CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY
REPORTER

CONTENTS

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

4 May, *Saturday*. End of first quarter of Easter Term.
5 May, *Sunday*. Preacher, The Most Rev. D. Martin, Archbishop of Dublin and Primate of Ireland, 11.15 a.m.
9 May, *Thursday*. Ascension Day. Scarlet Day.
11 May, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.
14 May, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House (see below).

Discussions at 2 p.m.	**Congregations**
14 May	11 May, *Saturday at 10 a.m.*
28 May	

Notice of a Discussion on Tuesday, 14 May 2013

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 107) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House, on Tuesday, 14 May 2013, at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Report of the General Board on the establishment of two Readerships in the School of Clinical Medicine (p. 477).

2. Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Readership in Neuroradiology in the Department of Radiology (p. 478).

Notice of benefactions

29 April 2013

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

(i)   a benefaction of $3,750,000 from the Institute for New Economic Thinking (INET), payable over five years, of which the capital and the income will be used to support a Cambridge-INET;

(ii) a charitable bequest of approximately £110,000 from the estate of Mrs Olive Wright. This benefaction, of which both the capital and the income may be used, is to be applied in support of the University's research into multiple sclerosis;

(iii) shares to the value of £20,405 from Ms Helen B. Rowe, granddaughter of the late Mr Robert Stewart Whipple. The benefaction will be added to the Whipple Museum of the History of Science Conservation Fund, which was established in November 2012 by members of Mr Whipple's family (*Reporter*, 6285, 2012–13, p. 124).

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Vacancies in the University

A full list of current vacancies can be found at http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/.

University Lecturer / Honorary Consultant in Paediatric Gastroenterology; salary: £74,504–£100,446; closing date: 27 May 2013 at 5 p.m.; further particulars: http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/1314/; quote reference: RP01100

Research Associate (fixed-term) in the Department of Medicine; tenure: funds available for three years in the first instance; salary: £27,854–£36,298; closing date: 23 May 2013 at 5 p.m.; further particulars: http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/1385/; quote reference: RC01158

Research Assistant/Associate (part-time, fixed-term) in the Department of Psychiatry; tenure: funds available for one year initially; salary: £24,049–£36,298 *pro rata*; closing date: 8 May 2013 at 5 p.m.; further particulars: http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/1381/; quote reference: RN01154

The University values diversity and is committed to equality of opportunity.

The University has a responsibility to ensure that all employees are eligible to live and work in the UK.

Elections

Professor Rodolphe Sepulchre, M.Sc., Ph.D., *Catholic University of Leuven*, Professor, University of Liège, has been elected to the Professorship of Engineering with effect from 1 September 2013.

Correction

The Election notice published on 17 April 2013 (see *Reporter*, 6303, 2012–13, p. 441) contained an error and should have read as follows:

Professor David John Cameron MacKay, M.A., *T*, Ph.D., *California Institute of Technology*, Professor of Natural Philosophy, Department of Physics, elected Regius Professor of Engineering, with effect from **29 March 2013**.

EVENTS, COURSES, ETC.

Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.

The University offers a large number of lectures, seminars, and other events, many of which are free of charge, to members of the University and others who are interested. Details can be found on Faculty and Departmental websites, and in the following resources.

The What's On website (http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/whatson/) carries details of exhibitions, music, theatre and film, courses, and workshops, and is searchable by category and date. Both an RSS feed and a subscription email service are available.

Talks.cam (http://www.talks.cam.ac.uk/) is a fully searchable talks listing service, and talks can be subscribed to and details downloaded.

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

Department of Chinese	Chuan Lyu Lectures, 2013: Professor Chen Kuo-tung will lecture on *British records, Taiwanese history: the English East India Company in Taiwan, 1670–1686*, on 13 May 2013 and *Beautiful island, inhospitable shores: British ship-wreckers, impressions of Taiwan, 1841–1842*, on 15 May 2013	http://www.ames.cam.ac.uk/news_events/chuan-lyu-lectures-2013.htm
Mathematics	Rouse Ball Lecture, 2013: *The quandary of the quark*, by Professor Christine Davies, on 21 May 2013 at 12 noon	http://www.maths.cam.ac.uk/news/5.html
Mongolia and Inner Asia Studies Unit	Research seminars are held fortnightly on Tuesdays; next seminar: *Political boundaries: watchdog media and the state in China and Russia*, by Maria Repnikova, on 7 May 2013	http://innerasiaresearch.org/easter-term-seminar-list/
Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities	*In defence of optimism*, by Gareth Evans, Humanitas Visiting Professor in Statecraft and Diplomacy, 2013 – lectures on 8, 10, and 13 May, and symposium on 14 May 2013	http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/events/2402/

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD

Professorship of Education (2008): Notice

The Professorship of Education (2008) becomes vacant on 1 October 2014. The General Board have received a recommendation from the Faculty Board of Education and the Council of the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences that, under the provisions of Statute D, XV, 18(*a*)(iii), the period of consultation be extended to 1 January 2014.

The Council has agreed to submit a Grace to the Regent House (Grace 4, p. 479) to extend the period of consultation for the Professorship.

REPORTS

Report of the General Board on the establishment of two Readerships in the School of Clinical Medicine

The General Board beg leave to report to the University as follows:

1. Autoimmune diseases cause a major and increasing global health burden. These diseases, and the immunological mechanisms underpinning them, are the subject of substantial research efforts within the School of Clinical Medicine, aimed at deepening the understanding of disease pathogenesis and developing potential novel therapeutic strategies. This is in keeping with the School's strategic focus on immunity and infections.

2. In order to exploit research in the area of immunity and infection for patient benefit, academic leadership in clinical research and trial design is required, and the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine therefore propose the establishment of a Readership in Vasculitis, funded for a single tenure by Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust. Vasculitis – which refers to a number of conditions characterised by vascular inflammation, all of which are autoimmune in origin – has been chosen as the focus for the Readership in order to support Cambridge's unique clinical strength in this area. Addenbrooke's Hospital is the major national referral centre for Vasculitis and also leads EUVAS, the European Vasculitis Research Consortium. Cambridge University Hospitals would award an Honorary Consultant contract to the Reader; the Faculty Board have undertaken to provide support and facilities for the Readership from within existing resources.

3. The Human Genome Project, coupled with recent advances in genetic technologies, has led to major advances in understanding the genetic basis of human disease. The utilization of this information for patient benefit is one of the major themes of current medical research. There is growing interest in the potential for utilizing personalized risk prediction in both disease prevention and clinical management.

4. The Department of Public Health and Primary Care has a major research focus on the genetic and lifestyle determinants of common disease, including cancer. To utilize this research for risk prediction and personalized medicine, a strong critical mass in risk modelling and genetic risk prediction is essential. The Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine therefore propose the establishment of a Readership in Cancer Risk Prediction, the full costs of which will be met by the School of Clinical Medicine from within existing resources.

5. The General Board have accepted the Faculty Board's proposal for the establishment of two Readerships. The criteria for appointment to a Readership through open competition will be identical to those for appointment through the senior academic promotions procedure. The Appointments Committee will be constituted as specified in the regulations for Readers and Readerships (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 743).

6. The General Board accordingly recommend:

I. That a Readership in Vasculitis be established in the Department of Medicine for a single tenure with effect from 1 August 2013.

II. That a Readership in Cancer Risk Prevention be established in the Department of Public Health and Primary Care for a single tenure with effect from 1 August 2013.

29 April 2013 L. K. BORYSIEWICZ, *Vice-Chancellor* MARTIN DAUNTON ROBERT KENNICUTT
PHILIP ALLMENDINGER SIMON FRANKLIN PATRICK MAXWELL
N. BAMPOS C. A. GILLIGAN RACHAEL PADMAN
H. A. CHASE DAVID GOOD JOHN RALLISON
SARAH COAKLEY SADIE JARRETT AMANDA TALHAT

Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Readership in Neuroradiology in the Department of Radiology

The GENERAL BOARD beg leave to report to the University as follows:

1. Neuroscience has transformed our understanding of the healthy brain and promises treatments for devastating disorders that affect millions of people. As the search for more effective therapies continues, unravelling the complexities of the brain and mind has become a multidisciplinary enterprise. Neuroscience now transcends biology and, increasingly, involves novel intellectual alliances such as computational, educational, and social neuroscience, neuroeconomics, neurophilosophy, and neuroethics.

2. The strong neuroscience community in Cambridge attracts large programme grants from national and international institutions which fund cutting-edge research. The reputation of the University's teaching and research has ensured that applications for Ph.D. and M.Phil. programmes are received from around the world. Within the School of Clinical Medicine, several departments are targeting substantial resources and research effort at understanding the human nervous system and the diseases which affect it. The contribution of imaging is crucial and the Department of Radiology has played a major role in developing new techniques in computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and ultrasound and is a pioneer in new methods of interventional image-guided procedures. The University's strength in neuroscience imaging is reflected in the facilities at the Wolfson Brain Imaging Centre, the MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, and the John van Geest Centre for Brain Repair.

3. In order to bring together the existing neuroimaging groups and provide leadership in research and teaching across the breadth of neuroscience topics, including neuroradiology, vascular imaging, and diffusion weighted MR imaging, the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine propose the establishment of a Readership in Neuroradiology, to be funded for a single tenure by Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust. Cambridge University Hospitals would award an Honorary Consultant contract to the Reader; the Faculty Board have undertaken to provide support and facilities for the Readership from within existing resources.

4. The General Board have accepted the Faculty Board's proposal for the establishment of this Readership. The criteria for appointment to a Readership through open competition will be identical to those for appointment through the senior academic promotions procedure. The Appointments Committee will be constituted as specified in the regulations for Readers and Readerships (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 743).

5. The General Board accordingly recommend:

I. That a Readership in Neuroradiology be established in the Department of Radiology for a single tenure with effect from 1 August 2013.

29 April 2013   L. K. Borysiewicz, *Vice-Chancellor*   Martin Daunton   Robert Kennicutt
                   Philip Allmendinger   Simon Franklin   Patrick Maxwell
                   N. Bampos   C. A. Gilligan   Rachael Padman
                   H. A. Chase   David Good   John Rallison
                   Sarah Coakley   Sadie Jarrett   Amanda Talhat

CLASS-LISTS, ETC.

Allowances to candidates for examinations

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

OBITUARIES

Obituary Notice

Professor Philip Ford, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of French and Neo-Latin Literature, and Fellow of Clare College, 1982–2013, died on Monday, 8 April 2013, aged 64 years.

GRACES

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 1 May 2013

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*, p. 107), will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 10 May 2013.

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 3 of the Report of the General Board, dated 6 February 2013, on the establishment of a Royal Society Research Professorship of Earth Sciences (*Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 433) be approved.

2. That the recommendations in paragraph 4 of the Report of the General Board, dated 6 March 2013, on the re-establishment of a Professorship in the Sainsbury Laboratory (*Reporter*, 6301, 2012–13, p. 408) be approved.

3. That the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Report of the General Board, dated 1 March 2013, on the establishment of a Readership in Number Theory (*Reporter*, 6301, 2012–13, p. 408) be approved.

4. That, on the recommendation of the General Board, the period in which the General Board are required to act under Statute D, XV, 18(*a*)(i) in respect of the Professorship of Education (2008) be extended until 1 January 2014 or until such earlier date as the Board shall determine after consultation with the Council of the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences and the Faculty Board of Education.[1]

---

[1] *Statutes and Ordinances*, pp. 36 and 730. See the General Board's Notice on p. 477.

ACTA

Congregation of the Regent House on 27 April 2013

A Congregation of the Regent House was held at 11 a.m. All the Graces that were submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6304, 2012–13, p. 472) were approved.

The Vice-President of Queens' College and the Master of Downing College presented to the Vice-Chancellor's Deputy, in the presence of the Registrary's deputy, JONATHAN MICHAEL HOLMES, M.A., Vet.M.B, Ph.D., of Queens' College, and RICHARD KEITH TAPLIN MBE, M.A., of Downing College, who have been nominated by Queens' College and Downing College for the office of Proctor for the academical year 2013–14.

The following degrees were conferred:

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 23 April 2013

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Pro-Vice-Chancellor Dr Jennifer Barnes was presiding, with the Registrary, the Senior Proctor, the Junior Proctor, and fifty-seven other persons present.

The following Reports were discussed:

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 6 and 18 March 2013, on IT infrastructure and support (*Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 418).

   Glossary:

HPCS	High Performance Computing Service
IS	Information Services
ISC	Information Services Committee
ISSS	Information Strategy and Services Syndicate
MISD	Management Information Services Division
PRC	Planning and Resources Committee
UCS	University Computing Service
UIS	University Information Services

Professor S. J. Young (Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Emmanuel College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, following a detailed review of existing IT in the University, the IT Review Committee, of which I was a member, proposed a number of principles which should guide our approach to developing IT provision in the future. The key idea underlying these principles is that our IT systems and structures should be designed to ensure that all staff and students are provided with the service that they need, and at a level which is commensurate with our standing as one of the leading universities in the world. I hope that few would argue with that.

Based on these principles, the Committee made recommendations in four main areas: governance, delivery, staffing, and systems. In my view, many of the issues addressed by these recommendations have a common cause, and that is the separation of our central provision into two distinct services, the UCS and MISD, each with its own Director, each with its own budget, and each with its own different governance arrangements. As a consequence, there is no one person with an overall responsibility for ensuring that we have a coherent programme of IT development and support across the University, and there is no single body which has oversight and control over central spending on IT. The result has been a lack of clear strategic goals, insufficient attention to users' needs, a lack of provision in some key areas, and duplication in others.

To address these problems, the Committee have recommended that the UCS and MISD are merged to form a single new institution called the University Information Services, with a single Director. A similar recommendation was made by Professor Finkelstein in 2001 in his report on 'CAPSA and Its Implementation' (*Reporter*, 5861, 2001–02, p. 157) but this was not acted on. A subsequent review in 2006 again took the easy option of leaving the two organizations to continue their independent existences (*Reporter*, 6079, 2006–07, p. 803). Here in 2013, we cannot afford to once again pass on the opportunity to form a single unified central support service. Information technology has moved on. It is now ubiquitous with the capacity to provide user-friendly information services

tailored for individual need. We need a joined-up IT organization in Cambridge to provide us with the joined-up services that we currently lack. Oxford was in a similar situation to us but has now grasped the nettle and merged their central IT services. We must do the same.

The formation of a single institution for IT demands a new governance structure. Council is accountable for the many statutory obligations placed on the University including audited accounts, and detailed statistical information returns to HESA and HEFCE. Since these responsibilities rely on systems managed by MISD, Council currently gains the necessary assurance and control through the Registrary to whom the Director of MISD reports. However, the new University Information Services must be independent of the UAS, and it would not be appropriate therefore for the new Director to report to the Registrary. Instead, Council and the General Board propose that they fulfil their responsibilities for accountability and control by having the new Director report directly to the Vice-Chancellor. The existing Information Strategy and Services Syndicate would be replaced by a new committee called the Information Services Committee which reports directly to the Council and the General Board.

This Joint Report, which I support, proposes the new regulations necessary to effect the above changes. It also proposes a mechanism for effecting the merger whilst protecting the positions of the existing Directors. However, whilst the Council and General Board are unanimous on the need for a merger, there are differing opinions on how it should be implemented.

The Report proposes that one of the existing Directors is appointed for a fixed term as interim Director in order to start the process of change without delay. At the end of the fixed term, the substantive office of Director of Information Services would be then filled by open competition.

Critics of this approach remind us that the cultures of the UCS and MISD are very different. Instead of attempting a merger now, the two organizations should be allowed to live together, say for a year, in their new accommodation in the Roger Needham Building. During this period a new Director of Information Services could be found by open competition. At the end of the year, the two organizations would have learned to love each other, and the subsequent merger would be much less painful.

There is merit in this alternative approach. However, in other roles I have had personal experience of managing mergers between culturally different groups. The problem with delay is that the extended uncertainty causes staff to worry more about their own future than the goals of the organization. This results in problems of defensive behaviour, anxiety, and a general loss of confidence and focus. Faced with uncertainty, the most capable staff start to look elsewhere.

A second problem with delay is that implementation of the revised governance arrangements cannot proceed until the UCS and MISD have a common reporting line. The other key recommendations of the review would therefore be put on hold, putting Cambridge further behind in its IT development.

Whatever is chosen for the formal merger date, there will inevitably be a period of parallel working and hence the change in status need not have a material impact on staff. However, by making the formal date sooner rather than later, work can at least begin on implementing all of the other recommendations.

At its meeting yesterday, Council agreed to revise the proposed timetable to enable it to consider the remarks

made at today's Discussion and respond accordingly. There is no risk-free approach to this or any other merger, but having agreed that a merger should take place and having moved the staff into the same building, it is in my view imperative that a route be found that enables the new organization and governance arrangements to be formally established as quickly as possible. I therefore urge the Council to confirm its intention to proceed with the merger, and do so at the earliest opportunity.

Mr I. M. Le M. Du Quesnay (University Council and Newnham College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, my name is Ian Du Quesnay: I am the Bursar at Newnham College, a member of the University Council, and also currently a member of the ISSS, although I speak entirely for myself.

There is much in the Report on IT infrastructure that is to be welcomed and I would wish to emphasize that I appreciate the full and open process of the consultation. It is with considerable regret that as a member of the University Council I found myself unable to sign the Report of the Council and instead co-signing a Note of Dissent.

The review process had achieved significant progress in gaining assent to the idea that the time had indeed come to unify the University's IT services and to merge UCS and MISD. I have been persuaded of that, although it is not clear to me that the merger, in and of itself, will fix any of the problems identified in the Report. But it will, if well carried through, perhaps provide a better basis for the future. IT is still an area which develops at bewildering speed and there is clearly a risk that with two distinct services, each with its own brief, some innovations will fall between the cracks. But there are risks that, in trying to bring together two services with such different and distinctive histories and cultures, we shall end up not with a new service that combines the best of both but either a mishmash or, worse yet, the triumph of one culture over the other. The review will fail in its laudable objectives if the implementation is badly handled.

The proposals for implementation, to my mind, exacerbate the risks inherent in this process unnecessarily. First there is the matter of timing. As we all know, the UCS is moving and, with them, vitally important infrastructure is being physically moved. The original timetable for doing this was shortened last summer by twelve months. UCS staff have moved heaven and earth to accommodate this newly imposed deadline; and last term an oversight committee or group was finally established to manage the risks. All is, so far as I know, progressing well. But the stresses on UCS staff should not be underestimated. So the timing of the merger which involves, as currently proposed, the imposition of a new single Director, in place by October 2013, to carry through the restructuring, with all the uncertainty that will bring to those in post, could hardly have been set for a worse moment. It is, at least, a thoughtless first step from a Review Group which makes so much of its concern for the well-being of the staff in IT and their career structures.

In order to keep to the promise of having no redundancies, a promise which played at least a significant part in gaining the assent to the merger from the two services, the Council has accepted a proposal that the first Director of the new service will be chosen from one of the two existing Directors. During the consultation I had repeatedly said I did not understand how the various aims of saving money, having no redundancies, and having a new Director for the new unified service were to be squared. That was simply because the option now adopted seemed to me then and seems to me now self-evidently disastrous and simply not an acceptable solution. Whichever existing Director is chosen, the outcome will transform the merger – intended to combine the best of both services and to create something new and distinctive from what had gone before – into a takeover of one service by the other and give a clear indication of which culture will be taken as the basis of the new service. I doubt it will work, at least in the short term and without many painful adjustments which will manifest themselves in suboptimal delivery of IT services throughout the period of adjustment. What is required is a period of cohabitation with support from an 'honest broker'.

I also have very significant reservations about the proposed governance and management of the new service.

The line manager of the new Director is to be the Vice-Chancellor. The new management committee, which is to report to the Council and to the General Board, will be chaired (so the proposal says) by the Vice-Chancellor – or by his duly appointed deputy. One model cited in support of the new ISC (rather than a Syndicate), was the Finance Committee. That Committee is indeed chaired by the Vice-Chancellor. But in the case of the ISC it is assumed that there will actually be a duly appointed deputy. That is a problem, for then the new Director has two masters: the Vice-Chancellor, and the ISC and its Chair. Anyone who has pondered the reasons for the ineffectiveness of ISSS or its predecessors (and I have done so at length having been a member for over twenty years of all of them) will understand that the University will not actually get an IT service which is responsive to its needs unless the service and its Director are unequivocally responsible to the ISC for the delivery of the priorities set by the ISC. If the Vice-Chancellor is to be the line manager, he should chair the ISC. If the ISC is chaired by a deputy, then that deputy should be the line manager.

Under the present proposals, this medium- and long-term structural weakness is compounded by the role of an implementation team consisting of internal members of the Review Group. So, in its early and formative stages (estimated to last for three years), the managers will actually be this third group. In this form there will be a third master at least temporarily in play. There probably does need to be an implementation group of some kind, more closely involved than ISC is designed to be in the long term, but it would be sensible to ensure that the members of that implementation group are a subset (including the Chair) of the ISC.

That brings me to the proposals for the ISC. The strengthening of School representation is to be welcomed. But it seems unduly restrictive to have candidates limited to Heads of School. Some of those will no doubt be suitable. But it is easy to run one's mind through those who have held that position recently and conclude that there have been at least a number of them who may have been very good Heads of School but would have no interest in, commitment to or knowledge relevant to developing an IT strategy or services for the entire collegiate University. Better, then, to have those places filled by persons to be nominated by the General Board for their balance of status and interest in IT.

My next point concerns the representation of the Colleges in this collegiate University. College IT was largely outside the scope of the Review. Originally it was suggested there should be a single representative on ISC. That was subsequently increased to two. But that is still below the three representatives on ISSS. That reduction cannot be and has not been justified. Almost all

undergraduates access IT services from their Colleges (and indeed from their homes outside of term) at least as much as they do from within their Departments. The same is true of many graduate students and will be increasingly true of this expanding sector. Many academics have their College room as their principal place of work. Colleges have made significant capital investment in the Granta Backbone, played significant roles in its management and development, and the situation with the telephone system is similar, both the old and the new VoIP system. Colleges have installed and maintain at their own costs massive amounts of IT infrastructure, extending the network and all that means way beyond what is directly installed and maintained by UCS. Colleges contribute significantly in terms of income to the ongoing maintenance and development of both UCS services and to CamSIS. The perspectives of the Colleges are distinctively different from those of the Departments and Faculties, and their representation needs to be reinstated at three members of the ISC to ensure they represent the needs of individual users, both students and academic staff, as well as their distinctive institutional needs.

My final point relates to budget matters. At present it is envisaged that the ISC will help frame the bid to PRC. That role needs clarification. The IT budget has to cover requirements dictated by external and regulatory requirements from Government, HEFCE, and others, and the requirements to renew and refresh equipment to provide back-up and resilience to vital services. There also need to be funds to support innovation and introduce new technologies. These different aspects are in constant tension, especially in regard to the development of software systems such as CamSIS. The ISC needs to hold the budget, which has to be sufficient for both externally driven requirements and persistent internal priorities (such as management reporting from the Enterprise systems) and to bring in new technologies on a reasonable timescale (such as wireless access). And ISC needs to have the authority to ensure that the new service delivers both what is needed and what is determined as priority by the ISC. The lack of a clear relationship with PRC and the failure to make the Directors of IT Services accountable to the ISSS for their spending of their budgets was one of the main reasons why ISSS was powerless to see that the strategies it agreed and articulated were actually delivered to any meaningful timetable. Without such a modification of the Terms of Reference, the Review Group's vision of a 'desktop for all' (whatever it might be exactly) will remain elusive and an unrealized dream. And so, without further tweaks to the current proposals, will many other aspects of their vision of a new model of IT service provision for the University.

Ms R. K. OLD (University Council and President, Cambridge University Students' Union):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I was also a dissenter from the Joint Report. As the Note I signed made clear, I fully agree that the time has come for a merger of the UCS and MISD, for the appointment of a Director of Information Services, and for a single University body that is both responsible for IT policy and strategy, and for holding the IT purse strings. My concern is instead with the proposed means of achieving this outcome.

The rapid timetable proposed by this Report seems unrealistic but also wholly unnecessary. Moreover, it would result in annual preparations for the start of term and for the arrival of new and returning cohorts of students –

which must already take place at the same time as the complete relocation of critical server equipment – becoming simultaneous with the pressures of a merger and transformation of working practices and environments for our hardworking IT staff. The rush seems deeply unwise.

I am also entirely unclear that the transition arrangements proposed will actually work. Surely better than the selection of just one of the current Directors to implement the merger would be to retain both in post and appoint a neutral specialist to oversee the smooth integration of the two services? I fail to understand how, otherwise, we can retain the best of each.

The outcome envisaged by the Report is positive, but I fear we are at risk of failing to achieve it.

Dr I. J. LEWIS (Director, University Computing Service):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am Dr Ian Lewis, Director of the University Computing Service.

In these comments I am speaking for myself rather than the UCS, not least because my colleagues in the UCS seem perfectly capable of speaking for themselves, a quality that serves both the University and the UCS well.

I would like to comment on three aspects of the Review Report and implementation plan.

Firstly, it is clear that the Review Committee listened carefully to the feedback provided on the first draft. Each adjustment to the proposals is in the interest of teaching and research at the collegiate University and I am grateful for both the considered thought and positive action of the Review Committee.

Secondly, today I would expect to hear reference to the UCS culture and the need to protect it. This culture is derived from many years of provision of critical resources to our eclectic mix of staff and students in Departments, Colleges, and affiliated Institutions, which has required sufficient empathy to recognize and respond to the factors important to those users. This has been helped by the UCS attracting high-calibre IT staff with qualifications comparable to those in teaching and research, which is a luxury not available to most of my peers in the industry. These things combine to create a work environment and culture particularly aligned to the Cambridge model, and it is understandable that colleagues in the UCS would be anxious that this is not naively discarded. Where the implementation plan contains an apparent emphasis on speed of execution, it should be understood this may be unsettling for UCS staff rather than reassuring.

Finally, and personally, the implementation plan understandably includes reference to my current role, and that of the Director of MISD. I recognize this is in the interest of being supportive, and in spite of the consequent leg-pulling in which colleagues seem to take delight, I am grateful to those involved who have made an effort to address this detail. Nevertheless, I want to emphasize that we must transition smoothly from the structural aspects of these proposals and concentrate on what we will actually do with the IT services to achieve the objectives highlighted in the Review.

Mr P. DAMPIER (Director, Management Information Services Division), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, one of the institutions that is directly affected by the proposed changes is the MISD, of which I am Director. I am unable to speak in person today as I am involved in the contractor interviews for the refurbishment of the Roger Needham Building. This new

building will provide modern accommodation for UCS and MISD situated in the heart of the University's expanding West and North West Cambridge sites.

The Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on IT infrastructure and support is a significant change for both UCS and MISD, and offers a unique opportunity to combine the tremendous qualities and professionalism of both institutions into a new single professional IT organization.

I believe the University is fortunate to have two organizations that are passionate about delivering IT services to the University to support world-leading research and teaching, and to enhance the reputation of the University of Cambridge.

I have received many comments about the timing of the Review and the perceived risks in moving forward too quickly. Indeed one would not associate the University with moving quickly, and in many cases this is appropriate. However, we must not doubt the professionalism and experience of our IT staff, to even consider that they would allow the delivery of services to falter under any circumstances.

On 6 December 2010, the Council appointed a committee to undertake a review of IT infrastructure and support (*Reporter*, 6228, 2010–11, p. 901). Since that time there has been uncertainty on the future of the UCS and MISD, and this continues today. I urge members of the Regent House to consider the strain this causes when trying to maintain our IT services, where demands for new and improved IT capabilities are constant, and where the future is uncertain. The Report proposes that

> subject to the approval of the merger it will be important for the Head of UIS, the new institution, to be in post no later than 1 October 2013 and for the person so appointed to be able to put a senior management team in place and resolve any remaining anxieties and uncertainties on the part of staff at all levels of the organization.

The critical importance of this timetable cannot in my opinion be understated. The move into a new modern building, purposely adapted for the needs of our IT professionals, under the leadership of a new Head of UIS and senior management team, provides the spring board needed for establishing the new organization.

In realistic terms, the appointment of the new Head of UIS will not undermine the significant activities involved over the summer in moving UCS equipment, and UCS and MISD staff, into new accommodation. The planning for these moves is well advanced, and overseen by the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor. The detailed moves are being undertaken by the IT specialists who are passionate about maintaining their services. To consider that the appointment of the Head of UIS would undermine this work does not recognize the professionalism and talent of our IT staff.

The timetable stated within the IT Report brings to a conclusion the very long period of uncertainty for UCS and MISD, and provides the opportunity to start building a new organization that combines the best of both cultures and recognizes the talent of our staff.

Professor F. P. KELLY (University Council, Professor of the Mathematics of Systems, and Master, Christ's College), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I speak today both as a member of the University Council and as Master of Christ's College. As a member of Council, I fully support the conclusions of the Review Committee and this Report, including the proposal to proceed with the merger of the UCS and MISD without undue delay.

It is, however, as a Head of House that I wish to make some specific comments. Colleges were not explicitly included in the terms of the IT Review, and this, coupled with the initial proposal to reduce the representation of the Colleges, from three members of the current Information Strategy and Service Syndicate to just one member on the new Information Services Committee, has rightly caused concern. This concern is widely felt, since most if not all Colleges rely heavily on the UCS for IT advice and support.

On the matter of representation, the Review Committee responded positively to our concerns and now proposes two College members in the expectation that one might be from the Bursars' Committee and one from the Senior Tutors' Committee. In the context of the revised membership of the ISC, I consider this to be a proportionate response that should be acceptable to the Colleges.

With regard to the impact of these changes on central support for the Colleges, I am persuaded that the changes will be beneficial in the longer term. A key element of the Review Committee's recommendations concerns the establishment of minimum standards of IT provision for all staff and students, and crucially, the provision of affordable central support to enable institutions to 'buy in' any services they need to meet these standards. I would expect that the Colleges will also aspire to these minimum standards of provision and would also be able to benefit where appropriate from the availability of the central support necessary to attain them.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to strongly welcome the Review Committee's recommendations relating to the reform of career structures for computing staff. These appear to me to be long overdue. I am sure that the Colleges will be watching these reforms and considering how they can adapt their practices to improve the career structures and mobility of their own IT staff.

Mr S. R. WAKEFORD (University Council and Education Officer, Cambridge University Students' Union):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I signed the same Note of Dissent as Rosalyn Old, and I agree with everything she said a few moments ago. My additional remarks are brief.

For an issue of such crucial importance to the entire University community, I was perplexed that the Council chose to rush, at the last moment, and to decline the opportunity of considering important outstanding issues. Following the revised timetable we agreed yesterday, the Council will now, at least, have an opportunity to discuss the remarks made here today, but it is difficult not to feel that it would have been better to take our time to make proposals to the Regent House that caused less concern, demanded fewer critical responses, and required fewer consequent revisions to make them work.

The second draft of the working group's review to the Council was a significant improvement upon the first. In particular, it reflected the fact that – as well as research – our University is also engaged in teaching, and the governance structure envisaged to consider research needs is now paralleled in the Joint Report with regard to teaching and learning. If this Report is approved by the Regent House, I hope that the implementation group would not also focus upon research – to the exclusion of teaching – as it conducts the restructuring process.

Mr N. M. Maclaren (University Computing Service), read by Mr J. Warbrick:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I should like to thank the panel for taking note of most of the comments.

I welcome the teaching and learning subcommittee. I am not surprised that it ignored the matter of teaching degree-level skills of one discipline to graduates from another, except for a passing reference in paragraph 12, because that is a matter for the Council. But what happened to the provision of advice and support? The latter is even within the title of this Report!

Since the beginning of March, I have advised academics on a wide variety of problems relating to their research, including numerical analysis, the applicability of FPGAs, software engineering tools, OpenAcc, language choice, image processing, and many questions on Fortran, C++ and parallelism; none of these are covered by any course given in the University or related to any service that we provide. I am sure that some of my colleagues could provide a similar list. Yet this is included in neither the responsibilities of the ISC in paragraph 72 nor the remits of the teaching and learning and research computing subcommittees (paragraphs 75 and 76).

The University seems to be adopting the governance model used in the national Civil Service; one of the facts that came out in the Hutton Inquiry is that scientists must change their spots and become mandarins in order to be promoted to the Senior Civil Service. Paragraph 64 ('the need for IT expertise at the highest level committee') has good intentions, but all members are chosen for their managerial and not their technical abilities, except for the student members. The same will necessarily be true of the new Director. My sources indicate that there has been one successful IT project that Her Majesty's Government has commissioned in the past 25 years, and that did not follow this model.

It may seem strange to people with managerial or political mind sets, but those of us with technical mind sets are not generally motivated by money, status, or power. However, we are by being involved in technical planning and decision making. Does the panel really regard the staff of the Computing Service as so unprofessional that they should be excluded from involvement in all strategic decisions (paragraphs 61 and 69)? The same is clearly not the case for Librarians, where its Syndicate has two elected representatives.

The much-touted staff consultation has been and is a complete sham. There was a meeting with the Director of Human Resources, and the notes of my colleagues indicate that there would be no feedback to Council. He was also quoted as saying that the decision had been taken, and the consultation would have no effect on it. That is merely adding insult to injury.

I support those of my colleagues who are proposing alternatives to this rushed merger, on top of the panicked schedule to move out of the Arup Building. That will cause major stress to a great many people, who will certainly not be compensated, and are unlikely even to receive appropriate gratitude.

This latest change to the conditions of contract is going to further discourage the best applicants from seeking a career in the central IT services. I can tell you from personal knowledge that several of them have turned down Computing Service jobs in favour of worse-paid ones because the career prospects were better. Since that is a good third of the potential applicants that have spoken to me, that should disturb the Council.

Overall, this Report makes very sad reading. It has improvements, but it is rather like starting out a trip to London by taking a bus to Sawston.

Mr M. B. Beckles (University Computing Service), read by Mr J. Warbrick:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, my name is Bruce Beckles and I am a member of the University Computing Service, and the future of the University Computing Service is one of the matters considered by the Report being considered. This Report is clearly only implementing some of the recommendations – recommendations C2, C1, and B1 (and at least some aspects of B2) – of the recently concluded IT Review.[1] However, even given that qualification, I am afraid that I am still somewhat unclear on what exactly this Report is and isn't proposing in connection with the IT Review.

Firstly, recommendation C2 states that the UCS, the Management Information Services Division, *and* the High Performance Computing Service should be merged. But this Report makes no mention whatsoever of the HPCS. Please will the Council give us an explicit statement on whether or not the HPCS is to be merged with the UCS and MISD? And, if so, does the intention that there be no redundancies also apply to HPCS staff? (The Report only makes this statement in relation to UCS and MISD staff.)

Secondly, what is the intention regarding all the other recommendations of the IT Review? Will further Reports at some future date implement these? Or are they being quietly shelved? Or will it be left to some combination of the Report's proposed 'implementation group', the Director of the new merged organization (University Information Services), and the new Information Services Committee to pick and choose which recommendations they wish to implement?

I am also a member of the Board of Scrutiny, and although I am not speaking on their behalf, I am speaking as a member of the Board. The Board often concerns itself with risk, and the intention to merge the UCS and MISD as quickly as possible, which, in particular, seems to mean that we cannot engage in a public, open recruitment exercise for the new Director of the UIS, is clearly fraught with risk. Has advice been taken as to whether the University is opening itself to legal challenges from qualified applicants who might have applied had we only allowed them to do so? Has the Council taken advice from the Risk Steering Committee regarding the application of the Continuity Management Policy and Risk Governance Framework (and related practicalities) to these proposals? Have the UCS and MISD been consulted as to what they perceive the operational risks of these proposals to be?

From the Report, and from the Council minutes of 18 February 2013 and 18 March 2013, it appears that the reason for this accelerated timetable is to reduce uncertainty, which, it would seem, outweighs any operational risk such haste might cause. I believe a number of my UCS colleagues will be speaking about these operational risks, and I fully endorse their concerns. I want to focus on a slightly different aspect of this timescale, namely its *positive* utility: what good things will we get out of merging so quickly?

Sadly, this Report doesn't tell us, and I'm unaware of any urgent project or service which is desperately awaiting the formation of the UIS so that it can commence. *Are* there any such projects or services? Is it actually the case that some important function of the University will suffer

horribly should it only have the services of the UCS and MISD, rather than of the new UIS, to call on in the 2013–14 academical year? I suspect not, but, if I am wrong, I trust the Council will let us know forthwith. But absent such urgent requirements, it seems to me that we won't really gain anything positive by merging by 1 October 2013 rather than by, say, 1 October 2014.

With regard to the proposed timetable 'reducing uncertainty', I'm afraid that, at least among UCS staff, it has had the opposite effect. In part this is because we, the staff of the UCS, can see no good operational or strategic IT-related reason for the speed of the merger. (And, of course, if there are no good reasons for doing something, then either there's no reason for doing it at all – which seems unlikely here – or the reasons must be bad ones.) But our uncertainly also stems from the strange limited-candidate internal recruitment for an interim Director of the UIS proposed by the Report, particularly as it is so vague as to how, and by whom, the selection from the two possible candidates will be made.

To give you some idea of just how unfortunate the situation is, I am going to air two rumours that are circulating amongst UCS staff. I stress that these are *rumours*, so I do not make any claims as to their plausibility or veracity, nor can I definitively attribute them to any particular source. The rumours are:

(1) That there is absolutely no chance that the Director of the UCS will be chosen as the interim Director of the UIS; and

(2) That the real reason for the speed of the merger is that a small number of key MISD staff threatened to resign if the merger was not completed by 1 October 2013, i.e. a small number of well-connected MISD staff have held the Council to ransom.

(I wouldn't be surprised if similar rumours, but with the terms 'UCS' and 'MISD' interchanged, are circulating amongst MISD staff.) I have no reason to suppose that either of these rumours are true, but it should be obvious just how damaging to staff morale these rumours are. It seems clear to me that part of the reason for such rumours is that, in the absence of any publicly-stated, credible reasons that explain why the merger is proceeding at this breakneck pace, people will try and come up with plausible reasons of their own.

What this also means is that we now have a situation where the merger is seen as a battle between the UCS and MISD from which there can only be at most one winner. Thus whichever Director is chosen as the new interim Director, around half of the staff of the new organization will feel alienated and demoralized. No one, after all, likes to be a loser. The irony, of course, is that in such a situation everyone – and most particularly the University as a whole – loses.

From a UCS perspective, this situation is made worse when we learn that the Director of MISD has openly said to his staff that this will not be a merger, but rather the formation of a new organization, and that his vision of the new UIS is too different from the vision of the Director of the UCS for them to work jointly on creating the new organization. It's hard not to see that rhetoric as threatening. Even worse, at a meeting with the Director of the Human Resources Division last week, as part of the 90-day consultation called for by this Report, UCS staff were told that they couldn't be given any assurances that any particular aspect of our working culture would be preserved in the new organization. Instead, it would be entirely up to the new Director what that culture would be.

Putting all these statements – or lack thereof – together, you can see that those members of UCS staff who, unlike Zaphod Beeblebrox, haven't had an entire universe created just for them, might be feeling just a tiny bit uncertain about their future in the University.

It occurs to me that there may be members of the University who support the idea of a merger because they feel that the UCS is better than MISD and MISD would benefit from being more like the UCS; others may feel the converse, that MISD is better and the UCS would benefit from being more like MISD. Well, if the merger continues down its 'winner-take-all-and-devil-take-the-hindmost' path then at least one of those groups will be very unhappy. As, indeed, will be anyone who was hoping that the merged organization would combine the strengths of the UCS and MISD and offset their weaknesses.

Finally, I observe that this Report is remarkably vague in a number of areas where the Council minutes of the relevant Council meetings are clearer. In particular, this Report doesn't say who would constitute the implementation group and who would select the new interim Director. Minute 65 of the Council meeting of 18 February 2013[2] states that the implementation group would consist of

internal members of the Review Group (the Senior Pro-Vice Chancellor, Dr Padman, the Chair of the Information Services and Strategy Syndicate and the Head of the School of Technology) and the Registrary;

and that the interim Director would be selected by

the implementation group together with the Vice-Chancellor (in the chair) and Professor Leslie.

The eagle-eyed might note that (*a*) the Registrary is included in both those collections of people, and (*b*) there is no attempt to have user or IT staff representation in either of those groups. For those who have previously represented to the Council and others that the Registrary should not be in charge of the new UIS this may be of some concern, even more so when one reflects that the current Director of MISD reports to the Registrary. (Presumably, in accordance with accepted best practice, the Registrary will excuse himself from much of the decision-making involved in choosing the interim Director, since he has a clear conflict of interest in relation to one of the candidates.) And it is certainly ironic that an IT Review that concluded that greater user representation is needed in the University's strategic decisions concerning IT should have its key recommendations implemented by groups without user representation.

The same minutes also plan for the return of ballot papers by 5 June 2013, which would 'make it possible to establish the senior leadership team by the end of the Easter Term' (i.e. 14 June 2013). It seems unlikely that it was ever the case that everything necessary to establish the senior leadership would be done between 5 June and 14 June; it seems much more plausible that almost everything that needs to have been done will be done before 5 June 2013. It therefore seems likely that the intention was to make the decision about the interim Director and their senior management team *before the results of the ballot are known*. (This seems even more likely given that the Council have now decided to delay the ballot so that they can take account of what is said in this Discussion – a decision, incidentally, of which I heartily approve.)

I believe it is disingenuous to ask the Regent House to vote for 'the creation of an organization headed by person A or person B' when you've already made a decision that it will be person B. People who might vote for 'one of person

A or person B', hoping it will be person A, might well not vote for person B if told it's person B or no one. So either the Council needs to tell us which of the Directors it has chosen before we vote, or it needs to assure us that the process to choose the Director – and it needs to tell us what that process will be, since minutes of a Council meeting do not constitute a Report – will not begin until after we have voted.

[1] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6302/Revised-IT-Review-Report.pdf
[2] http://raven.intranet.admin.cam.ac.uk/committee/council/Council%20Meeting%20Minutes/2013/18%20Feb%202013%20Council%20Minutes.pdf

Mr J. P. KING (University Computing Service), read by Mr R. J. Dowling:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am Julian King, an elected member of the Information System and Services Syndicate, employee of the University Computing Service and member of the Regent House.

I must confess I am confused by the Council's proposal to appoint a temporary Information Services Director for three years.

Why does Council think that limiting the applicants to just two is appropriate? At the very least it is open to accusations of sexism and racism given that the candidates are both white men.

Why do they think the University will be best served by an appointee that they don't consider appropriate to be the ongoing Director? Or, if they do think they are good enough, why aren't they appointed through open competition? Or at the very least open competition across the entire University?

Come to that, do they not think that pressuring one of the current Directors into the role is unfair on them?

Why do they think that a professional (as opposed to an academic) Director given a temporary appointment for three years would stay for the full term, rather than move on to a new, more stable position when the opportunity presented itself?

Then there is the question of the choice of three years. That probably isn't long enough to complete a restructure, and it certainly isn't long enough to judge whether that restructuring has been effective. It is long enough to cause an enormous amount of stress to staff, only to have someone new come along and potentially restructure again.

In short, why do they think that introducing three years of guaranteed uncertainty will be good for any aspect of the University, let alone the morale of staff of the newly combined University Information Service?

Merge now, or merge later, but appoint a new Director when you have found the right candidate for the role and in the meantime the current Directors can act as deputy Directors for the newly formed UIS jointly reporting to the ISC.

Mr R. J. DOWLING (University Computing Service):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am Bob Dowling, a Divisional Head in the University Computing Service and a member of its Senior Management Team.

This summer the University's Computing Service will be moving two hundred servers, fifty thousand user mailboxes, and nearly a petabyte of data, all without interruption to user services. We will be moving the University's connection to the internet. We will be laying additional networking for the Addenbrooke's site, new networking for the North West Cambridge site, and diverting enormous amounts of networking from the New

Museums site which has been the focus of University networking for decades – again all without interruption to the service. We will be moving from our machine room of forty years to three smaller machine rooms scattered across the City, prior to a second move in 2014 to the West Cambridge Data Centre. We are laying in fibre with the servers that we are moving there. This movement is starting in late July / early August and is scheduled to run until the end of October, spanning the start of the academical year, a time of peak load for us.

So, make no mistake, this summer the University's core IT infrastructure is more vulnerable than it has been at any point in its past. All we ask is that no more straws be added to the camel's back.

So what do Council and the General Board propose? They want to add a tree trunk to the camel's back. This summer they are going to replace the UCS with the new UIS under an interim Director. Now, one of two things can happen: either the interim Director changes something or he does not. If he does change something, then the risks of the move are only increased. Perhaps, I am told, he will only change the senior management layers. I'm sorry, but if you believe that the UCS' senior managers aren't intimately involved with the move, then you don't understand how seriously we take it. Alternatively, the interim Director may change nothing. If that is the case, why are we rushing to get him in for October 2013?

I am told that there is a risk of 'uncertainty' hanging over two co-located IT organizations that have not been merged yet and that the interim Directorship alleviates this uncertainty. I am aware of no such uncertainty in the UCS. The uncertainty is over three years of interim Directorship followed by a different permanent Directorship. Far better would be to co-locate the UCS and MISD in the Roger Needham Building on the current timetable but leave the formal merger to October 2014 and to use the intervening year to do a proper search for a permanent Director.

The University's IT infrastructure is already at significant risk this summer and I beg the Regent House not to make the situation worse.

Dr R. CHARLES (University Computing Service and Newnham College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am Ruth Charles, a manager in the University Computing Service and a Bye Fellow of Newnham. I spent ten years working in the IT industry before taking up my current post at UCS.

Firstly I congratulate the Review Panel on the improvements they have made to the final version of the IT Review. It is clear that they listened to the comments made in the Discussion of 20 November 2012[1], and revised their review in light of them. This is most refreshing, and gives me hope that what I say today may also have some effect.

As a Regent I am keen that the outcome of the Review is that IT services in Cambridge are of the highest standard, and the University's IT infrastructure which underlies and facilitates so much of the University's research and teaching is of the best possible quality. We all agree that a world-class University must have world-class IT.

The staff of the UCS, in striving to deliver such facilities all day, every day, expect routinely to work outside normal office hours when needed, and to be flexible about dealing with issues whenever they may arise. The true mark of excellent infrastructure and support is that no-one really notices them. Everything they do happens in good time, there are no problems, and everything just works. A surprising amount of invisible hard work goes into making

this happen, and I believe at the moment UCS services do in general just work. Consequently their reliability, resilience, and robustness is assumed.

As a manager in UCS I'm involved in the planning for the move to the Roger Needham Building this summer. If we get this right you will not notice that we have moved. Everything will still just work. As a manager I'm also concerned about the impact the review and the implementation plan has on the people I manage and my colleagues more broadly across the Service, as these are the people who make this all just work. The IT Review panel has done a good job, and now the details of the implementation plan for its proposals are critical to achieving the desired results.

Recommendations C1 and C2 deal with the creation of a new Director of Information Services and the merger of MISD, UCS, and the High Performance Computing Service. These recommendations are amplified in paragraphs 91–98 where it states:

> the panel acknowledges that the complete merger is a process which will take some time; experience from other Universities makes that clear. (paragraph 92)

The following paragraphs recommend a convergence programme involving the staff of both organizations, starting with a co-location. This is what we have planned for in the refit of the Roger Needham Building, with UCS and MISD physically moving to that building in September. We think we can set up home together with MISD while making sure that all our University services continue to just work. At the same time, because of the careful approach laid out in the IT Review, we have also reassured staff that this will be a slow and measured process, that there will be no big surprises, and most importantly no distractions over the critical summer period so that they can focus on the job in hand – making sure that everything moves safely – while to the general University it continues to just work.

Imagine our surprise when in the last *Reporter* of Lent Term we learnt that

> the Council is concerned by the risk of a prolonged period of uncertainty, not only for the staff of the two existing institutions, but for the continued delivery of systems and services on which the University's teaching, research, and core operations ... critically depend. They consider that risk will be managed most effectively by proceeding with the integration of the two institutions as quickly as possible.[2]

The logic seems to be that 'if it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly'. Additionally, Council has taken the view that it is undesirable for the current Directors to work together on the integration of the organizations, something that would happen as routine in the IT industry. Instead a frankly bizarre two-horse race is proposed resulting in one Director emerging as winner and the other as loser. Inevitably this will transform a merger of equals into a victor and a vanquished, opening a rift within the new organization.

The Council says that the accelerated timescale is intended to create certainty and remove doubt. Speaking as a member of staff I can assure them that this has had precisely the opposite effect. Rapidly following on the heels of this bombshell was a reiteration of the commitment made in the Review to no redundancies, and so UCS and MISD have entered 'a period of consultation with staff, extending over 90 days.' This is no doubt intended to re-assure staff of good intentions, but I will note in passing that it is unfortunate that 90 days has until recently been

the recommended consultation period for redundancy situations and so has a particularly menacing resonance that has not gone unnoticed.

Last week the Director of HR visited UCS and MISD to begin this consultation. Direct questions were asked, but only evasive answers given. We still do not know what the consultation is actually about, although we have now been told some of the things that it is not about. It is not about redundancies, it does not feed into the IT Review, and it does not feed into the Council's implementation plan. In fact no-one seems to know what the consultation will feed into. Even the Director of HR had no clear answer to that question. It is all rather Kafkaesque. The net result is that staff who were content and optimistic about their futures in a new expanded organization are now worried and on edge.

It seems to me that there are a lot of good intentions in play. We would all like this merger to just work, but the problem with good intentions is what they can pave. To bring together the best of UCS and MISD will take time and careful planning. Instead, we are currently faced with an unseemly rush that risks snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. I would ask the Council to reconsider both the timescales for their implementation plan and how they wish to proceed with the current consultation to ensure that we really do have the best chance of making this all just work.

[1] *Reporter*, 6287, 2012–13, p. 179
[2] *Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 419

Mr R. J. STIBBS (University Computing Service and President, Downing College), read by Dr R. Charles:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, yesterday I delivered the following letter to the Vice-Chancellor. It was signed by 75 members of staff of the University Computing Service including Regents and non-Regents, and is dated 19 April 2013:

Dear Vice-Chancellor,

I write as the Chairman of the University Computing Service's Staff Meeting to express staff disquiet about the Council's plans for the implementation of the IT Review.

We, the staff of the UCS, are extremely concerned about the likely consequences of the proposed timetable and interim appointment, which we believe could be highly damaging to the successful implementation of the Review.

The Council's proposals put both senior parties in an almost impossible position, and make it far more likely that the merger will take place in an atmosphere of resentment and disinclination to go the extra mile, just as people in both organisations were starting to get used to the idea. They also mean that the merger would happen at a moment of very considerable stress for UCS staff, immediately on the heels of the biggest logistic exercise we have ever carried out (we refer to the move of approximately 200 services during August and September, not the staff), with the attendant extreme time pressure and need to avoid disruption to the business of the University. MISD, though not having to move most of their servers, will also be under pressure because of the move of staff, which in their case is scheduled for the last weekend in September.

The move into a shared building will itself, over time, start to produce some of the benefits envisaged from the merger, and could allow the formal merger to be completed on a sensible timescale, under a new Director. By trying to rush the process, and by the proposal for a hasty and undignified two-horse race, we think the University is risking not only disastrous effects on staff morale in both organizations, but a much slower and less efficient final result, to the detriment of support for the University's core business.

The Council's recommendation is also lending fuel to the people who would like to see the whole Report thrown out. We doubt if there is any mileage in this, but a number of people who were hitherto reasonably happy with, or at least resigned to, the plans in the Report are so no longer.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Stibbs and 74 others

Professor R. G. McMahon (Institute of Astronomy and Fellow of Clare Hall):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, my name is Richard McMahon, I am Professor of Astronomy at the Institute of Astronomy. I am the Chair of our departmental computing oversight committee which includes a member of the UCS Institution Liaison team as a key member and is advised by a user committee. I am also Chair of the School of Physical Sciences IT Committee which is an advisory committee consisting of academic representatives for each of the nine Departments. The committee also includes two senior computing officers who are IT co-ordinators who are employed part-time, one day a week.

I am making this contribution in a personal capacity. My opinions are influenced by my experience in the management and development of scientific computing infrastructure and systems over 20 years. I am a heavy user of remote networked and local IT systems. I also have departmental responsibility for the delivery of systems which meet the needs and expectations of a diverse set of users. In addition, I strive to maintain the motivation of our IT staff whilst implementing structural changes, where we introduce more formal prioritization and project management procedures.

In my opinion, the final report from the Review was as expected a significant improvement, which is what you expect from a review that has a draft report and a consultation. I have read the written submissions and the Review Committee's responses and I think that the reviewers have done an excellent job of dealing with and taking into account the input from a representative set of stakeholders.

I personally believe that the merger of the UCS and MISD will be of immense benefit to the University, including the staff in both organizations who are themselves crucial to the success of the merger. Whilst the proposed merger is implemented it is crucial that there is flexibility on both sides from the staff and their managers. It is also vital that there is effective communication concerning changes in order to ensure the continued commitment, motivation, and trust of staff affected by any changes.

Any change, especially where computers are involved, is both an opportunity and a threat. Thankfully, in Cambridge we are endowed with a large cohort of highly skilled IT professionals who are qualified to manage the risk from the proposed changes. I trust that they will work

to continue, if the evidence from today's session is true, to deliver the service that will improve the working environment for themselves and their career progression and user services.

I will now give some detailed comments on some of the substantive issues:

(*i*) *Governance and line management*

The proposed structure with strong academic-led governance is appropriate to this University and is more user-centric than the previous structure. It also recognizes the crucial central importance of communication channels that allow for both expert technical advice and the effective capture of user requirements and feedback.

(*ii*) *Merger of central IT services*

The existence of two separate central IT organizations is plainly purely historical. Merging the two organizations under a common Director who reports to a senior academic is widely supported and I believe will allow the University to deliver the IT service that you expect in the 21st century with the ever-increasing needs and expectations of users.

(*iii*) *Timescale for the merger*

The issue I think is the timescale. I see no strong reason to delay the creation of the new IT institution. The communication phase of this change management process has already started with the 90-day staff consultation. The creation of the institute on 1 October is a vital first step in the merger of the two organizations. The Report says that the two organizations will work in parallel and I would expect that for the first 3–6 months, many staff will see no difference as most of the work will happen at the higher levels, especially, obviously, the staff who are involved in frontline activities, such as the new student arrivals, moving network servers and email. It just seems obvious to me that they will not be at risk. I think that Y2K-type scaremongering about takeovers and the risk of disruption to user-facing services is demoralizing for the staff and it is disturbing the less confident users around the University. I believe the senior academic staff in the University and in the UCS and MISD are familiar with risk management processes and I trust that they can work together to make the merger a success. The merger, it says, will take three years. There is a budget of £2 million for that merger, so extra staff can in principle be brought in to help. I think that very soon after the merger, staff and users will see improvements in service.

(*iv*) *Interim leadership of the new merged organization*

The University's main asset is its staff and it is not unreasonable of the Council and General Board to assume that: (*a*) an interim Director could be appointed from the existing two Directors; (*b*) that the two Directors would work together to make the new organization a success; and (*c*) that their local knowledge would be a more manageable risk to all concerned. I do not have a strong opinion on this issue, and possibly a senior academic could be involved in an enabling role. But I think the more important issue is the skillset of the new Director. The most important skill in my opinion is a proven record in communication, their ability to communicate effectively with their stakeholders, i.e. own staff, the academic community, and the central University administration. I suggest that the new institute has a senior post of Communication Lead. I have noticed that Cambridge Assessment has specifically advertised such a position and I suggest that such a position is created inside the new organization to help with communication with the stakeholders.

To conclude, I strongly support the proposed changes in governance and the creation of a new institution. In my

opinion, the proposed merger should take place on the timetable proposed, i.e. creation of a new institute on 1 October 2012, with the two organizations working in parallel initially, and with a budget of £2 million for the two- to three-year integration process.

My main concern is that if the new user-centric structure is to work it will require significant improvements in IT-related communication and co-ordination at the School level, both between the Schools and their Departments, and Schools and the centre. I advise that in the fund for the transition, the University funds IT co-ordinators in all the Schools to make the merger a success.

Mr M. SARGEANT (Management Information Services Division):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, although I welcome the proposal to merge in principle, I have concerns about the way that it is being handled.

Alarm bells rang when I read the recent Report which went into detail about the arrangements for the current directors of MISD and UCS but said very little about the future of staff in the new merged organization. This, combined with 90 days of consultation with staff and its usual connotation of indicating preparation for redundancy, shifted significantly support for the merger. Staff are now more concerned about their terms and conditions under the new regime and how long the promise of no redundancies will last for.

This clumsy approach to the merger does not augur well for the future. It is not even clear that the achievement of the potential full benefits is an objective. If it were, the appointment of the Director would be by open competition to secure the best person for the job and this also would dispel some of the concerns that there would be a takeover by either UCS or MISD.

As for the timescales for the merger, I do not see the benefit of delay. It will create further uncertainty for staff and lose the momentum for change. Once the decision has been made we should start the process. For the first few months after the appointment of the new Director, it is likely that there will not be much in the way of change for staff while the senior managers plan for the change.

I would like to finish by asking the Council to advise:

(i) Will they reconsider the process for appointing the new Director so that it is by open competition?

(ii) It is clear how the two Directors will be treated under the proposal. Can you firm up and give more detail to staff of UCS and MISD about their future terms and conditions, including the process for merging areas of responsibility with the likelihood of, say, two managers being replaced by one and potentially the rationalizing of PD33s for all staff?

Ms R. M. COLEMAN FINCH (Management Information Services Division):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I have worked for MISD for over 12 years. I am married to someone who has worked for the UCS for nearly as long, and I have good friends in both organizations. I will be directly affected, twice over, by these proposals, as will many people I care about. I also look at these proposals as a professional software developer, and as an Officer of the University, concerned with the best interests of the University.

I am broadly supportive of the report produced by the IT Review Committee, and by the specific proposal to create a new University Information Service from UCS and MISD. I think that three years is a sensible timescale for achieving full integration without seriously disrupting the many services provided by both existing organizations. I think the new UIS has the potential to be a really good thing for the University, and I am personally determined to do my bit towards making it so.

I am concerned by two aspects of the proposed implementation. These are the starting date of 1 October 2013, and the appointment of one of the existing Directors to oversee the merger.

MISD and UCS are co-locating this summer in the Roger Needham Building on the West Cambridge site. On current plans, I expect to move with my MISD colleagues sometime in September. This is always a very busy period, during which our users are preparing for the start of the academical year. It is going to be a real challenge to achieve the move without disrupting our service. We will barely have had time to settle into the new building by 1 October. If there are building delays or moving problems, we may not have done so.

I have great sympathy for my colleagues in UCS who not only have an even more challenging move, but who also face a significant change in commute and daily environment: from the city centre to Madingley Road is a much bigger change than from one side of Madingley Road to the other. This is a great deal of change on a very tight timescale.

So I ask the Council: have they considered the effects of the co-location on the ability of staff to engage with a merger beginning on 1 October?

My second concern is with the restriction of candidates for the interim Director of the new organization to the two Directors of the current organizations. UCS and MISD are very different organizations right now, with very different cultures. Organizational culture can be hard to define, but the floor plans for the Roger Needham Building show a remarkably clear visual difference between 'their side' and 'our side'.

If the University is to really reap the benefits of a new unified organization, the UIS will need to take on the best aspects of both existing cultures, not replace one by the other. With the greatest respect for the two existing Directors, they have each spent years embedded in, leading, and shaping their respective organizational cultures. It will be hard for either of them not to simply expand the existing culture they lead. I do not say they cannot do it, just that it will be hard.

It will be very hard not to see an appointment of the current MISD Director as a takeover of UCS by MISD, or vice versa. I think that such a perception of takeover is a real risk to the success of the project, by alienating staff. An actual cultural takeover would present a bigger risk, losing much of the benefits of the merger.

Does the Council recognize how much harder a task they will be giving the new Director of UIS, if that Director comes from just one of the organizational cultures?

Does the Council recognize the risk of staff disengagement, if they fear their existing organizational culture will be thrown away in favour of that of the other organization?

The reason given for the short timetable is to prevent uncertainty, and I accept that it is hard to make medium- or long-term decisions without knowing who will be in charge. The short timetable, along with the need to understand the collegiate University, is then used to justify the restricted shortlist of who will be in charge. There are indeed risks in medium-term uncertainty, but I see no acknowledgement of the risks of this rushed certainty.

I would very much like the Council to consider a delay to the merger in order to allow both organizations to settle into their new home, and start to get to know each other better. That would do wonders for reducing the risks of staff alienation, and also help us find the best aspects of each other's culture.

I would very much like the Council to use the extra time to seek a new Director in open competition rather than the suggested two-horse race. That would do wonders for the confidence of staff and the University in the new UIS.

As an Officer, as an IT professional, and as an affected employee, I want this merger to take place and to be a success. I am concerned that the timetable and the shortlist for Director make success less likely.

Ms V. L. ALLAN (University Library and Centre for Applied Research in Educational Technologies (CARET)), read by Mr R. S. Haynes:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I speak as a member of this University who is seriously concerned by the latest proposals for the merger of UCS and MISD. As I am sure others have noted, the rush to complete the merger seems unnecessary, and the decision to appoint one of the existing directors of the two institutions concerned as interim Director of the merged organization may not be wise, and was in fact recommended against in the original report.

There are two additional points I would like to make.

First, we are assured in the Report currently being discussed that there will be no redundancies of current MISD or UCS staff. Can the Council please give a similar assurance that there will be no redundancies among computing staff in Departments and other institutions?

Second, the report to Council of 22 October 2012 and the Report under discussion both mentioned the need to reform the ISSS. The current Report states that the ISSS will be dissolved, and a new body created. However, it fails to address why the ISSS was not as successful as was hoped, and I can see no reason why the new body will succeed any better. This was noted by Mr Warbrick in the Discussion on 20 November 2012. I would like the Council to answer this question: how will the ISC improve the computing provision of the University?

Dr R. WATSON (Faculty of History and Clare College), read by Mr R. S. Haynes:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the current proposal to merge UCS and MISD at breakneck speed is ill thought-out and, quite frankly, is a recipe for disaster and chaos. I call on Council to reject the proposal in its current form and to develop a more sensible and workable strategy for the future of IT at the University of Cambridge.

Dr P. GOPAL (Faculty of English), read by Mr R. S. Haynes:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the University Computing Service has always provided stellar support to academic staff and I am personally extremely grateful to our many excellent colleagues who keep it running so smoothly. I am, therefore, very concerned about the manner in which this proposed merger is being conducted: its unviably accelerated timescale and the patently opaque procedure by which it is proposed that a new Director is to be selected. This has serious implications for the University as a whole and the way in which a self-governing institution such as ours carries out major transformations such as the creation of the proposed UIS, a top-down creation if there was ever

one. The manner in which this whole process is being conducted exudes a real disregard for the people who make an institution work smoothly and positively. This is destructive managerialism at work. I call on members of the Regent House to put the brakes on this juggernaut and ensure that a properly scrutinized and fully consultative process takes place instead.

Dr J. E. SCOTT-WARREN (Faculty of English and Gonville and Caius College), read by Mr R. S. Haynes:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I wish to register my anxiety about the speed with which proposals for the merger of UCS and MISD are being implemented. The Council needs to give serious attention to the distinctive cultures of the two institutions, and to consult more widely on the question of whether it is possible to preserve the core strengths of each in a merger.

Relatedly, we need greater transparency over the issue of how the interim Director of the UIS is going to be chosen. And the Council ought to reconsider the feasibility of the timetable. Is it really possible to make wholesale changes to the organizational structures of these institutions at the same time as they are engaged in major relocations? Or will the result be a catastrophic interruption to the IT services on which we all rely?

Mr R. S. HAYNES (University Computing Service):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it was very heartening to see that the IT Review panel had taken account of its two public consultations and the Discussion on 20 November 2012[1], to produce a much-improved second report.[2] It was with shock and a heavy heart that we read how the recommendations were lost or fragmented in Council's proposal[3] to proceed with an overly hasty merger of MISD and UCS at the worst time and timescale by any measures, and to hastily select, by an unspecified and abnormal procedure, an interim Director of a new UIS from one of the existing Directors of the UCS and MISD. Thankfully, many concerns have been alerted by the helpful Notes of Dissent, and I must add to those concerns and alerts.

To be clear, missing was any clarity of what parts of the IT Review's recommendations were proposed to be kept by Council and the Board when endorsing the 'broad thrust' of the Review Committee's recommendations, as well as which parts would be lost in the rush to adopt a morphed subset of the Review's ideas, while not addressing the conveyed concerns. If we are to agree to a new UIS and a new Director, why not recruit in the usual manner, as recommended by the IT Review?[4] How exactly would the proposed merger benefit the IT organization and operation of the University and the Colleges, rather than giving co-location time, and why omit the High Performance Computing Service as recommended?[5] Leaving these matters dangling does not help move ahead together with the required clarity and confidence.

Missing too were the concerns about proper professional development and career structures for IT staff, at a time of inordinate stress and uncertainties of future roles, which had been added to most of the very same central IT staff.

Missing again was any hint or reference to guidance from groups such as the Risk Steering Committee, to assure that all affected parties in the University and Colleges have identified and taken account of the acknowledged and required business continuity planning, and to confirm that there would be sufficient support and safeguards in place in the proposed timescales to assure the

operational integrity of all central systems and services across the lifespan of this proposed rushed and radical transformation of the University's core IT provision and its immediate fallout.

Missing as well was any clear case or evidence as to why this proposed haste would do anything other than increase uncertainties, stresses, and strains at a time when this has already been amplified with the existing rush to move staff, systems, and critical services out of the New Museums site, and perhaps to a lesser extent out of Greenwich House, MISD's current home, and over to the West Cambridge site.

Since the only reason provided for the proposed rushed timescale is concern about 'the risk of a prolonged period of uncertainty, not only for the staff of the two existing institutions, but for the continued delivery of systems and services on which the University's teaching, research and core operations ... critically depend',[6] it is of pivotal importance that we know what consultations and risk assessments have informed this opinion.

With this in mind, on Thursday, 18 April 2013, during the initial meeting for the staff consultation called for by Council and the Board, UCS staff asked the HR Director for a number of clarifications and assurances. Included were expressed uncertainties about jobs and roles, the risk of loss of the particular professional cultures, and about trying to clarify the Council's concerns of risk, given that UCS and MISD staff are best placed to judge the risks and uncertainties associated with their responsibilities, including for the systems and critical services.

HR was asked if it would work with staff to organize a survey to clarify and address Council's concerns on these crucial matters, and so help better address the issue of timescales. HR was unwilling to assist in this concern. Can we call on Council to ask someone, perhaps including the Risk Steering Committee, to assist with this important effort, perhaps consulting more widely among the user community as is a stated key intention of the IT Review, so that we can have better information and reasons to proceed at an appropriate pace? In fact such wider consultation is a key part of the existing Information Strategy for the University, published on 11 May 2009,[7] in which the Council and the General Board state in section 3 that,

> The University of Cambridge is also a complex institution in which decision-taking is both diffuse and devolved, a reflection of its self-governing and democratic status. The overall objective should be that information systems are managed in such a way as to maximize benefit to users, whilst achieving an acceptable level of ease of maintenance and cost over the long term.
>
> The strategy has the express intent of putting the users' needs and aspirations first rather than attempting to construct a top-down approach.

And again, in section 4, 'the Information Strategy has been developed with users' interests as paramount'. Will Council now stop this rush and take proper stock of what is in the best interests of all users?

An additional worry about the initial consultation with HR was that it was made clear that there was no intention to take forward any of the points and concerns raised in the staff consultation, except perhaps to Professor Jeremy Sanders, presumably as Head of the HR Committee. If this persists, it would undermine the substantial point of the staff consultation, as well as ACAS and other best practices for such consultations. If needs be, as the current timescale has been adjusted a few times already to account for new information, it could be revised again to give time for

affected staff and the wider user community to inform this crucial process as part of the duty of care to affected staff, and due diligence to all who would be affected by the substantial changes being proposed.

Will the Council confirm that there will be a route for the staff feedback to be properly considered in the deliberations leading up to the drafting of a Grace?

Finally, to the concern about preserving the various existing cultures, either in entirety or at least the best parts of all, as recommended by the IT Review. HR has indicated that it cannot really help here, and that it will evolve with the new Director and developments. Of course the existing different cultures derive from the history and primary focus of the different services – the UCS developing along with and out of the Computer Laboratory, and MISD developing along with the growth of central administration, and HPCS along with the demands for computing-intensive research. Not only should these cultures not be rapidly interrupted, but neither will they be able to be radically interrupted, if each area is to continue to work closely with and respond to the needs and developments in their respective parts of the University. The excellence of our University seems to stem in part from applying a kind of evolutionary principle, complete with experimentation and some duplication and overlap in our Departments and Faculties and administration. Should our central IT services be so different to enable their evolution? Moreover, this is an expected outcome of such an IT review in higher education, as indicated by the strategic ICT (information, communications, and technology) Toolkit[8] commissioned by the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, a key principle from which states

> We define the maturity of strategic ICT as a measure of how well ICT is integrated and aligned with the enterprise-wide institutional strategy and therefore able to deliver maximum value and agility.

Can we pause, take stock, and make sure that we are preserving the best of the cultures which have served us well so far, and letting us evolve through the necessary process of growing out of any bad habits that may have accompanied our growth thus far and not add any unnecessary new ones?

[1] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6287/section10.shtml

[2] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6302/Revised-IT-Review-Report.pdf

[3] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6302/section5.shtml

[4] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6302/Revised-IT-Review-Report.pdf; p. 23, Recommendation C1, paragraph 91

[5] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6302/Revised-IT-Review-Report.pdf; p. 24, Recommendation C2

[6] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6302/section5.shtml; item 3

[7] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2008-09/weekly/6150/6.html

[8] http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/strategicmanagement/strategictechframework.aspx

Dr S. J. Cowley (University Council and Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it is good to see so many of the MISD and the UCS co-located in the Senate-House this afternoon. A number of people have expressed what their expertise in computing is. I am a mathematician. My first

contribution to any Discussion was 20 years ago on the Review of Computing; I reread my comments from 20 years ago which should have looked awful but in fact they stood up rather well, so maybe I am prescient!

I was one of the four members of the Council who signed one of the Notes of Dissent (and I am in fact the fourth to speak). I did this because I believe that the most important aspect of this Report is whether it will deliver improved IS provision for the University; the current proposals run the risk of not doing so. In particular, while I agree with the general thrust of the Report, in that the time has come for the merger of the UCS and the MISD, for the appointment of a Director of Information Services, and for a single University Committee of the Council that is responsible for IS policy, strategy, and financial matters, I am yet to be convinced that the details are correct; and it is the details that will determine whether this third attempt at reform in a decade will deliver. I will focus on three main points: the committee structure, the reporting line, and the timetable for implementation.

First, however, I would like to thank the Council for agreeing, yesterday, to adjust the timetable to allow for consideration at a full Council Meeting of the remarks at this Discussion.

The Committee structure

The Review refers to a number of the currently successful aspects of IS provision within the University. For instance, paragraph 81 states

> The network, on which so much else depends, works very well, and was something where any weaknesses would be instantly apparent to a large number of people.

This is a revision of the original report of the Review where 'simply works' appeared instead of 'works very well'. I think that this revision was possibly triggered by one of the comments in the response by the Faculty of Mathematics (written by me), namely:

> The network doesn't 'simply work'. It is supported by a dedicated responsive staff, and an informed committee with a technically competent Chairman. This is one of the reasons why the telephone replacement project distinguished itself from a number of other enterprise-wide systems by delivering on time and under budget. Another reason for the success was that it was clear where the buck stopped, with the Director of the UCS making it clear it was his responsibility.

The committee concerned is the Joint Network Management Committee (JNMC), and indeed the Review itself refers to 'the successful work of such groups as the Joint Network Management Committee'.

My reference to the JNMC might be viewed as somewhat self-serving, since I have been a member of that committee, or its immediate predecessor, for the last six years. However, this membership has given me an insight into what is perceived as a successful IS committee.

- Do the great and the good serve on it? On the whole, no.
- Does it usually have detailed Agenda and Minutes, and clear reasoned papers? Oh, I wish.
- Would a casual observer view the way it conducts its business as somewhat chaotic? Probably.
- Does it have members who understand the technical details of networks? Yes.
- Do these members, as diplomats might put it, have frank exchanges of views? In spades.
- Do we still all get on? I hope so.
- Does the Committee sometimes collectively change its mind? Amazingly for a committee in Cambridge, it does.

- Does the Committee work? Apparently so!
- Will the Information Services Committee have much in common with the JNMC? I doubt it.

As proposed, the ISC looks like a slimmed down version of the Planning and Resources Committee; the PRC is the committee to which the present ISSS reports (in my view rather ineffectively). One way to obtain the ISC from the PRC is to remove four Pro-Vice-Chancellors, three Heads of School and two members of the General Board (including the current Chairman of the ISSS), and add a member appointed by the Council and a student, and make the Registrary (who attends PRC) a member. This is not the only way to obtain the membership of the ISC, but there is an element of truth in this characterization, and there is no doubt that the overlap between the PRC and the ISC is going to be large. So will the ISC work?

Now it so happens that I am also a member of the PRC.

- Do the great and the good serve on the PRC? Yes (with the exception of myself and maybe somebody else).
- Does the PRC have detailed Agenda and Minutes, and clear reasoned papers? Over 300 pages is not uncommon, although sometimes it is difficult to see the wood for the trees.
- Would a casual observer view the way that the PRC conducts its business as somewhat chaotic? No.
- Does it have members who understand the technical details of networks? No, but that's because the PRC should not. So let's rephrase this question, and the subsequent questions.
- Will the ISC have enough members who are sufficiently IT informed or savvy? I doubt it.
- Will the members of the ISC have 'frank' exchanges of views? Probably not a sufficient number.
- Will the ISC sometimes collectively change its mind? I have difficulty imagining that.
- Will the ISC work? Well, the majority of the Council thinks it will, and I think pigs will fly first.

The ISC does need at least some members from the great and the good and with sufficient clout; but, crucially, these members need to be leavened by a sufficient number of members who understand IS, who understand the needs of students, academics, and other staff, who can appreciate the technical difficulties of implementing large systems, and who are willing to argue the case in an informed manner. The old IT Syndicate had that, the ISSS marginally so, and the proposed ISC is sadly lacking. And just to be clear, the IT Syndicate was not responsible for CAPSA/CUFS; that was another production with, in my opinion, an insufficiently technically informed committee running it.

The proposed membership of the ISC needs revision since the current proposal will not deliver improved IS provision for the University.

The reporting line

The Director of Information Services needs to report to someone who is technically informed, and who has sufficient time to devote to IS. As we observed in our Note of Dissent, reporting to the Vice-Chancellor (VC) looks, superficially, attractive, but the VC may not always be someone with both significant interest in the development of IS and the time to give it any priority. Note the both/and. The VC at the time of the CAPSA/CUFS debacle had the expertise, but apparently not the time (this being the only explanation I can come up with, given that many computer officers, the Board of Scrutiny, and even myself, knew that debacle was inevitable). VCs are appointed for five years renewable to seven, Pro-VCs for three years renewable to six. An IS informed academic with sufficient time should

be appointed as Chairman of the ISC for three years renewable to six, and the DIS should report to her or him.

The reporting line needs revision since the current proposal is not robust enough to deliver improved IS provision for the University.

The timetable for implementation

At the Council it was argued that a merger of the UCS and the MISD by 1 October 2013 was needed to bring certainty, and to reassure staff. In other organizations such as the Civil Service that may be the case, but not here. No one is going to lose their job, and we already have dedicated members of staff, many of whom are delaying their summer holidays so that the move of over 200 crucial IT services from central Cambridge to west Cambridge can be accomplished successfully. At this stage these staff do not need the uncertainly of not knowing who is going to be their Director in the next year. They need the certainty as to whom they will be reporting as the systems bed down and the inevitable problems are ironed out.

There is also the issue or, to be more honest, the problem, of the different cultures in the MISD and the UCS. One is fairly corporate, the other far less so. One has an 'open-plan' culture, the other is more individualistic. One tends to work set hours, the other works more flexible hours (and sometimes, I think, all hours). They each have their advantages and disadvantages. If the merger is to be successful, one service should not perceive that it is being taken over by the other, and that is what will be perceived if either of the current Directors is appointed as interim DIS. The two services have worked side-by-side for over ten years in different buildings; they can do it for another year in the same building. Over that period, the Chairman of the ISC can act as 'honest broker' if necessary, and the University can conduct a proper search for a new Director who can then merge the two cultures once he or she has had time to settle in. A shot-gun marriage will not deliver improved IS provision for the University.

I have a few more minor points.

I want to touch very briefly on the matter of the two current Directors. The Report recommends that

two University Offices of Director be established, with responsibilities and duties to be determined by the Council, for Mr P. Dampier and Dr I. Lewis,

and there is a paragraph concerning implementation. This is a sensitive matter and the Council did not discuss this matter in any detail, indeed I was asked not to continue when I raised the matter in the light of my background information.

Reference has also been made to minimum standards in Departments and Colleges but there are no handles in the Report for the DIS to pull. Much IT provision is still devolved to Departments and Colleges, so as far as I can see, the DIS will have responsibility without power.

Finally, referring to the earlier remarks concerning the consultation, I have looked up the consultation when the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology was formed; as far as I can tell from that Report, the staff consultation preceded the Report and the decision, and that might be a good idea here.

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 6 and 18 March 2013, on amendments to the pay and grading scheme for non-clinical staff implemented following the Second Joint Report of 25 July 2005 (*Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 423).

Dr S. J. Cowley (University Council and Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the Council. I did not sign this Report for three reasons. First, I have an immediate conflict of interest because, as a Senior Lecturer, I might stand to benefit from two extra increment points if the Report is approved. Second, while I am sympathetic to many of the suggestions in principle, there are a couple of points where I believe that fine tuning would improve the Report. Third, I believe that this may not be the time in practice to proceed with at least some aspects of the Report.

However, before going into detail I should apologize. Due to pressure of work or my own disorganization, depending on which way you look at it, I failed to respond to the consultative paper, or participate in the previous Discussion. At the time, the IT Review and my other commitments seemed more pressing.

That a review of the Pay and Grading Report of 2005 was needed was not in doubt. For instance, when the Market Supplement scheme was introduced, a number of us argued that its operation would be problematic, and so it has proved (see the coded language in paragraph 4.1). Further, a number of us argued that it would be disadvantageous for women, and so the statistics suggest. To some extent the first issue is being addressed with the introduction of the Advanced Contribution Supplements and the Market Pay scheme, both of which look to be improvements on the old Market Supplement scheme. However, I have a technical request here. Under the old Market Supplement scheme all awards above 10% had to be approved by the Council. In the case of the Advanced Contribution Supplements there is no such stipulation, and in the case of the Market Pay scheme it is proposed that the approval should be by the Remuneration Committee of the Council. I propose that awards above 10% should continue to be approved by the Council. Of course the Council may delegate that authority to its Remuneration Committee, but since the Remuneration Committee is not constituted in *Statutes and Ordinances* and could be abolished by a vote of the Council, a reference to the Council would be more robust. As to equality assurance, I have little hope, despite the valiant efforts of some fellow members of the Council, that the measures outlined in paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2 will turn out to be little more than window dressing.

My next point concerns the significant extension of the number of steps in Grade 12. This looks very good news for professors and academic-related staff on Grade 12. Five bands (if you include band zero) become four, and the number of steps on each non-trivial band increase from 6, 6, 6, and 6 to 9, 8, 8, and 14. As a mathematician my arithmetic is sometimes lacking; however, it seems to me that these extra steps at the top of the current scales must increase the wage bill, probably significantly. Yet I read that the financial 'impact is expected to be limited in the short term'. No it is not. In the long term it is going to have consequences for the University finances, e.g. an impact on the University capital plan, and/or the number of staff that can be employed, and/or the need to squeeze yet more out of the less well paid. I have three comments on this aspect.

First, the current draft of the forthcoming Allocation Report states

The key message of this Budget Report is that, whilst the hoped-for improvement is materialising, … there remain significant uncertainties in the external environment, and it remains as important as ever that the University practices financial restraint and seeks to secure value for money in all its activities. In particular, the Council remains concerned that the University should conduct its financial affairs in such a way as to enable continued capital investment at a level consistent with global competitiveness.

Money is tight. If the above quote is to be taken seriously, then before the Council gives the green light to this Report, there should be a full financial assessment indicating the estimated extra costs of Senior Lecturers, Professors, and academic-related staff moving up the salary scale.

Second, while I can just about envisage the need for a fourteen-point band 4 scale for outstanding academics (although I think that a restructuring into five bands would have been preferable), I find it hard to believe that it is necessary for academic-related staff (and here I should make a declaration of interest: my wife is an academic-related member of staff). The principle that the number of discretionary points for academic and academic-related members of staff can differ is already established. Academic-related staff on Grades 9 and 11 have discretionary points, but academics have none; academic-related staff on Grade 10 have three discretionary points, but academics have none at present (although if the current proposals go through they will have two). At present academic and academic-related staff on Grade 12 have the same number of increments: in particular depending on their band and initial step, they have a minimum of three increments and a maximum of five increments (since each band has six steps). I would propose that there continue to be no difference for the first three bands, but while academic-related staff on band 4 (that has fourteen steps) should continue to enjoy the possibility of a minimum of three increments, they should be limited to a maximum of seven increments (corresponding to the other bands).

My third point is that I think that the timing of this proposal is ill advised. I have already quoted from the draft of the forthcoming Allocations Report. Further, concerning future cuts in the Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills (BIS), driven by the Government's austerity programme, Sir Steve Smith is quoted in the *THE* (*Times Higher Education* supplement) as stating that 'a much more significant financial avalanche is on its way'. We are meant to be in this together; what message should BIS take from this University and others, that at a time of austerity we are finding money to reward the highest paid, as for example illustrated in recent articles in the *THE* on professorial and vice-chancellor pay. (Two footnotes: (i) I did spot an error concerning a Cambridge figure, and (ii) I was reassured to note that our current VC's pay is less than that received by the current Director of OFFA (Office for Fair Access) when the latter was at the University of Bedfordshire.) Indeed, the Planning and Resources Committee were informed by a Pro-VC that other universities are offering transfer salaries in the lead up to the REF that cannot possibly be recouped in increased research income. This is collective madness. For the sake of the sector someone needs to take a stand and offer leadership.

Further, many of us were unhappy at having to approve a £9,000 fee for undergraduates. Increases in the remuneration of those who are already well paid by any objective standard (other than that of the City) should not be on the backs of students. Glenda Jackson got it right two weeks ago:

The basis to Thatcherism was that everything I had been taught to regard as a vice – and I still regard them as vices – under Thatcherism was in fact a virtue: greed, selfishness, no care for the weaker, sharp elbows, sharp knees. They were the way forward.

The tide may be changing. Barclay's is re-engineering its pay practices, and the Tory Party seems to have rediscovered manufacturing and possibly even society. The University has, as far as I can tell, always believed in society, indeed we describe ourselves as a self-governing community of scholars. We have traditionally looked wider than our own self-interest. When supplementary payments for professors were first introduced in the 1980s (at the then Government's insistence), provision was made for professors to opt out. The numbers opting out, and in some cases the names, were published in the *Reporter*. When I referred to this recently I expected to be told that times had moved on, and so I was by a Pro-VC. But that Pro-VC, and possibly others, might need to recognize that time has moved on again. We are in a time of austerity, but we are in a time of austerity when we also need investment in Science; indeed earlier this week leaders of Britain's most eminent scientific bodies urged the Government to guarantee funding for research and innovation to help fuel Britain's recovery from recession. This funding is needed, but it should be spent on equipment and young researchers, not on old[er] senior lecturers, professors, or administrators (or the Director of OFFA for that matter). We need leadership to ensure that we do not lose sight of the *raison d'être* (or should that be the Mission Statement) of the University, a charitable institution. Yesterday I made a similar point to the Council. Collectively we are urging financial restraint; we should take a lead from our colleagues in the late 1980s, and practice it. Ideally I would advocate approving this Report in principle, but then putting its implementation on ice until the end of austerity. But that probably is too idealistic in the run up to the REF (Research Excellence Framework) (although of course this Report will be implemented after the census date for the REF, so whether it will have any useful effect is debatable). What my colleagues do is of course up to them, however at the very least I will not seek any benefit from the changes proposed in this Report until after I leave the Council.

Professor J. K. M. Sanders (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional Affairs), read by the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I speak as Chair of the Human Resources Committee and also Chair of the Working Group that drew up the proposals that form the basis of this Report.

In the Michaelmas Term 2012, the Council and General Board published a consultative paper proposing amendments to the Second Joint Report on Pay and Grading that was enacted in 2006 (*Reporter*, 6283, 2012–13, p. 83). No comments were made at the November Discussion other than those I made introducing the paper.[1] Since then, an extensive consultation has taken place across the University, during which the proposals were generally welcomed by Faculties and Schools. There has also been close scrutiny by the Legal Services Office and an Equality Assurance Assessment.

The final Report contains only minor amendments from the original, essentially fleshing out the details of process in some areas. I therefore commend it to the Regent House for approval so that it can be implemented by the end of 2013.

[1] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6287/section10.shtml#heading2-31

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, this Report marks the latest stage in a process of radical change in the relationship between academics and the University. When I became a University Teaching Officer (UTO) in 1980 I joined a 'community of scholars'. I signed no written contract, and I had no line manager. My duties were set out in the Statutes.

The career grade in Cambridge then was that of University Lecturer. The University Teaching Officer made his or her way up the scale of annual increments on the basis of length of service. Most had a College Fellowship to which little or no remuneration might be attached.

Written contracts for UTOs were a novelty in Cambridge when they were brought in many years later at the time when I was a member of the Council. I remember it being argued that Cambridge really had to keep up with the times.

These contracts were controversial when they were first introduced. In particular certain terms thought to restrict academic freedom of expression were widely resented. Some individuals were sufficiently indignant to refuse to sign the contracts with which they were presented when they were promoted. They continued to draw the lower salary while using their new titles, until it was pointed out that the newly-promoted could (and in any case should) enter into their new University Offices by signing a book in the Old Schools under Statute D, I ,4.[1] Once they did that they got their back pay, whether the contract was actually signed or not.

Between the introduction of those contracts and the present Report came the externally imposed National Framework Agreement of 2003 and the HERA proposals. In 2005, Cambridge, like other universities, created a single salary spine for all its employees. The national plan backed by HEFCE was intended to improve 'recruitment and retention' of staff; ensure equal pay for work of equal value; reward individual contribution; develop 'career progression'. But it set worker against worker in the resentments created by what were perceived to be the resulting far from equal rewards.

In Cambridge the process of implementing this change was not without its contentious moments. A ballot was held in Michaelmas 2005 over the proposals about the ways in which payments supplementary to salary should be determined and over the publication of names of those awarded them.[2] The Tenth Report of the Board of Scrutiny expressed concerns in 2005 about fairness and rigour and about the scale of the changes of policy and principle involved in assimilating academic and other staff onto a single 'spine'.[3] The Twelfth Report of the Board of Scrutiny commented in July 2007 that:

> The Board has previously noted the risks to the University of failing to carry out this process in a way that seemed to all staff to be fair and transparent. Unfortunately the process has not been perceived as successful by many staff, particularly academic-related and assistant staff. For example, the Board is aware of an informal survey carried out amongst IT staff which shows that just under half the respondents were dissatisfied with the process and a further quarter were only partially satisfied. Staff morale has consequently been affected.

Those were episodes in the transition towards the altered landscape the present Report lays before the Regent House.

The first point I want to make is that it is not clear to me how the proposals it contains will resolve the problems of perceived unfairness. The annual increments of the past are now to be, it is proposed, replaced by a system in which it is increasingly necessary to demonstrate that one is getting better at one's job all the time in order to win financial rewards. Professors, who used to be on a flat single rate, will need to prove they are making a 'sustained and improving contribution' in order to 'progress' through 'bands'. Providing a career pathway at least to the salary level of a Reader for the Senior Lecturer who makes 'significant contributions other than through research' is also envisaged.

'Market payments' have not been working, admits the Report:

> Individuals are unable to rely upon the continuous receipt of market supplements, creating insecurity. Furthermore, it can be difficult for departments to provide market data and evidence as part of the review process to support the continuation of a market supplement, especially for academic posts.

And:

> In an academic environment, the 'market' can in some cases effectively be a single individual, and the role therefore cannot be benchmarked for salary purposes.

The solution proposed is for the market supplement to mutate to become part of the individual's underlying pensionable stipend. There are to be 'advanced contribution supplements' to enable outstanding individuals to be paid extra for five years for hypothetical future achievements. Should the achievements not be 'achieved', 'it is not expected that an ACS [Advanced Contribution Supplement] awarded on recruitment would be removed', but a question mark might hang over the end of the probationary period. And 'on expiry of the ACS Period, the ACS would continue in place until it could be considered' under the next regular review.

Entanglement with the academic promotions procedure, for promotion is no longer solely on merit but depends on affordability, seems likely to lead to injustices:

> For example if a Reader on spine point 63 is offered a professorship by another University, she/he may be offered an ACS to bring her/his total pay up to the level of a Professor (point 68). If however within the period specified, the individual does not achieve promotion to a professorship, the ACS would be removed and the individual's total pay would revert back to the Reader point 63.

For academic-related staff there is to be a counterpart arrangement. Criteria are set out in Schedules to the Report. They seem vague.

My second point is that this all seems further to consolidate the move away from collegiality to hierarchy and with it the loss of the sense of being a member of a community of scholars. The 1995 Supplement to the Oxford *Gazette* in which Oxford discussed how best to reward academic distinction is well worth rereading, not least for its frequent mention of the 'community of scholars'.[4] If I search the *Reporter* for this phrase I find it in an Oxford Notice about the election of a new President of Oxford's Corpus, who is to serve in 'a non-hierarchical community of scholars'.[5]

In Cambridge, the Court of Discipline, 2007, considering a case involving alleged student plagiarism, saw plagiarism partly as an offence against the standards and expectations of the University as a community of scholars.[6] There is a mention of the community of Islamic scholars in an advertisement for a summer visiting scholarship at Pembroke.[7] But there is little evidence that this sense of scholarly community and concomitant collegiality remains a strong central assumption of academic life in Cambridge.

The 'community of scholars' has slipped out of the picture in favour of competition. The University remains collegiate but seems no longer collegial. The stated reason for the present Report is that Cambridge needs to remain 'competitive' in 'the external employment market'. I think that is regrettable. It is more regrettable still that it apparently attracted no comment on the committees planning these proposals or we might have expected to read the phrase somewhere in these present proposals.

[1] 'Unless it is otherwise provided by Statute or Ordinance, every officer shall be admitted to his or her office as soon as may be after the commencement of tenure by subscribing, in a book kept at the Registry, a declaration that the officer will well and faithfully discharge all the duties of the office, and by entering in the book the date of entering upon the office', http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/2012/statute_d-section1.html#heading2-1
[2] The Cambridge Implementation of the Single Spine: Notice Second Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a new pay and grading structure for non-clinical staff: Notice and announcement of a ballot, http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2005-06/weekly/6012/6.html
[3] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2004-05/weekly/6009/25.html
[4] http://www.ox.ac.uk/gazette/supps/9495/1_4351.pdf.
[5] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2008-09/weekly/6125/32.html
[6] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2007-08/weekly/6098/4.html
[7] http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2008-09/weekly/6136/32.html

Report of the Council, dated 18 March 2013, on the future of the Management Committee of the University Health Services and its sub-groups (*Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 431).

Dr D. Good (Chair, Management Committee of the University Health Services, Chair, University Counselling Service Executive Committee, Department of Psychology, and King's College), read by the Senior Proctor:
Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I speak today as both Chair of the current Management Committee of the Health Services and as Chair of the Counselling Service Executive to welcome this Report and the establishment of a Student Health and Wellbeing Committee in place of the current arrangements. It has been considered at length by both existing committees which include representatives of the bodies and agencies which are affected by it, and its recommendations are supported by them.

As the Report notes, this reorganization will enable better co-ordination across a range of educational and student support activities provided by the University by incorporating responsibility for them within the Academic Division with a line of report to the General Board's Education Committee. College representation on the new Committee and the Board's Education Committee will also enable co-ordination with the many activities of the Colleges which are fundamental to every student's experience of studying here.

Within the portfolio of activities for which the Management Committee has had responsibility, the Counselling Service Executive has had a very specific role in co-ordinating University and College interests and this is preserved in the new arrangements.

While the new reporting lines for student and staff counsellors will ultimately be to the Academic Division and the Human Resources Division respectively, the Head of the Counselling Service will retain a professional role with respect to the counselling activities of both staff and student counsellors. He or she will support the Head of the Human Resources Division on matters relating to staff counselling more generally as outlined in the recent advertisement for this post.

Dr S. J. Cowley (University Council and Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics):
Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Reports that I don't sign seem to come along in threes rather like buses. I will keep my remarks brief.

This Report needs fine-tuning. The Appointments Committee needs to be sorted out. The current regulations as far as I can tell do not cover the staff involved. Details of this are in an email that I sent to the Business Committee prior to the publication of this Report.

Paragraph 3 also suggests the recommendations will result in a reduction in the number of University health-related committees. Maybe I can't add up but as far as I can tell, this may be true in name but not in substance.

I think it would be good if details of legislation were correct and similarly details of argument.

Report of the General Board, dated 6 February 2013, on the establishment of a Royal Society Research Professorship of Earth Sciences (*Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 433).

No remarks were made on this Report.

Report of the General Board, dated 6 March 2013, on the re-establishment of a Professorship in the Sainsbury Laboratory (*Reporter*, 6301, 2012–13, p. 408).

No remarks were made on this Report.

Report of the General Board, dated 1 March 2013, on the establishment of a Readership in Number Theory (*Reporter*, 6301, 2012–13, p. 408).

No remarks were made on this Report.

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Newnham College

The following elections and appointments have been made with effect from 1 October 2013 unless otherwise indicated:

Elected into a Research Fellowship:

> Tekla Bude, M.St., *Oxford*, M.A., Ph.D., *Pennsylvania* (from 1 November 2013)
> Min Zhang, M.Eng., *Tsinghua*
> Fiona Stewart, M.Sci., *Glasgow*, Ph.D., *Cambridge*

Appointed Volterra Fietta Junior Research Lecturer in Public International Law at Newnham and at the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law (joint appointment):

> Andrew Sanger, M.A., *SE*, LL.M., *LSE*

Elected into a Visiting Bye-Fellowship (Easter Term 2013):

> Margaret Deuchar, M.A., *N*, Ph.D., *Stanford*

Robinson College

Elected into a Fellowship in Class B with effect from 23 April 2013:

Dr Helen L. Thaventhiran, B.A., *TH*, M.St., *Oxford*, Ph.D., *K*

St John's College

Elected to Fellowships under Title B, from 18 April 2013:

> John Ryan Taylor, B.S., *Santa Clara*, M.S., Ph.D., *California San Diego*
> Alexis Onawa Wilshaw, B.A., *JN*

Vacancies

Corpus Christi College and the Department of Physics: Physics Teaching Resource Developer and Schools Liaison Officer; tenure: fixed-term, for three years; salary: £24,000–£30,000; closing date: 13 May at 5 p.m.; further particulars: http://www.corpus.cam.ac.uk/vacancies

Gonville and Caius College: Teaching Associates, to help provide supervision for undergraduate students of the College; up to twelve non-stipendiary posts available; closing date: 20 May 2013; further particulars: http://www.cai.cam.ac.uk/joiningcaius

Other Notices

Churchill College: An exhibition of sculptures and drawings by Nigel Hall, RA, will take place at Churchill College, Storey's Way, from 4 May to 2 June 2013; the exhibition is open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Further details are available at http://www.chu.cam.ac.uk/about/art/exhibitions/nigel_hall.php.

Selwyn College: This year's Ramsay Murray Lecture will be held on Friday, 10 May 2013 at 5.30 p.m. in the Faculty of Law, LG19, West Road. Professor Mark Mazower, Ira D. Wallach Professor of History, Columbia University, New York, will be speaking on *The crisis in Greece and the state of Europe: a historian's perspective*. Further particulars are available at http://www.sel.cam.ac.uk/news/ramsaymurray2013.html.

Trinity Hall: A Memorial Service for Dennis Avery (23 October 1940 – 23 July 2012), Trinity Hall, 1980, LL.M., Honorary Fellow, will be held on Saturday, 1 June 2013 at Trinity Hall. The Service will take place in the Chapel at 2.30 p.m. followed by a Reception in the Master's Lodge. Dennis Avery will be remembered in Cambridge for his outstanding philanthropy to Trinity Hall and the University of Cambridge. Those wishing to attend should register their attendance by email (jp251@cam.ac.uk) or phone (01223 332563).

EXTERNAL NOTICES

University of Oxford

Balliol College: Fixed-term University Lecturership (CUF) and Tutorial Fellowship in Law; salary: £55,157, with substantial additional benefits; closing date: 24 May 2013; further particulars: http://www.balliol.ox.ac.uk/vacancies/2013/april/university-lectureship-and-tutorial-fellowship-in-law

Oriel College: The Eugene Lee-Hamilton Prize for the best Petrarchan Sonnet; further details: http://www.oriel.ox.ac.uk/content/eugene-lee-hamilton-prize-2013

St Hilda's College: Stipendiary Lecturer in Philosophy; tenure: one year from 1 October 2013; salary: £16,347–£18,385; closing date: 21 May 2013 by 12 noon; further particulars: http://www.st-hildas.ox.ac.uk/news-events-and-vacancies/vacancies