

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6524

WEDNESDAY 31 OCTOBER 2018

VOL CXLIX No 6

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	87
Discussion on Tuesday, 6 November 2018	87
Election of a member of the Council's Finance Committee in class (b)	87
Discipline Committee	87

Awards, etc.

Seatonian Prize	88
-----------------	----

Events, courses, etc.

Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.	88
------------------------------------------	----

Notices by the General Board

Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine	88
Faculty Board of Mathematics	88
Membership of the Botanic Garden Syndicate	89

Regulations for examinations

Economic Research for the M.Phil. Degree	89
Economics for the M.Phil. Degree	89
Finance and Economics for the M.Phil. Degree	90
Modern South Asian Studies for the M.Phil. Degree	90

Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

Annual Meetings of the Faculties	90
----------------------------------	----

Form and conduct of examinations

Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery: Final M.B. Examination, 2018–19	91
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Graces

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 31 October 2018	93
------------------------------------------------------------	----

Acta

Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 17 October 2018	94
Result of ballot on Grace 1 of 18 April 2018 (Membership of the Regent House for Directors of Research and Principal Research Associates)	94
Result of ballot on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 and on an amendment (Faculty membership criterion)	94

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Fly-sheets reprinted

Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 and on an amendment (Faculty membership criterion)	95
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Report of Discussion

Tuesday, 23 October 2018	99
--------------------------	----

College Notices

Elections	104
Vacancies	104

Societies, etc.

Cambridge Philosophical Society	104
---------------------------------	-----

External Notices

Oxford Notices	104
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

1 November, *Thursday*. All Saints' Day. Scarlet Day.

4 November, *Sunday*. Commemoration of Benefactors. Scarlet Day. Preacher before the University at 11.15 a.m., The Rev. Prof. J. M. Brown, *G*, Emerita Beit Professor of the History of the British Commonwealth in the University of Oxford (Lady Margaret's Preacher).

6 November, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. (see below).

9 November, *Friday*. Michaelmas Term divides.

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

6 November

20 November

4 December

Congregations (Saturdays unless otherwise stated)

24 November, *at 2 p.m.*

Discussion on Tuesday, 6 November 2018

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House, on Tuesday, 6 November 2018 at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Report of the Council, dated 15 October 2018, on the use of external finance in accordance with the authority granted by Grace 2 of 10 May 2018 (*Reporter*, 6522, 2018–19, p. 63).

Further information on Discussions, including details on format and attendance, is provided at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions/>.

Election of a member of the Council's Finance Committee in class (b)

31 October 2018

A vacancy will arise on the Council's Finance Committee for a member of the Regent House, elected by representatives of the Colleges, to serve for three years from 1 January 2019.

The election is conducted in accordance with the Single Transferable Vote regulations. Voting is by postal ballot.

Nominations should be made in writing to the Head of the Registry's Office, University Offices, The Old Schools, Cambridge, CB2 1TN, and must include a statement by the person nominated that he or she is willing to serve on the Finance Committee. Nominations and statements should be made by **12 noon on Wednesday, 14 November 2018**. Nominations should be supported by the signatures of two members of the Regent House.

If a ballot is necessary, papers will be dispatched by Monday, 26 November 2018, for return by 12 noon on Friday, 7 December 2018.

Discipline Committee

The Discipline Committee met on 14 September 2018 to consider a charge brought by the University Advocate against a student member of the University. The Committee consisted of: Mr L. Kosmin (Chair), Dr M. Jones, *DAR*, Professor C. Barnard, *T*, Professor I. Hutchings, *JN*, and Ms N. Blanning, *JN*. Ms S. d'Ambrumenil, *EM*, acted as Secretary to the Committee, with Ms G. Parker, *R*, assisting. On the application of the student concerned, the Committee consisted of senior members only and sat in private.

The student was charged with two counts contrary to Regulation 7 of the General Regulations for Discipline: possession of unauthorized material, and use of unauthorized material during an examination for an undergraduate course. The student submitted a not guilty plea to both counts. The University Advocate outlined the circumstances of the case and the student's representative addressed the Committee on procedural matters and the merits of the case.

The Committee considered the case and found that one count contrary to Regulation 7, possession of unauthorized material during an examination, was proved beyond reasonable doubt. The Committee found the student not guilty of one count contrary to Regulation 7, use of unauthorized material during an examination.

The University Advocate and the student's representative made submissions in relation to penalty and mitigation.

In relation to penalty, the Committee considered the points of mitigation, including the student's personal circumstances. Taking all factors into account, the Committee determined that, in accordance with Special Ordinance D (ii) 3, the student have their mark for the relevant paper reduced to a pass mark. The Committee noted that this penalty would have no impact on the classification that the student was awarded.

AWARDS, ETC.**Seatonian Prize**

The Examiners of the Seatonian Prize for the best English poem on a sacred subject give notice that the subject for 2019 is:

‘Take, O take him, Mighty Leader,
Take again thy servant’s soul.
Grave his name, and pour the fragrant
Balm upon the icy stone.’

from Prudentius

The Prize is open for competition among all members of the Senate, and all persons who are possessors of the status of Master of Arts. Further details are available at <https://www.divinity.cam.ac.uk/about-us/prizes#section-11>.

The Prize for 2018 was awarded to Mr Colin Wilcockson of Pembroke College.

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 individual Faculty, Department, and institution websites, on the What’s On website (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/whatson/>), and on Talks.cam (<http://www.talks.cam.ac.uk/>).

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

<i>Faculty of History</i>	2018 Ellen McArthur Lectures: <i>Time horizons as boundaries for market, public and social enterprise</i> , by Professor Avner Offer, University of Oxford, at 5 p.m. on Thursday 1, Wednesday 7, and Thursday 8, November 2018 in LG19, Faculty of Law, Sidgwick site	https://www.hist.cam.ac.uk/events/ellen-mcarthur-lectures
<i>Faculty of History</i>	Inaugural lecture: <i>Frontiers of scientific knowledge in South Africa: Global science, national horizons</i> , by Professor Saul Dubow, Smuts Professor of Commonwealth History, at 5.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 28 November 2018 in Cripps Court Auditorium, Magdalene College	https://www.hist.cam.ac.uk/events/world-history-inaugural-lecture
<i>Britten Sinfonia</i>	<i>At Lunch One: A new song cycle</i> by Luke Styles featuring tenor Mark Padmore, alongside music by Vaughan Williams, at 1 p.m. on Tuesday, 20 November 2018 at West Road Concert Hall	https://www.brittensinfonia.com/event/at-lunch-one-18-19-2/

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD**Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine****With immediate effect**

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine, has approved the addition of the Director of the Institute for Continuing Education to the membership of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine.

Schedule I to the regulations for Classes of Faculty Board Membership, Elections, and Periods of Office (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 607) has been amended such that the number of members in class (e) (representatives of cognate studies and holders of specified offices) increases from ten to eleven and the total membership is revised accordingly, and in Schedule III by inserting the Director of the Institute for Continuing Education as the holder of a specified office.

Faculty Board of Mathematics**With immediate effect**

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Mathematics, has approved an amendment to the membership of the Faculty Board of Mathematics.

Schedule I to the regulations for Classes of Faculty Board Membership, Elections, and Periods of Office (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 607) has been amended such that the number of members in class (d) (co-opted members) increases from four to five and the total membership is revised accordingly.

Membership of the Botanic Garden Syndicate

(Statutes and Ordinances, p. 646)

With immediate effect

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Botanic Garden Syndicate, has approved a change to the Botanic Garden Syndicate's membership to allow the appointment of external members, whilst preserving a majority on the Syndicate of those who are members of the University.

Regulation 2 of the regulations for the Botanic Garden has therefore been amended to read as follows:

2. There shall be a Syndicate called the Botanic Garden Syndicate, which shall consist of:
 - (a) the Vice-Chancellor (or a duly appointed deputy) as Chair;
 - (b) the Head of the Department of Plant Sciences;
 - (c) eight members of the Senate, two appointed by the Council, two by the Faculty Board of Biology, and four by the General Board, at least six of whom shall be members of the University;
 - (d) not more than four persons co-opted by the Syndicate, provided that it shall not be obligatory for the Syndicate to co-opt any person or persons.

Members in classes (c) and (d) shall be appointed or co-opted in the Michaelmas Term to serve for four years from 1 January following their appointment or co-optation. The Director of the Botanic Garden shall act as Secretary to the Syndicate.

REGULATIONS FOR EXAMINATIONS

Economic Research for the M.Phil. Degree

(Statutes and Ordinances, p. 523)

With effect from 1 October 2019

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Economics, has approved an amendment to the regulations for the examination in Economic Research for the degree of Master of Philosophy by advanced study, so as to include projects and class presentations in addition to written papers, and to give students the option to choose between a dissertation or paper examined by examination or project work.

Regulation 1.

By amending Regulation 1(a) so as to read:

- (a) seven compulsory and one additional module, selected from a list of core and optional modules published by the Degree Committee for the Faculty of Economics, which shall be examined by written papers, projects, or class presentations;

Economics for the M.Phil. Degree

(Statutes and Ordinances, p. 524)

With effect from 1 October 2019

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Economics, has approved an amendment to the regulations for the examination in Economics for the degree of Master of Philosophy by advanced study, so as to include projects and class presentations in addition to written papers, and to give students the option to choose between a dissertation or paper examined by examination or project work.

Regulation 1.

By amending Regulation 1(a) so as to read:

- (a) six compulsory and two additional modules, selected from a list of core and optional modules published by the Degree Committee for the Faculty of Economics, which shall be examined by written papers, projects, or class presentations;

Finance and Economics for the M.Phil. Degree

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 528)

With effect from 1 October 2019

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Economics, has approved an amendment to the regulations for the examination in Finance and Economics for the degree of Master of Philosophy by advanced study, so as to include projects and class presentations in addition to written papers, and to give students the option to choose between a dissertation or paper examined by examination or project work.

Regulation 1.

By amending Regulation 1(a) to read:

- (a) six compulsory and two additional modules, selected from a list of core and optional modules published by the Degree Committee for the Faculty of Economics, which shall be examined by written papers, projects, or class presentations;

Modern South Asian Studies for the M.Phil. Degree

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 537)

With immediate effect

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Degree Committee for the Department of Politics and International Studies, has approved an amendment to the regulations for the examination in Modern South Asian Studies for the degree of Master of Philosophy by advanced study, so as to add a progression hurdle in the form of a formative essay.

By inserting a new Regulation 3 as follows:

- 3.** In order to proceed to the examination, candidates must submit a formative essay of 1,500–2,000 words on a topic agreed with the candidates' supervisors.

The Degree Committee for the Department of Politics and International Studies is satisfied that no candidate's preparation for the examination will be adversely affected by this change.

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.

Annual Meetings of the Faculties

Computer Science and Technology

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Computer Science and Technology gives notice that the Teaching Conference and Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 6 November 2018, in Lecture Theatre 1 of the William Gates Building, JJ Thomson Avenue. All members of the Faculty are invited to attend.

Earth Sciences and Geography

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Earth Sciences and Geography gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 20 November 2018, in the Seminar Room, Department of Geography, Downing Place. The business will be the election, in accordance with the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 605), of two members of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve for four years from 1 January 2019.

Nominations for election and notice of any other business should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Board (email: as820@cam.ac.uk) not later than Thursday, 15 November 2018.

Music

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Music gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at 2 p.m. on Thursday, 22 November 2018, in Lecture Room 5 of the Faculty of Music. Notice of any other business should be sent to the Secretary of the Faculty Board, Mr Alex Drury (email: administrator@mus.cam.ac.uk), to arrive not later than Monday, 12 November 2018.

FORM AND CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS

Notices by Faculty Boards, or other bodies concerned, of changes to the form and conduct of certain examinations to be held in 2018–19, by comparison with those examinations in 2017–18, are published below. Complete details of the form and conduct of all examinations are available from the Faculties or Departments concerned.

Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery: Final M.B. Examination, 2018–19

The Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine gives notice that, with effect from the assessments to be held in 2018–19, the form of the examination for Final M.B. Examination for Parts I, II, and III (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 475) will be as follows:

FINAL M.B. EXAMINATION, PART I

The Final M.B. B.Chir. examinations are concerned with the principles and practice of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense, in line with the learning objectives for Year 4. The Part I examination may include material relating to General Medicine, General Surgery, Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, General Practice, Pathology, Public Health Medicine, Paediatrics, Psychiatry, and other medical and surgical specialities as appropriate.

The Part I examination is designed to assess the candidate's

- knowledge and experience of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense (as defined above) in line with the Year 4 learning objectives;
- understanding of the pathological basis of disease;
- ability to apply that knowledge and experience to the management of patients;
- ability to communicate effectively with patients and to respect their autonomy;
- experience of ethical problems in clinical medicine.

Candidates may be asked to interpret radiographs and scans, electrocardiograms, clinical photographs, and other data. Knowledge, skills and behaviour will be assessed. Written papers are assessed without knowledge of the candidate's name.

The examination comprises two components:

Component 1

Written Examination:	Marks:	40% of the Part I total
<i>Single Best Answer (SBA)</i>	Length:	3 hours
<i>Paper</i>	Structure:	Up to 150 five-option, single response computer-marked questions <i>To pass:</i> students must achieve the pass mark as set by the examiners, or higher

Component 2

Clinical Examination:	Marks:	60% of the Part I total
	Length:	Up to 2.5 hours
	Structure:	Eleven stations of up to 12 minutes' duration, testing history-taking, clinical reasoning and other interpersonal communication skills, and core clinical/physical examination skills, using real and simulated patients. <i>To pass:</i> students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher. In addition, candidates must achieve a pass in at least three of the communication skills stations and in at least three of the clinical/physical examination skills stations. Where a station is made up of two sub-stations, a pass in both sub-stations is required to achieve an overall pass on that station.

Note: to achieve an overall pass in the Final M.B. Part I Examination, students must pass both components; one resit opportunity will be permitted.

FINAL M.B. EXAMINATION, PART II

The Final M.B. B.Chir. examinations are concerned with the principles and practice of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense, in line with Year 5 learning objectives. The Part II examination may include material relating to General Medicine, General Surgery, Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, General Practice, Pathology, Public Health Medicine, Paediatrics, Psychiatry, and other medical and surgical specialities as appropriate.

The Part II examination is designed to assess the candidate's

- knowledge and experience of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense (as defined above) in line with the Year 5 learning objectives;
- understanding of the pathological basis of disease;
- ability to apply that knowledge and experience to the management of patients;
- ability to communicate effectively with patients and to respect their autonomy;
- experience of ethical problems in clinical medicine.

Candidates may be asked to interpret radiographs and scans, electrocardiograms, clinical photographs, and other clinical data. Knowledge, skills, and behaviour will be assessed. Written papers are assessed without knowledge of the candidate's name.

The examination comprises three components:

Component 1

<i>Single Best Answer (SBA) Paper</i>	Marks:	25% of the Part II total
	Length:	3 hours
	Structure:	Up to 150 five-option, single response computer-marked questions <i>To pass:</i> students must achieve the pass mark as set by the examiners, or higher

Component 2

<i>Extended Clinical Cases Paper</i>	Marks:	25% of the Part II total
	Length:	3 hours
	Structure:	Up to ten questions of short answer format <i>To pass:</i> students must achieve the pass mark as set by the examiners, or higher

Component 3

<i>Clinical Examination</i>	Marks:	50% of the Part II total
	Length:	Two circuits, each lasting up to 1.25 hours (total examination time up to 2.5 hours)
	Structure:	Two circuits, each comprising six stations of up to 12 minutes' duration, testing history-taking, clinical reasoning and other interpersonal communication skills and core clinical/physical examination skills, using real and simulated patients. One circuit will focus on Paediatrics, and the other on Women's health (the latter may require the assessment of major adult systems, e.g. cardiovascular, respiratory, abdominal, neurological). <i>To pass:</i> students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher. In addition, candidates must achieve a pass in at least three of the Paediatric examination stations and in at least three of the Women's health examination stations. Where a station is made up of two sub-stations, a pass in both sub-stations is required to achieve an overall pass on that station.

Note: to achieve an overall pass in the Final M.B. Part II Examination, students must pass all three components; one resit opportunity will be permitted.

FINAL M.B. EXAMINATION, PART III

The Final M.B. B.Chir. examinations are concerned with the principles and practice of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense in line with the Year 6 learning objectives. Accordingly, they may include material relating to General Medicine, General Surgery, Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, General Practice, Pathology, Public Health Medicine, Paediatrics, Psychiatry, and other medical and surgical specialities as appropriate.

The Part III examination is designed to assess the candidate's

- knowledge and experience of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense (as defined above) in line with the Year 6 learning objectives;
- understanding of the pathological basis of disease;
- ability to apply that knowledge and experience to the management of patients;
- ability to communicate effectively with patients and to respect their autonomy;
- experience of ethical and legal issues in clinical medicine.

Candidates may be asked to interpret radiographs and scans, electrocardiograms, clinical photographs, and other data. Knowledge, skills, and behaviour will be assessed. Written papers are assessed without knowledge of the candidate's name.

The examination has four components, two written and two clinical.

Component 1

1A: <i>Single Best Answer (SBA) Paper One</i>	Length:	2.5 hours
	Structure:	Up to 125 five-option, single response computer-marked questions
1B: <i>Single Best Answer (SBA) Paper Two</i>	Length:	2.5 hours
	Structure:	Up to 125 five-option, single response computer-marked questions <i>To pass:</i> marks for 1A and 1B will be combined and students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher

Component 2

<i>Short Answer Question (SAQ) Paper</i>	Length:	2 hours
	Structure:	6–8 structured short essay questions testing improving health, ethics, law, and professionalism skills and knowledge
	<i>To pass:</i>	students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher

Component 3

<i>Simulated Clinical Encounter Examination (SCEE)</i>	Length:	Up to 3 hours
	Structure:	Up to twelve 15-minute stations assessing history-taking, clinical reasoning, and other interpersonal communication skills using simulated patients/professionals
	<i>To pass:</i>	students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher, as well as passing a minimum of 50% of the examination stations. Where a station is made up of two sub-stations, a pass in both sub-stations is required to achieve an overall pass on that station.

Component 4

<i>Clinical Examination (CE)</i>	Length:	Up to 3 hours
	Structure:	A combination of not less than ten stations, of either 7.5-minutes or 15-minutes, testing core clinical skills and physical examination skills using real patients
	<i>To pass:</i>	students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher, as well as passing a minimum of 50% of the examination stations. Where a station is made up of two sub-stations, a pass in both sub-stations is required to achieve an overall pass on that station.

Note: to achieve an overall pass in the Final M.B. Part III Examination, students must pass all four components; one resit opportunity will be permitted for the written components.

GRACES**Graces submitted to the Regent House on 31 October 2018**

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. 105) will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 9 November 2018.

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 4 of the Report of the General Board, dated 3 October 2018, on the establishment of certain Professorships (*Reporter*, 6521, 2018–19, p. 52) be approved.
2. By inserting in Regulation 1 of the regulations for the Military Education Committee (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 137) new sub-paragraph (*j*) as follows and renumbering the remaining sub-paragraph:¹
 - (*j*) the Chief Executive of the East Anglian Reserve Forces and Cadets Association;

¹ The Council, on the recommendation of the Military Education Committee, proposes this amendment to the membership of the Committee to facilitate co-operation with the local Reserve Forces and Cadets Association.

ACTA**Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 17 October 2018**

The Graces submitted to the Regent House on 17 October 2018 (*Reporter*, 6522, 2018–19, p. 65) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 26 October 2018.

Result of ballot on Grace 1 of 18 April 2018 (Membership of the Regent House for Directors of Research and Principal Research Associates)

26 October 2018

The Registry gives notice that, as a result of the ballot held between 15 and 25 October 2018, the following Grace of the Regent House was **approved**:

That the recommendations in paragraph 3 of the Report of the Council, dated 7 February 2018, on membership of the Regent House for Directors of Research and Principal Research Associates (*Reporter*, 6494, 2017–18, p. 385) be approved.

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

<i>Number of valid votes:</i>	721 (no invalid votes)
In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	621
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	100

No fly-sheets were received in relation to this ballot.

Result of ballot on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 and on an amendment (Faculty membership criterion)

26 October 2018

The Registry gives notice that, as a result of the ballot held between 15 and 25 October 2018, Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 in its amended form was **approved**.

The Grace in its amended form reads as follows:

That, with effect from the promulgation of the Roll of the Regent House on 6 November 2019, in the Ordinance on membership of the Regent House under Statute A III 11(e) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 104), the text ‘provided that no person shall qualify for membership in categories (i), (iii), or (iv) unless he or she is also a member of a Faculty, or holds an appointment listed in those categories in a Department or other University institution which is independent of a Faculty’ be replaced by the following text

‘provided that no person shall qualify for membership in category (iii), unless he or she has held an appointment listed in that category, or any other role qualifying that person for membership, for a total period of at least three years continuously prior to the date of promulgation of the Roll.’

And that the words ‘Research Associate’ be removed from category (i) and the words ‘Research Associates and’ be inserted at the start of category (iii).

The results of the voting on this Grace and the amendment, conducted under the Single Transferable Vote regulations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 115), are as follows:

<i>Number of valid votes:</i> 783 (no invalid votes) (Quota: 392)				
	<i>First count</i>	<i>Transfer of option 3 surplus</i>	<i>Second count</i>	<i>RESULT</i>
1. In favour of the Grace in its original form	334	10	344	
2. In favour of the Grace in its amended form	379	23	402	APPROVED OPTION
3. Not in favour of the Grace in either its original or amended form	70	-70		
<i>Non-transferable</i>		37	37	
TOTAL	783		783	

The fly-sheets received in relation to this ballot are reprinted on p. 95.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registry*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE ‘REPORTER’

FLY-SHEETS REPRINTED**Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 and on an amendment (Faculty membership criterion)**

In accordance with the Council's Notice on Discussions and Fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 110), the fly-sheets from the ballot on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 and an amendment (Faculty membership criterion) are reprinted below. Fly-sheets are reprinted in the order in which they appeared in the ballot booklet, which was random. For the result of the ballot, see p. 94.

Voting Rights Flysheet: Grace 1 of 27 June 2018

We ask all Regents to oppose the Council's amendment to the Grace, under which many research staff who are already members of the Regent House will be deprived of their membership and stripped of the right to vote.

For example, of the 56 research associates already at the Computer Laboratory in September 2018, and who can now vote, 30 will lose that right from October 2019 if the amendment is passed. We don't know exactly how many new hires will also be affected, but if the amendment were to come into force at once, then 42 RAs would be disenfranchised – three-quarters of the total.

And this will happen because the Computer Laboratory is inclusive: all RAs and SRAs automatically become members of the Faculty of Computer Science and Technology, so they all become members of the Regent House.

The nearby Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology is not under any Faculty, so its research staff have long been included by default. There, too, RAs and SRAs hired since October 2015 will lose the vote if the Council's amendment goes through.

Other departments where RAs hired after October 2015 will lose the vote include Engineering, Land Economy, Criminology, CRASSH, HPS, the Language Centre, the Sainsbury Lab, the Stem Cell Institute, the Gurdon Institute, the Systems Biology Centre, CISL and the new Toxicology Unit. As well as the Council's amendment disenfranchising staff already in post, new hires from November 2018 won't get to vote until October 2022. Across the University, it will exclude between a half and three-quarters of our research staff.

Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 is the way forward. It will extend the inclusive approach to all. But the Council's amendment will impose an arbitrary three-to-four year delay; hundreds of existing Regents will be kicked out.

In some cases the right to vote will have been mentioned to new hires as they decided to work here, so their employment rights will be infringed. And the requirement that the qualification period be continuous will discriminate against staff who take a career break – with women likely to suffer most.

Cambridge must extend the franchise to all postdoctoral research workers, as inclusive faculties already do. It must not expel existing members of our governing body and it must not discriminate against women.

The undersigned members of affected institutions urge Regents to vote in favour of the Grace by ranking it first and to rank the Council's amendment last. This will protect the rights of our junior colleagues.

R. J. ANDERSON
A. R. BERESFORD
D. J. BERRY
A. F. BLACKWELL
R. W. H. BRICHENO
A. P. CAINES
R. P. G. CARTER
G. M. CRONIN
J. A. CROWCROFT
S. CUMMINS
V. H. EVERETT
F. A. N. FINCH
A. FRANCESCHINI
R. C. FRANKLIN
N. J. GAY
G. D. GOODRICK
L. M. GOUGH
T. G. GRIFFIN
K. GUDKA

S. B. HOLDEN
A. J. HUTCHINGS
G. C. JENKINSON
T. M. JONES
J. A. LANGLEY
I. J. LEWIS
D. W. MCBRIDE
M. M. MAHMOUD-ANIS
A. L. MILROY
A. W. MOORE
R. M. MORTIER
R. D. MULLINS
A. MYCROFT
E. T. NAPIERALA
C. M. NIGHTINGALE
R. M. NORTON-WRIGHT
S. M. OOSTHUIZEN
R. B. PETTIT
A. C. RICE

P. ROBINSON
S. J. SCHAFFER
M. A. SCOTT
P. M. SEWELL
S. P. SKOROBOGATOV
S. J. SMITH
J. Q. STAFFORD-FRASER
C. A. STEWART
S. H. TEUFEL
D. R. THOMAS
A. B. TURNER
J. WARBRICK
R. N. M. WATSON
D. J. WISCHIK
J. D. WOODRUFF
J. M. WYBURD
E. YONEKI
J. A. ZEITLER

FLYSHEET: Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 (Faculty membership criterion)

The composition of the Regent House is important in determining the future of decision-making by our university.

Currently, faculty membership is so variably applied across the university that it is inherently unfair. Some Faculties now grant membership to all Senior Research Associates, Research Associates, Computer Associates and various other roles; others grant membership only to those who contribute significantly to teaching, or by virtue of seniority of role. This variability excludes some groups of staff who have demonstrated a high level of commitment to the organisation in some Schools, while in others, it automatically enfranchises others whose focus is quite rightly on their research and teaching career development. We agree that an alternative needs to be found.

However, simply abolishing the Faculty membership criterion without providing an alternative will mean that the stewardship of the University will no longer be in the majority hands of those with a demonstrable commitment to the University, because of the enormous expansion of grant-based, fixed term early-career researcher cohort, particularly in the biomedical sciences. UK science funding is responsible for this, not the university.

We believe that the amendment, which would replace the highly inequitable Faculty membership rule with a qualifying period of service, is preferable for several reasons.

The introduction of a qualifying period is designed to maximise the capacity of the Regent House to determine the best interests of the university. It better empowers those who are likely to make a contribution. It also avoids a further skew of membership from the arts to the sciences. It does not exclude part time staff, nor those taking parental or care leave, as has been rumoured.

Regent engagement is far less full than it could be, and this issue needs working on, but simply adding well over 2000 new Regents is not the answer. We accept that by introducing a three-year rule that will enfranchise a sizable previously-excluded group, some current members may be temporarily removed for a period – but most would be re-entered on the Roll within a year and this simply represents a short-term transitional unevenness.

Who should govern the University? We argue that there have to be qualification criteria, and that the right to determine the University's long-term future, including its research, teaching and spending priorities should be provided to those staff who have embarked on a longer-term commitment to the University. The qualifying period is not a perfect solution, but is far preferable to the Grace in its original form, as it serves as a proxy for selecting those most likely to have an interest in Cambridge's particular needs and governance arrangements. It allows the Regent House to be much more inclusive while maintaining a credible balance in its make-up.

We urge you to make the **amended version of the Grace** your first preference.

D. S. H. ABULAFIA	J. G. EVANS	P. MOORE
J. S. ALDRED	E. V. FERRAN	J. R. NORRIS
G. P. ALLEN	J. D. FIRTH	R. PADMAN
P. M. ALLMENDINGER	A. L. FOWDEN	N. PEAKE
A. G. ARTAVANIS-TSAKONAS	G. M. FRASER	G. G. PENG
N. BERLOFF	R. J. GILBERTSON	M. J. PERRY
L. M. BIGGS	B. B. GROISMAN	S. T. RICHARDSON
C. J. B. BROOKES	J. HALL	D. C. RUBINSZTEIN
M. BURGESS	R. D. HAYWARD	F. J. RUSSELL
T. K. CARNE	N. J. HOLMES	C. A. SARGENT
A. T. CATES	A. S. JEFFREY	H. J. SHARPE
M. E. CATES	P. B. JONES	G. C. S. SMITH
C.-C. P. CAULFIELD	F. E. KARET	S. SMITH
D. J. CHEESMAN	A. P. KELLY	H. E. THOMPSON
S. J. COWLEY	R. R. KERSWELL	C. A. TOUT
P. F. CHINNERY	I. B. LEADER	S. WELLER
S. J. COWLEY	P. J. LEHNER	T. L. WILLIAMS
C. M. CRUMP	A. M. L. LEVER	P. M. H. WILSON
S. B. DALZIEL	J. R. LISTER	M. B. WINGATE
J. DANESH	A. W. MCCASKIE	D. F. WOOD
P. P. D'AVINO	S. J. MARCINIAK	M. R. WORMALD
A. C. DAVIS	S. MARTIN	A. D. YATES
J. A. DICKENS	J. M. R. MATHESON	S. J. YOUNG
C. J. EDMONDS	P. H. MAXWELL	
S. J. EGLEN	T. G. MICKLEM	

Flysheet on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018**On the Membership of the Regent House**

We urge you to vote in favour of the Amendment to the Grace.

The aim the Amendment, like that of the original Grace, is to correct an anomaly in membership of the Regent House. The difference between the Amendment and the Grace is how this is achieved and, most importantly, in the resulting size and balance of Regent House.

At present, the Regent House consists of about 1800 academics, 850 academic-related staff, 1300 research staff and 1550 who qualify either as College Fellows/Officers (not employed by the University), or as Affiliated Lecturers, or as members of staff of the Press or Cambridge Assessment. If the unamended Grace were to be approved, about 2100 persons would be newly enfranchised, resulting in research staff being close to, or in, the majority, and further increasing the imbalance in membership between the arts and sciences.

We agree that the current “discipline lottery”, whereby staff in similar roles may or may not be members of Regent House depending on the institution they belong to, needs to be replaced with a consistent verifiable policy. This situation has arisen because Faculties now approach membership in different ways. Some Faculties continue to follow the conventional practice of including as members only those who have significant responsibilities for delivering teaching, or similar, while others have started to grant membership to all those holding the above roles.

Like the original Grace, the Amendment enfranchises all Senior Research Associates, unestablished Lecturers and Affiliated Lecturers; however, it replaces Faculty membership with a 3-year qualifying period for both Research and Computer Associates. The rationale is that we believe that the governance of the University, including responsibility for its teaching, research and finances, should be in the hands of those with at least a medium-term commitment to the University.

The Amendment would result in the membership of the Regent House being more consistent, while maintaining a balance in its composition. Research staff are essential for the robust health of the University, but should they be in a majority in the Regent House, given that approximately half spend less than 3 years working at Cambridge?

We demur from the suggestion that the Amendment introduces illegal discrimination. While it will disenfranchise (from November 2019) some current Regents who have been employed for less than 2 years today, all such persons will be reinstated if they continue to work for the University, in many cases for only 1 further year.

Fundamentally this ballot is about who should govern the University. Short of enfranchising all staff, or maybe all staff and students, there have to be qualification criteria. No straightforward criterion will easily select those individuals with a real interest in, and appreciation of, Cambridge’s long-term needs, but we argue that the qualifying period is a workable and acceptable substitute.

We urge you to vote for the **amended version of the Grace** as your first preference.

D. S. H. ABULAFIA	A. L. GREER	S. MARTIN
L. H. BOYLE	N. J. HOLMES	M. J. MILLETT
T. K. CARNE	H. E. M. HUNT	M. R. E. PROCTOR
C.-C. P. CAULFIELD	J. M. E. HYLAND	D. B. SKINNER
R. L. C. CHARLES	R. R. KERSWELL	M. C. SMITH
S. J. COWLEY	H. LAMAN	C. A. TOUT
S. B. DALZIEL	I. B. LEADER	P. M. H. WILSON
S. J. EGMEN	J. R. LISTER	M. R. WORMALD
T. E. FORSTER	C. H. LOCH	

Fly-sheet on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 (Faculty membership criterion) and amendment

We urge Regents to vote in favour of the original Grace, *unamended*, and to give lowest preference to the amended form. The Grace concerns the status afforded to research staff at grade 7, that is, holding a doctorate or equivalent experience. Currently,¹ such staff are treated inequitably, by being granted or withheld the Regent House franchise according to arbitrary criteria: whether one is under a Faculty, and if so, which one. The Grace simply removes this link between Faculties’ various membership policies and that of the Regent House. The main effect is that *all* research staff of grade 7 or above will become Regents, rather than just an arbitrary subset at present.

The issues here reflect wider shifts in academic career structures and funding models. The increasingly thin slicing of research income, by project, inherently favours unestablished positions and bottom-heavy staffing, despite increased overall spend. Few believe this to be a good model. As a leading recipient of research funding, this change affects Cambridge more than most.

We believe there are many good reasons for the Grace, both principled and practical.

- **On principle: the inequity of the status quo is unacceptable;** full enfranchisement is the only option that does not have unacceptable downsides (as we now elaborate).
- **On principle: it corrects for the gradual erosion of established positions** which has already skewed the composition of the Regent House. This is part of the casualisation we see across the Higher Education sector, and is driven in large part by a shift in government policy – specifically the widening imbalance, beginning in the 1980s, within the UK’s ‘dual support’ funding system, whereby core funding has declined significantly relative to

project-based grant funding.² Academic and research positions at grade 7, or its close equivalents predating the single spine, have included University Assistant Lecturers (UALs), Senior Assistants in Research (SARs) and Research Associates.³ Only the latter, being unestablished, have not been fully included in the Regent House, even though both UALs and SARs were frequently of time-limited tenure. **It is therefore incorrect to suppose that only ‘long-term’ appointees should be Regents; at no point has this been the rule.**

- **On principle: it complements the increasing inclusion of older Regents**, already occurring through elimination of the age limit and increasing inclusion of retirees kept on as Directors of Research. (We have no objection to those changes in themselves.)
- **In practice: the Regent House will benefit from more eyes and more minds.** We live in a time where University business is increasingly adversarial – pitched in an oblique language of public relations, and driven by financial, regulatory or administrative pressures which can be remote from academic needs. This demands ever greater scrutiny, which the present Regent House is ever less successful at providing. The fraction of academic staff who participate in governance is small. Contention rates for elections to both Council and the Board of Scrutiny have fallen, as has participation in Discussions. We believe that including Research Associates stands to improve the functioning of the Regent House, by including a great many staff able to make positive contributions.
- **In practice: unengaged Regents are benign.** Although not everyone newly included by this change will become an engaged citizen, nor do many academics and other existing Regents. Conversely, it is easy to find evidence of already-enfranchised Research Associates contributing positively. This experiment has been running for decades, thanks to the patchy Faculty-by-Faculty enfranchisement, which has been in place since well before 1995. We know *no cases* of Research Associates doing harm through being ‘prematurely’ enfranchised. It is scaremongering to suggest that unengaged Research Associates will somehow harm the Regent House.

We urge you to give lowest preference to the amended form of the Grace. The Amendment invents an entirely new criterion applying only, arbitrarily, to unestablished staff: years of continuous service. We reject this on several grounds.

- **On principle: it would disenfranchise many current Regents**, chiefly Research Associates at inclusive-policy Faculties with fewer than three years’ continuous service.
- **On principle: it is unacceptable to require a qualifying period only for one staff group.** A plausible intention of this is to include only those who are sufficiently familiar with the University’s ways that they can participate well. But why then should a qualifying period not apply to all? And why must the three years be *continuous*?
- **On principle: a qualifying period has been proposed and rejected before**, in May 2003⁴. On that occasion only a *two-year* qualifying period was proposed, but was criticised at Discussion both for its lack of inclusiveness and for its perverse outcomes in many cases. This (and other) dissatisfaction led to an ‘interim’ transcription of the pre-existing clauses from the 1995 Statutes into the new Ordinances, with only minor changes, which has persisted to this day. If any qualifying period is to be imposed, its details must be worked out with great care. **It is therefore preferable to reject the Grace wholesale than to accept it in amended form.**
- **In practice: it is perverse to believe a qualifying period would bring net benefit**, when the evidence noted above points entirely to the contrary. The Amendment will greatly reduce the pool, while also risking secondary denting of participation – since awakening an interest in governance after three habit-forming years of exclusion is likely more difficult than igniting it in a new appointee.

Our University now has an opportunity to lead from the front, by affording full citizenship to all sufficiently qualified research staff. This is both a positive change in its own right, and an important step in asking many hard questions on whose answers a healthy academic future depends.

We urge you to give highest preference to the unamended Grace, and lowest to its amended form.

R. J. ANDERSON
T. D. BAUEREISS
A. P. CAINES
S. CUMMINS
S.-A. GANNON
S. E. HAKENBECK

A. J. HUTCHINGS
A. P. JUDSON
S. R. KELL
D. LLEWELLYN-JONES
R. M. MORTIER
A. MYCROFT

S. PASTRANA PORTILLO
D. I. REDHOUSE
M. A. SCOTT
K. E. SPENCE
D. R. THOMAS

¹ See <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/2017/chapter01-section3.html>

² See Adams & Bekhradnia, ‘What future for dual support?’, HEPI, 2004. <https://www.hepi.ac.uk/2004/02/01/what-future-for-dual-support/>

³ The office of University Assistant Lecturer was abolished in 2003 chiefly on the grounds that appointees were consistently overqualified; see <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5915/18.html>. SARs are apparently no longer appointed.

⁴ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5927/15.html>

Flysheet on Grace 1 of 27 June 2018 (Faculty membership criterion) and amendment

The current Ordinance on membership of the Regent House is discriminatory because some Faculties currently choose to exclude some otherwise eligible research staff, leading to unequal rights across the University.

The Grace makes research staff members of the Regent House, irrespective of Faculty. The Amendment re-introduces discrimination because it adds a qualifying period of *continuous* service – but only for some staff. Any qualifying period should apply to all staff, irrespective of their source of funding, or to none at all.

Therefore we, members of the Department of Computer Science and Technology, urge Regents to rank the Grace in its original form first and the Amendment last.

R. J. ANDERSON	G. C. JENKINSON	D. E. POUNDS
A. E. ARCIA MORET	B. D. JONES	Z. SHAMS
T. D. BAUEREISS	C. MOLINA JIMENEZ	C. A. STEWART
P. BROOKS	J. MOORE	D. R. THOMAS
R. BUKIN	E. T. NAPIERALA	G. TITMUS
A. P. CAINES	R. M. NORTON-WRIGHT	A. B. TURNER
C. K. HADLEY	S. PASTRANA PORTILLO	B. WANG
A. J. HUTCHINGS	L. C. PAULSON	M. WOJCIK

REPORT OF DISCUSSION**Tuesday, 23 October 2018**

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Mr Roger Mosey was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Junior Proctor, the Deputy Senior Proctor, and thirteen other persons present.

The following Reports were discussed:

Twenty-third Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 30 September 2018 (Reporter, 6521, 2018–19, p. 42).

Mr T. N. MILNER (Chair of the Board of Scrutiny in 2017–18, and Darwin College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I have the honour of introducing this Report. My latest term on the Board and my year chairing it ended on October 1st and I must begin by thanking the other members for their patience and collaborative work over the last year, as well as for providing consistent good humour and stimulating company and not least for electing me as their Chair. Those who read the summary of our activity in 2017–18 will see that the time and effort involved in producing these Reports is significant; it is for the members to research, write, and edit them, while the Board's Support Officer assists with the administration of the meetings.

The Board of Scrutiny makes no special claim on understanding or wisdom. It is no more (but no less) than twelve members of the Regent House drawn from across the University and its Colleges; eight elected directly and four indirectly through their nomination by a College for election as Proctor or Pro-Proctor. Unlike the Council or the General Board, it has no executive function and it is not in that sense an opposition or 'management in waiting', although a number of former members serve and have served on the Council. As will be seen in the Report, the Board aims to help self-governance work by grappling with and teasing out the business of the University as it evolves, through studying the documents it must examine and discussion with those it meets, as well as through noting remarks made at Discussions. It is part of a system of checks and balances, but only rarely does it suggest to members of the Regent House at large how they might vote. It does, however, make recommendations, which combined with the thinking-through in its Reports, should

help members of the Regent House to engage with University business and the decisions we are asked to make. At the same time it hopes to assist the Council and the General Board as policy-makers by providing an independent commentary and perspective on that area.

It will come as no surprise that, as mentioned in our Report, we believe that there are serious challenges facing the University. We hope that both this Report and its predecessors will interest and encourage members of the Regent House to engage thought, energy, and time (upon which there are already heavy demands) in our business as a whole, and not only around particular concerns, important though these may be. In a democratic system such engagement must include willingness to participate through service on the Council or the Board of Scrutiny. Four places on the Board are open for election every other year. Time-consuming though such service may be, it is also highly rewarding.

Mr D. J. GOODE (Chair of the Board of Scrutiny, Faculty of Divinity, and Wolfson College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am the Chair of the Board of Scrutiny, but am speaking in this Discussion in a personal capacity.

The Board of Scrutiny customarily engages in a detailed analysis of matters it thinks of importance for the University, and produces recommendations. This twenty-third Report is no different, and the Board has made eight recommendations, each of which needs to be implemented.

You will be relieved to hear that I am not going to comment on each of the Report's 74 paragraphs, nor even all eight of its recommendations. I am going to limit my remarks to two sections: governance and human resources, though much of the human resources section is really also about governance.

Paragraphs 16 to 18 deal with amendments to Graces. It has become clear that the Council should have the ability to propose an amendment to an initiated Grace. The present regulations concerning amendments put the decision on the admissibility, and form, of amendments in the hands of the Vice-Chancellor. This may be appropriate while the Council does not have the authority to propose amendments to initiated Graces unless an amendment has already been proposed by individual members of the Regent House. But, as the Vice-Chancellor is the ordinary Chair of the Council, she or he might be perceived to have a conflict of interest if, the Council having proposed its own amendment to a Grace initiated by members of the Regent House, a competing amendment to that Grace needs to be ruled inadmissible, or a choice between the Council's own amendment and similar amendments by members of the Regent House must be made. Decisions on admissibility or form of amendments should not be made by the Chair of the body proposing an amendment of its own to a Grace it did not initiate.

Paragraph 18 deals with a situation which arose in the ballot on Grace 1 of 7 February 2018¹ and an amendment.² The ballot paper said:

Under Regulation 11 of the regulations for Graces and Congregations (Statutes and Ordinances, p. 105), the Vice-Chancellor has authority to determine the form of the voting paper when an amendment has been proposed. Normally the paper would allow voters to indicate their preference for the following option: against the Grace in either its original or amended form. In this case, the Vice-Chancellor has determined that this option should not be included, as this would allow the possibility of the retention of the provision concerning the age limit, which could be challenged as discriminatory.

Members of the Regent House found themselves forced by this determination into an Orwellian version of Hobson's Choice: unable to reject the Grace and the amendment, on the flimsy ground that this might allow a 'possibility' which 'could' be challenged, while, whichever way one voted – either in its original form or amended – the only possible outcome of the ballot was approval of the Grace!

Paragraph 18 of this Report is clear and unequivocal:

Amendments should not remove the power of negation from the Regent House. An un-amended Grace changing an unsatisfactory or unlawful situation can be rejected, even if that is unlikely and undesirable. Removing that choice in a ballot if an amendment or amendments arise diminishes the authority of the Regent House.

As it turns out, Grace 1 of 7 February 2018 in amended form was approved by a narrow margin and the Regent House informed in a Notice of 23 March 2018;³ but, following an objection from a College over the Long Vacation, the Grace was set aside in a Notice of 24 September 2018,⁴ and the matter in question will be reconsidered.

It is wholly unacceptable that the Regent House was denied the democratic right to reject both the Grace and the amendment, and forced to approve the Grace in either one form or the other, and this must not happen again.

Paragraph 71 of the Report deals with the increasing use of unestablished posts in the University. The Board says:

While the use of unestablished posts may be appropriate in certain contexts, such as the acquisition of specialist skills for a fixed-term project, or to provide temporary cover, the Board is concerned that if this trend continues, it will have constitutional implications for the Regent House. It could also lay the University open to discrimination claims if staff with similar duties have different terms and conditions.

The glacial progress of the working group on membership of the Regent House (see paragraph 20 of this Report) has resulted in an initiated Grace from members of the Regent House to force the issue, and an amendment, both of which are, along with a Grace proposed by the Council, the subject of a ballot in which voting is still open.⁵ The Board's recommendation at paragraph 21 begins by saying:

Active engagement by members of the Regent House in governance is essential...

Indeed it is, and I urge any members of the Regent House present here today who have not yet voted to read the fly-sheets, consider the issues raised, make up your mind, and vote before 5 p.m. on Thursday.

¹ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6494/section1.shtml#heading2-4>

² <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6496/section1.shtml#heading2-4>

³ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6501/section9.shtml#heading2-15>

⁴ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2018-19/weekly/6519/section1.shtml#heading2-8>

⁵ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2018-19/weekly/6519/section1.shtml#heading2-9>

Mr G. CHESTERMAN (Director of the Careers Service, and St Edmund's College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, my colleagues and I at the Careers Service acknowledge the Board of Scrutiny's latest report and welcome the Board's comments on the 17% planned increase in postgraduate student numbers over the coming three years (paragraph 59) impacting on all those departments supporting our students (paragraphs 61 and 62).

Over the last ten years, student numbers have increased from some 17,800 to 21,600, an increase of over 20%. The introduction of new one-year Masters courses accounts for much of this increase. These students are enthusiastic and demanding users of the Careers Service, having to cram their careers research, identify employers, make strong applications, and succeed at interview into an already tightly-packed nine-month period. As of today, 53% of all Masters students have already engaged with the Careers Service, less than a month after arriving in Cambridge. Our undergraduates and Ph.D. researchers have the relative luxury of three years to complete this process. Many Masters students chose to study at Cambridge with the main aim of securing a job, and we have every sympathy for this cohort, many of whom – barely a week after arriving here – need to immediately and actively engage with the Careers Service and employers to secure an offer of employment post-graduation. Our international students also have the added complexities surrounding work permits for those hoping to start work in the UK, and this only adds to their anxieties.

Although we have introduced new ways of supporting all our students over the last fifteen years: more group work, calling on the generosity of employers' time to run skill sessions, hosting more careers events, and using well-tailored technology to support individual students – we still face infinite student demand for our finite resources. The Careers Service has not benefited from any commensurate increase in the number of our chest-funded staff to meet the 20% student increase over the last ten years. And, this coming year, we are having to deal with a chest income that remains flat.

I am speaking on behalf of only one department supporting students, the Careers Service. However, I hope that any decision to increase postgraduate numbers by yet another 13%, most of them one-year Masters students, over the next three years is accompanied by decisions to allocate additional resources to allow our support departments to continue to provide the essential professional support our students have a right to expect, and many need.

Dr M. J. RUTTER (Department of Physics):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, a significant part of the Board of Scrutiny's Report for 2017–18 is concerned with governance. In May 2017 Council set up a Working Group to consider, and to Report, on various aspects of governance, including the membership criteria for the Regent House. We still await its Report.

Last year saw Council submit a Grace to extend to Principal Research Associates and Directors of Research the possibility of membership of the Regent House on the same terms as the lower grades of Senior Research Associates and Research Associates. That recommendation had been made in an earlier Report in 2010, but was never Graced.

Twenty-six members of the Regent House then signed an amendment to this Grace to remove the requirement for Research Associates and Computer Associates to be members of a Faculty before they qualify for Regent House membership. Council ruled this amendment inadmissible, as not being relevant to the purpose of the Grace, but accepted the amendment as a Grace in its own right, despite it having far fewer than the fifty signatures one would expect for a Grace. This new Grace then attracted an amendment of its own, proposing a three-year qualifying period before gaining Regent House membership.

The 'twenty-six member Grace' would add approximately two thousand people to the roll of Regent House – a larger number than the number of votes cast in most Ballots recently. It would significantly alter the balance of Regent House between Officers and those whom HR likes to call 'contract staff', and between the Arts and the Sciences.

It would deepen the division between unestablished academic-related IT staff, almost all of whom would become members, and the many other highly-skilled unestablished academic-related staff, none of whom would be admitted. Not a change which I would propose under a claim of fairness and equality.

Changes to the membership of the Regent House on this scale need careful thought and open Discussion. The timescales for proposing amendments, complete with a full set of signatures, mean that they tend to be rushed. In this case I believe that there are signatories who now realize that their wording has unintended and unwelcome consequences.

I look forward to the Report from Council's Working Group, although now with some fear that all sides seem to have lost confidence in it. I look forward to the Discussion which will follow, as I have plenty more to say on this issue which I will spare you today. And I hope that the recent Grace, whatever the outcome of the Ballot, does not tie the hands of the Working Group.

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, having read *Microcosmographia Academia*, I know the safe response when faced with Young Men in a Hurry. I was therefore a little disturbed that the reassuring words '*non placet*' did not appear on the electronic balloting system, having been replaced with 'neither'.

The Board is concerned about the growth in the number of unestablished academic-related staff, and juxtaposes comments on implications for Regent House membership with concerns that the University might be open to discrimination claims if staff with similar duties have different terms and conditions. This is a concern, but I hope that the Board is clear that some benefits, privileges and responsibilities arise from employment, and some from one's position within the membership of the University. Being an employee of the University, and being a member of the University, are quite distinct concepts.

The Board appears not to be concerned about the growth of unestablished research posts. My concern is that I believe that there has been a growth of such posts at the level of Principal Research Associate and Director of Research, that is to say, above the pay-grade of Lecturer. Indeed, I believe that this growth has caused the Council-initiated Grace to which I referred at the start of these remarks. It is hard to see why people of this seniority, who are clearly research active and generally performing with international recognition, should be denied Established posts when Established posts are available to academic-related staff who are active in neither teaching nor research.

Finally the Board's Report also discusses finance, and in particular Chest allocations. It notes some significant recurrent allocations to CUDAR, the UAS, and the UIS. Significant in that they would fund many chairs of the sort that are proposed in the other Report to be Discussed this afternoon. However the Board of Scrutiny's Report makes no attempt to discern whether this expenditure of Chest money is producing a benefit for the University. I can imagine that it could be a wise, necessary, and fruitful investment. I can imagine that it could be a profligate waste. I would find it helpful if the Board's Report guided my imagination.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it is convenient to place beside what the Board says in its Report the Vice-Chancellor's report of his *MyCambridge* Consultation, particularly the section on 'Governance, management, and systems'.¹ That begins with:

It was acknowledged that Cambridge was one of the most democratic universities in the world, with all members of the Regent House being potential participants in fundamental decisions,

There discussion of the role of the Regent House as governing body² of the University (or at all) ends.

Nor does the Vice-Chancellor's Consultation summary address another area of concern to which the Board gives space and thought in this year's Report: the problem of the increasing number of unestablished posts. The Consultation summary merely notes in passing that 'there were calls to address inequalities such as established vs. unestablished posts'.

The Board stresses the constitutional danger of this 'trend': *Established offices, both academic and academic-related, are regulated by Statutes and Ordinances, confer membership of the Regent House and its associated entitlements (only some unestablished posts offer this), ...*

Statistics for appointments for the last five years show that appointments to unestablished posts are increasing and the Board points out that the:

criteria on which a decision to change from established to unestablished (or vice versa) is made are not readily available, nor is there any identification of this trend in the People Strategy – Action Plan (2016–21).

‘The Board is concerned that if this trend continues, it will have constitutional implications for the Regent House,’ and recommends that ‘the effect of reducing the Establishment with regard to governance and conditions of employment’ should ‘be actively reviewed and the reasons for it be made transparent’.

Under the heading of the ‘Governance Review’, the Board comments that ‘progress’ with this ‘seems slow’. The Board puts this down in part to ‘the increased demand on resources’ created by the more frequent use of the provision under which:

Any fifty members of the Regent House may initiate a Grace for submission to the Regent House, and any twenty-five members may initiate a proposal for the amendment of a Grace already submitted to the Regent House but not yet approved (Special Ordinance A (i) 5).

This, suggests the Board, may indicate a need for ‘greater overall support for our governance processes’.

There is a paradox here. On the one hand the Board calls for active ‘engagement by members of the Regent House in governance’. On the other hand it notes that ‘since 2017 there has been a marked increase in the frequency of Graces initiated by members of the Regent House’. Its more frequent use demonstrates the importance of that right of the Regent House, hard won during the Wass Reforms. (It is still less easy than the right of twenty members of Oxford’s Congregation to submit a Resolution, the counterpart of a Grace.³ Yet members of the Regent House have the immense advantage of the publication of a full Report with recommendations while members of Congregation have only ‘a preamble shortly stating the principle of the measure’⁴ when asked to approve a legislative proposal.)

The Board recognizes that it takes some degree of mastery of the rules on the part of members of the Regent House to initiate a Grace properly and effectively. It asks whether the rules ‘are sufficient, clear, and not unduly complex’, and whether ‘these processes – including the limitations of Graces – could be better advertized, e.g. on the governance web pages?’

Does the problem go deeper? There is a case for saying that the active intervention of members of the Regent House in this way has become an indication that there are strains in the system. If a rare use of an extraordinary power becomes more frequent it is important to ask why that is happening. It may suggest that the Council has not had its ear as close as it should to Regent House concerns, as well as that the Regent House has not been as active as it could in speaking in Discussions.

This Report of the Board of Scrutiny makes its own significant contribution to the ‘governance’ review, which includes Discussions and membership of the Regent House, but much of its Report this year is given up to noting points where the system has been showing signs of strain. These do not coincide tidily with the topics which form the remit of the review and for that reason it has seemed worth highlighting them in remarks in this Discussion. For the Governance Review’s ‘three topics’ approach carries obvious risks to the integrity of the constitution as a whole.

The Board of Scrutiny sees the role of members of the Regent House as ‘active’ participants in governance, as central:

The Board hopes to assist the Council as well as helping members of the Regent House to engage with and make decisions about business; for example through commenting at Discussions, or by opposing, supporting, amending, or promoting Graces.

‘We hope to encourage discussion and collaborative thinking across the University,’ it adds.

It is not the first time it has stressed how important this is.

In its last Report, the Board drew attention to the need for members of the Regent House, as well as members of the Council, to be clear about their rights and responsibilities: ‘Understanding the respective duties and powers of the Council and of the Regent House is important’.

The Report goes further. Membership of the Regent House is a privilege which carries a responsibility to master the rules of engagement. The Board adds a warning about the consequences of failure to do that:

Restrictions imposed both by our own Statutes and by law create the potential for tension between the desire of members of the Regent House to be active in governance (which the Board strongly supports) and the constraints on the University and its Council (the membership of the latter being predominantly elected or approved by the Regent House). If this is not understood, it might in time corrode confidence in our constitution.

The Board makes the practical suggestion that:

those initiating a Grace should be actively encouraged to consult an officer such as the University Draftsman for advice, to avoid proposing formulations which are likely to be contrary to law or our Statutes, or to prove ineffective because they are imprecise or ambiguous.

One hopes they will, for there is nothing like exactness in legal drafting to cool the blood and assist in the task of thinking things through.

¹ <https://www.v-c.admin.cam.ac.uk/university-consultation-summary-report>.

² Statute A III 1.

³ Statute IV 1(2) and Regulations Part 3 at https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/statutes/regulations/529-122a.shtml#_Toc28141429.

⁴ Regulations 2(2), https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/statutes/regulations/529-122a.shtml#_Toc28141429

Mr J. A. HARDING (Head of the Disability Resource Centre, and Queens’ College), read by the Deputy Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I would like to make a comment supporting the statement in paragraph 62 of the Board of Scrutiny’s 23rd Annual Report stating the need for increased capacity for University student services, including the Disability Resource Centre (DRC).

To add some contextual data, I can report that the total number of current disabled students disclosing a disability to the collegiate University rose from 600 in 2008 to 3,100 in 2018 (i.e., those are the total current disabled student numbers in those two years in July).

In the last three years the total number of disabled students has risen by 70% alone. Given that a high proportion of these students are students with mental health difficulties, the complexity of cases has also increased, so it is not just about the numbers. Also, in relation to increase in graduate student numbers, the proportion of disabled graduate students as a proportion of the whole (i.e., all disabled students) has risen from 30% in 2008 to 50% in 2018. This has led to an increase in demand on the DRC outside of term times as this cohort of students are here all year round.

These increases in numbers, demand, and case complexity have placed significant pressure on the DRC, its staff, and its central role in ensuring the institution meets its statutory duties with regard to support for disabled students.

Although the DRC has had some welcome additional resource during the period 2008–2018 this has not been in line with the increase in student numbers, and so I welcome the Board of Scrutiny's statement regarding supporting the capacity of student support services to meet increased demand for services and further planned increases in Student numbers.

Dr P. A. SLIWA (Faculty of Philosophy, and Sidney Sussex College), read by the Deputy Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am speaking in my role as one of Cambridge UCU's Equality and Diversity Officers. I note points 22–27 with great interest and welcome the acknowledgement that the University finances are in great financial health. The following observation in paragraph 26 strikes me as particularly noteworthy:

In summary, over the last seven years the University has enjoyed real income growth that has matched or even exceeded that of many successful private sector businesses, whilst limiting growth in key elements of its cost base (principally wages). This has led to an unusual situation where the University has been through a period of what appears to be favorable financial circumstances for the institution as a whole, while the majority of its employees have generally experienced a fiscal squeeze at individual and often Departmental levels.

The fiscal squeeze is real. Since 2009 wages for staff at the University of Cambridge have risen by only 9.5%. Meanwhile the cumulative inflation (using CPI) has been 24.6%, average house prices in Cambridge have risen by nearly 90% according to Land Registry data, and the UCam workplace nursery fees have risen by 35%.

The fiscal squeeze is particularly pronounced for women. The gender gap at Cambridge (total pay) stands at 20% and the low wage growth is almost certainly a contributing factor. As basic wages fall in real terms, the University has increasingly relied on bonus payments. According to the University's own Gender Pay Gap reporting data, the average bonus payment has risen from £273 in 2008 (adjusted to 2018 pounds) to £886 today; but last year bonus payments totaled over £8 million to men and just £2.6 million to women. Particularly alarming is the exponential growth of Market-Related Payments (MRPs), which have quadrupled since 2008 to £4,068,557 today, and are also disproportionately awarded to men. Thus, while the overall gender gap has decreased over the last years, the contribution of these additional payments to the Gender Pay gap has increased.

It is time for this University to start channeling some of its income growth into its greatest assets: namely its staff.

Dr J. E. SCOTT WARREN (Faculty of English, and Gonville and Caius College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I would like to comment on paragraphs 12–14 of the report.

In paragraph 12 of the Report, the Board of Scrutiny expresses disquiet at what it calls the 'marked increase in the frequency of Graces initiated by members of the Regent House'. The claim that there has been a marked increase is substantiated by a footnote that traces the use of

member-initiated Graces as far back as 2012. It would have been helpful had the Board supplied a longer-term picture of trends in this area, so we could have a clear sense of whether 2012–16 or 2017–18 is the anomalous period.

In paragraphs 13–14 of the Report, the Board criticises the Grace directing disengagement from direct or indirect investment in fossil fuels, and notes that this is a matter where ultimate responsibility lies with the Council. The Board makes reference to the fact that the Council has 'general management of our affairs, including investments, with consequential obligations as trustees under charity law' and cannot be bound by directives from the Regent House.

While all of this may be true, the Report appears to imply that to adopt a policy of divestment from fossil fuel assets would in some way conflict with the obligations of members of Council as trustees under charity law. It looks as if charity law is being invoked here, as so often, to suggest that the University cannot do anything that would prejudice its short-term financial advantage.

As I understand it, under charity law, the obligations of Council members are to ensure that they are not acting in a self-interested way, such that they might benefit directly from their decisions, and that they act in a manner that is prudent bearing in mind the aims of the charity and the long-term future of the institution. Given the imminent risk of climate breakdown, recently reiterated in a deeply concerning IPCC report, it is clear that the long-term future of the University as an institution can only be secured by the most strenuous response on the part of the Council. It is therefore quite possible that, by refusing to act on the Grace calling for divestment, Council members are in dereliction of their duty under charity law.

It is a great shame that the Board of Scrutiny did not take the opportunity to scrutinize the report of the Divestment Working Group, a wholly inadequate document that fails to consider the case for positive action, choosing to put short-term profit maximization ahead of all other goals. The failure of the University to address what the Vice-Chancellor has called the 'defining moral issue of our time' is a mistake that it will come to repent.

Mr R. S. HAYNES (University Information Services):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Regent House members, I too would like to show appreciation for the Board of Scrutiny report, and would like to focus on a few particular concerns regarding the area of Human Resources.

The recommendation in Paragraph 73 of the Report suggests that:

As part of the further development of the People Strategy the Council should clarify the policy – and criteria – for the creation and filling of unestablished posts.

A concern raised among Research and IT staff in the University will hopefully be addressed by the current ballots concerning Regent House membership of Research Associates and Computer Associates.

Regrettably at times Regent House membership, which is intended by *Statutes and Ordinances*, has been made unavailable by omissions within some Faculties to ensure that their Research Associates and Computer Associates are added to the Regent House roll.

In addition, in too many cases in recent years some posts have been publicized and filled on the basis of role titles which are either not in *Statutes and Ordinances*, or are using a role title for everyday purposes while maintaining a parallel role title which is in *Statutes and Ordinances*. Regrettably, given such confusions, it is not always clear

whether a role is intended to include Regent House membership or not. This is a particular problem for those roles which would otherwise include Regent House membership, but applicants are neither aware nor apprised of this intention due to the confusion created by alternate role titles.

I have experience of accompanying colleagues to appeal to grading decisions, and have received confirmation from HR that it is accepted practice to use such non-*Statutes and Ordinances* titles – or to use titles in a local sense which are at odds with *Statutes and Ordinances* titles. As an example, to use the role title of ‘Senior Computer Officer’ for a post which in actuality is graded and centrally listed as a Computer Officer. For established posts, Regent House membership is not normally a concern, but the role confusions are a problem for Computer Associates and it would seem some other academic-related posts.

May I ask the Council to investigate these role title anomalies, and provide assurance that HR will in future make clear actual *Statutes and Ordinances* titles, as well as Regent House membership where applicable to roles?

Report of the General Board, dated 3 October 2018, on the establishment of certain Professorships
(Reporter, 6521, 2018–19, p. 52).

No remarks were made on this Report.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor accepted a request from Professor Edwards to make a remark on a point of order.

Professor A. W. F. EDWARDS (Gonville and Caius College):
Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I apologize for arriving late to this Discussion, but I didn’t really arrive late – I arrived at the East Gate before Great St Mary’s had struck 2 p.m. and found it locked.

By the time I had walked down the road to the next gate Great St Mary’s had struck 2 p.m.. I would like you to ensure that the East Gate is open for a Discussion. In my case it takes about thirty seconds to walk from my room in Tree Court so there is no likelihood of any delay.

It was simply that the Gate was not open when it should have been.

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Fitzwilliam College

Elected into a Fellowship in Class A with effect from 1 October 2018:

Jonathan Rogers, LL.B., *Nottingham*, Ph.D., *UCL*

Murray Edwards College

Elected to a Supernumerary Fellowship from 1 October 2018:

Heiner Thies Edmund Lindenthal, Ph.D., *Maastricht*

Vacancies

Christ’s College: Janeway Post-doctoral Research Fellowship and College Teaching Officer in Economics (fixed-term); tenure: three years; closing date: 20 November 2018 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/vacancies-christs-college>

Downing College: Kim and Julianna Silverman Research Fellowship in Physical and Biological Natural Sciences, Engineering, or Computer Science; tenure: three years from 1 April 2019 with renewal possible for a further two years; emolument: £22,013–£26,243; closing date: 7 December 2018 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.dow.cam.ac.uk/join-downing/academic-vacancies>

Mays-Wild Research Fellowship in any area of Physical Natural Sciences; tenure: three years from October 2019; emolument: £22,013–£26,243; closing date: 7 December 2018 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.dow.cam.ac.uk/join-downing/academic-vacancies>

SOCIETIES, ETC.

Cambridge Philosophical Society

Lecture cancellation

The Society’s third talk of the Michaelmas Term, which was to be given by Professor Peter Leadlay, FRS, in the Bristol-Myers Squibb Lecture Theatre on Monday, 5 November 2018, has been cancelled due to unforeseen circumstances.

Further details are available at <http://www.cambridgephilosophicalsociety.org/lectures.shtml>

EXTERNAL NOTICES

Oxford Notices

Balliol College: Alumni Officer; salary: £24,492–£31,910; closing date: 19 November 2018; further details: <https://www.balliol.ox.ac.uk/balliol-people/vacancies/2018/october/alumni-officer>

Nuffield College: Postdoctoral Research Officer (Centre for Social Investigation); salary: 30,394–£31,616; fixed term: eighteen months from 1 January 2019 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 26 November 2018 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/the-college/jobs-and-vacancies/postdoctoral-research-officer-centre-for-social-investigation/>