

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6605

WEDNESDAY 3 FEBRUARY 2021

VOL CLI No 17

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	327
Discussion on Tuesday, 9 February 2021	327
Election to the Nominating Committee for External Members of the Council	327

Vacancies, appointments, etc.

Appointments and grants of title	327
Vacancies in the University	329

Regulations for examinations

Classical Tripos	329
Engineering Tripos	330
Linguistics Tripos	330
Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos	331
Philosophy Tripos	331
Theology, Religion and Philosophy of Religion Tripos	331
Master of Finance	332
Music for the M.Phil. Degree by advanced study	333
Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University	333

Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos	333
English Tripos, 2020–21	334
History and Modern Languages Tripos, 2020–21	334
Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos, 2020–21	335

Obituaries

Obituary Notices	335
------------------	-----

Graces

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 3 February 2021	335
---	-----

Acta

Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 20 January 2021	335
Congregation of the Regent House on 30 January 2021	335

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Report of Discussion: 26 January 2021

Report of the Council on the establishment of an Endowment Fund Supervisory Body	340
Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2019–20	344
Annual Report of the General Board to the Council for the academic year 2019–20	345
Report of the General Board on the introduction of a Master of Architecture degree in the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art	345

College Notices

Elections	346
Events	346
Vacancies	346

External Notices

Oxford Notices	346
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES**Calendar**

9 February, *Tuesday*. Discussion via videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).
 13 February, *Saturday*. Lent Term divides.

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

9 February
 23 February
 9 March
 23 March

Congregations (Saturdays unless otherwise stated)

27 February, 11 a.m. (degrees in absence only)
 27 March, 11 a.m. (degrees in absence only)

Discussion on Tuesday, 9 February 2021

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 105) to a Discussion via videoconference on Tuesday, 9 February 2021 at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Supplementary Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 11 January 2021, on Allocations from the Chest for 2020–21, (*Reporter*, 6604, 2020–21, p. 322).

Those wishing to join the Discussion by videoconference should email UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk from their University email account, providing their CRSid (if a member of the collegiate University), by 10 a.m. on the date of the Discussion to receive joining instructions. Alternatively, contributors may email remarks to contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk, copying ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk, by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion, for reading out by the Proctors,¹ or ask someone else who is attending to read the remarks on their behalf.

¹ Any comments sent by email should please begin with the name and title of the contributor as they wish it to be read out and include at the start a note of any College or Departmental affiliations they have.

Election to the Nominating Committee for External Members of the Council

29 January 2021

The Vice-Chancellor announces that he has received the following nomination for election to the Nominating Committee for External Members of the Council (*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 112), and that it has been certified to him that the candidate has consented to be nominated.

Class (d): Members of the Senate elected by the Regent House

Candidate:

Nominated by:

Dr SUSANNA MARY AVERY-QUASH, *PET*

Dr S. M. Murk-Jansen, *PET* and Mr T. N. Milner, *DAR*

No other candidates having been nominated, the Vice-Chancellor declares that Dr Avery-Quash is elected to the Nominating Committee with immediate effect until 30 September 2023.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.**Appointments and grants of title**

The following elections, appointments, reappointments, and grants of title have been made:

APPOINTMENTS**University Senior Lecturer**

Judge Business School. Dr Niyazi Ufuk Taneri, M.Phil., Ph.D., *CLH*, B.Sc., *Wisconsin*, appointed from 27 April 2021 until the retiring age.

University Lecturer

History. Dr Dror Weil, B.A., M.A., *Tel Aviv*, M.A., *Taiwan National Cheng Chi, Taipei*, M.A., Ph.D., *Princeton*, appointed from 1 April 2021 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Director

Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences. Professor Ulrike Tillmann, B.A., *Brandeis University*, Ph.D., *Stanford University*, Habil., *University of Bonn*, Professor of Mathematics, University of Oxford, appointed Director of the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Professor of Mathematical Sciences with effect from 1 October 2021.

University Offices (Estate Management). Mr Graham Vincent Matthews, B.Sc., *Liverpool John Moores*, M.B.A., *Cranfield School of Management*, FRICS, appointed from 1 October 2020 until the retiring age, and designated Director of Estates, and subject to a probationary period of three months.

GRANTS OF TITLE

Affiliated Lecturers

Asian and Middle Eastern Studies. Dr Shana Cohen, *ED*, Dr Amal Elesha Marogy, Dr Benjamin Matthew Outhwaite, *CHR*, Dr Elisabetta Ragagnin and Dr Esther Miriam Wagner, *ED*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2022. Dr Julian Hargreaves, *ED*, has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further two years.

Classics. Dr Max Peter Leventhal, *CL*, and Dr Thomas James Nelson, *CC*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2022.

Education. Dr Denise Mary Ann Chappell, Ms Vivienne Rebecca Corrie-Wing, Dr Tracy Maria Fuller, Ms Esther May Hunt, Mr Charles Mark Pettit, Ms Anna Catherine Playle, Ms Caroline Jayne Venn and Mr Matthew Robert Sparkes have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2022. Dr Ruth Sellers has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 January 2021 until 31 December 2022.

History. Dr David Robert Cowan, *EM*, Dr Anjali Datta, *CHR*, Dr William Frederick Peter Foks, *K*, Dr Jean-Michel Johnstone, *F*, Dr Joshua Martin Rhodes, Dr Eleanor Dezateux Robson, *JE*, Dr Saumya Saxena, *JE*, and Dr Samuel Garrett Zeitlin, *CC*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2022. Dr Renan Baker, *ED*, Dr Arnold Conway Hunt, *G*, and Dr Damien Anthony Valdez, *T*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further year. Dr Martin Robert Allen, *W*, Dr Gareth William Atkins, *N*, Dr Melissa Tay Calaresu, *CAI*, Dr Joseph Peter Canning, *Q*, Dr Leigh Taliaferro Denault, *CHU*, Mr Michael James Edwards, *JE*, Dr Bronwen Everill, *CAI*, Dr William Henry Foster, *HO*, Dr Elizabeth Ann Foyster, *CL*, Dr Sachiko Kusukawa, *T*, Dr Thomas Benedict Lambert, *SID*, Dr Simone Maghenzani, *G*, Dr Scott Howard Mandelbrote, *PET*, Dr Duncan James Needham, *DAR*, Mr Allen George Packwood, *CHU*, Dr Martha Kate Peters, *MUR*, Dr David Robert Pratt, *DOW*, Professor James Russell Raven, *M*, Dr Richard William Serjeantson, *T*, Dr Maria Christina Skott, *M*, Dr David Lawrence Smith, *SE*, Dr Andrew Mark Spencer, *CAI*, Dr Andrew Clague Thompson, *Q*, Dr Sylvana Palma Tomaselli, *JN*, and Dr Elisabeth Maria Cornelia van Houts, *EM*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further two years.

Human, Social and Political Science. Dr Marie-Francoise Colette Besnier, Dr Christina Geisen, Dr Nancy Amelia Highcock, Dr Tanja Hoffmann, Ms Camille Michele Helene Lardy, *SID*, Mr Peter Alexander Lockwood, *DAR*, Dr Erol Mehmet, Dr Tobias Muller, Dr Burcu Ozcelik and Dr Peter Matthew Schauer have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2021. Dr Albert Sanghoon Park and Dr Matthew Robert Sparkes, *LC*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2022. Dr Maja Spanu, *HO*, has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 6 October 2020 until 5 October 2022. Dr Helen Alycia Alderson, Dr Shana Cohen, *ED*, Dr Robert Nathan Duschinsky, *SID*, Dr Zeynep Basak Gurtin, *K*, Dr Samantha Jane Lucy, *N*, Dr Natalie Camille Morningstar, Dr Priscilla Pereira Viera Da Costa Garcia and Ms Ana Sofia Pfingsthorn have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further year. Dr Maria Ignacia Arteaga Perez, *R*, Dr Françoise Barbira Freedman, *CL*, Dr Joe Ellis, *PEM*, and Dr Rosalie Anne Jones Mcvey, *CHR*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further two years.

Law. Professor John Stephen Bell, *PEM*, Dr Elaine Abigail Odette Freer, *R*, Dr Nicholas Friedman, *JN*, Ms Emily Gordon, *LC*, Dr Liron Shmilovits, *CTH*, Dr Brian Damien Sloan, *R*, Dr Sara Margarita Valdebenito Munoz and Dr Alexandra Wigzell have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2021. Ms Zoe Louise Adams, *K*, Dr Geoffrey Carroll Barnes, Professor Peter Frederic Cane, *CHR*, Dr Simon de Smet, Ms Sarah Fraser-Butlin, *SE*, Dr Julius Grower, *JE*, Dr Thomas Charles Hawker, *G*, Mr Leslie Kosmin, Dr Christopher Phillip Stephen Markou, *JE*, Dr Rose Anne Melikan, *CTH*, Sir Denis O'Connor, Dr Michael Price, *PEM*, and Mr Gavin Robert have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further year.

Mathematics. Dr Ronald Ashley Reid-Edwards, *TH*, and Dr Jack Edward Smith, *JN*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2022. Ms Irena Borzym, *CTH*, Dr Christopher John Bewick Brookes, *CC*, Dr Jeremy Nicholas Butterfield, *HO*, Dr Rachel Deborah Camina, *F*, Dr Berry Boris Groisman, *SID*, Dr Christopher John Reeday Illingworth, Dr Stuart Martin, *M*, Dr Peter John O'Donnell, *ED*, Dr Orsola Rath-Spivack, *LC*, Dr Paul Alexander Russell, *CHU*, Dr Frederick Peter Treasure, *CAI*, Dr Simon James Wadsley, *HO*, and Dr Andras Zsak, *PET*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further two years.

Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics. Dr Edmund Birch, *SE*, Dr Samantha Nicole Edwards, Dr Marion Hannah Madeleine Glaumaud-Carbonnier, Dr Ares Naya Llop, *F*, Professor Francis Joseph David Nolan, *F*, Dr Darren Michael O'Byrne, Dr Ehsan Shareghi Nojehdeh, Dr Rebecca Ann Sugden, *CAI*, and Dr Doriane Zerka have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 until 30 September 2022. Dr Monica Boria has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further year. Dr Miriam Bouzouita, Mr Paul Albert Hoegger, *F*, Dr Simone Kugeler-Race, Dr Daria Mattingly, *R*, Ms Emily Kate Price, *R*, Ms Sura Qadiri, *CHR*, Dr Roberto Blas Sileo and Dr James William Womack, *F*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further two years.

Music. Dr Kim Ashton, *F*, Dr Nicholas Bell, *T*, Dr Charlotte Alice Bentley, *EM*, Dr James Burke, Dr Ross Graham Cole, *CL*, Dr Marco Ladd, *EM*, Mr Michael Ladouceur, Dr Ariana Sarah Phillips-Hutton, *DAR*, Mr Graham Alexander Charles Ross, *CL*, Professor Susan Rutherford, *JE*, Dr Francesca Vella, *JN*, and Mr Gareth F. Wilson have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 January 2021 until 31 December 2022.

Pathology. Dr Paul Anthony Wright Edwards, *CL*, has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2020 for a further two years.

Vacancies in the University

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

Clinical Lecturer in Anaesthesia in the Department of Medicine; tenure: fixed-term, four years or until CCT; salary: £34,466–£60,960 or £33,885–£58,672 or £38,694–£52,036; closing date: 28 February 2021; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/28535/>; quote reference: RC25530

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.

REGULATIONS FOR EXAMINATIONS

Classical Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 296)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Classics, has approved the amendment of the regulations to better tailor language papers to the needs of students.

Regulation 13.

By amending the titles of Papers 6 and 7 as follows:

- Paper 6. Translation into Greek prose and verse (also serves as Paper GL 6 of Part IA of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)
- Paper 7. Translation into Latin prose and verse (also serves as Paper GL 7 of Part IA of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

Regulation 14.

By amending the regulation to read as follows:

- 14.** Every candidate shall offer: Paper 1 or Paper 2A or Paper 2B; either Paper 3 or Paper 4; and Paper 5. In addition, a candidate may offer one or both of Papers 6 and 7. No candidate may offer more than one of Papers 2A, 2B and 4.

Candidates shall be eligible to take papers as follows:

- Paper 1. candidates who had A-Level (or equivalent) in Greek before entry to the University;
- Paper 2A. candidates who had no knowledge of Greek before entry to the University;
- Paper 2B. candidates who had G.C.S.E. (or equivalent) but not A-Level (or equivalent) in Greek before entry to the University;
- Paper 3. candidates who had A-Level (or equivalent) in Latin before entry to the University or who have previously taken the Preliminary Examination to Part IA of the Classical Tripos;
- Paper 4. candidates who did not have A-Level (or equivalent) in Latin before entry to the University.

Regulation 17.

By removing Paper 2 and replacing it with the following:

- Paper 2A. Alternative passages for translation from Greek authors (Option A) (also serves as Paper GL 12A of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)
- Paper 2B. Alternative passages for translation from Greek authors (Option B) (also serves as Paper GL 12B of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

Regulation 18.

By amending the regulation to read as follows:

18. A candidate shall be required to offer six papers as follows:

Paper 1 or Paper 2A or Paper 2B; Paper 3 or Paper 4; Papers 5 and 6; and two papers chosen from among Papers 7–10.

Candidates shall be eligible to take papers as follows:

- Paper 2A. candidates who had no knowledge of Greek before entry to the University;
- Paper 2B. candidates who had G.C.S.E. (or equivalent) but not A-Level (or equivalent) in Greek before entry to the University;
- Paper 4. candidates who had little or no knowledge of Latin before entry to the University.

SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

The Faculty Board of Classics gives notice of the following amendments to the supplementary regulations for the Classical Tripos to amend the descriptions of certain papers in line with the changes to the papers in the Tripos regulations noted above.

PART IA

By replacing Papers 6 and 7 with the following:

Paper 6. Translation into Greek prose and verse

This paper will contain exercises for translation into Greek prose and verse, some of which may be attempted only by candidates for Paper 2A and 2B.

Paper 7. Translation into Latin prose and verse

This paper will contain exercises for translation into Latin prose or verse, some of which may be attempted only by candidates for Paper 4.

PART IB

By replacing Paper 2 with the following:

Paper 2A. Alternative passages for translation from Greek authors (Option A)

This paper will contain passages for translation, both seen and unseen, and is offered by candidates who had no knowledge of Greek before entry to the University.

Paper 2B. Alternative passages for translation from Greek authors (Option B)

This paper will contain passages for translation, both seen and unseen, and is offered by candidates who had G.C.S.E. (or equivalent) but not A-Level (or equivalent) in Greek before entry to the University.

Engineering Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 323)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Engineering, has approved the amendment of the regulations for the Engineering Tripos so as to remove the deadlines by which students may request permission to delay proceeding to Part IIA and IIB. The regulations have been amended as follows:

By removing from Regulation 15(b) the phrase ‘by the division of the Easter Term of the year in which Part IB is taken’.

By removing from Regulation 24(c) the phrase ‘by the division of the Easter Term of the year in which Part IIA is taken’.

Linguistics Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 379)

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics, has approved the following suspensions of papers.

With effect from 1 October 2020

Regulation 12.

The following paper will be suspended until further notice:

Paper 8. Morphology (also serves as Paper Li. 8 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

The following papers will be suspended in 2020–21 and each alternate year thereafter:

Paper 12. History of ideas on language (also serves as Paper Li. 12 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

Paper 13. History of the English language (also serves as Paper 15(b) of Part II of the Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic Tripos, Paper 42B of Part II of the English Tripos, and as Paper Li. 13 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

With effect from 1 October 2021

Regulation 12.

The following papers will be suspended in 2021–22 and each alternate year thereafter:

Paper 11. Historical linguistics (also serves as Paper 15(a) of Part II of the Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic Tripos, as Paper 42A of Part II of the English Tripos, and as Paper Li. 11 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

Paper 14. History of the French language (also serves as Paper Li. 14 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 395)

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics, has approved the following suspensions of papers and other amendments concerning the availability of papers.

With effect from 1 October 2020

SCHEDULE B

The following papers will be suspended in 2020–21:

- It. 2. Structure and varieties of Italian (also serves as Paper 34 of the Linguistics Tripos)
- It. 10. The language of Italy (also serves as Paper 20 of the Linguistics Tripos)
- Sl. 6. Russian culture after 1953
- Sl. 11. Russia in revolution, from 1861 to 1917
- Sl. 12. Socialist Russia 1917–1991
- Sp. 10. The culture and language of contemporary Catalonia

The following papers will be suspended in 2020–21 and each alternate year thereafter:

- Li. 12. History of ideas on language (Paper 12 of the Linguistics Tripos)
- Li. 13. History of the English language (Paper 13 of the Linguistics Tripos)

The following papers will be suspended until further notice:

- Sp. 12. Latin-American culture
- Li. 8. Morphology (Paper 8 of the Linguistics Tripos)

SCHEDULE 1B

By removing Paper Ge. 1 and adding a footnote to Paper Ge. 4 to note that it may be replaced by two long essays under Regulation 23.

With effect from 1 October 2021

SCHEDULE B

The following papers will be suspended in 2021–22 and each alternate year thereafter:

- Li. 11. Historical linguistics (Paper 11 of the Linguistics Tripos)
- Li. 14. History of the French language (Paper 14 of the Linguistics Tripos)

Philosophy Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 424)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Philosophy, has approved the amendment of the title of Paper 9 in Part II of the Philosophy Tripos from ‘Wittgenstein’ to ‘Wittgenstein and his successors’.

Theology, Religion and Philosophy of Religion Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, pp. 429 and 434)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Divinity, has approved the suspension of the following papers for the Theology, Religion and Philosophy of Religion Tripos in 2020–21:

- B1.C. Sanskrit
- B9. God and the *imago Dei*
- B12. Theology and the natural sciences I
- C4. Topic in the history of Christianity
- C7. Topics in the study of religion
- D1.(a) Old Testament
- D1.(c) Political theology

The Faculty Board of Divinity gives notice of the following amendments to the supplementary regulations for the Tripos to revise the topics of two papers.

SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

PART IIb

Paper D1.

(f) Conversion and Abrahamic religions

This paper will introduce students to religious conversion as a form of interreligious relation among Abrahamic religions. The paper builds on the findings of sociology, psychology, and anthropology.

Paper D2.

(c) Philosophy, ethics and the other

This paper will introduce students to perennial questions concerning how one should live; the relationship between effect and religious outlook and truth; the relation of scripture and revelation to philosophy; and the significance of 'the other' for understanding one's own moral and intellectual life. It will address these questions with reference to a range of sources, for example, Maimonides, Spinoza, Mendelssohn, Kant, Cohen, Buber, Weil and Levinas – a philosophical lineage which has been influential on a range of disciplines.

With effect from 1 October 2021

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Divinity, has approved the amendment of the title of Paper A7 from 'Introduction to Judaism, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism' to 'Studying world religions: History, comparison, dialogue'.

The Faculty Board of Divinity has amended the supplementary regulations for the paper as follows:

PART I

Paper A7. Studying world religions: History, comparison, dialogue

This paper will introduce students to the comparative study of religions and guide their scholarly engagement with at least two major religious traditions of their choice.

Master of Finance

(Statutes and Ordinances, November 2020, p. 477)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Business and Management, has approved amendments to the regulations so as to recategorise the types of modules, removing the Group designations and renaming as core and elective modules, and to require forms of assessment to be announced by the Faculty Board.

By replacing the current Regulation 7 with the following, removing Regulation 5 and renumbering the remaining regulations.

[6.] The Master of Finance Examination shall consist, at the choice of the candidate, of compulsory modules, elective modules, and project work, as outlined below. Examination of the modules may be by written paper, essay, coursework, or another mode of assessment announced by the Faculty Board. Each candidate will have to complete a minimum of three written papers, the duration of which will be announced by the Faculty Board.

(a) Compulsory modules

The Faculty Board shall publish the topics and form of assessment for each compulsory module by the end of the Easter Term immediately preceding the start of the course.

(b) Elective modules

The Faculty Board shall publish the topics and form of assessment for each elective module by the end of the term immediately preceding the term in which the work is to be completed.

(c) Project work

The Faculty Board shall publish information on project work and the format for submission by the end of the Lent Term provided that the Board shall have the power of subsequently issuing amendments if it has due reason for doing so and is satisfied that no candidate's preparation for the examination is adversely affected.

The Examiners shall have power to examine a candidate *viva voce* on any or all of the three sections of the examination (a)–(c).

Music for the M.Phil. Degree by advanced study

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 544)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Music, has approved the following amendments to the special regulations for the examination in Music for the degree of Master of Philosophy as follows:

By amending Regulations 2(a) and 3(a) to read as follows (retaining the footnote in each case):

- (a) a portfolio of abstracts totalling not more than 1,500 words and an essay of not more than 3,500 words^[1] on issues in musical studies;

Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 600)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Strategic Committee of the Institute of Continuing Education, has approved the following amendments to the Schedule of Examinations delivered by the Institute of Continuing Education:

By removing the following awards from the Schedule:

- Certificate in the Making of the English Landscape: Garden History
- Certificate in the Making of the English Landscape: Sources and Methods
- Certificate of Higher Education in Historic Environment

By adding the following new 60-credit courses:

- Certificate in Classical Studies
- Certificate in Politics

By adding the following new Postgraduate Certificate, including an Apprenticeship route:

- Postgraduate Certificate in Research and Innovation Leadership
- Postgraduate Certificate in Research and Innovation Leadership (Apprenticeship)

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.

Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 287)

With effect from 1 October 2020

The Faculty Board of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies gives notice of the following updates to the supplementary regulations for the Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos and the addition of new supplementary regulations for Papers J.20 and MES.44 in Part II.

SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

PART IB

MES.19. The formation of the modern Middle East

This paper examines key moments in the formation of the modern Middle East with an emphasis on developing an understanding of the periods of transition and conflict that have shaped and defined modern societies in the region since the nineteenth century.

PART II

C.15. The Chinese tradition: Chinese art and visual culture

This course covers Chinese art and material culture stretching from the Neolithic period up to the present with a focus on dynastic and early modern times.

C.16. Cultural history of late-imperial China

This paper explores major themes in late-imperial China.

C.20. Contemporary Chinese society

An introduction to key socio-political and cultural developments in reform-era China (from the early 1980s to the present), while situating them in the historical contexts of the late Imperial and Maoist periods. Topics covered will include Chinese political culture, kinship and marriage, reproduction and family planning, gender and sexuality, urban and rural lives, ethnic minorities, religion, state and society, nationalism, migration, law and society, etc. The analytical approaches are drawn from anthropology, political science, sociology and cultural studies.

J.17. Topics in modern Japanese history

This advanced seminar-based course will explore approaches to and topics in recent scholarship of modern Japanese history.

J.20. Premodern Japanese literature and culture

This seminar-style paper explores facets of classical, medieval and/or early modern literature and culture.

K.1. Modern Korean reading and writing

This course is designed to enable students to comprehend elementary-level Korean texts and write simple essays in Korean. Students are introduced to the Korean alphabet, Hangeul and distinctive features of Korean grammar. They will learn to read and understand various Korean texts, and ultimately to produce essays in Korean.

MES.44. Economy/culture in the Middle East and beyond

This paper explores critical anthropological approaches to the study of economy and culture. The main regional focus is on the Middle East but the themes are also studied comparatively, drawing on ethnographic accounts from other parts of the world.

English Tripos, 2020–21

The Faculty Board of English gives notice that the form and conduct of the papers for examination in the 2020–21 academic year for Parts IA, I and II of the English Tripos will be as specified below.

All papers that would usually have been sat as three-hour (or in the case of Part I and Part II ‘Practical Criticism: Critical Practice’, three-and-a-half hour) ‘closed-book’ and invigilated exams, will now be sat online as ‘open-book open-web’ exams within a six-hour time window (or up to a nine-hour time window in the case of students allowed extra time).

There will be no restrictions on referring during the assessment to books and other materials, whether on paper, online, or in computer files. There will be a word-count range of 750–1,250 (+/- 5% at either limit) prescribed for each essay, which will be intended to approximate to the amount that can generally be written by hand under normal examination conditions. In the case of the single-answer option for the Part II ‘Tragedy Paper’, the word-count range will be 2,250–3,750 (+/- 5% at either limit).

Part IA, Paper 1.

For 2021 only, Section A will now consist of only one question, rather than two as previously.

Part I, Paper 2.

There will be no Section A this year; candidates will be asked to write three essays.

Part I, Paper 3.

Section A will no longer have a translation element; students will instead be assessed on the basis of one extended commentary.

Part I, Paper 5.

The glossing exercise (Question 1 of Section A) has been cancelled. Students will be examined by three essays, of which one will be on the set text of *Cymbeline*.

History and Modern Languages Tripos, 2020–21

The Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics gives notice that, with effect from the examination to be held in 2021, the form of the examination for the following paper for the History and Modern Languages Tripos will be as specified below. The Faculty Board is satisfied that no student’s preparation for the examination will be adversely affected by these changes.

PART IA

*SCHEDULE A***German***GEA3. Introduction to German: German culture*

Question 2 which was originally compulsory will no longer be compulsory in 2020–21.

Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos, 2020–21

The Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics gives notice that, with effect from the examination to be held in 2021, the form of the examination for the following paper for the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos will be as specified below. The Faculty Board is satisfied that no student's preparation for the examination will be adversely affected by these changes.

PART IA

SCHEDULE A

German

GEA3. *Introduction to German: German culture*

Question 2 which was originally compulsory will no longer be compulsory in 2020–21.

OBITUARIES

Obituary Notices

WALTER GARRISON, 3rd Viscount RUNCIMAN OF DOXFORD, CBE, M.A., FBA, Fellow of Trinity College, sometime President of the British Academy, died on 10 December 2020, aged 86 years.

DAVID ANTHONY WASHBROOK, M.A., Ph.D., Fellow of Trinity College, died on 24 January 2021, aged 72 years.

GRACES

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 3 February 2021

The Council submits the following Grace to the Regent House. This Grace, unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 105) will be deemed to have been approved at **4 p.m. on Friday, 12 February 2021**. Further information on requests for a ballot or the amendment of Graces is available to members of the Regent House on the Regent House Petitions site.[§]

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 11 of the Report of the General Board, dated 4 December 2020, on the introduction of a Master of Architecture degree in the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art (*Reporter*, 6600, 2020–21, p. 244) be approved.

[§] See <https://universityofcambridgecloud.sharepoint.com/sites/RegentHousePetitions> (Regent House members only).

ACTA

Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 20 January 2021

The Grace submitted to the Regent House on 20 January 2021 (*Reporter*, 6603, 2020–21, p. 302) was approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 29 January 2021.

Congregation of the Regent House on 30 January 2021

A Congregation of the Regent House was held by videoconference at 11 a.m. The necessary Officers were present.

Having been elected a Deputy Proctor under the provisions of Special Ordinance C (iii) 1 (Grace 1 of 2 December 2020), CRISTIANO ANDREA RISTUCCIA, of Trinity Hall, made the public declaration in accordance with Statute C IV 3.

All the Graces (*Reporter*, 6604, 2020–21, p. 324) and the supplicats for degrees were approved.

The following degrees were conferred in absence:

This content has been removed as it contains personal information

This content has been removed as it contains personal information

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 26 January 2021

A Discussion was held by videoconference. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Dr Jessica Gardner was presiding, with the Registrar's deputy, the Junior Proctor, the Senior Pro-Proctor and eleven other persons present.

The following items were discussed:

Report of the Council, dated 14 December 2020, on the establishment of an Endowment Fund Supervisory Body

(*Reporter*, 6601, 2020–21, p. 259).

Ms T. A. FRANKLIN (Chief Investment Officer and Jesus College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am the Chief Investment Officer of the Cambridge University Endowment Fund, a Director of Cambridge Investment Management Limited, a member of the Jesus College Investment Committee and an alumna of Jesus College. The purpose of the Cambridge University Endowment Fund ('CUEF' or 'the Fund') is to serve the University, Colleges and trusts by delivering world-class, sustainable investment performance. The Fund aims to fulfil this mission in a manner consistent with the values of the University. At present the Fund has 18 investors – the University itself, 13 Colleges and 4 trusts associated with the University. The Fund has delivered against its goals by providing an annualised return of 10.3% during the past ten years; the Fund delivered £123 million in dividends to its investors in the financial year to June 2020, of which £95 million went to the University in support of teaching, research and other activities.

In keeping with the global stature of the University, Cambridge Investment Management Limited ('CIML'), which organises the endowment, aims to achieve excellence in all aspects of its operations, including its governance. At present, this goal is impeded by the fact that Council represents the University in its dual capacities as investor in the Fund and as its Trustee. This structure creates potential conflicts of interest and limits the level of transparency that Cambridge Investment Management is able to provide. CIML is regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority ('FCA'), which stipulates (among many other things) that all investors in the Fund must be treated equally, for example by receiving access to the same information.

The creation of the Endowment Fund Supervisory Body ('EFSB') will create a governance structure that is consistent with the Endowment's regulatory framework. The EFSB will act in the interests of all investors, thereby eliminating the conflicts of interest currently arising from the University's various roles. The composition of the EFSB will enable the provision of full transparency of the Fund's portfolio and operations to the members of the EFSB. The fact that the membership of the EFSB will comprise individuals with expertise in investments will also allow it to engage in continual, active, oversight of Cambridge Investment Management Limited, helping the organisation to continue to improve on the service it delivers to its investors. In direct contrast to concerns that have been raised, the EFSB structure will allow for increased disclosure and significantly more active governance than has been possible to date.

I am personally committed to continually improving transparency into the endowment's activity and performance, and to delivering against the environmental

sustainability targets that were outlined in Council's statement of 1 October 2020.¹ It is a privilege to serve in this position, and I look forward to continuing to do my utmost to maximise the financial support the CUEF provides to the University and to all investors in the Endowment in pursuit of their goals.

¹ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2020-21/weekly/6590/section1.shtml#heading2-6>

Mr G. P. ALLEN (Wolfson College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am the Chair of the Board of Scrutiny, speaking in a personal capacity. I should declare that I am also Chair of the Finance Committee of Wolfson College and that most of the College's endowment is invested in the Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF).

I have three comments on this Report.

First, it appears to be a sledgehammer to crack a nut. Apart from a debatable argument about the Council's potential conflicts of interest, which the signatories of the note of dissent describe as an illusion, the Report tells us very little about what is broken and needs fixing. Apparently the current arrangements need to be more 'effective' and the new arrangements will allow the Council to articulate its views on the management of the University's investments to the proposed Supervisory Body 'more robustly' than currently – both vague expressions used by authors of Reports when they want to sound strong and assert control. I am grateful for the illumination just provided by the Chief Investment Officer. However, can the Council clarify what isn't working operationally?

Secondly, the current Financial Regulations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, November 2020, p. 1059) define the Investment Board as the 'board which manages for the University the investment of the CUEF'. The Report before us does not acknowledge this important part of the current machinery (or how it may lack effectiveness or robustness) other than in paragraph 7 where there is mention of the EFSB's 'Investment Advisory Board', which I take to be a demoted Investment Board shorn of its managerial role. When that Board was set up it was described by the then Vice-Chancellor in a press statement of 11 January 2006 issued by the University as 'a significant step forward for the University' and needed so that Cambridge's benefactors could 'be confident that gifts to the endowment will be managed according to global best practice'. Since the confidence of benefactors is no less important now than it was then, can I suggest that the constitution and duties of the Investment Advisory Board, particularly as the source of high-powered global investment expertise should, for the avoidance of doubt, be set out in the Ordinances for the EFSB.

Finally, the new arrangements give the EFSB far reaching powers, subject only to reporting annually to the Regent House, to set the investment objectives, the distribution objective and investment principles for the CUEF. In particular, Recommendation II if approved would rescind the current Ordinance for the distribution from the Amalgamated Fund which was enacted by the approval of the Report of the Council on distributions from the Amalgamated Fund (*Reporter*, 5983, 2004–05, p. 282). The latter Report carefully explained why moving to a total return policy would serve the University better than one based on income alone, proposed a smoothing formula for income, and provided safeguards to discourage frequent changes of policy – which require approval by Grace on the recommendation of the Finance Committee and

Council. The Council's current Report offers no explanation for setting aside these thoughtful provisions and instead places matters in the hands of the proposed EFSB. Will the Council review the 2004–05 Report and reflect on whether Recommendation II of the current Report is necessary or wise?

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the reason for this proposal is outlined in the Annual Report of the Council, which is also for Discussion today, namely that:

In Lent Term 2019, the Council agreed in principle to establish a new Endowment Fund Supervisory Body (EFSB) as part of a new governance structure for the CUEF. This would separate the role of the University as the corporate trustee of CUEF and parent entity of CIML, on the one hand, from its role as investor in the CUEF on the other. The new governance arrangements for the CUEF were proposed to ensure that the University (through the EFSB and the Council respectively) is able to discharge the duties arising from these distinct roles properly and lawfully.

Behind this lies the story of the battle to achieve 'divestment' from fossil fuels in Cambridge's investments. In June 2016 the Council approved a report on 'Investment Responsibility' (the ACBELA report). There was a Discussion on a Topic of Concern on that in November 2016.¹ Then came a Regent House-initiated Grace in January 2017,² seeking to require the Council to publish a *Report* to the University within twelve months.

A Divestment Working Group duly prepared the document which was published in May 2018,³ alongside a revised Carbon Reduction Strategy.⁴ This did not take the form of a Council *Report*. This was simply headed 'Divestment Working Group Report'. The Council published its *Response* to this document in June 2018 under *Notices*. This Response did not take the form of a *Council Report* either, but members of the Council nevertheless published a dissenting note with it.⁵

A Topic of Concern Discussion was held on the 'Future of the Investment Office' on 5 February 2019,⁶ in which among other things it was suggested that there were 'undisclosed conflicts of interest held by members of the Divestment Working Group'.⁷ There perhaps lies one of the prompters for the present proposal, that above all there must be no conflict of interest in the 'discharge' of 'duties' in connection with the University's investments.

The Council's new Annual Report records that in July the Council 'received an update on the implementation of the proposed governance structure, including further details on the proposal for establishing the EFSB'. The relevant Council Minute (374) of that meeting begins by emphasising the need to 'separate the role of the University as the corporate trustee' from 'the role of representing the University as investor', in a way which would 'not constrain the Council's ability to express its views on investment; rather the Council would be able to act in the interests of the University without fear of legal challenge'.

We are told that the proposal was approved by a majority. What is wrong with it? The Note of Dissent says it all really. There is indeed a hard-to-avoid conflict between investing to maximise the value of the University's endowment and investing in such a way as to avoid investments involving 'fossil fuels'. But is this the way to address it? The Note of Dissent again:

If these proposals are accepted, they will disempower the Council and the Regent House and create a quasi autonomous entity populated entirely by self anointing members who have 'relevant professional experience in finance'. The EFSB will therefore be immunised against any future 'interference' by the Council let alone the Regent House and as stated in the Ordinance have 'power (without limitation) to set the investment principles for the CUEF'.

Some of the concerns raised about the Property Board seem to present themselves again here. There is a risk of governance-drift away from the supervision of the University's governing body, the Regent House. The Regent House let the Property Board Grace go unchallenged. Should it permit the one needed to create the EFSB come into force in the same way? The decision whether to allow it lies with the Regent House because an Ordinance has to be created to establish the EFSB.

¹ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2016-17/weekly/6446/section10.shtml#heading2-21>

² <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2016-17/weekly/6450/section10.shtml#heading2-23>

³ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6507/DWG-Report-2018.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6507/Carbon-Reduction-Strategy-2018.pdf>

⁵ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6511/section1.shtml#heading2-4>

⁶ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2018-19/weekly/6537/section6.shtml>

⁷ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2018-19/weekly/6537/section6.shtml>

Mr A. M. REID (Wolfson College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I retired a little while ago as the University's Director of Finance, and was Secretary to the Investment Board, and Director and Compliance officer of Cambridge Investment Management Limited. I was deeply involved in the move to the new approach to investment management and the Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF) in its current form, and the establishment and development of the Investment Office. My comments are largely of a historical and philosophical nature.

The University's long term investment assets were previously held in the Amalgamated Fund, the original form of the CUEF, which was invested in a traditional way in global listed equities and bonds, with direct UK property holdings. The securities element was outsourced to an external fund manager, overseen by a sub-committee of the Finance Committee. For the 50 years since the Amalgamated Fund was set up this approach had served the University well.

However things were changing. Our assets were reaching a critical mass, new asset classes (such as private equity and absolute return) were becoming accessible but would require specialist management, and the move to total return opened up new opportunities and challenges. We wanted to go into the Cambridge 800th fundraising campaign with, and able to demonstrate, effective management of our investments. Our then Vice-Chancellor had seen at Yale the benefits that a deep intellectual approach to endowment management could give.

I was a member of a working group set up by the Finance Committee in the mid-2000s to review the University's investment arrangements. Our recommendations, accepted by Council and the University, were to establish an

in-house Investment Office overseen and supported by an expert and engaged Investment Board. We had looked at successful models, notably in the US endowments. We were particularly struck by Yale's investment culture and philosophy, however were determined that we should not simply follow and should seek a special Cambridge solution. We were keen that the new arrangements were firmly *embedded* at the centre of the University, able to absorb its needs and temperaments. We saw it almost as an intellectual and academic endeavour, integrated with the broader thinking of the University. The Chief Investment Officer would report directly to the Vice-Chancellor and the Investment Board directly to Council. We wanted the Investment Office to be a University department, not a subsidiary company. Binding the CUEF and its management close to our centre would, we believed, lead – over the decades – to the CUEF best reflecting these needs and temperaments. The CUEF would be distinctively 'Cambridge', and generate the best long term financial returns which are so essential to support our work.

We envisaged opening up the CUEF to Trusts and Colleges in due course and, once the new arrangements had settled down and the portfolio developed to the satisfaction of the Investment Office and the Investment Board, the necessary steps were taken. These were not inconsiderable, requiring various legal and regulatory structures and submitting to authorisation and regulation by the Financial Conduct Authority.

Our arrangements have worked well. Investment returns since the CUEF came under 'new management' in 2007 have been excellent and volatility, i.e. risk, materially less than public markets. The investment model and strategy are well established. We were fortunate in securing our first Chief Investment Officer, Nick Cavalla, and his team, and I have little doubt that Tilly Franklin will continue the success, provided that she and her team are given the clarity, time, freedom and support to get on with their task.

I have spent some time setting out the history and now want to link with the Report. I am conscious that things move on, as indeed should I, the environment changes and that there has been considerable recent debate which may have drawn out challenges in the current structure including possible or perceived conflicts of interest. Yet there are a number of points that I would like to make.

The proposals lead to steady shift of the CUEF from the centre of the University. There is a nudge away from Council. The vision of the CUEF being firmly *embedded* at the centre of the University, able to absorb its needs and temperaments, is gradually being lost. It is as if the CUEF is simply a third party fund in which the University, Trusts and Colleges choose or not to invest and which is managed by an arm's length manager, excellent though that manager may be. The Report states that '[Council] will retain the ultimate sanction of being able to withdraw its investments from the CUEF'. I suggest that that is not the right way to look at it – it is Council's responsibility to make sure that the CUEF remains the best it can possibly be.

The CUEF was opened up to wider Cambridge as a *service* to Colleges and Trusts. But the CUEF is designed to suit the University and not necessarily to be all things to all wider Cambridge. The objectives, strategy, and operating rules of CUEF in general reflect the needs of the University. 'Potential views of other investors' should of course be taken into account but should not impact the way the CUEF is managed and operated. For example a particular College may prefer to be able to trade CUEF units more easily, and may have views on asset allocation or market conditions so to dovetail with its circumstances,

yet the CUEF should not be required to adapt its approach to accommodate these preferences if it would potentially impact the University's benefit from the CUEF's long term return performance.

Operationally no investor is favoured over the others: unit pricing, liquidity, purchase/redemption terms, etc. are the same. The University does not directly benefit from having other investors in its fund, except that the relatively modest cost of the investment office is spread more widely. Clearly it benefits *indirectly* by the investment success of wider Cambridge.

I am trying to see where conflicts of interest arise. If the CUEF, its structure, policies, objectives, strategy and rules – as determined by the University, through Council, for its own needs and temperaments – is appropriate for Colleges and Trusts (which in my view will be overwhelming the case for the Cambridge Trusts and depend on the particular circumstances of Colleges) then they should invest; if not, then they don't.

I offer the perspective of a College investor. Wolfson College (I am on its Finance Committee) decided at an early stage to invest virtually all its relatively modest endowment in the CUEF. We saw the opportunity of access to a well diversified portfolio including asset classes not easily accessible, expertly managed, with a long term time horizon, an investment objective and strategy that made sense, a University governance structure that we understood, and a distribution policy that we could adopt. We welcomed the added benefits of administrative simplicity and the frequency and predictability of the distribution cash flows. We accept entirely that the University sets the rules for the CUEF, but know that the College is not disadvantaged over other investors. Wolfson should and does regularly review whether the CUEF remains suitable but so far we remain delighted with the decision. I mention Wolfson since from my personal viewpoint there I do not see what the problem is that needs to be fixed.

The Report proposes a new body, the EFSB. If this were simply a committee of Council to facilitate the Council's work in respect of the CUEF then I could support wholeheartedly – the Finance Committee does this at present. But although Council will control the composition of the EFSB, it appears to be abdication rather than delegation. Council will now have merely '... a strong influence on the operation of the CUEF...' as its majority investor. Council established and developed the CUEF and now appears to want to cast it loose. The proposal nudges the CUEF towards being simply a fund in which the University invests but is not distinctively 'Cambridge'. Will the CUEF – in the long term – be as excellent as it could be?

I am not clear who will be in charge. We will have Council, the EFSB, the Finance Committee Financial Investment Sub-committee, CIML's board, the Investment (Advisory) Board, and views of other investors. Many cooks. Clarity, consistency and patience are required for successful endowment management and I am not sure that the complexity we see in the Report's Annex B helps. I regret the apparent de-emphasis of the Investment Board and distancing it from Council. My experience has been of a serious, expert and engaged Board, providing excellent advice, challenge and support to the Chief Investment Officer.

In summary, I could perhaps accept an EFSB but wonder if it is necessary and I worry about possible long term consequences. The conflicts of interest point has not been well explained. However I note Tilly Franklin's earlier

supportive remarks and much respect her views. I ask Council to make sure that the CUEF remains distinctively ‘Cambridge’ and does not evolve into simply an arm’s length fund with Cambridge investors. If the Council ever contemplates disposing of the University’s investment in the CUEF it will have failed. I also ask that the Council ensures that the Investment Office, with the Investment (Advisory) Board, is given the clarity, time and support to go about its work and without parameters being changed frequently.

Dr N. HOLMES (Department of Pathology), read by the Senior Pro-Practor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the University Council but I am speaking today in a personal capacity. The impetus for the proposed changes in the management of the CUEF is primarily due to the perceived need to address a vulnerability to regulatory scrutiny. The regulatory environment has shifted over the past decade and I believe that the University’s position as trustee, investor and having oversight of management of the CUEF creates difficulties as long as Council has responsibility for all three.

I am not going to sugar coat the pill. The suggestions from colleagues who signed the note of dissent that the Council will have less direct influence on CUEF investment policy are broadly true. My own personal view is that the Council has had more indirect than direct influence in the past. It will continue to have strong indirect influence, both through appointment of three members of the proposed Endowment Fund Supervisory Body (EFSB) and as the principal investor. I am satisfied that, in practice, the Council will continue to have an effective influence on the CUEF. I think it not only right, but essential, that the management of the CUEF allows other investors views and interests to be appropriately included.

My understanding is that as long as the CUEF is a multi-investor fund, we have no option but to step back from direct control of the fund’s investment policy and direction. So, I believe we have to act to change the current situation. We could have chosen to require the other investors to withdraw their funds and retain direct control of our investment policy. I am glad that was not the recommendation to Regent House for two reasons. First, as someone with a ‘collegiate view’ of Cambridge, I believe that the opportunity to invest in the CUEF has been valuable and appreciated by a number of Colleges. Second, there is a benefit to the University in efficiency and flexibility of operation of the fund by having a larger overall pot.

Finally, just because we have not had any concerned interest from the FCA so far, I do not think that we can expect that to last forever, especially now that the inherent conflicts are being debated in public.

Mr M. H. LEWISOHN (Christ’s College), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I serve as Deputy Chair of the Council and as a senior banker at UBS. For a number of years, I have taken a keen interest in the governance of the Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF), having determined some time ago that there was significant room for improvement.

There is no doubt in my mind that the governance arrangements now envisaged for the CUEF and in particular the establishment of the Endowment Fund Supervisory Board (EFSB) will be far more effective in protecting the University’s interests. The era of black box investing has ended and we now have a much more transparent process. As the principal investor in the CUEF, the University has a greater ability to influence its policies, as has already been clearly demonstrated by the ambitious plans announced last term in relation to CUEF achieving the target of a carbon-neutral portfolio. The new governance structure allows the University to separate appropriately its roles as principal investor in the CUEF and as trustee (in which capacity, the EFSB oversees Cambridge Investment Management Limited, the FCA regulated wholly-owned University subsidiary which manages the CUEF).

Of course, it is true that before proposing any changes to the investment objectives, the distribution objectives or the investment principles of the CUEF, the trustee is bound to consult and take into account the views of all the investors in the fund in accordance with its fiduciary duty to act in their best interests. That is a legal requirement. But in practice the views of the principal investor are likely to be accorded the greatest weight. In addition, the membership of the EFSB stipulates that of its six members, three are to be appointed by Council, including the Chair. Moreover, as is standard practice for University bodies, the Chair will have the casting vote.

In conclusion, far from being relegated to a passive role, the views of the University are bound to be respected in all future deliberations, in my view in a far clearer and more accountable way than was previously the case. On a personal note, I would wish to assure all members of the Regent House and Council that if appointed as the first Chair of the EFSB, I am committed to ensuring that the EFSB is not seen as ‘a quasi-autonomous entity populated by self-anointing members’ but as a critical element of the University’s successful governance of its Endowment Fund for decades to come.

Mr T. HARVEY-SAMUEL (Trinity Hall), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am the Bursar of Trinity Hall and a Trustee and Honorary Treasurer of the Gates Cambridge Trust. The establishment of the Endowment Fund Supervisory Board (EFSB) is to be welcomed. It will bring appropriate and necessary clarity of accountability in respect of the fulfilment of the University’s various roles in respect of the CUEF. It will also deliver improved alignment with regulatory requirements for the management of Europe’s largest University Endowment fund.

This action is entirely consistent with the progressive implementation of improved governance, transparency and sustainability with respect to the CUEF. As the second largest investor in the CUEF, the Gates Cambridge Trust welcomes this progress and supports the creation of the EFSB.

Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2019–20, dated 16 December 2020

(*Reporter*, 6601, 2020–21, p. 263).

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, in the present Report in detail we have not had before about what was done last academic year under the University's Emergency Management Plan. I rather think the Plan was formerly on the open web but now it is behind Raven access, so is it no longer a public statement of what is deemed acceptable under suspension of the University's governance.

This Report gives a substantial but unapologetic account, stating what was done, but without comment or evaluation. Everyone recognises that those who acted during the suspension intended to do their best for the University, and that much necessary adjustment was achieved in a timely manner. But 'lessons' to be 'learned', it will be remembered, were the theme of the Topic of Concern Discussion the Council itself offered on 14 July. It is still not clear how this 'learning' is to be organised or what the University is to be told about its outcomes. I am only too well aware of having made remarks on the 2020 suspension of governance more than once before, since Discussions began to be permitted again in June. Perhaps I may venture to put a few more thoughts into the historical record while we wait for a more self-critical account from the Council.¹

Of particular interest in this Report is the additional detail about the bodies which were formed – though without reference to the Regent House – and which proceeded to run the University and in some cases apparently still do. In a Notice in response to remarks I made in Discussion of the previous year's Annual Report of the Council on 4 February 2020, the Council published a detailed statement in the *Reporter* of 28 September 2020. It pointed to Statute A IV 7(b) which permits the Council to appoint 'committees, whether standing or occasional', 'from time to time'. So did the Council expressly appoint these bodies and define their remits and membership, for it continues to be responsible for the exercise of any powers it may delegate? If so where is this recorded? The Council's Minute (399) mentions tantalisingly that the Gold Team's 'membership now included public health representatives', but who else?

The *apologia* in the present Report sometimes makes 'the University' the actor in events. For example: 'The University strove to continue its core activities, while cancelling all meetings of more than fifty people.'

When it comes to 'doing' things 'the University' is of course the Regent House as governing body, not the Council (Statute A III 8). The Regent House was never invited to Grace any of the surely quite exceptional powers needed to suspend the governance of the University as it is claimed was done.

The Council could of course delegate its powers and did, but it could delegate only the powers it actually had. The Regent House may of course 'delegate by Grace to the Council or to another University body or authority to act on its behalf in such matters as it may from time to time determine'. But it was not invited to do so at the outset of this suspension of governance, or since.

Frequently the Report we are discussing resorts to the passive voice, omitting to state who or what did the action described, as in 'publication of the *Reporter* was temporarily suspended and communication with staff and

students moved to frequent messages'. These include the messages which have been put online as 'University statements' under the names of the Vice-Chancellor or Pro-Vice-Chancellors. By whom or what body was it decided to 'move' such 'communication' to 'messages', and what authority could such 'statements' or 'messages' carry compared with publication in the *Reporter*? The rules governing the *Reporter* and its contents are in Ordinances and only the Regent House had the authority to change the governing domestic legislation. It has not been asked to do so.

That Notice of 28 September 2020 says that 'the Council and the [General] Board recognise their responsibility for presenting decisions concerning major changes in policy to the Regent House for approval', but it seems to consider that it is sufficient to do this in Annual Reports such as the one we are discussing, in retrospect and with only limited scope:

Their Annual Reports provide a summary of the proposals submitted for Regent House approval in the form of Reports and Graces. In addition, the Council reports each year to the Regent House recommending allocations from the Chest.

'Changes in the University's senior leadership' are listed in the Report, a category still undefined as to its membership, and their powers. Special Ordinance A (viii) 4, under Statute A X 8 now contains the provisions about delegation which were formerly in Statute K, 9. This now allows delegation to a person as well as a body, which makes the continuing uncertainty about the concept of 'senior leadership' the more troubling.

The Minutes of the first meetings of the Council under the 'suspension of governance' arrangement include (18 March) notes of summaries from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Enterprise and Business Relations), 'who chaired the Recovery Task Force'. It was reported to Council 'that four potential scenarios had been developed and circulated to University institutions'. 'The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Enterprise and Business Relations) summarised the work of the "Crimson" Recovery Task Force since the last meeting of the Council':

The Council noted that the other Task Forces (for Education, Research, People, Buildings and Digital Infrastructure, with a Colleges Task Force to follow) were developing action plans for each scenario and identifying issues which would involve difficult or potentially controversial decisions, as well as potential strategic opportunities for the University.

The Council merely 'welcomed the publication of the guiding principles'. It made some suggestions which are not listed in the Minutes.

In the June Minutes the Vice-Chancellor reported that 'the Council had received a draft statement from the University setting out key principles for teaching in the academic year 2020–21, via the papers of its Business Committee'. Business Committee records are accessible only by Council members. They may not be read by mere members of the Regent House. The Council received a paper in the form of an Update from the Recovery Task Force (Paper No. 20.06.15.B1) introduced by the Chair of the Recovery Task Force. That too is not accessible to members of the Regent House.

It is possible to see more, but not yet the whole story. I made a Freedom of Information request during the summer. In mid-July, on the last day the law allowed for a response, I was told that 'the time required to locate, retrieve and extract the information you have requested would considerably surpass 18 hours of staff time charged at £25 per hour, and therefore that your request exceeds the

appropriate limit of £450'. So I made a less extensive request which I was assured would be fulfilled, comprising:

- (i) The notes of the meetings of the University-level Gold and Silver Teams since January 2020, insofar as those notes exist.
- (ii) The notes of the meetings of the following University-level Task Forces (all operating under the overall direction of the University-level Gold Team) since January 2020, insofar as those notes exist: the Finance Task Force; the Student/Education Task Force; the Buildings Task Force; and the Staff Task Force.

I received that material on 13 August.

I am bound to wonder why it needed so long to locate records of these bodies (and all those Task Forces now mentioned in the Annual Report) since one would expect members of the Council to have been provided with them automatically so as to fulfil their responsibility to supervise the exercise of powers they had delegated. It should have presented no great difficulty to check them for anything the law allowed to be blacked out and send them in response to an FOI request.

Among the present Annual Report's statements in the passive voice is that:

The Covid-19 Gold Team, involving senior leadership from across the University, was established to make strategic decisions across the whole of the collegiate University's business activities. The team was supported by task forces on students, staff, finances, buildings, communications, digital infrastructure and research.

Perhaps the Council could now publish the membership lists and remits of all these committees, teams and taskforces and how and to whom they reported? Would not that make a good start to the task of 'learning lessons'? (Could we know what 'team' or 'taskforce' will be doing that?)

The present Annual Report tells us that the Recovery Plan has been designed against the 'fifteen projects which arose in response to, or took on a greater significance because of, Covid-19' and which 'mapped onto the University Priorities Framework', approved by the Council in 2019, on which there is a Table in the Report. Implementation of each area of the plan will pass to the University bodies with responsibility for that area. Thus the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC) and Resource Management Committee will oversee resource allocation and budgetary control. How will the constitutionally recognised and the constitutionally unrecognised but, it seems, still continuing bodies cooperate?

When the Council met on 20 July 2020 its Minutes stated that it:

thanked the Recovery Taskforce for its work, noted the update and approved the direction of travel set out in the recovery plan. It also agreed that the General Board should oversee the implementation of the recovery plan, supported by a small programme management team.

That appears to be the arrangement, though it is described rather differently in the present Report:

The Council agreed that the General Board would be responsible for the overall co-ordination and monitoring of the implementation phase, with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Enterprise and Business Relations) overseeing the implementation of the recovery plan as a whole.

Could the General Board tell us how this is all going in a Notice please?

Mr G. P. ALLEN (Wolfson College and Chair of the Board of Scrutiny):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Report, at pages 270–71, notes that there were three Discussions on topics of concern – two requested by members of the Regent House, and one called by the Council itself on decisions taken to manage the University's activities at the start of the Covid-19 Pandemic. Responses to the first two Discussions were published roughly six months after the relevant Discussion – ample time one might think for the Council to gather its collective thoughts. However, a response to the Discussion on the Covid-19 arrangements, which took place on 14 July 2020, is still outstanding. According to this Report the Council expects to publish a response to those remarks in Lent Term 2021 i.e. between 8 and 10 months since the Discussion which the Council itself called, I assume because it was interested in the views of the Regent House as the University's governing body. Will the Council expedite the publication of a response?

Annual Report of the General Board to the Council for the academic year 2019–20, dated 16 December 2020

(Reporter, 6601, 2020–21, p. 272).

No remarks were made on this Report.

Report of the General Board, dated 4 December 2020, on the introduction of a Master of Architecture degree in the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art

(Reporter, 6600, 2020–21, p. 244).

No remarks were made on this Report.

¹ <https://www.governanceandcompliance.admin.cam.ac.uk/audit-regulatory-compliance/emergency-planning/university-emergency-management-plan>

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Downing College

Elected to a Fellowship in Clinical Medicine from 1 December 2020:

Mr Richard Justin Davies, M.A., M.B., M.Chir., LRCP, FRCS, EBSO

King's College

Elected on 20 January 2021 to a Research Fellowship for four years from 1 October 2021:

Dr Malarvizhi Jayanth, B.A., *Madurai Kamaraj University*, M.A., *English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad*, M.A., Ph.D., *University of Chicago* (Slavery and its Impacts)

Mr Said Reza Huseini, B.A., M.A., M.Phil., *Jawaharlal Nehru University*, B.A., M.A., *Leiden University* (History and Culture of the Countries of the Silk Roads)

Elected on 21 January 2021 to a Research Fellowship for four years from 1 October 2021:

Dr Alexandra Clarà Saracho, B.Eng., *Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya*, M.Res., Ph.D., *CL* (Mathematical Sciences and Engineering)

Trinity College

Elected into a Fellowship under Title C with effect from 22 January 2021, as College Senior Lecturer in Mathematics:

Jack Thorne, FRS, B.A., M.A.St., Ph.D.

Appointed Senior Bursar with effect from 6 January 2021:

Richard Turnill, Fellow under Title C since 1 October 2020

Selected for Fellowships under Title A from 4 October 2021:

Rory Gregson, B.A., *CHR*, B.C.L., M.Phil., *Oxford*

Oliver Janzer, B.A., M.Math., Ph.D., *T*

Henry Lee-Six, M.A., Ph.D., M.B. B.Chir., *T*

Benjamin Marschall, B.A., M.A., *Humboldt University Berlin*, M.Litt., *St Andrews Stirling*, (Ph.D. candidate, *DAR*)

Wladislaw Michailow, B.Sc., *Augsburg*, M.Sc., *Technical University Munich*, (Ph.D. candidate, *T*)

Naomi Richman, B.A., M.St., D.Phil., *Oxford*

Daniel Sperrin, B.A., M.St., D.Phil., *Oxford*

Rita Teixeira Da Costa, B.Sc., *Instituto Superior Técnico, University of Lisbon*, M.A.St., *T*

Events

Trinity College

Clark Lectures 2021

Rita Felski will deliver the 2021 Clark Lectures on the theme, *Remix: on literature and theory*, at 5 p.m. on Thursdays 18 February, and 4, 11 and 18 March, via Zoom webinar; lecture details and joining instructions: <https://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/events/clark-lectures-2021>

Vacancies

Clare Hall: Senior Tutor and Fellow; tenure: ASAP; closing date: 15 February 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.clarehall.cam.ac.uk/jobs/2021/senior-tutor>

Darwin College: Cambridge Zero David MacKay Non-Stipendiary Research Associates (several available); tenure: one year from April 2021 with the possibility of annual renewal to a maximum of three years; closing date: 28 February 2021 at 5 p.m.; further details: <https://www.darwin.cam.ac.uk/research/associates>

EXTERNAL NOTICES

Oxford Notices

Brasenose College: Nicholas Kurti Research Fellowships in the Sciences (Senior and Junior) and William Golding Research Fellowships in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (Junior); non-stipendiary, but include Senior Common Room membership with free meals, and research and hospitality allowances; tenure: from 1 October 2021 for five years for the Senior Fellowship (may be renewed) and three years for the Junior Fellowships (non-renewable); closing date: 1 March 2021 at 9 a.m.; further details for all posts: <http://www.bnc.ox.ac.uk/vacancies/academic-vacancies>

Nuffield College: Postdoctoral Researcher in the History of Slavery in the City of London; tenure: three years from 1 May 2021 or as soon as possible thereafter; salary: £34,804; closing date: 22 February 2021; further details: <http://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/the-college/jobs-and-vacancies/postdoctoral-researcher-history-of-slavery-in-the-city-of-london/>

St Catherine's College: Graduate Scholarships; tenure: from 1 October 2021; value: £3,300–£5,000 per annum; closing date: 12 March 2021; further details: <http://www.stcatz.ox.ac.uk/prospective-students/postgraduate-admissions/student-finance-and-scholarships/>

Wolfson College: Communications Officer (part-time); salary: £20,299 per annum for 22.5 hours per week (FTE: £32,929); closing date: 14 February 2021; further details: <https://www.wolfson.ox.ac.uk/vacancy/communications-officer>

Senior Development Officer; salary: £32,929–£38,348; closing date: 28 February 2021; further details: <https://www.wolfson.ox.ac.uk/vacancy/senior-development-officer>