial Hardship Support: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/funds/>

Council Business: <http://raven.intranet.admin.cam.ac.uk/committee/council/>

Lecture-list: <http://timetables.caret.cam.ac.uk/>

Chancellorship election: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/chancellorship/>

The *Cambridge University Reporter* appears on Wednesdays during Term. Special Numbers are also published from time to time.

Notices for publication in the *Reporter* should be sent to the Editor, Cambridge University Reporter, Registry's Office, The Old Schools, Cambridge, CB2 1TN (tel. 01223 332305, fax 01223 332332, email reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk). Copy should be sent as early as possible in the week before publication; short notices will be accepted up to **4 p.m. on Wednesday** for publication the following Wednesday. Inclusion is subject to availability of space.