

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6613

WEDNESDAY 21 APRIL 2021

VOL CLI No 25

## CONTENTS

### Notices

Calendar	469
Discussion on Tuesday, 4 May 2021	469
HRH The Duke of Edinburgh	469
Waiver of residence requirements for students in Easter Term 2021	469
Recovery Programme overview	470
Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Professorship: Correction	471
Ballot of the Regent House: Voting open until 29 April 2021	471
Annual Reports	472

### Vacancies, appointments, etc.

Vacancies in the University	472
-----------------------------	-----

### Awards, etc.

Pilkington Prize winners, 2021	473
Evans Fellowships, 2021	473

### Events, courses, etc.

Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.	473
--	-----

### Reports

Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Professorship	474
--	-----

### Obituaries

Obituary Notice	474
-----------------	-----

### Acta

Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 17 March 2021	474
Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 31 March 2021	474
Congregation of the Regent House on 27 March 2021	474

### *End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'*

### Report of Discussion: 23 March 2021

Remarks on the Governance Review report: Membership of the Regent House	481
--	-----

### College Notices

Elections	491
Vacancies	491
Events	491
Other Notices	491

### Other Notices

Needham Research Institute	492
----------------------------	-----

### External Notices

Oxford Notices	492
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

## NOTICES

### Calendar

27 April, *Tuesday*. Full Term begins.

1 May, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 11 a.m. (degrees in absence only).

4 May, *Tuesday*. Discussion via videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).

13 May, *Thursday*. Ascension day. Scarlet day.

### Discussion on Tuesday, 4 May 2021

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) and any other members of the collegiate University who may wish to attend for item 1, to a Discussion via videoconference on Tuesday, 4 May 2021 at 2 p.m. The following items will be discussed:

1. The University's Recovery Programme and its projects (see p. 470).
2. Report of the General Board, dated 19 April 2021, on the establishment of a Professorship (p. 474).

Those wishing to join the Discussion by videoconference should email [UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto: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](mailto:contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk), copying [ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk), by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion, for reading out by the Proctors,<sup>1</sup> or ask someone else who is attending to read the remarks on their behalf.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

### HRH The Duke of Edinburgh

The Vice-Chancellor greatly regrets to publish formal notice of the death, on 9 April 2021, of HRH The Duke of Edinburgh, Chancellor 1976–2011. A Doctor of Law *honoris causa* since 1952, His Royal Highness was Visitor of Churchill College and an Honorary Fellow of Trinity College and of St Edmund's College, and while Chancellor was Visitor of a number of other Colleges. The Chancellor has sent a letter of condolence to Her Majesty The Queen and many tributes have been given to the outstanding contribution to the collegiate University made by His Royal Highness over thirty-five years.

The Vice-Chancellor, certain University officers, the Master of Trinity College, a representative of Churchill College and the Vice-Master of St Edmund's College attended a service in commemoration of His Royal Highness held for the City and University in Great St Mary's Church on Friday, 16 April. The University Bellingranger records that on Friday, 9 April, shortly after the University Clock struck 6 p.m., the tenor bell of the University Church was tolled 99 times by Jonathan Shanklin of Magdalene College. An Obituary Notice in the customary form appears in this issue (p. 474).

A Memorial Service in the University Church will be held in due course.

### Waiver of residence requirements for students in Easter Term 2021

15 April 2021

In January 2021, as a result of the government's decision to announce a national lockdown in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Council agreed to waive residence requirements for the Lent Term 2021 (*Reporter*, 6602, 2020–21, p. 291). As the government has not yet published further information about the return of students for in-person learning and teaching from Easter Term 2021, the University's policy on returning students<sup>1</sup> remains unchanged:

- For students who have been given permission to return for in-person teaching for practical or practice-based subjects, as well as for research students, this permission continues.
- For students who have previously been given permission to return by their College for reasons of health, or access to study spaces and facilities, this permission continues.
- Other students who have not previously been given permission, but who wish to return for Easter Term, are encouraged to apply to their College for permission to return if they need to do so for reasons of health (including mental health) or to access study space and facilities.

The Council has therefore agreed to extend the waiver of residence requirements by granting an allowance for the Easter Term 2021 to students who are not to return to Cambridge for the start of term. Further guidance from the government is expected by 17 May 2021, following which the University's policy on returning students will be reviewed, but the waiver of residence requirements will remain in place for those students who have not returned for the majority of Easter Term 2021.

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.cam.ac.uk/coronavirus/students/guidance-for-all-students/february-2021-plans-for-lent-term-easter-vacation-and-easter-term-2021#exceptionalreasonstotravel>.

## Recovery Programme overview

15 April 2021

### Summary

In July 2020, the Council approved the University's Recovery Programme (RP) as developed by the Crimson Recovery Taskforce (*Reporter*, 6587, 2019–20, p. 542). As noted in the *Reporter* of 24 March (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 445) the RP now has a suite of thirteen projects (several of which have already begun work), a budget, a reporting/governance structure, and a project management team to direct the Programme.

Following on from its response to the Board of Scrutiny's Twenty-fifth report (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 447), the Council has provided a detailed overview of the Programme below. There will be an opportunity to comment on the projects at the Discussion on 4 May 2021 (see p. 469). The Vice-Chancellor has agreed that all members of the collegiate University can attend the Discussion for this item, in addition to those already entitled to do so.

### Background and rationale

As with other disruptive events in the University's history, the Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted what is distinctively resilient about Cambridge. Despite the upheavals of 2020 and 2021 so far – and thanks to the extraordinary commitment, flexibility and hard work from staff and students – the University continues to deliver world-class research and teaching for the benefit of society and retains its distinctive residential, collegiate form.

But the pandemic has also underlined areas – some already known, some newly revealed by the exceptional conditions of the past year – where the University needs to learn and adapt. For example, the sudden, externally necessitated move to remote working for large numbers of staff has illustrated the urgent need for a unified system for procuring and supporting the IT infrastructure necessary for agile working, as well as creating an opportunity to think strategically and creatively about how the University uses its estate. The financial impact of the pandemic has underlined the need to improve some administrative processes to make them more efficient, while also providing a stimulus to thinking about new revenue streams.

By identifying these opportunities for change and putting in place the resources and expertise to capitalise on them, the Recovery Programme is a critical part of the University's response to the pandemic and will ensure that Cambridge retains its global position of excellence, continues to deliver its mission, and remains resilient enough to weather future crises.

Key opportunities identified – or underlined – by the past year and addressed by the Recovery Programme are:

- Developing excellence in online education, and ensuring that Cambridge attracts exceptional students from around the globe;
- Delivering impactful research;
- Helping staff thrive now and in the future;
- Creating the best culture and physical spaces for all the University's activities while making the best use of existing resources;
- Accelerating established work to improve the effectiveness of administrative processes, reduce complexity and put the University on a sustainable financial footing.

The RP consists of thirteen projects, carefully designed, costed and resourced, that will address these areas over the next three years (and in some cases longer). Together, these projects will make a transformative contribution to the University, creating working environments and approaches to professional life that will help staff give their best, re-shaping key infrastructure to optimise support for research, teaching and learning, and ensuring financial sustainability by streamlining processes and reducing complexity. Besides a wide range of non-financial benefits, the RP has the capacity to deliver significant recurrent cost savings.

The Recovery Programme is intended not just to renew and strengthen the University in the aftermath of Covid-19, but also to deliver tangible benefits to the region, nation and wider society – for example, through building Cambridge's research capacity and strategic alliances in the field of infectious disease, making new high-quality online courses available to a global audience, and innovating, testing and modelling best practice in research culture and the effective use of research facilities.

The Recovery Programme will be most successful if it can garner engagement and input from staff at every level and in every area. The Programme has an engagement and communications strategy that focuses on enabling two-way communication between stakeholders and projects, and providing timely, engaging and transparent updates about the programme, its work and its successes, to key audiences.

### Governance, administration and budget

The Council has delegated oversight of the implementation of the RP to the General Board, which is acting as a programme board. The academic sponsor for the RP is Professor Andy Neely, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Enterprise and Business Relations, supported by a small Project Management Office (PMO). The PMO team provides project management support and guidance to those working on individual projects as well as overseeing the Programme as a whole.

Funding for the first year of the Recovery Programme was approved in December 2020 (*Reporter*, 2020–21: 6593, p. 96 (see paragraph 38); 6597, p. 172). RP projects have to submit a detailed business case for consideration by the Planning and Resources Committee or its Resource Management Committee (or the appropriate delegated authority). Permission to draw down funding is granted on approval of the business case.

### Projects

Brief summaries of the projects (listed and linked below) are provided at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2020-21/weekly/6613/RP-ProjectSummaries.pdf>. The level of detail given varies according to the stage of development of the project: more detail is supplied for those, like Cambridge Impact on Society, that have already had approval for their business case and are in the implementation phase, while some, like Reshaping the Estate, that are still in the scoping phase, have only high-level summaries.

1. International Student Recruitment
2. Cambridge Advance Online
3. Research Culture
4. Global Health Infectious Disease
5. Effective Utilisation of Research Space
6. Rebalancing the Industrial Portfolio (project completed; no summary available)
7. Supporting Our Staff
8. Cambridge Impact on Society
9. Enhanced Financial Transparency
10. Reshaping the Estate
11. Reimagining Professional Services
12. Strategic Procurement and Purchasing
13. Digital Workplace

### Further communications

Regular updates on the RP are provided to heads of institutions at fortnightly issues briefings. More general information, including news stories and case studies about RP projects, is published on the Recovery Programme Sharepoint site, <https://universityofcambridgecloud.sharepoint.com/sites/COVIDRecovery/SitePages/The-Recovery-Programme-all-staff.aspx> (Raven access only), which will be updated regularly.

## Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Professorship: Correction

19 April 2021

There was some information missing from the Board's Report, dated 24 March 2021, proposing the establishment of a Professorship of Magnetic Resonance Physics (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 465). That information, explaining why the Professorship was to be established for Dr Martin Graves in the Department of Radiology, is now provided below.

A large focus of the Department's research is developing novel MRI probes, acquisition and image analysis methods and translating them for use in the clinic. The Department has a long history of publishing world-leading clinical MRI research and is fortunate to have an excellent arrangement with the NHS to use their machines for clinical research, including state-of-the-art equipment provided by General Electric (GE) Healthcare. Dr Graves is a Fellow of the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, recognising his contribution to MRI physics and research internationally. His appointment will provide leadership within the Department's MRI medical physics team and will also play a pivotal role in maintaining strong links between the NHS, the University and GE Healthcare.

The advent of artificial intelligence has created many opportunities for medical imaging. There is a need to create large imaging datasets to develop and test algorithms and capitalise on the interest and expertise of mathematicians and computer scientists at the University. The new centre for AI and the Maths in Healthcare Imaging programmes rely heavily on data. This appointment will drive the rapid creation of an end-to-end solution where datasets can be pulled from the NHS to be used safely for the benefit of the AI community. Furthermore, Dr Graves' deep knowledge of the NHS Picture Archiving Systems means that algorithms can be deployed within the governance and regulatory framework in a timely manner, allowing prospective testing of these clinical tools and demonstrating impact and effectiveness to patients.

This Professorship is fully funded by Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust until retirement conditional on the Professorship being held by Dr Martin Graves and Dr Graves holding an honorary clinical contract, as this is a co-terminous appointment.

## Ballot of the Regent House: Voting open until 29 April 2021

The following ballot is currently open for voting by members of the Regent House:

- Ballot on Grace 1 of 17 February 2021 (establishment of an Endowment Fund Supervisory Body)

**Voting closes at 5 p.m. on Thursday, 29 April 2021** and members who are listed on the Roll of the Regent House promulgated on 6 November 2020 are eligible to vote. Voting information, including fly-sheets and access to the online voting portal, is available at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/ballots/voting/Pages/Ballot-EFSB-ET2021.aspx> (Raven required).

## Annual Reports

The following Annual Reports have been received by the Council and/or the General Board and are available as indicated:

---

**ADC Theatre Annual Report, 2019–20:**

<https://www.adctheatre.com/about-us/administration/>

---

**Cambridge Assessment Annual Review, 2019–20:**

<https://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/news/our-publications/annual-review/>

---

**Cambridge University Libraries Annual Report, 2018–19:**

[https://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/files/cambridge\\_university\\_libraries\\_annual\\_report\\_2018\\_19.pdf](https://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/files/cambridge_university_libraries_annual_report_2018_19.pdf)

---

**Cambridge University Press Annual Report, 2019–20:**

<https://www.cambridge.org/about-us/annual-report>

---

**Environmental Sustainability Report, 2018–19 and 2019–20:**

<https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/documents/Environmental-Sustainability-Report-201819.pdf>; and  
<https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/documents/Environmental-Sustainability-Report-201920.pdf>

---

**Fitzwilliam Museum Syndicate Annual Report, 2018–19:**

<https://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/aboutus/mission> [links in right-hand menu]

---

**Information Services Committee Annual Report, 2019–20:**

<https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/documents/ISC-AnnualReport-201920.pdf>

---

**Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences Annual Report, 2019–20:**

<https://www.newton.ac.uk/documents/annual-reports>

---

**Language Centre Annual Report, 2019–20:**

<https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/documents/LanguageCentre-AnnualReport-201920.pdf>

---

**Scott Polar Research Institute Review, 2019:**

<https://www.spri.cam.ac.uk/about/sprireview/2019/review2019.pdf>

---

**Wellcome Trust/Cancer Research UK Gurdon Institute Prospectus, 2019:**

<https://www.gurdon.cam.ac.uk/about/prospectus>

---

**West and North West Cambridge Estates Board Annual Report, 2019–20:**

<https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/documents/nw-cam/nw-cam-annual-report-2020.pdf>

---

Details of further published Annual Reports will appear in the *Reporter* of 28 July 2021.

## VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

### Vacancies in the University

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

**Assistant Esquire Bedell (University Ceremonial officer) in the Governance and Compliance Division of the University offices;** fixed-term and part-time appointment, hours as required by events (£30 per hour); closing date: 3 May 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/29367/>; quote reference: AJ26287

**NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Cardiology or Haematology in the Department of Medicine or the Department of Haematology;** tenure: four years (or until CCT), available immediately and no later than 30 June 2022; salary: £34,466–£60,960 or £33,885–£58,672 or £38,694–£52,036; closing date: 9 May 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/29191/>; quote reference: RC26124

**NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Haematology or Infectious Diseases or Neurology in the Department of Haematology or the Department of Medicine or the Department of Clinical Neurosciences;** tenure: four years (or until CCT), available immediately and no later than 30 June 2022; salary: £34,466–£60,960 or £33,885–£58,672 or £38,694–£52,036; closing date: 9 May 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/29192/>; quote reference: RC26125

**NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Medial Microbiology in the Department of Medicine;** tenure: four years (or until CCT), available immediately and no later than 30 June 2022; salary: £34,466–£60,960 or £33,885–£58,672 or £38,694–£52,036; closing date: 9 May 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/29196/>; quote reference: RC26128

**NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Medical Oncology or Renal Medicine or Clinical Oncology in the Department of Medicine or the Department of Oncology;** tenure: four years (or until CCT), available immediately and no later than 30 June 2022; salary: £34,466–£60,960 or £33,885–£58,672 or £38,694–£52,036; closing date: 9 May 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/29194/>; quote reference: RC26127

**NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Otolaryngology or Neurosurgery or Vascular Surgery in the Department of Clinical Neurosciences or the Department of Surgery;** tenure: four years (or until CCT), available immediately and no later than 30 June 2022; salary: £34,466–£60,960 or £33,885–£58,672 or £38,694–£52,036; closing date: 9 May 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/29193/>; quote reference: RC26126

**NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Paediatric Gastroenterology in the Department of Paediatrics;** tenure: four years (or until CCT); salary: £34,466–£60,960 or £33,885–£58,672 or £38,694–£52,036; closing date: 16 May 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/29183/>; quote reference: RP26117

*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.*

## AWARDS, ETC.

### Pilkington Prize winners, 2021

The Pilkington Prizes are awarded annually to members of staff in recognition of their contributions to teaching excellence. The awards were initiated by Sir Alastair Pilkington who believed that the quality of teaching was crucial to the University's success.

The Cambridge Centre for Teaching and Learning is delighted to announce the 2021 Pilkington Prize winners as follows:

Dr David Clifford, *HO* – Faculty of English  
 Dr Elizabeth Fistein, *LC* – School of Clinical Medicine  
 Professor Beverley Glover, *Q* – Department of Plant Sciences  
 Dr Hannah Joyce, *JN* – Department of Engineering  
 Dr Nikhil Krishnan, *R* – Faculty of Philosophy  
 Professor Clare Morris – Institute of Continuing Education  
 Mr Bill Nicholl, *HO* – Faculty of Education  
 Dr Tina Potter, *N* – Department of Physics  
 Dr Dee Scadden, *DOW* – Department of Biochemistry  
 Dr Peter Sloman, *CHU* – Department of Politics and International Studies  
 Dr Anne Swift – Department of Public Health and Primary Care  
 Mr Alan Thorne – Department of Engineering  
 Dr Edward Tipper, *JN* – Department of Earth Sciences

More information about the awards, including winners from previous years, can be found on the Cambridge Centre for Teaching and Learning website: <https://www.cctl.cam.ac.uk/pilkington-prize>.

### Evans Fellowships, 2021

The Advisory Committee for the Evans Fund gives further notice that it intends to proceed to an election of an Evans Fellow or Fellows early in the Easter Term. A graduate of any university is eligible to apply, provided that they intend to engage in research in anthropology or archaeology in relation to Southeast Asia. The Advisory Committee is also interested to hear from senior scholars seeking contributions towards major projects, as well as early career researchers and graduate students applying for small research grants, in geographical areas covered by the remit of the fund.

For further information and the application form, visit the webpage: <https://www.socanth.cam.ac.uk/about-us/funding/research-funding/evans-fund>. The deadline for applications is **27 April 2021**.

## 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/>). A variety of training courses are also available to members of the University, information and booking for which can be found online at <http://www.training.cam.ac.uk/>

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology	2021 Max Perutz Lecture: <i>The coming of age of de novo protein design</i> , by Professor David Baker, Director of the Institute for Protein Design, University of Washington, at 4 p.m. on 27 April 2021 via Zoom	<a href="https://www2.mrc-lmb.cam.ac.uk/news-and-events/scientific-seminars/">https://www2.mrc-lmb.cam.ac.uk/news-and-events/scientific-seminars/</a>
Milner Therapeutics Institute	Milner Seminar Series: <i>Targeting the gut for the treatment of metabolic diseases</i> , by Professor Fiona Gribble, Wellcome MRC Institute of Metabolic Science, at 1 p.m. on 29 April 2021 via Zoom, advance registration required	<a href="https://www.milner.cam.ac.uk/milner-seminar-series/">https://www.milner.cam.ac.uk/milner-seminar-series/</a>

**REPORTS****Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Professorship**

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

1. Following a referral from the Senior Academic Promotions 2020 Appeals Committee, the Vice-Chancellor's Committee decided to put forward Dr Suchitra Sebastian for promotion to a Professorship. The General Board agreed by circulation on 15 April 2021 to recommend the establishment of a Professorship for Dr Sebastian, to be backdated to 1 October 2020. After consulting with Dr Sebastian, the Board has agreed that the title of the Professorship should be the Professorship of Physics. The Readership currently held by Dr Sebastian would be held in abeyance during the tenure of the Professorship.
2. The General Board recommends that, with effect from 1 October 2020, a Professorship of Physics be established for Dr Suchitra Sebastian for one tenure, placed in the Schedule to Special Ordinance C (vii) 1, and assigned to the Department of Physics.

19 April 2021

STEPHEN J. TOOPE, *Vice-Chancellor*

KRISTINE BLACK-HAWKINS

ANN COPESTAKE

JOHN DENNIS

TIM HARPER

NICHOLAS HOLMES

CHRISTOPHER KELLY

NIGEL PEAKE

ANNA PHILPOTT

RICHARD REX

GRAHAM VIRGO

CHRIS YOUNG

**OBITUARIES****Obituary Notice**

His Royal Highness The Prince PHILIP, DUKE OF EDINBURGH, KG, KT, OM, GCVO, GBE, PC, (Hon.) LL.D., FRS, FREng, (Hon.) FRSE, Visitor of Churchill College, Honorary Fellow of Trinity College and of St Edmund's College, sometime Chancellor, died on Friday, 9 April 2021, aged 99 years.

**ACTA****Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 17 March 2021**

The Grace submitted to the Regent House on 17 March 2021 (*Reporter*, 6611, 2020–21, p. 437) was approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 26 March 2021.

**Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 31 March 2021**

The Graces submitted to the Regent House on 31 March 2021 (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 466) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 9 April 2021.

**Congregation of the Regent House on 27 March 2021**

A Congregation of the Regent House was held by videoconference at 11 a.m. The necessary Officers were present. All the Graces (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 465) 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, 23 March 2021**

A Discussion was held by videoconference. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Mr Roger Mosey was presiding, with the Registrar's deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Junior Proctor and twenty-four other persons present.

The following item was discussed:

***Governance Review report: Membership of the Regent House***

(*Reporter*, 6609, 2020–21, p. 395).

Dr N. HOLMES (University Council and Department of Pathology):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am the Chair of the Governance Review Working Group which recommended this consultation document to Council and would like to make some remarks about the Working Group's deliberations before adding some personal observations of my own.

The Working Group was asked by the Council to consider issues of membership of the Regent House, the composition of the Council and the arrangements for Discussions such as we are having today. This consultative report is primarily concerned with the first of these issues, though noting in paragraph 31 the importance of reflecting any changes to Regent House membership in future consideration of Council.

The Working Group took a fundamental approach to the issue of Regent House membership and it is largely this which has resulted in the Working Group's unanimous recommendation to adopt a higher threshold for qualification for Regent House membership. We were mindful that the Regent House is the Governing Body of the University, with the responsibility for approving its legislative business and the power to propose their own measures. Proper exercise of this responsibility does require experience, time and a confident independence. While these qualities are not confined to staff in Grades 9–12, we concluded that they are considerably more common among such staff.

We were also concerned to retain a strong voice for established academic faculty and to avoid a significant adverse movement in the balance of arts and humanities versus science and technology. 36% of our academic staff are within the two of our six Schools which focus on arts and humanities, but only 11% of Grade 7/8 research staff. Inclusion of such staff necessarily reduces the overall representation of 'the arts' regardless of other factors and the more research staff included, the greater the science dominance.

We did not expect the recommendation for a Grade 9 qualification to be uncontroversial. It is certainly not intended to reflect any suggestion that a valuable contribution to the work of the University is not made by all categories and grades of staff. I also wish to emphasise that the proposals will not result in the removal of any current members from the Roll of Regent House. Indeed, additional data have been published today on the *Reporter* website – they will be in tomorrow's official publication – which takes account of this 'grandfathering' proposal. Predictably, this analysis suggests that adverse effects on racial diversity are lessened by 'grandfathering'. We expect the representation of both BAME and women staff in the GG9 model to improve further as a result of the University's drive to improve diversity in senior roles.

I can also expand somewhat on the views of the Working Group on Council membership and Discussions. We expect to recommend that all staff and students should have the right to speak at Discussions as well as Regent House members and that new categories of membership be created to allow for the voices of non-Regent House members to be heard within Council.

*I want now to signal a shift in perspective and the following remarks are made in a personal capacity only.*

I fully accept that individuals in Grades 7 and 8 – or their equivalent posts before Grades existed – have made important contributions to the deliberations of the Regent House. If there was an effective and simple way to include just those in such Grades who fully engage, then I would be advocating it, but there is not. For many years, the University used Faculty membership as a sign of such engagement and though it was imperfect, it did some good. Sadly, some Faculties chose to remove the selectivity intended by this requirement and it became a 'faculty-code lottery'. A ballot of the Regent House replaced the Faculty qualification in 2019 with a three-year service requirement for those qualifying by virtue of holding posts as Research Associates and Computer Associates. This is also imperfect and I know many dislike it. The Working Group considered that it would be important to retain some form of selectivity if staff from Grades 7 and 8 were to be enfranchised.

Removal of a service requirement strengthens the case for a boundary at Grade 9. I favour inclusivity but not necessarily at any cost. So, I will be honest that the prospect of a Regent House including all staff at Grade 7 and above causes me grave concern. This Regent House would have more than 10,700 members and be one in which academic staff comprised less than 22% of those who are University staff. It would be dominated by a mix of early careers research staff (60% of whom spend less than three years at Cambridge) and professional service staff, 2/3rds of whom are in Grades 7 and 8. Such an imbalance strikes me as one which risks poor future decisions.

I want to end on a personal note. I can see how easy it would be to disparage my concerns as coming from a white, middle-aged man in Grade 10. However, I myself have been a postdoc. It was many years ago and at another research-intensive University. I had no say in the governance of that institution and I did not expect one. I expected to stay there for no more than five years and lacked the perspective to help shape their future. I had opinions certainly, including strongly negative views on the way that institution treated, not postdocs like myself, but its junior faculty. Nevertheless, it seemed right, even at the time, that I had no power to propose change or to support it, rather that such decisions should be in the hands of those with a longer term stake in the institution.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it is good to have this thoughtful Consultation document put up for early Discussion. It lists expectations, including that members of the Regent House will take the time to familiarise themselves with the University's governance and contribute to Discussions. This would make membership a privilege with attached responsibilities which are well worth their stating, though it is not clear whether sanctions are envisaged against any members who neglect them.

It notes that twice recently radical changes have been made to the categories of employees eligible for membership of the Regent House (with effect from the

promulgation of the Roll in November 2019) and removing the age-limit (implemented from November 2020). These took place without addressing a fundamental question it would be good to have looked at properly now, when – as the Consultation describes – the members of the present Regent House have become untidily various in their relationship to the University.

The members of the democratic governing bodies of Cambridge have historically been its academics. When the Regent House took its present form as the University's governing body in the 1926 Statutes its members were guaranteed to be academics with at least M.A. status a requirement until 1994. The *Reporter's* record shows a community of equals debating freely down the years in the published Discussions.

From 1926 until a quarter of a century ago there were few administrative University Officers in Cambridge, the Registry, and from 1885 an Assistant Registry who had become three Assistant Registraries by 1921. However, it was long a convention that even the Registry did not make remarks in Discussions. In the last half century English universities have gained large bodies of administrators, Cambridge among them.

Its administrative University Officers are members of the Regent House. It remains vanishingly rare for members in the UAS to speak in Discussions. I remember an occasion some years ago when I suggested one might do so. She was told off by the then Registry who said it was not an acceptable practice for an administrator to speak. That could suggest a serious imbalance between the responsibilities of membership accepted by academics and those deemed to apply to administrators. Why is there this difference and does it matter? The present Consultation experiments with wording about the qualification for membership, skirting uneasily round this problem. It suggests that all members should

appreciate the importance of teaching and research to the University's endeavours, although it is not considered a prerequisite for members to be engaged directly in those activities themselves.

It includes 'providing professional support' for teaching and research. Adding 'in a more senior role' at that point is unfortunate in lending credence to the emerging unconstitutional language of 'Senior Leadership'.

I can best point to a potential danger in this gulf between the academic and the administrative approach to contributing to Discussions by quoting from the Wass Syndicate archive. It contains a memo from the then Secretary General. He deprecated the way 'members of the Regent House regard themselves as sharers in decision-making rather than simply as employees of the University'. He criticised 'the spirit of independence' and 'the culture' of 'a self-governing community of scholars which is administered rather than managed'. 'I can think of no useful role for the Regent House', he added.

I am not suggesting that anything like that mindset may be found in the current UAS or among the administrators in Departments. Administrative staff are endlessly helpful and do not seem to position themselves personally for trench warfare with academics. But they work in a differently managed framework where they do not seem to feel free to give their personal views in Discussion. That could matter if they outnumbered the academic members when it came to a ballot.

How did so many non-academic additions come to be made to the membership of the Regent House? A clause in the Education Reform Act 1988, the legislation which removed old-fashioned academic tenure, required

universities to adopt procedures to protect academics against unfair dismissal. Cambridge Statute C I 3(a) preserves the wording of the Act's protection of academics against 'placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges' for exercising their academic freedom'.

However, s. 203(4) of the Act added that:

Any reference in this section to academic staff includes a reference to persons whose terms of appointment or contracts of employment are, in the opinion of the Commissioners, so similar to those of academic staff as to justify their being treated as academic staff for the purposes of this section.

That appropriately extended the protection to the obviously academic-related such as senior librarians and laboratory staff and in due course to computing staff, but in Cambridge – and elsewhere – this led to the inclusion of a growing body of senior administrative staff.

After the Unified Administrative Service was set up under the supervision of the Council in 1996, Tim Mead as the new Registry energetically set about gaining the consent of Council to the identification of a new 'structure', which would make the UAS 'professional'. He proposed dividing it into several Divisions.<sup>1</sup> Each of these was to have its own Director as Head of a Division, with an emphasis on their being professionally qualified as appropriate.

There was protest that these senior appointments were being made to unestablished posts. 'Establishing' these posts and consequently making these Directors University Officers required an Ordinance. A Report on the Unified Administrative Service duly appeared on 3 March 2001, suggesting a dual role for these new Officers, who would both share in 'the senior management of the University' with a 'responsibility to help in policy development', and be responsible for the management of the Unified Administrative Service and its Divisions.<sup>2</sup> So this went some way towards shifting the traditional 'civil service' approach of the University's administrators towards encouraging them to see themselves as 'managers'.

On the evidence of the Consultation, the distinction between established and unestablished posts and its relationship to entitlement to membership of the Regent House would bear close scrutiny. Today a sizeable proportion of administrative staff hold established University Offices, for example, as Assistant Registraries and Senior Assistant Registraries. Nevertheless, the Consultation draws 'attention to the growth in the number of unestablished roles, particularly in academic-related positions'. The Consultation notes that there are 'numerous examples of individuals carrying out the same academic-related jobs side by side, one with the additional rights of an established office and the other without'. The Consultation also points to the problem caused by appointments to a variety of titles not known to the *Statutes and Ordinances*. Defining membership of the Regent House 'by the titles of the roles held' is therefore, it suggests, 'no longer a practicable means for identifying qualifying roles, as the number of individual titles has proliferated. This has led to apparent incoherences, for example 'the inclusion of senior Computer Associates in Grade I but not their managers'.

The Commissioners under the 1988 Act – one of whom was Cambridge's then Vice-Chancellor David Williams – were to draw up model procedures to be used to ensure the Act's protections of academic staff. These, amended to fit each University, became Statute U in Cambridge. After the Technical Review of the Statutes, they are now to be found in a Schedule to Statute C, pending their eventual demotion to a lower level in the University's domestic legislation, as

explained in Statute C I 8. However, for the first time this new Statute C brought established and unestablished staff together in the Statutes by making provision ‘for employment generally by the University’, and replacing the former ‘Statute D (about University officers) and Statute U (about ‘academic staff’)’.<sup>3</sup>

Burrow in the confusingly-arranged HR website and you will discover routes to the procedures still applicable to University Officers only; those applicable to ‘unestablished academic and academic-related staff, including contract research staff’; and those to be found for everyone else in the Assistant Staff Handbook. It is particularly regrettable that there has also been a huge expansion of unestablished academic posts among the contract research staff, who are certainly ‘academic’. The post-1988 ‘Officer’ procedures can be changed only by Grace, the others more easily. That all seems to merit some tidying up.

The Consultation suggests that the ‘distinction between established and unestablished roles could be set aside across the membership of the Regent House by the adoption of a simpler model based on grade. ‘Grades’ came to Cambridge after Higher Education Role Analysis was forced on universities from 2000. Cambridge carried out the necessary but not uncontroversial process of lining up its academic and non-academic staff on equivalent grades. In March 2007, in the wake of its ‘North Reforms’, Oxford adopted its own Grade 8 as its qualifying grade for membership of Congregation including those ‘assessed as equivalent’ (Oxford Statute IV, 3–4). That can lead to some confusion about entitlement there, with a few new members of Congregation published in most issues of the Gazette.

When the Regent House was established in 1926 to replace the Senate as the University’s governing body the reason for this change was a recognition that the Senate, composed of holders of the M.A. Degree and above, was too large to function as an effective governing body. That is arguably the case again now. For Cambridge to choose its Grade 9 as the qualifying grade would be the best way to place limits on its growing even bigger, though even that would reduce this year’s Roll (4,730) only to 3,713.

But would it ensure that the democratic governance of the University is still essentially academic, or at least that the academic-related members whose work is not genuinely ‘so similar to those of academic staff as to justify their being treated as academic staff’ will feel free to contribute their personal views to Discussions without having to get permission from a line manager in the Old Schools?

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Council on the Unified Administrative Service, 21 March 2001, <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2000-01/weekly/5842/19.html>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2000-01/weekly/5842/19.html>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2010-11/weekly/6233/section7.shtml>

Mr B. BAGGS (University Information Services):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I read with interest the recent report on the consultation on Regent House membership. This subject is a door on which I have been banging for years. I therefore welcome the report. I still, however, have serious concerns about the proposals and do not think they go far enough.

My concern is this: as a Grade 5 this report implies my opinions, and other staff below Grade 7, aren’t worthy of the Regent House, or rather they are of less importance to those of staff at grades above. This surely is wrong.

As a staff member with a long service record I perhaps more than most have a very keen interest in the University’s affairs and want a say in debate and to be able to vote.

I am also a regular reader of the *Reporter* – this makes me very rare amongst my colleagues, most of whom are often on higher grades. In fact, I am usually the one who provides a succinct summary of the *Reporter* to them, and highlights sections that may be of interest.

I cannot see how is it possible to use such a crude criterion as grade to decide to exclude me, and others on the lower grades, from the Regent House and debate? The use of these arbitrary divisions is most unhelpful. Why not allow all staff members membership? What is the Regent House so scared of? If all staff could be members it would lead to a much more equitable situation and align much more closely with the University’s professed claims of fair and equal treatment for all staff. This whole situation is not too dissimilar to fighting for representation and votes in any sphere, whether for those of an under-class or for that of women.

Of which, it was interesting to see that there are more women staff members than men, yet under both proposals this will not be reflected in the membership of the Regent House. It would be interesting to see the gender split on lower grades. Without this data but at a rough guess it is the lower grades that are mainly occupied by women. Therefore, the suggested proposals would be disenfranchising them and would thus be an exclusionary and sexist policy. If either proposal is accepted women’s opinions would knowingly be being excluded from the Regent House and debate. This cannot be right.

Surely the time is ripe for a generation-defining shake-up and invigoration of the Regent House.

One staff member, one vote. It’s that simple.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it might be appropriate to link pay and Regent House membership. But if so, is now the right time?

Pay is determined by a role grading process, introduced in 2006, called HERA. It was introduced in haste to reduce the threat of legal action in equal pay cases. The methodology and intellectual property of HERA is owned by ECC Ltd, and is considered to be a commercial secret. I am one of a small minority in Cambridge who has been trained to grade roles using HERA, to the point at which I could score a role by hand without using ECC’s online tool. At the time I first did this, it was not clear if anyone else in the University could.

I find it unsettling that we grade the roles of assistant and academic-related staff using a process whose details we are not permitted to share for fear of infringing commercial rights. There are plenty of concerns at all levels about how well HERA works in Cambridge, especially for specialist technical roles. A few years ago some joint work by the three local Unions and HR uncovered several anomalies. Until there is a thorough review of how HERA is operating, which there has not been in the fifteen years since its introduction, I would find it hard to support a widening of its scope.

It might be appropriate to link pay and Regent House membership. But it might not be.

The Regent House is one of the bodies which governs the University. The University is generally thought of as a self-governing body of scholars who are active in research and teaching. Of course it also employs other staff who are essential to its smooth operation, but who are its employees, not its members, and a society’s governors should generally be drawn from its members.

Membership of the University is precisely defined in *Statutes and Ordinances*, and one becomes a member through matriculation. Current students, all graduates, and all members of the Regent House are entitled to speak at Discussions. Given the importance of today's topic, the Vice-Chancellor, as is his right, has exceptionally extended permission to attend and speak to all members, which includes, amongst others, de-registered students who have not graduated.

One might imagine that the membership of the Regent House is drawn from the more senior members of the University. That has not been the case for some while. Research Associates and Computer Associates who are not members of the University may still automatically become members of the Regent House. This does not make them members of the University. So the Regent House currently probably contains a couple of hundred people who have not taken any form of matriculation oath. Those who do matriculate become members of the University for life. The University does not believe in its membership being coterminous with one's employment, but rather membership is for life.

Reform is needed, particularly to address anomalies around Computer Associates. Who can justify Computer Associates being the only category of unestablished academic-related staff entitled to membership? (And I speak as someone who once was a Computer Associate.)

I naïvely thought that this was a minor issue. Whereas Computer Associate was the job title of unestablished IT staff in the pre-HERA days in which IT staff had their own salary scale, since the introduction of HERA in 2006 the title has been little used and is heading for extinction.

However, those drawing up the Roll have used a very broad interpretation of the term Computer Associate in Ordinance, regarding any unestablished post whose job description suggests IT or IT management to be covered by the phrase 'Computer Associates, Grades I, II, and III' of Ordinance. In 2018 there was a Report<sup>1</sup> and a Grace to remove the anomaly that research staff up to Senior Research Associates could be members of the Regent House, but the higher grades of Principal Research Associate and Director of Research were omitted. No such Grace was needed for Senior Computer Associates, for it seems that posts whose best match would have been to that of Senior Computer Associate in the old naming scheme are being included anyway, presumably deemed to be no more than Grade I Computer Associates.

Strangely this largess does not appear to extend to the unestablished Deputy Directors of the UIS, even though one might have considered them to be IT managers.

It does not seem reasonable that our current rules give the Registry's office such scope for interpretation, or such a burden of working out which roles are, or are not, IT-related. Is a web post a content and communications post, or a technical IT post?

Every time we hear of a set of people excluded from the Regent House, and let another category in, participation rates seem to fall. There are some outside who want to be inside, but most do not. Some might like a choice. Currently Regent House membership cannot be refused or resigned, save by quitting one's post. If it is to be an integral part of one's job, rather than arising from one's membership of the University, presumably one's performance in keeping abreast of the business of the Regent House becomes an employment issue.

I believe that the Regent House should be smaller: Fellows and Established Officers. I also happen to believe that there should be some Established research positions.

One might argue that this proposal is too modest, and one should include just Fellows. Fellows, through their membership of their SCRs, are likely to have a social circle which includes members of other Departments, and this gives them a much wider, and more balanced, view of the University and are better able to make disinterested decisions for the benefit of the University as a whole. Those whose experience of the University is limited to a single Department may have a much less balanced view, and therefore are less useful in decision-making. Some might say that my proposal would have another clear advantage; it would terminate my membership, though not my ability to speak at Discussions.

Given that all undergraduates may speak at Discussions, it would seem reasonable to extend that right to all research staff too. We currently regard attending and speaking at Discussions as a lesser right than that of being a Regent, and it seems odd to me to be considering including amongst our Regents those who currently cannot Discuss. Sometimes the Vice-Chancellor does choose to open Discussions to the very broad category of 'all employees of the University and Colleges' as he did for the Discussions on North West Cambridge,<sup>2</sup> on Prevent<sup>3</sup> and on the University's investments.<sup>4</sup> Sometimes other extensions are announced, such as 'all employees of the University who are members of the USS' for a USS Discussion,<sup>5</sup> or just 'members of the collegiate University', as is the case today.<sup>6</sup>

I do not believe that pay determines who should govern a community of researchers and teachers, nor do I believe that pay is a proxy for seniority. As one example, in matters of governance, I believe that postdocs should rank before people in the Investment Office. In the matter of pay, that is not realistic.

Currently research staff, including postdocs, enjoy a well-deserved special status with respect to Regent House membership, a status which they have shared with Computer Associates for decades. Indeed, the inclusion of Computer Associates dates from an era in which computers were rare, bespoke items whose care involved many of the aspects of a research role, and whose carers often had a research background. That is not generally the case today. This Report makes postdocs equal to any other Grade 7 staff member, despite the fact that postdocs are always research active, and often active in teaching too, whereas other Grade 7 staff are generally not. If the University is serious about its commitment to research and teaching, it should not be ashamed to favour those directly engaged in research and teaching, particularly in matters relating to its governance. It may wish to consider ways of balancing such favouritism to reduce the extent to which a PI's 'contract research staff' can outvote the PI.

We need to be clearer about who we, as members of the University, are, and whom we employ to assist the academic community, but not to join or govern it. To say that these two categories are distinct is not to say that one is unessential or unvalued. The risks of confusion have been known for millennia, set to verse by Kipling, but attributed to Agur long before him. This being a community of scholars, I will end with Jerome's translation.

*Per tria movetur terra,  
Et quartum non potest sustinere:  
Per servum, cum regnaverit.*

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 6494, 2017–18, p. 385.

<sup>2</sup> *Reporter*, 6400, 2015–16, p. 53.

<sup>3</sup> *Reporter*, 6423, 2015–16, p. 479.

<sup>4</sup> *Reporter*, 6486, 2017–18, p. 145.

<sup>5</sup> *Reporter*, 6497, 2017–18, p. 412.

<sup>6</sup> *Reporter*, 6611, 2020–21, p. 431.

Mr T. N. MILNER (Darwin College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I comment very much in a personal capacity, although these thoughts do follow a second period of service on the Board of Scrutiny; governance being an area which routinely attracts its attention. The Governance Review Working Group will have faced a difficult task addressing this particular aspect of governance and I congratulate them and those who have supported them on providing the basis for a balanced and careful report.

It presents a variety of information about the Regent House as it is now and might be under the proposed changes. Perhaps one should be cautious, however, about focusing too hard on overall size. A particular aspect of the Senate as the governing body, which the 1926 changes and creation of the modern Regent House tried to address, was not just size with respect to its normal operations, but its majority of non-resident alumni members, able to overwhelm resident opinion by force of numbers over particular issues. Those actively engaged in the work of the institution would seem to be in a rather different position.

The 1926 reforms created a Regent House as a subset of the Senate, but very different in both size and composition from what we have now, or would have under either of the options for change. Option G7+ would take it up to 8,000, while G9 would take it down to just under 6,000. A Regent House even of this latter size cannot expect to operate on the basis of regular personal contact or membership anything like as settled and uniform in experience as its predecessors of not so very long ago. When thinking of the stated principles which should underly membership and (d) to (f) in particular, I could not but help recalling the persistent difficulties, concerning to the Board from an early stage (and the Council too) around getting members of the Regent House to engage. Will increasing or decreasing the current membership by a thousand have much impact on this, or indeed on its effectiveness or otherwise as a governing body? Unless there is greater engagement, probably not.

As worthy of attention is perhaps the potential impact on both the age-profile (at a time when we have just returned to membership or continued as members a significant group of those aged over 70) and on the proportion of women and BAME staff, matters carefully detailed in the report. As acknowledged, if we do move to G9, then some fully-active staff, by chance or intent in longer-term service and so acquiring understanding and experience and exercising significant responsibility, may no longer qualify, or arrive at membership only late on. This could influence both their potential contribution and retention, financial rewards apart.

Section thirty-one details ways in which the Council may seek to engage staff in the governance processes. The recommendations of the Wass Syndicate some years ago resulted in a decision to remove membership of a Board or Syndicate as a qualification for inclusion in the Regent House. While it might be inappropriate in relation to, for example, a Board of Electors, some opportunities for committee service by longer-serving staff, centrally or at Faculty/Departmental/institutional level might offer another route into either Regent House membership or wider engagement in governance?

Professor R. J. ANDERSON (Department of Computer Science and Technology, and Churchill College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Cambridge stands at a crossroad. Will we remain a self-governing community of scholars or become something more like a workers' collective?

The typical university, both here and overseas, is run by a self-perpetuating elite, where Vice-Chancellors appoint senior administrators who select nomination committees that appoint trustees and in due course the new Vice-Chancellor. In Cambridge this natural process of elite capture is mitigated by the Council, about half of which is elected by the Regent House, and by the Regent House itself. I have served three terms on Council as an elected representative of the Professors and Readers, and initially stood for election to block a plan by the elite to appropriate all academic intellectual property. On average there have been about half a dozen members of Council who were prepared to stand up to bad ideas from the administration, and I believe we have made a real difference.

Most of the issues that members of the Regent House cared about had to do with creeping bureaucracy and the burden of compliance. We know the theory: as a computer scientist I teach students how the time it takes to run a program with  $N$  participants may be proportional to  $N$ , to  $N \log N$ , to  $N$  squared or even more, depending on the design. We have less data on the practice, and indeed we are offered no figures on the precise breakdown of the current Roll of the Regent House. However, when Graham Allen retired as Academic Secretary in 2015, he told us that when he first came to Cambridge in 1983 the officers in the General Board office numbered 16 but by the time he left the comparable figure for the Academic Division was around 200. This is going to get worse as the University grows. I also hold a 20% post at Edinburgh which is twice the size of Cambridge in terms of student numbers; the overhead is an extra layer of administration and a significantly greater compliance burden. If Cambridge is going to double in size during the career of today's junior academics, we had better think of the likely consequences now.

In the Colleges, we have been careful with the franchise. At Churchill, we don't give the vote to By-Fellows, or to Emeritus Fellows other than former Masters. The University has been more generous, as Professor Evans has described. We extended the vote from teaching officers to other officers, as they were mostly librarians, museum curators and computer officers – many of whom had Ph.D.s, published academic papers, or supervised students.

We are now in a different place. Thanks to the casualisation of academia worldwide, most of our employees who are active researchers are now Research Associates rather than officers. Back in 2018, the Regent House was persuaded by a narrow margin to disenfranchise RAs who had not worked at Cambridge for long enough. That was in my view a mistake, like Brexit; but it was a mistake that may be somewhat easier to rectify. Regent House already appeared to change its mind later that year when it elected Dr Sam Ainsworth to the Council. Unfortunately the senior management team decided not to grandfather Sam and he was expelled from the Council. I am pleased to hear from Dr Holmes that his current proposals have learned from that mistake.

This is not the only recent policy decision in which a legalistic 'human resources' approach has been taken to matters that should really be decided in the context of the University as a community of scholars. The recent UIS decision to remove Hermes email accounts from emeritus staff, followed by a screeching U-turn and a promise to make an exception for Regents, should give pause for

thought. We should also take note of the proposal that Affiliate and Associate Lecturers lose their membership of the Regent House. The Old Schools appear to have been taken over by the HR lawyers on these issues.

If, as some on Council suggest, we enfranchise everyone from Grade 7, while excluding Affiliate and Associate Lecturers, and RAs with less than three years' service, then will scholars have a majority at all? Dr Holmes warns us that in a Regent House of over 10,000 we would not be. Dr Rutter reminds us that the HERA grading system is a commercial secret, and in any case setting the vote by a pay grade discriminates against scholars. A computer scientist who works for us as a lecturer earns about half what they would earn if working as an engineer; this already leads to anomalies around computer staff and others.

And even if we follow Dr Holmes, go for Grade 9 and have a small majority of scholars, how long will it last, given the growth in the Press and Assessment, and on what moral grounds can we resist a call to enfranchise all the Assistant Staff too? Dr Holmes concedes that all staff should have the right to speak at the Regent House; can we forever deny them the vote? Mr Baggs makes that point with great eloquence. Breakpoints on pay are not defensible; if there are no other criteria then the only sustainable position in the long run is a workers' cooperative. It is perfectly intellectually respectable to argue that Cambridge University should become an organisation like the Co-op, particularly in a Labour town like Cambridge. However, I doubt a majority of Regents would support it. And hard experience – at the Co-op, at mutual building societies and elsewhere – suggests that a pure workers' cooperative is highly vulnerable to elite capture.

My own vision for Cambridge remains the one that served us so well down the centuries: that of a self-governing community of scholars. I therefore propose that future admission to the Regent House should be limited to employees with a Ph.D., which was more or less a description of the House when I joined the staff in 1995. It would clearly be wrong to expel existing Regents, the way Council expelled Sam Ainsworth. But new staff members should not become Regents unless or until they earn a doctorate, or perhaps meet some criterion by publication or by their contribution to teaching. If some precedent is called for, Professor Evans noted that since 1926 we have restricted voting in the Senate to M.A. holders. Requiring a Ph.D. would adjust for grade inflation.

We have fudged this issue for years by minor tweaks to our Ordinances. But we now come to a decision point. Will Cambridge continue to be a self-governing community of scholars, or will that be allowed to fade away? Will the Colleges alone remain as real communities, whose members can cause real trouble when their leadership takes a wrong turn, or can we keep the University's leadership accountable too? For these reasons, membership of the Regent House must continue to be based on scholarship, as it has been since its establishment in 1926.

Ms K. M. JEARY (University Information Services):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the Cambridge Security Incident Response Team and I have worked for this University for nearly thirty years.

Briefly I am appalled by these proposals. I spent over ten years on temporary contracts before being made a member of the Regent House, in itself a cause of anxiety but I accepted this because there were many others in the same position. When I was finally made a member of the Regent House (after two *ad hominem* promotions) the relief and the sense of belonging was immediate and important to me.

These proposals look to destroy the basis of the collegiate University as I have known it. That removes any sense of commitment from academic-related, research and other more junior staff in a time when many of them are already under great strain because of Covid-19 and lockdown. To those who want to continue as full members of the collegiate University these proposals are a kick in the teeth.

At a time when the University is under great and continuing strain the answer to the current problems is not less democracy; it is, if anything, more. We will all be the poorer and less diverse as an institution if the proposals are adopted as they stand.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a University Computer Officer based in University Information Services, and a long-standing UCU<sup>1</sup> member, departmental representative and caseworker. With appreciation for the Working Group's efforts and the Governance Review report on Membership of the Regent House, it was helpful to see the concrete proposals for change. While there clearly has been great effort to try to find a fair option for greater representation in our precious University democracy, the concerns still linger that we have not yet found the best path for these vital principles of fairness and representation suitable for the needs of our great University.

Psalms 133 reminds us about 'how good and how pleasant it is for people to live [... and we might add work ...] together in unity!' Gandhi noted that 'Our ability to reach unity in diversity will be the beauty and the test of our civilization.' Mary Parker Follett, a pioneer of organisational theory and behaviour, suggested that 'Unity, not uniformity, must be our aim. We attain unity only through variety.' Overall, democracy requires and thrives on greater diversity in our community, and the greater is our democracy the greater is our University. Regrettably, the current proposals would seem to create greater imbalances in many categories, except perhaps for the G7+ proposal, however it would need an adjustment to be more fair.

The very helpful but often neglected Behavioural Attributes Framework<sup>2</sup> kindly provided by HR include a stress on *Valuing Diversity, People Development, Negotiating and Influencing*. The similarly neglected Leadership Attributes Framework,<sup>3</sup> kindly provided by PPD (the Personal and Professional Development team) and intended for the more senior members of the University, have a similar emphasis in these and other categories, which includes *Develop people and mentorship* as important for teams and the wider community. We need to ensure that any resulting changes help improve and advance both the individuals as well as the whole of our University community.

Focusing on the proposed G7+ option, while neither it nor other proposals can alone resolve imbalances in the number of women and BAME colleagues represented, the G7+ model seems likely to provide the best means by

which to expand inclusivity and participation. However why should there be the suggested service requirement of three years before inclusion and participation in the Regent House? The primary concern is surely that it takes time to get to understand the workings of the University and of the Regent House. Why is this? Might it be that we do not make it straightforward to get to know just how this body and the University more generally works? I have the privilege of organising inductions for new IT professionals in the collegiate University, an induction which includes some necessary clues into just how the University is organised and how it works. Of course included in this is an introduction concerning the role of Regent House.

Would it not help to have an induction into the processes and protocols for the Regent House, for new members? This would help support the case for helping Grade 7 and above members be aware, involved and active in Regent House activities at an early stage – and the development and mentoring involved would be meeting the call and the serious purposes noted in the attributes frameworks mentioned earlier. In fact, and Regent House induction might be more generally helpful for all new staff, as a matter of course. Regardless of the timing and the decision about the current proposals, I and other members of the Cambridge branch of UCU would be happy to help organise this, along with other University groups. As a serious proposal, shall we start such an induction process, and ideally at the soonest?

<sup>1</sup> University and College Union, see <https://www.ucu.org.uk>.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/policies-procedures/behavioural-attributes/behavioural-attributes-framework>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ppd.admin.cam.ac.uk/leadership-development/leadership-attributes-framework>

Ms J. A. LANGLEY (University Information Services), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a Computer Officer at the University Information Services. I joined the University at the Department of Engineering in 2003 and the Regent House seven years later.

My experience of the current arrangements for membership of the Regent House is that they are arbitrary and that we need to overhaul them. But we must do that in a way that is neither arbitrary nor discriminatory.

Several of my co-workers joined the Department of Engineering at around the same time as me; they happened to be men. They were put forward for membership of the Regent House right away when they joined. I received no induction when I joined, and it wasn't until seven years later, as they discussed voting on some matter, that I realised that they had this privilege, and I did not. Over the years, I saw my male contemporaries promoted as I languished at my original Grade 7. By the time I left, they were all Grade 9. Shortly before I left, a male G9 colleague left, and his duties fell on my shoulders in addition to my existing ones. I had to strongly protest the situation before the Department even considered promoting me to G8 in partial recognition of this. I left when it became clear that I was being victimised for protesting the discriminatory treatment I received. Fortunately, I now work in a department that appreciates my work and treats me fairly.

What is the relevance of this to Regent House membership?

1. Membership should be automatic for those who qualify for it. Cases like mine, where someone is simply forgotten about for years, should not happen.

2. The grade-based proposals set minimum grades of either G7 or G9. I believe that setting the minimum at G9 would discriminate against women and minorities.
3. Setting a service requirement for some grades of staff (7 and 8) but not others would also discriminate against women and minorities based on an unfounded assumption about their attitudes and commitment to the University.
4. Having a more diverse group of people involved improves decision-making, so setting discriminatory membership thresholds for membership of the Regent House is not only wrong, it's bad for the University.

What evidence formed the basis of the three-year service requirement in the G7+ model?

Dr R. CHARLES (University Council and University Information Services), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the Council, a manager in the University Information Services and a member of UCU. I am generally supportive of both the Report and the consultative approach followed in presenting it to the University. I attended last week's online consultation and listened carefully to what was said.

I welcome the proposed simplification of a grade-based model for membership. In this pay grades are used as a proxy for seniority. That seems a reasonable approach for identifying the more senior people who should collectively make up our Governing Body. Such a model addresses and removes many of the inequalities, resentments and confusions that have emerged over the years surrounding membership as our employment practices have evolved and more staff are recruited on a variety of contracts. It also has the potential to create a more inclusive and representative Governing Body, with the added benefit that it would be much more straightforward to administer.

If we adopt a grade-based model the question becomes where should the threshold for membership lie? The report offers us two options:

- Grade 9: where University Lecturers normally start.
- Grade 7+: where most research staff are normally appointed. This would also involve a qualifying period of three years for staff in Grades 7 and 8 only.

The G9 model would reduce the size of the Regent House. We know from our annual Equality and Diversity reports that Grade 9 is also the point where, to put it bluntly, the University starts to become more male, pale, and stale.

The alternative Grade 7+ model would create a slightly larger and more diverse Regent House. One that more closely reflects the current make-up of the University. It would enable greater representation of women and BAME staff. It would include more of our younger staff. All of these groups bring with them different perspectives and I believe extending the ability to take part in the University's Governance would lead to better and more inclusive decision-making. Consequently, I support setting the threshold at Grade 7, but am unconvinced that applying a qualifying period only to staff below Grade 9 has merit. Our local UCU branch agrees with this and last week passed a motion supporting the adoption of the grade-based model. The union also supports a Grade 7 threshold without any service requirement as such would be discriminatory.

I will now turn to the arguments that have been put forward against the Grade 7 proposal. These centre around five broad themes:

- that the Regent House may become too large;
- that the Regent House should primarily consist of academics;
- that the interests of those making decisions about the long-term future of the University should be closely aligned with the long-term interests of the University;
- that enfranchising more people will dilute rather than increase participation; and
- that other forms of representation will be available for the disenfranchised.

A lot has been made of the issue of size. From the Equality and Diversity impact assessment<sup>1</sup> we learn that the G7+ model would create a larger Regent House (5,873) which poses ‘administrative and efficiency challenges’. Quite what these challenges might be are never articulated. This is curious as one of the drivers of the proposal is to simplify membership, and by extension how the Roll is compiled. A grade-based model would in fact greatly simplify this. All ballots and elections are now online using systems designed to scale with the numbers using them. I see no reason why an increase in size would lead to additional administrative and efficiency challenges. Put simply, this is a red herring.

More compelling is the view that the Regent House should continue to have a majority drawn from those most heavily involved in teaching and research. I agree – our essence and strength comes from being a diverse community of scholars. The question is which of those scholars deserve a voice?

Would academic voices really lose their primacy if the G7 model was adopted? Here those favouring a G9 threshold draw a separation between ‘academics’ and ‘researchers’, while teaching staff are not mentioned at all. Have we forgotten that our research and teaching staff are also academics? The vast majority of these groups will only be enfranchised if we adopt the G7 threshold. Comparing the G9 and G7 models we discover that combining those separately categorised as ‘academics’ and ‘researchers’ would account respectively for 74.5% or 64.7% of a reformed Regent House. Both thresholds leave academics in the majority. What is gained with the Grade 7 model is greater diversity and a broader range of perspectives. These can only benefit a forward-looking University.

There is little substantive to suggest that the interests of staff on Grades 7 and 8 are less well aligned with the long-term interests of the University than those on higher grades. Instead, the reality that more staff in those grades are on fixed-term contracts is presumed to separate their interests from that of the University. If this is the case then adopting the G7 model would have the bonus of better aligning both.

It is also true that more academic-related staff would be included with a Grade 7 threshold. This would include Departmental Administrators, Computer Officers and Librarians many of whom are already Regents. All are used to engaging with complex ideas, debates and have a vested interest in the future success of the University. In these groups the feature that tends to separate a Grade 9 post from those at 7 and 8 is whether they hold line management responsibilities. I suggest that whether someone is a line manager or not is a poor basis for determining whether they can engage effectively with University business, or indeed whether their interests are aligned with those of the University.

A lack of engagement and participation was another concern raised in last week’s consultation Q&A meeting. It is true that participation rates in elections and ballots are relatively low but suggesting that expanding the number of Regents will do little to address a democratic deficit seems illogical. There is nothing to support this argument and everything to suggest that extending the membership to a wider constituency at Grades 7 and 8 will rejuvenate membership and invigorate participation. I suggest that we will get more and better engagement with democratic decision-making with greater enfranchisement, not less.

Finally, we come to a problematic area. A view that was repeated twice during last week’s Q&A meeting in the most reasonable of tones: that whilst it was recognised that all groups should have a voice, this did not mean they should have a vote and other ways will be available for those disenfranchised voices to be heard. It is a line we’ve heard before. One that has been used to keep groups disenfranchised since the dawn of time. It is the weakest of arguments, but one often put forward by those with power to those without. ‘Trust us’ they say, ‘there will be ways you can have a say too’, but it is never the way that really counts, is it? Consultations can be ignored – it is the fact that a consultation has taken place that is important – we have gone through the motions. But votes do matter. The right to a vote matters. Who has a say on the future of our University matters. This Report is all about ensuring that those best placed to make judgements about the future of the University have that vote.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2020-21/weekly/6609/RH-EqualityImpactAssessment.pdf>

Dr Y. T. CHUA (President of the Postdocs of Cambridge Society, and Department of Computer Science and Technology), Dr J. P. BATTIS (Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies) and Dr J. D. KAGGIE (Department of Radiology and Downing College), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, we, the President and Officers of the Postdoctoral Society of Cambridge, strongly oppose the proposed threshold for membership at Grade 9, resulting in the removal of Grade 7 and Grade 8 Research Associates from the Regent House. We believe that administrative simplicity is not a sufficient reason to disenfranchise staff. The University relies on the contributions of unestablished staff, and their perspectives are vital to the University.

The G7+ model is already in use, and a related model has previously existed with Grade 7+ members within Regent House. Excluding members who have historically been part of Regent House would be inappropriate, especially for those who have committed three or more years of service to this University. In addition, the G9 model would decrease the representation of BAME members, thus reversing current institutional efforts in diversity, equality and inclusion.

The consultation suggests that Grade 7 and 8 members on fixed-term contracts lack the ‘long-term perspective’ required for responsible governance. We agree that the current Regent House membership model fails to extend rights to departmental administrators and other deserving staff who have worked within the University multiple years. One might argue that these staff actually have a longer future to consider than those who are near retirement (yet not facing similar questions about membership rights), but we maintain that all of these perspectives are important.



These inequities should not be mobilised as a pretense to strip Grade 7+ research staff of their voice and representation in governance.

Furthermore, it is wholly inequitable to enfranchise teaching staff within Regent House while excluding research staff employed at equivalent levels. Length of employment has been cited as a rationale for the proposed change in membership, but teaching staff can hold shorter contracts than peers in research positions. An increasing number of Grade 7 research associates hold unestablished roles for ever longer, and repeated, periods.

We support the view that rights should be recognised and protected across greater segments of the Cambridge community, as we become more egalitarian and protective of those in sensitive positions. The steady increase in unestablished roles and shorter contract lengths in recent years necessitates membership privileges in Regent House.

Finally, we note that extending rights to all Grade 7 staff would not cause material change to the current model. However, a shift to the G9 model would deal a blow to the diversity of an institution that is meant to represent the University community. As noted in the *Reporter*, the move to the G9 model would disenfranchise 12% of BAME staff, a disconcerting and unwelcome step in the wrong direction.

For the above reasons, we believe that Regent House membership should be uniformly extended to all staff at Grade 7 and above. At the very least, the Regent House should reject the proposal for the G9 model and preserve the membership rights made possible by the G7+ model under consideration.

Dr S. R. KELL (Christ's College), read by the Senior Proctor: Deputy Vice-Chancellor, both options proposed in this report will significantly increase the proportion of Regents drawn from roles under the unhelpfully vague heading of 'Professional Services'. It appears the report proposes to do away with the Regent House as nominally a primarily academic body. It is curious that the text of the report does little to highlight or justify such a change, which is made apparent mainly in the charts.

Such a change would further erode the practice of academic self-governance. The report disingenuously implies a precedent exists in the inclusion of research staff in the Regent House, whom it labels as 'non-academic' (with a lower-case 'a'). An upper-case 'A' might have sufficed to make this statement technically correct, but in any case this is a false representation. When I and others moved for more inclusive membership criteria in relation to the so-called 'postdoctoral community', a prime motivation was that Research staff are emphatically *not* a community apart, but rather already *de facto* a part of the University's unique academic community. They are people of academic training, academic values, on the academic career path, engaged directly in fulfilling the academic mission of the University. Despite that, many of them did and do hold no greater status in the University than 'people who do not exist' (to borrow a phrase from Professor Edwards).<sup>1</sup> As it happened, and entirely contrary to the report's claims, the Regent House opted *not* to enfranchise significantly more such non-people, when it narrowly approved Amendment 1 to Grace 1 of 27 June 2018. The Amendment's three-year qualifying period was concocted explicitly to ensure the number changed little; the Grace's effect was then merely to select a similar number by a less arbitrary criterion. By my reckoning the Regent House grew by 8% in November 2019, and some fraction of that is presumably attributable to the Grace, but that is scarcely a blip against the background of year-on-year increase;

similar increases have been observed in recent years without changes in membership criteria. With or without such small changes, one should not confuse this with the issue of enfranchising more staff who are truly non-academic with a small 'a'.

Academic self-governance matters because academic needs, culture and practice are often directly at odds with corporate culture and practice. At a time when university management, both in Cambridge and elsewhere, is increasingly corporate and therefore increasingly poorly aligned with academic needs, if anything it would better serve the University's mission to strengthen rather than erase this distinction. Therefore I hope the Regent House will find both of the report's proposed 'options' unacceptable.

The report's flaws do not end there, but I will highlight just one more. The proposed 'G9' option is misleadingly presented as 'resetting the level of seniority and experience required for enfranchisement'. Far from 'resetting' it to a prior state after some implied period of decay, the G9 proposal would in truth set the threshold higher than it has been set before. To pick just one point of reference: until 2003 when the position was abolished, University Assistant Lecturers were paid at the equivalent of Grade 7, were employed on a fixed-term basis, yet their disqualification as Regents would have been unthinkable. There has been no decline in the competence of Grade 7 Academic or Research staff to be involved in governance, nor in the importance of including less-than-senior staff in such processes. What has been hugely eroded, gradually over several decades, is the share of government research funding given on the block-grant basis that would allow creation of University Offices, as opposed to the project basis which today funds increasingly many precarious unestablished staff. So let me reiterate a question I asked in my remarks of 22 January 2019,<sup>2</sup> as yet unanswered by Council: what representations is the University making, or planning to make, to the UK government, its Research Councils and its Funding Councils, on the subject of reforming funding policy to enable healthier career structures at early- and mid-career stages? Only if this is done, perhaps in collaboration with other universities within the Russell Group, can the problem of perverse career structures be addressed. The bizarre and retrograde measures contemplated in the present report appear in part to be artifacts of that perversity.

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 6373, 2014–15, p. 362 at p. 364.

<sup>2</sup> *Reporter*, 6535, 2018–19, p. 376 at p. 379.

Mr M. R. ABBERTON (President of Cambridge UCU), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am contributing to this discussion as the President of the Cambridge University and College Union (UCU). At a branch meeting last week, members of Cambridge UCU voted overwhelmingly to support moving to a G7+ model for membership of the Regent House. We believe that the G7+ model under consideration would address many anomalies and inconsistencies in the way staff can qualify for membership, especially for academic-related staff. Conversely, we believe that adopting a G9 model would be unjust, regressive, and undemocratic. We believe systematic exclusion of major classes of staff engaged in academic and academic-related work will lead to poorer decision-making.

According to the *Reporter* of 4 March, Regent House members are required to 'make disinterested decisions for the benefit of the institution as a whole'. However, the membership is so unrepresentative of the whole institution

that it is difficult to see how it is fit for purpose. Academic staff make up 14% of University staff, yet almost 44% of the Regent House membership; under the G9 model favoured by the Governance Review Working Group, that last figure would rise to just short of 50%. Cambridge UCU represents academic, research and academic-related staff together; our members know how essential their collective efforts are for the running of the institution as a whole.

For too long, academic-related staff have been seen as second-class citizens. And yet without the work they do, the mission of this University – the ‘pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence’ – would be impossible. It cannot be right that academic-related staff make up over 50% of the staff at this University, yet under 20% of the Regent House roll. We oppose the tendency towards unestablished contracts, which led to this situation, but if it is not reversed then some way must be found to return this group of staff to the Regent House. If the status quo is untenable, the G9 model is little better: under that proposal, academic-related membership would rise to 22.9% of the roll, meaning less than half of academic-related staff would have Regent House rights.

Furthermore, it is hard to imagine how the pursuit of research can be furthered by disenfranchising researchers. A considerable and increasing amount of the work of this University is now performed by postdoctoral researchers employed at Grade 7 or 8 – not just research, but teaching as well. For those researchers, the suggestion that lower-paid staff lack the requisite expertise, objectivity, or long-term perspective to engage in decision-making is difficult to understand. Good decisions are made as a result of increasing the participation of diverse constituencies throughout the University, not restricting it to a narrower tranche of academic staff.

For many years, Cambridge UCU has called attention to the intersections of casualisation, low pay and inequality, where the University depends on a casualised workforce composed disproportionately of women and BAME workers. We have also been campaigning for more work on the gender and BAME pay gaps – the former standing currently at 18.4%, the latter still to be calculated properly. As a result women and BAME staff are disproportionately excluded under a G9 model. The figures in March’s *Reporter* should act as a wake-up call for the University. Instead, they seem to have been shrugged off by the Governance Review Working Group, which in spite of all the evidence still supports the G9 proposal.

For all these reasons, as a union, we strongly oppose the G9 model, and prefer the G7+ as an alternative. I would nevertheless like to make two further points. First, it should be remembered that even this model continues to exclude the majority of casualised staff and those on short-term contracts. This is why we opposed the service requirements introduced in August 2019, which saw so many postdoctoral researchers excluded from the Regent House; this is why we continue to oppose service requirements – the ‘+’ of G7+ – as unnecessary and discriminatory. Staff on short-term contracts are treated as a transient phenomenon, yet they comprise a permanent and increasing part of this University’s workforce. Undoing this trend requires giving those staff a voice, not cutting them out of all governance.

This leads me to my final point. Whatever the model used to determine its membership, the Regent House is not a fit forum for redressing and improving the working conditions of staff at this University. Cambridge is the only institution of its kind that still does not recognise the UCU.

We are pleased that the University has displayed a willingness to agree a recognition deal. But this episode serves as a reminder of why all staff need a recognised trade union, including – and especially – academic-related and research staff. The more say we all have in our working lives, the better the decisions this University will take.

Dr K. OTTEWELL (Senior Proctor, Emmanuel College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, section 35 of this report notes that should a grade-based model for membership of the Regent House be adopted, it would be necessary to assess whether ungraded posts, or those graded using a different system, should qualify. Among such will be the offices specifically excluded from the grading process, ranging from the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, through the High Steward and their Deputy, the Commissary, the Proctors, Pro-Proctors and additional Pro-Proctors, the Orator, the Esquire Bedells, the University Organist and the University Marshal, to the University Advocate and their Deputy. Some are non-stipendiary and if stipends are payable separate arrangements apply, reflecting the difficulty of associating them with a grade.

Oxford has adopted a grade-based approach for most University staff, but has also found it necessary to keep specific provisions for certain postholders to be members of Congregation under Statute or Regulation. Not everyone holding the ungraded offices at Cambridge would necessarily have other qualifications for membership. A number of those nominated to be Proctor have not gained or regained their membership until elected by the Regent House, first as Pro-Proctor and then Proctor, to serve as its particular officers and formal representatives.

Formal proceedings and governance sometimes run together; Congregations of the Regent House normally grant only Graces for degrees, but, if necessary, they can decide other business that the Council might decide to submit in Congregation, as opposed to publication in the *Reporter*. When the Proctors are elected in Congregation, the Esquire Bedells, members of the Senate-House Syndicate, stand in scrutiny and as the Special Ordinance says, ‘...shall take their own votes and those of other voters by the words *placet* or *non placet*’.

**COLLEGE NOTICES****Elections***Corpus Christi College*

Elected to a Fellowship in Class F with effect from 15 March 2021:

Rachel Claire Lawson, M.A., *Oxford* (Director of Development and Alumni Relations)

Elected to a Fellowship in Class B for three years from 1 October 2021:

Samuel Warren Lasman, B.A., *Yale*, Ph.D., *Chicago* (Gaylord and Dorothy Donnelley Early-Career Research Fellow)

*Murray Edwards College*

Elected to Research Fellowships from 1 October 2021:

Moataz Ibrahim Mohamed Mohamed Assem, Ph.D., M.Sc., *Bogazici*, M.B. B.Chir., *Alexandria*

Tiarnan Doherty, B.A., *Worcester, Mass.*, M.E., *UCD*

Elected to the Henslow Fellowship from 1 October 2021:

David Frederick Willer, Ph.D., *F*

*Wolfson College*

Elected to a Junior Research Fellowship (Title BI) with effect from 1 April 2021:

Zsófia Lóránd, B.A., M.A., *Eötvös Loránd, Budapest*, M.A., Ph.D., *Central European*

Omer Karin, B.Sc., *Technion – Israel Institute of Technology*, M.Sc., Ph.D., *Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel*

Naosuke Mukoyama, LL.B., M.Phil., *Tokyo*, D.Phil., *Oxford*

**Vacancies**

*Christ's College*: College Lectureship and Fellowship in Law; tenure: four years from 1 September 2021 or as otherwise agreed (non-renewable); stipend: £32,816; closing date: 14 May 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/vacancies-christs-college>

Postdoctoral Research Fellowship and College Lectureship in Economics; tenure: four years from 1 September 2021 or as otherwise agreed (non-renewable); stipend: £36,914–£41,526; closing date: 25 May 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/vacancies-christs-college>

*Downing College*: College Teaching Associates (in Classics, Law, Natural Sciences (Ecology and Zoology), and Sociology) to provide supervision for undergraduates of the College; tenure: one year from 1 October 2021 with the possibility of renewal; non-stipendiary but includes a benefits package and supervisions paid at the standard intercollegiate rate; closing date: 30 April 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.dow.cam.ac.uk/join-downing/academic-vacancies>

*King's College*: Non-Stipendiary Research Fellowship in Biological and Medical Sciences, 2021; tenure: from 1 October 2021 for up to four years or until external funding ends (whichever is sooner); non-stipendiary but collegiate benefits apply; closing date: 30 April 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.kings.cam.ac.uk/research/research-fellowships>

*Sidney Sussex College*: Non-Stipendiary Research Fellowship in Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences and Geography; tenure: three years from 1 September 2021 (non-renewable); closing date: 1 June 2021; further details: <https://www.sid.cam.ac.uk/about-sidney/vacancies/non-stipendiary-research-fellowship>

*Trinity College*: Research post in the History of Race; tenure: three years; stipend: £28,214 plus benefits; closing date: 30 April 2021; further details: <https://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/research-post-in-the-history-of-race/>

*Trinity Hall*: Fixed-Term Fellowship in Mathematics; tenure: four years from 1 September or 1 October 2021; stipend: £29,176 (pensionable); closing date: 26 April 2021 at 12 noon; further details and application form: <https://www.trinhall.cam.ac.uk/about/vacancies/academic-vacancies/>

Walter Scott Fixed-Term Fellowship in Physics; tenure: four years from 1 September or 1 October 2021; stipend: £29,176 (pensionable); closing date: 26 April 2021 at 12 noon; further details and application form: <https://www.trinhall.cam.ac.uk/about/vacancies/academic-vacancies/>

**Events***Emmanuel College***Cambridge Seminars in the History of Cartography**

Peter Geldart, Philippine Map Collectors Society, presents *Nicholas Norton Nicols and his maps of Mindanao*, at 1 p.m. on 4 May 2021 via Zoom. For joining instructions please email: [events@emma.cam.ac.uk](mailto:events@emma.cam.ac.uk); further details are also available at: <https://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/departments/maps/cartographic-events/camsem>

*Lucy Cavendish College*: Dr Jessica Taylor is #LivefromLucy with a talk on *Reducing treatment-related toxicity for Children with WNT Medulloblastoma*, at 6 p.m. on 5 May 2021 via Zoom; information and joining instructions: <https://www.lucy.cam.ac.uk/events>

**Other Notices**

*King's College*: The H. E. Durham Fund provides small grants to Cambridge undergraduates for Long Vacation projects connected with the purpose of advancing, improving, or disseminating knowledge of human or animal life in health or in disease; closing date for applications: 12 May 2021; further details: <https://www.kings.cam.ac.uk/news/2021/h-e-durham-fund-2021>

**OTHER NOTICES****Needham Research Institute****Bursar (part-time)**

The Trustees of the Needham Research Institute are seeking to recruit a part-time Bursar to manage the Institute's financial affairs. Currently, the job involves approximately one working day per week throughout the year. The post is for three-years in the first instance with the possibility of renewal. The closing date for applications is 30 April 2021 and further information is available on the Institute's website: [http://www.nri.cam.ac.uk/Bursar\\_advert\\_2021.html](http://www.nri.cam.ac.uk/Bursar_advert_2021.html)

**EXTERNAL NOTICES****Oxford Notices**

*Faculty of History and Worcester College*: Professorship of Modern History; tenure: from 1 September 2021 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 14 May 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk>, vacancy ID: 149882

*Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages and The Queen's College*: Schwarz-Taylor Professorship of the German Language and Literature; tenure: from 1 January 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 10 May 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk/>, vacancy ID: 149885

*Lady Margaret Hall*: Stipendiary Lectureship in Music; tenure: part-time (six contact hours per week) from 1 September 2021; stipend: £13,756–£15,471 for six hours at current rates; closing date: 30 April 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.lmh.ox.ac.uk/about-lmh/jobs/stipendiary-lectureship-music>

Stipendiary Lectureship in Physics; tenure: part-time (three contact hours per week) from 1 October 2021; stipend: £6,878–£7,736 for three hours at current rates; closing date: 30 April 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.lmh.ox.ac.uk/about-lmh/jobs/stipendiary-lectureship-physics>

Career Development Fellowship in Early Modern Literature; tenure: five years from 1 October 2021; salary: £32,817–£40,322; closing date: 14 May 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.lmh.ox.ac.uk/about-lmh/jobs/career-development-fellowship-early-modern-literature>

*Magdalen College*: Home Bursar; permanent position (subject to probation); tenure: from 1 September 2021 or as agreed; salary: £66,000–£76,000 plus collegiate benefits; closing date: 7 May 2021 at 12 noon; further information: <https://www.magd.ox.ac.uk/job-vacancies/>

*St Cross College*: 7th Lorna Casselton Memorial Lecture; Professor Ingrid Daubechies, Duke University and the first woman President of the International Mathematical Union, will speak on *Mathematics and art conservation*, at 5 p.m. on 13 May 2021 via Zoom; admission is free but reservation required; information and booking: <https://www.stx.ox.ac.uk/event/mathematics-and-art-conservation>

*The Queen's College*: Career Development Fellowship in Early Modern History; tenure: three years from 1 October 2021 (non-renewable); salary: £33,000 plus benefits; closing date: 26 April 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.queens.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

© 2021 The Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the University of Cambridge, or as expressly permitted by law.

The University is the owner or the licensee of all intellectual property rights in the site and in the material published on it. Those works are protected by copyright laws and treaties around the world. All such rights are reserved.

Material prepared for the primary purpose of providing information about the University of Cambridge, its teaching and research activities, its subsidiary companies and organisations with which it is associated or affiliated has been placed on the site by the University ('University Material').

Subject to statutory allowances, extracts of University Material may be accessed, downloaded, and printed for your personal and non-commercial use and you may draw the attention of others within your organisation to University Material posted on the site.

Notices for publication in the *Reporter*, or queries concerning content, should be sent by email to [reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk); messages may also be left by telephone to 01223 332298.

Advice and information is available on the *Reporter* website at <https://www.reporter.admin.cam.ac.uk/>.

Copy should be sent as early as possible in the week before publication; short notices will be accepted up to **4 p.m. on Friday** for publication the following Wednesday. Inclusion of notices is at the discretion of the Editor.