

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6633

WEDNESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2021

VOL CLII No 4

CONTENTS

Notices		Reports	
Calendar	55	Twenty-sixth Report of the Board of Scrutiny	62
Discussion on Tuesday, 26 October 2021	55	Graces	
Amending Statutes for Wolfson College	55	Graces submitted to the Regent House on 20 October 2021	73
Christmas and New Year closing and 3 June 2022 Bank Holiday: University Offices	55	Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 22 October 2021	74
Report of the Council on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff: Ballot timetable	56	Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 23 October 2021	74
Events, courses, etc.		<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.	56	Report of Discussion: 12 October 2021	
Vacancies, appointments, etc.		Report of the General Board on major modifications to the Education Tripos (no remarks)	75
Vacancies in the University	57	Report of the General Board on the introduction of a Design Tripos and Master of Design Degree in the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art (no remarks)	75
Notices by the General Board		College Notices	
Academic Career Pathways (Research and Teaching), 2022 exercise: Committee memberships	57	Elections	75
Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.		Vacancies	75
Annual Meetings of the Faculties	59	External Notices	
Physical Sciences (Environmental Data Science) for the M.Res. Degree, 2021–22	60	Oxford Notices	75
Advanced Computer Science for the M.Phil. Degree, 2021–22	61		



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES**Calendar**

20 October, *Wednesday*. End of first quarter of Michaelmas Term.

22 October, *Friday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.

23 October, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.

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

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

7 November, *Sunday*. Commemoration of Benefactors. Scarlet Day. Preacher before the University at 10 a.m., Sarah Teather, of St John's College, Director of the Jesuit Refugee Service UK (Lady Margaret's Preacher).

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 pm.)

26 October

9 November

23 November

7 December

Congregations (Saturdays unless otherwise stated)

22 October (Friday), 10 a.m.

23 October, 10 a.m.

3 November (Wednesday), 3.30 p.m. (Honorary Degree)

27 November, 10 a.m.

Discussion on Tuesday, 26 October 2021

The Vice-Chancellor invites members of the Regent House, University and College employees, registered students and others qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105 as amended by Grace 2 of 28 April 2021) to attend a Discussion **in the Senate-House**, on Tuesday, 26 October 2021 at 2 p.m. The following Reports will be discussed:

1. Report of the Council, dated 11 October 2021, on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff (*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 47).
2. Report of the Council, dated 11 October 2021, on the arrangements for Discussions (*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 50).
3. Report of the General Board, dated 8 October 2021, on the establishment of a Professorship (*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 51).

Those wishing to attend should refer to the Notice on arrangements for attending Discussions (*Reporter*, 6630, 2021–22, p. 4). Contributors who are unable to attend in person may email remarks to contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk, copying ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk, by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion, for reading out by the Proctors,¹ or ask someone else who is attending to read the remarks on their behalf. General information on Discussions is provided on the Governance site at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions>.

The Report in this issue (p. 62) will be discussed on 9 November.

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

Amending Statutes for Wolfson College

14 October 2021

The Vice-Chancellor begs leave to refer to his Notice of 29 September 2021 (*Reporter*, 6630, 2021–22, p. 2), concerning the text of a Statute to amend the Statutes of Wolfson College. He hereby gives notice that in the opinion of the Council the proposed Statute makes no alteration of any Statute which affects the University, and does not require the consent of the University; that the interests of the University are not prejudiced by it, and that the Council has resolved to take no action upon it, provided that the Council will wish to reconsider the proposed Statute if it has not been submitted to the Privy Council by 14 October 2022.

Christmas and New Year closing and 3 June 2022 Bank Holiday: University Offices

14 October 2021

The Council has authorised the closure of the University Offices from 1 p.m. on Friday, 24 December 2021, until 8.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 4 January 2022. It has also authorised the closure of the University Offices on Friday, 3 June 2022, when there is an additional Bank Holiday to mark the Queen's Platinum Jubilee, except to the extent that services are required to remain open to support examinations, which will be held as usual. The University Messenger Service will not operate during the periods of closure.

Report of the Council on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff: Ballot timetable

19 October 2021

The Council has agreed that there will be a ballot on the recommendations of its Report on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff (see *Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 47, at paragraph 4). The options on the ballot paper will be determined after publication of the Grace and the receipt of any amendments, but the Council wishes at this stage to confirm the timetable for the ballot assuming no amendments are received. Voting will be held in accordance with the Single Transferable Vote regulations. The Registry will arrange for the circulation of any fly-sheet concerning the ballot, signed in accordance with the Council's Notice on Fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 110, as amended by Notice, *Reporter*, 6614, 2020–21, p. 496).

The timetable will be the same as for the ballot on Grace 2 of 29 July 2021 (discontinuation of public display of class-lists), with a deadline for fly-sheets of 1 p.m. on 12 November 2021, and voting opening at 10 a.m. on 26 November and closing at 5 p.m. on 6 December 2021. Members of the Regent House are asked to use the Regent House Petitions site to circulate fly-sheets.¹

¹ See <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/key-bodies/RH-Senate/Pages/RH-Petitions.aspx> for details.

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 <https://www.training.cam.ac.uk/>

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

<i>Cambridge University Libraries</i>	2021 Sandars Lectures: The Reader for this year's series, Dr Orietta Da Rold, Associate Professor, University of Cambridge and Fellow of St John's College, will speak on the subject <i>Paper past and paper future</i> ; the lectures will take place at 5 p.m. on 9, 10, and 11 November 2021, in the Umney Theatre, Robinson College and as a livestream; registration for both options required.	<i>Information and registration:</i> https://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/sandars/sandars-lectures-2020-21
<i>Ax:son Johnson Centre for the Study of Classical Architecture</i>	Seminar Series 1: A seminar series for the newly launched Centre will be held weekly at 12 noon on Fridays in the Music Room, West Lodge, Downing College and livestreamed via Zoom; first seminar on 22 October: <i>Classicism and the working man in England in the 19th Century</i> , by Dr Frank Salmon, Director of the Ax:son Johnson Centre, Associate Professor of the History of Art and Fellow of St John's College.	<i>Event information and registration:</i> https://classicalarchitecture.eventbrite.com <i>Centre information:</i> https://csca.aha.cam.ac.uk/
<i>History of Art</i>	Slade Lectures in Fine Art 2021: Professor Philippe Descola, Collège de France and École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, will speak on the theme <i>Making things visible: An anthropology of figuration</i> ; lectures take place at 5 p.m. on Tuesdays throughout Michaelmas Term, in LG19, Faculty of Law, West Road and will be recorded.	<i>Information and registration:</i> https://www.hoart.cam.ac.uk/aboutthedept/sladeprofs

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.**Vacancies in the University**

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

Rouse Ball Professorship of Mathematics in the Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics; tenure: from 1 September 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; informal enquiries: Professor James Norris, Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: norris@maths.cam.ac.uk); closing date: 31 December 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/31848>; quote reference: LF28548

Sheild Professorship of Pharmacology in the Department of Pharmacology; tenure: from 1 October 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; informal enquiries: Professor Laura Itzhaki, Head of Department and Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: lsi10@cam.ac.uk); closing date: 16 November 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/31837>; quote reference: PL28542

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.

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD**Academic Career Pathways (Research and Teaching), 2022 exercise: Committee memberships**

The Academic Career Pathways (Research and Teaching) 2022 exercise, for the consideration of promotion to the academic offices of Associate Professor (Grade 10) and Professor (Grade 11 and Grade 12), launched in September. The deadline for the submission of applications is 2 November 2021. The membership of the Committees for the 2022 exercise is set out below. Further information is available at: <https://www.acp.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/>.

Vice-Chancellor's Committee

The Vice-Chancellor, Professor Stephen Toope (*Chair*)
 Professor Louise Joan Gullifer (Arts and Humanities)
 Professor Valerie Gibson (Biological Sciences)
 Professor Elizabeth Ann Howlett Hall (Clinical Medicine)
 Professor Christopher Mark Kelly (Humanities and Social Sciences)
 Professor Richard Vincent Penty (Physical Sciences)
 Professor Alan Lindsay Greer (Technology)

Externals:

Professor Clare Lees, *University of London* (Arts and Humanities)
 Professor Susan Wray, *University of Liverpool* (Biological Sciences)
 Professor David John Burn, *Newcastle University* (Clinical Medicine)
 Professor Emily Jackson, *London School of Economics and Political Science* (Humanities and Social Sciences)
 Professor Daniela Bortoletto, *University of Oxford*, (Physical Sciences)
 Professor Rebecca Cheung, *University of Edinburgh* (Technology)

SCHOOL COMMITTEES*Arts and Humanities*

Professor Louise Joan Gullifer (*Chair*)
 Professor Simon David Goldhill
 Professor Geoffrey Allan Khan
 Professor Catherine Jane Crozier Pickstock
 Professor Michael Moriarty
 Professor Christopher John Young
 Professor Clare Lees (*External*)

Biological Sciences

Professor Valerie Gibson (*Chair*)
 Professor Julie Ahringer
 Professor Matthew James Allen
 Professor Anna Philpott
 Professor Christopher William Joseph Smith
 Professor Susan Wray (*External*)

Clinical Medicine

Professor Elizabeth Ann Howlett Hall (*Chair*)
 Professor Patrick Francis Chinnery
 Professor Ismaa Sadaf Farooqi
 Professor Tamsin Jane Ford
 Professor Patrick Henry Maxwell
 Professor Julian Charles Rayner
 Professor David John Burn (*External*)

Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor Christopher Mark Kelly (*Chair*)
 Professor Jennifer Chloe Gabrys
 Professor Timothy Norman Harper
 Professor Oliver Bruce Linton
 Professor Pauline Margaret Rose
 Professor David Walter Runciman
 Professor Emily Jackson (*External*)

Physical Sciences

Professor Richard Vincent Penty (*Chair*)
 Professor Sir Shankar Balasubramanian
 Professor Serena Michelle Best
 Professor Peter Howard Haynes
 Professor James Anthony Jackson
 Professor Nigel Peake
 Professor Daniela Bortoletto (*External*)

Technology

Professor Alan Lindsay Greer (*Chair*)
 Professor Robert Stewart Cant
 Professor John Stephen Dennis
 Professor Andrew Mawdesley Pitts
 Professor Paul James Tracey
 Professor Giulia Viggiani
 Professor Rebecca Cheung (*External*)

FACULTY COMMITTEES**1. School of Arts and Humanities***Combined Faculty Committee One:*

*Architecture and History of Art, English, Music,
 Philosophy and Divinity*

Professor Charles Alan Short (*Chair*)
 Professor Caroline Vout*
 Professor Clare Elizabeth Chambers
 Professor Raphael Thomas Richard Lyne
 Professor Maire Ni Mhaonaigh
 Professor Susan Kathleen Rankin
 Professor Jan Melissa Schramm
 Professor George Hendrik Van Kooten
 Ms Rachel Elizabeth Plunkett (*Secretary*)

Combined Faculty Committee Two:

*Classics, Modern and Medieval Languages and
 Linguistics, and Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*

Professor Emma Fiona Wilson (*Chair*)
 Professor David Alexander Syme Fergusson*
 Professor James Peter Timothy Clackson
 Professor Katherine Nicole Bennison
 Professor Stephen Phelps Oakley
 Professor Ian Gareth Roberts
 Professor Roel Sterckx
 Professor Sarah Jean Colvin
 Mr Nigel Matthew Thompson (*Secretary*)

2. School of the Biological Sciences*Biology and Veterinary Medicine*

Professor Beverley Jane Glover (*Chair*)
 TBC*
 Professor Sarah Jane Bray
 Professor Gerard Ian Evan
 Professor Julian Michael Hibberd
 Professor Laura Susan Rahman Itzhaki
 Professor Christopher David Jiggins
 Professor Mark Henry Johnson
 Professor Steven Robert Henry Russell
 Professor Geoffrey Lilley Smith
 Professor James Lionel Norman Wood
 Mr Julian Mark Jacobs (*Secretary*)

3. School of Clinical Medicine*Clinical Medicine*

Professor Edward Thomas Bullmore (*Chair*)
 Professor Angela Charlotte Roberts*
 Professor Richard James Gilbertson
 Professor Judy Hirst
 Professor Matthew Anthony Lambon Ralph
 Professor Andrew William McCaskie
 Professor Sir Stephen O'Rahilly
 Professor Susan Ozanne
 Professor Sylvia Therese Richardson
 Professor David Henry Rowitch
 Dr Litsa Maria Biggs (*Secretary*)

* Member appointed external to the Faculty.

4. School of the Humanities and Social Sciences*Economics*

Professor Leonardo Felli (*Chair*)
 Professor Lucia Antonia Salome Reisch*
 Professor Helen Elizabeth Thompson*
 Professor Eric Baird French
 Professor Christopher John Harris
 Professor Vasco Miguel Pereira Marques de Carvalho
 Professor Alexey Onatskiy
 Dr Susan Wan (*Secretary*)

Education

Professor Gordon Thomas Harold (*Chair*)
 Professor Loraine Ruth Renata Gelsthorpe*
 Professor Karen Sue Coats
 Professor Geoffrey Francis Hayward
 Professor Susan Lee Robertson
 Professor Ricardo Sabates Aysa
 Professor Nidhi Singal
 Professor Andreas Stylianides
 Ms Kate Marie-Josephine Allen (*Secretary*)

History

Professor David James Maxwell (*Chair*)
 TBC*
 Professor Eugenio Federico Biagini
 Professor Saul Herman Dubow
 Professor Mary Rachel Laven
 Professor Alexandra Marie Walsham
 Professor Mary Teresa Josephine Webber
 Dr Elizabeth Haresnape (*Secretary*)

*Human, Social and Political Sciences and the
 Department of History and Philosophy of Science*

Professor Timothy Mark Lewens (*Chair*)
 Professor Esra Gulsum Ozyurek*
 Professor Patrick Jacques Nicole Baert
 Professor Judith Mary Browne
 Professor Harri Mikael Englund
 Professor John Ernest Robb
 Ms Marie Butcher (*Secretary*)

Law, Land Economy and Criminology

Professor Peter Mandler* (*Chair*)
 Professor Albertina Albors-Llorens
 Professor Martin John Dixon
 Professor Mark Christopher Elliott
 Professor Richard Griffith Fentiman
 Professor Loraine Ruth Renata Gelsthorpe
 Professor David Ross Howarth
 Professor Elisabete Manuela Alves Silva
 Professor Sarah Elizabeth Worthington
 Ms Laura Clare Smethurst (*Secretary*)

5. School of the Physical Sciences*Earth Sciences and Geography*

Professor Bhaskar Vira (*Chair*)
 Professor Ruth Elizabeth Cameron*
 Professor Marie Edmonds
 Professor Sally Anne Gibson
 Professor Richard John Harrison
 Professor David Arnold Hodell
 Professor Michael Hulme
 Professor Clive Matthew Martin Oppenheimer
 Professor Sarah Anne Radcliffe
 Dr Adam Nigel Strange (*Secretary*)

Mathematics

Professor Nicholas Dorey (*Chair*)
 Professor Catherine Jane Clarke*
 Professor Emmanuel Francois Jean Breuillard
 Professor Colm-cille Patrick Caulfield
 Professor Raymond Ethan Goldstein
 Professor James Ritchie Norris
 Professor Richard John Samworth
 Professor Anthony James Scholl
 Professor Carola-Bibiane Schönlieb
 Professor Edward Paul Scott Shellard
 Ms Hannah Louise Fox (*Secretary*)

Physics and Chemistry

TBC (*Chair*)
 Professor Sally Anne Gibson*
 Professor Ruth Elizabeth Cameron
 Professor Catherine Jane Clarke
 Professor Christopher Alexander Hunter
 Dr James Henry Keeler
 Professor Richard Gerard McMahon
 Professor Jonathan Russell Nitschke
 Professor Michael Andrew Parker
 Professor Michael Christopher Payne
 Professor David Alastair Ritchie
 Professor Jason Joseph William Alexander Robinson
 Ms Angela Wanjiku Macharia (*Secretary*)

* Member appointed external to the Faculty.

6. School of Technology*Business and Management*

Professor Jochen Heiko Runde (*Chair*)
 Professor Nicola Susan Clayton*
 Professor Mauro Federico Guillén
 Professor Jennifer Anne Howard-Grenville
 Professor Stylianos (Stelios) Kavadias
 Professor Bart Maria Andreas Corneel Lambrecht
 Professor Rafael Lopes Rogo
 Professor Wah Sung (Vincent) Mak
 Professor Michael Gerald Pollitt
 Ms Julie Brown (*Secretary*)

Computer Science and Technology

Professor Peter Michael Sewell (*Chair*)
 Professor Simon David Guest*
 Professor Alastair Richard Beresford
 Professor Ann Alicia Copestake
 Professor Mateja Jamnik
 Professor Srinivasan Keshav
 Ms Caroline Anne Stewart (*Secretary*)

*Engineering and**Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology*

Professor Richard William Prager (*Chair*)
 TBC*
 Professor Holger Babinsky
 Professor Andrew John Flewitt
 Professor Simon John Godsill
 Professor Simon David Guest
 Professor Clemens Friedrich Kaminski
 Professor Timothy Herbert Warren Minshall
 Professor Róisín Meabh Owens
 Professor Michael Patrick Forbes Sutcliffe
 Ms Leesa Osborn (*Secretary*)

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.**Annual Meetings of the Faculties***Architecture and History of Art*

The Annual Meeting of the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art will be held at **1.45 p.m. on Tuesday, 16 November 2021**, via Zoom. The main business will be the election, in accordance with the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 608), of two members of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve for four years from 1 January 2022. Nominations for election (for which the consent of the candidate must be obtained, signed by the proposer and seconder) and notice of any other business for the meeting should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Board, Mr A. Bennett (email: faculty.manager@aha.cam.ac.uk), Faculty of Architecture and History of Art, to arrive not later than 12 noon on Tuesday, 9 November 2021.

Classics

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Classics gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at **9 a.m. on Thursday, 11 November 2021** via Zoom. The main item of business will be the election of two members of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve from 1 January 2022, in accordance with Regulation 1 of the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 608).

Nominations for election, notice of any other business and requests for a Zoom invitation should be received by Mr Nigel Thompson (email: nmt24@cam.ac.uk), Faculty of Classics, Sidgwick Avenue, not later than Monday, 8 November 2021.

Computer Science and Technology

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Computer Science and Technology gives notice that the Teaching Conference and Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at **2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 9 November 2021** by videoconference. All members of the Faculty are invited to attend. Joining instructions will be circulated to all Faculty members ahead of the meeting.

Divinity

The Annual Meeting of the Faculty of Divinity will be held at **2.15 p.m. on Thursday, 28 October 2021**, via Zoom. The business to be discussed will include the Chair's report and the election, in accordance with the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 608), of two members of the Faculty Board to serve for four calendar years in class (c), from 1 January 2022. Nominations for the posts in class (c) must be seconded, and the consent of the candidate obtained in advance, and should reach the Administrative Officer, Faculty of Divinity, West Road, Cambridge, CB3 9BS, not later than Monday, 25 October 2021. Notice of any other business to be discussed should reach the Administrative Officer by the same date.

Earth Sciences and Geography

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Earth Sciences and Geography gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held online at **2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 23 November 2021**. The main business will be the election, in accordance with the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 608), of three members of the Board in class (c) to serve for four years from 1 January 2022.

Nominations for the election and notice of any other business should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Board (email: as820@cam.ac.uk) not later than 16 November 2021.

Mathematics

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Mathematics gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at **2.15 p.m. on Thursday, 18 November 2021**. The main business will be the election, in accordance with Regulation 1 of the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 608), of:

- two members of the Faculty Board in class (a)(ii) to serve from 1 January 2022 for four years
- one member of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve from 1 January 2022 for four years
- one member of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve from 1 January 2022 for two years

Nominations, confirmed by the proposer and seconder, for which the consent of the candidate must be obtained, should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Board, Ms H. Fox (email: secretary.board@maths.cam.ac.uk; Room B1.30, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road), not later than 12 noon on Thursday, 11 November 2021. Notice of any other business should reach the Secretary by the same date.

Physical Sciences (Environmental Data Science) for the M.Res. Degree, 2021–22

The Degree Committee for the Faculty of Earth Sciences and Geography gives notice that with effect from the examinations to be held in 2021–22, the form of examinations will be as follows:

Guided Team Challenge	Written report of up to 2,000 words and an oral presentation	10% of the total mark
Research Project	Written report of up to 5,000 words and an oral presentation	75% of the total mark
Ph.D. Project Proposal	Written proposal of up to two pages and an oral examination conducted on the Ph.D. Project Proposal, Research Project, and general field of knowledge	15% of the total mark

In addition, candidates are required to attend core and domain courses:

Core 1	Foundations of data science
Core 2	Probabilistic machine learning
Core 3	Environmental risk
Core 4	Environmental data analysis

Students will choose one from each of the following domains:

Application Domain

4M22	Climate change mitigation
IDP1	Atmospheric chemistry and global change
IDP2	The Earth system and climate change
PLL2	Responses to global change
Earth Sciences (Part III)	Natural hazards
Earth Sciences (Part III, Option 18)	Frontiers of ice core science
Earth Sciences (Part III, Option 21)	Computational geosciences
Mathematical Tripos (Part III)	Fluid dynamics of climate

Specialist Domain

3F8	Inference
L48	Machine learning and the physical world
L310	Mobile robot systems
LMI4	Advanced machine learning
Computer Science Tripos (Part II)	Deep neural networks
Computer Science Tripos (Part II)	Machine learning and Bayesian inference
Computer Science Tripos (Part III)	Cloud computing
Mathematical Tripos (Part III)	Statistical learning in practice
Mathematical Tripos (Part III)	Statistics in medicine

Advanced Computer Science for the M.Phil. Degree, 2021–22

The Degree Committee for the Faculty of Computer Science and Technology gives notice that the modules available for study for the M.Phil. in Advanced Computer Science (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 516) in the academic year 2021–22, and the form of the examination of each module, will be as follows:

Module Number Title and mode of assessment – coursework (c), written test (t)

Michaelmas Term 2021

L18	Automated reasoning (c and t)
L21	Interactive formal verification (c)
L46	Principles of machine learning systems (c)
L48	Machine learning and the physical world (c)
L50	Introduction to networking and systems measurements (c)
L90	Overview of natural language processing (c)
L95	Introduction to natural language syntax and parsing (c)
L101	Machine learning for language processing (c)
L108	Category theory (c and t)
L304	Multicore semantics and programming (c)
L310	Introduction to robotics (c)
L312	Digital signal processing with computer music (c)
L314	Digital signal processing (c)
L335	Machine vision perception (c)
L352	Advanced graphics and image processing (c)
LE49	Probabilistic machine learning (c)
R02	Network architectures (c)
R47	Distributed ledger technologies: Foundations and applications (c)
R244	Large-scale data processing and optimisation (c)
R252	Theory of deep learning (c)
R265	Advanced topics in computer architecture (c)

Lent Term 2022

L15	Topics in logic and complexity (c and t)
L32	Advanced robotics (c)
L41	Advanced operating systems (c)
L45	Representation learning on graphs and networks (c)
L98	Introduction to computational semantics (c and t)
L118	Advanced topics in category theory (c)
P230	Interaction with machine learning (c)
R01	Advanced topics in computer systems (c)
R254	Cybercrime (c)
R255	Advanced topics in machine learning (c)
R260	Technology, law and society (c)

Easter Term 2022

No modules offered currently in Easter Term 2022.

Further details can be found by following the appropriate links from <http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/teaching/current/acs.html> and <https://www.cst.cam.ac.uk/teaching/masters/>.

The Degree Committee for the Faculty of Computer Science and Technology gives notice of the form of the evaluation of the Research Skills programme for 2021–22. Students must accumulate a minimum of twelve credits from core and optional units. The mode of delivery and work required for each unit will vary. Students will be required to submit a Research Skills logbook which records the units attended and provides evidence of the work completed for each unit.

The Degree Committee for the Faculty of Computer Science and Technology reserves the right to withdraw any module should fewer than five students enrolled on the M.Phil. in Advanced Computer Science elect to study them. To satisfy timetabling, resourcing or other constraints, the Faculty Board may impose a cap on the numbers of students from any particular course who may take a particular module.

REPORTS

Twenty-sixth Report of the Board of Scrutiny

The BOARD OF SCRUTINY begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. The Board of Scrutiny was established on the recommendation of the Wass Syndicate (*Reporter*, 1988–89, p. 617) to provide independent analysis and oversight on behalf of the Regent House, in particular by examining the Annual Report of the Council (including that of the General Board to the Council); the Abstract of the Accounts; and any Report of the Council proposing allocations from the Chest. It has the right to comment on related matters that it believes should be drawn to the attention of the University, including issues of policy. Further information can be found on the Board's website¹ and in *Statutes and Ordinances*.² The Board has the right of reporting to the University and this is its Twenty-sixth annual Report.

2. The Board encourages members of the Regent House, as the University's governing body, to think about and engage in governance as part of a process intended to be complementary to, not in conflict with, the Council and the General Board. Nevertheless, the intention of the Wass Syndicate was to provide an additional mechanism for holding the Council to account for the increased powers it had acquired, particularly in relation to the items that the Board is required by Statute to examine.

3. Although the Board aims to assist the Council in its work it is important to note that the Board is a constitutionally separate body, exercising the responsibilities and powers conferred by Statute as well as engaging with the conduct of business; for example, through commenting at Discussions, or by opposing, supporting, amending or promoting Graces. The Board may be able to comment more freely than the Council, or give greater attention to certain areas of business, and although it has some capacity to act on its own account, it cannot supplant the responsibilities of the Regent House collectively, any more than it can perform the work of the Council. We hope to encourage discussion and collaborative thinking across the University.

Activity of the Board 2020–2021

4. Eighteen meetings of the whole Board took place by Zoom, including three at which Senior Officers attended as guests: the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Stephen Toope; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategy and Planning, Professor David Cardwell; and the Registrar, Ms Emma Rampton. In the course of the year, Dr Gilly Carr and Mr Gavin Flynn took up vacant places on the Board caused by the resignations of Ms Edna Murphy and Ms Saba Alai respectively.

5. Smaller working groups met with the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education, Professor Graham Virgo; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional and International Relations, Professor Eilís Ferran; the interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research, Professor Anne Ferguson-Smith; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Business and Enterprise, Professor Andy Neely; the Head of the Disability Resource Centre, Mr John Harding; the Chair of the Examination and Assessment Committee, Professor Chris Young; the Director of Estates, Mr Graham Matthews; the Chief Financial Officer, Mr Anthony Odgers; the Director of Finance, Mr David Hughes; the Acting Director of Human Resources, Ms Andrea Hudson; the Director of the Strategic Partnerships Office, Dr Karen Kennedy; the Head of the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals, Ms Sarah d'Ambrumenil; the Head of the Foundation Year, Dr Alex Pryce; the Director of the Careers Service, Ms Jenny Blakesley; the Head of the University Research Office, Dr Peter Hedges; the Head of the Research Operations Office, Dr Jo Dekkers; the Chair of the Council's Governance Review Working Group, Dr Nicholas Holmes; Senior Adviser to the Vice-Chancellor on Online Education, Professor Richard Prager; Managing Director of Cambridge Online Education at the Press, Ms Anna Wood; Cambridge Student Union President (Undergraduate), Mr Ben Margolis; Cambridge Student Union President (Postgraduate), Ms Aastha Dahal; and the Welfare and Community Officer, Ms Alice Gilderdale.

6. Further information and assistance was provided by the Head of the Governance and Compliance Division, Dr Regina Sachers; by the Director of University Information Services (UIS), Professor Ian Leslie; by the University Draftsman, Ms Ceri Benton, and by the Council Secretariat, Ms Madeline Mc Kerchar and Ms Dee Vincent. The Board is duly grateful to all of them for their time and thought and records its thanks. The Board again records its thanks to Ms Rachel Rowe for the production of agenda, and commendable notes and minutes in a challenging year.

Context of the Board's Report

7. The last academic year continued to be challenging for the University because of the restrictions and uncertainties resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic. Successive 'lockdowns' caused most teaching and examining to be moved online, restricted access to academic facilities, and caused disruption to research programmes. Almost all formal University business, including Discussions and Congregations, was conducted virtually, and although in-person Congregations resumed for General Admission, guests were not permitted. The Board, exceptionally, produced a supplementary Report in the Lent Term (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6604, p. 322) commenting on the Council's Allocations Report (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6593, p. 96), the regular publication of which had been postponed from the Easter Term until the financial impact of the pandemic could be assessed.

8. In recognising the exceptional commitment, creativity, and patience shown by staff throughout the collegiate University in managing the circumstances of the last year, the Board draws particular attention to the successful programme for the weekly asymptomatic testing of students as a notable home-grown initiative, drawing on expertise of staff across the University, which provided ongoing reassurance for the University community, thus enabling the continuation of much business as usual.

¹ <https://www.scrutiny.cam.ac.uk/>

² Statute A VII: <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/pdfs/2020/statutea.pdf>, and Ordinances: <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/pdfs/2020/ordinance01.pdf>.

FINANCE*Financial Statements*

9. For the financial year ending 31 July 2020, the consolidated financial statements for the University (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6617) recorded an ‘adjusted operating deficit’ of £(90m) on a turnover of £2,075m compared to a surplus of £16m on a turnover of £2,192m in the previous financial year. The ‘adjusted operating deficit’ is, according to the University management, considered the most representative measure of underlying performance.

10. The deficit in the year under review largely reflected the adverse impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the trading performance of Cambridge Assessment and Cambridge University Press. The pandemic had limited (or possibly even a net positive) financial impact on the academic University as some additional pandemic-related spending was offset by savings from a reduction in activity levels as staff worked from home and many planned events were cancelled.

11. Similarly, the reduction in consolidated turnover was largely due to a sharp decline in turnover from Cambridge Assessment (£377m in 2020 compared to £478m in 2019) and also a smaller, but still significant, decline in Cambridge University Press (£318m in 2020 compared to £334m in 2019). Most other income streams continued their long-term upward trend.

12. A notable exception to this was research income which fell in 2020 to £579m compared to £592m in 2019. Whilst the absolute year-on-year decline was modest, this marks a sharp change from the pattern of recent years, which has seen research income consistently growing faster than other income streams. Although some of the reduction in research activity is considered a temporary Covid-related phenomenon, this is an area which will need to be watched closely in the future.

13. £52.1m, (almost 9% of total research income), was received from the European Commission and it remains to be seen exactly how this will be impacted by Brexit over the medium to longer term, and the extent to which any reduction is ultimately offset by increases in funding from elsewhere.

14. In summary, the Covid-19 pandemic has caused significant operational disruption to the entire collegiate University and has had a very adverse financial impact on some parts of it – notably Cambridge Assessment, Cambridge University Press and the Colleges, where key income streams have experienced substantial declines. In the case of the academic University, the nature of the income streams and expenditure means that there has been relatively limited impact on income and probably some net reductions in expenditure. There has been limited discernible overall negative financial impact so far and, bizarrely perhaps, there is some evidence that the pandemic may even turn out to be a ‘net financial positive’ in the years ahead – to the extent that it has potentially initiated certain changes in practice that have the capacity to deliver recurring cost savings, and also stimulated the productive deployment of technology across the University.

Allocations Report 2021–22

15. The approved Chest Allocation for 2021–22 (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6623, p. 717) is summarised in the following table, alongside a comparison with the corresponding Allocations for the previous four years:

£m	2021–22	2020–21	2019–20	2018–19	2017–18
Forecast Chest income	541.8	516.7	492.1	471.1	453.2
Total allocations	(569.8)	(529.4)	(508.2)	(496.3)	(474.6)
Chest surplus / (deficit)	(28.0)	(12.7)	(16.1)	(25.2)	(21.4)

16. For each of the last five years, the Council has presented a deficit Allocations budget to the Regent House. Whilst the deficit in any one year is reasonably modest, the accumulated deficit Allocation over the last five years has now reached £103m. The Board remains unconvinced that any decisive action has been taken to address this persistent deficit, and is concerned that an annual deficit will simply continue into the future and will, at some point, start to cause more serious damage to the University’s financial position.

17. The Board is particularly concerned that repeated deficits have arisen when total Chest income has experienced growth of around 19.5% over the five years under review; equivalent to a compound annual growth rate of 4.6% per annum which is well ahead of inflation.

18. Also of concern is the disclosure in this year’s Allocations Report of the existence of £234m of ‘Spendable Reserves’ in the Schools and Departments and a further £17m of ‘Spendable Reserves’ in the non-School Institutions’ (NSIs). Surprisingly, the former figure has increased since the previous year when it was £224m.

19. Even more surprising is the fact that throughout the era of the deficit Allocations budgets, total Departmental Reserves have grown from £321m on 31 July 2017 to £398m on 31 July 2020. The growth of £77m over the period actually exceeds the sum of the Allocation deficits for the three financial years 2017–18, 2018–19 and 2019–20 which comes to £63m.

20. A Department with reserves may be compared to a large jar of sweets. Each year, a certain number of sweets are added to that jar (an Allocation of funds from the central University). Each year, a certain number of sweets are eaten (expenditure by the Department). The number of sweets remaining in the jar at the end of the year (closing reserves) is the number at the start of the year (the opening reserves) plus the number added less the number eaten. If the number of sweets in the jar rises steadily over time, then it must mean that the number of sweets added each year consistently exceeds the number of sweets eaten each year.

21. The significant growth in Departmental Reserves between 2017 and 2020 appear to reflect, in part, the fact that Allocations from the Chest are not being spent fully each year, which suggests some level of consistent ‘over-allocation’ by the University. This excess allocation is neither affordable to the University nor, on the face of it, does it appear to be actually needed by the Departments.

22. Whilst the Board accepts that Departmental Reserves may arise for a number of sometimes complex reasons, and that some portion of those reserves may not be ‘Spendable’ and some reserves are not directly derived from Chest Allocations, it is still extremely hard to make sense of the current situation. The Board believes that the Council needs to explain to the Regent House why it is recommending deficit allocations budgets year after year given the growing evidence that at least part of these allocations are not obviously being spent by Departments. In paragraphs 40–43 of the Allocations Report, a number of future measures are described under the title ‘Initiatives to make the University more efficient, achieve recurring savings or generate net income’. These measures include estimated net revenues of £70m over five years post-investment arising from the ‘Surplus Improvement Fund’, £17m per annum of savings arising from ‘Strategic Procurement and Purchasing’, targeted savings of £11m per annum from ‘Re-imagining Professional Services’ and a suggestion of savings of up to £7m per annum from ‘Re-shaping the Estate’.

24. These initiatives are to be welcomed. However, to a significant extent, it will be up to the Schools and NSIs to take active steps to engage with and realise the potential benefits from these initiatives. The Board does not believe that the annual endorsement by Council of deficit Allocations budgets which appear to be set based on overly-conservative expenditure forecasts by Schools and NSIs can possibly act as an incentive for those same Schools and NSIs to embrace such initiatives and seek cost savings and efficiencies in the way envisaged.

25. The Board recommends that Council insists on recommending a balanced Allocations budget from now on, i.e., one that returns the University to a sustainable financial framework. Only in exceptional circumstances should the Council recommend an Allocations budget that is materially out of balance and, in such circumstances, the Council should explain to the Regent House what those exceptional circumstances are and how it will ensure that the Chest will be brought back into balance within a reasonable timeframe.

Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF)

26. The consolidated University has some £3,040m of assets in CUEF as at 30 June 2020 representing around 60% of its entire net assets of £5,069m (as at 31 July 2020). In 2019–20, CUEF made a distribution of £126m to the consolidated University which amounts to around 6% of the University’s total income.

27. CUEF operates a ‘fund of funds’ strategy where it selects a roster of specialist external managers in a range of asset classes and places some proportion of its total funds with each of its external managers. CUEF is managed by Cambridge Investment Management Limited (a wholly-owned subsidiary of the University) under investment and distribution policies set by the Council on the advice of its Investment Board. The theory is that the professionalised management at CUEF can select market-beating specialist external managers across a range of ‘uncorrelated’ and often ‘illiquid’ asset classes with the objective of securing better investment returns at lower risk than by other approaches. This performance-focused approach has been popularised by several major US endowments and was adopted by Cambridge from 30 June 2008.

28. The investment returns since that date to 30 June 2020 have averaged 9.0% per annum, and have therefore exceeded the official target of CPI plus 5.0% (which averaged 7.0% per annum over the period 2008 to 2020) and also slightly exceeded the internal ‘65:35’ benchmark (a composite index covering global equities, UK property, world bonds and UK index-linked gilts which averaged 8.5% per annum over the equivalent period). The returns have, however, fallen short of those available from the MSCI All Country World index (which averaged 9.8% per annum over the equivalent period). This final point is important as investment in the MSCI All Country World index is available via extremely low cost and completely transparent index tracker products.

29. In the years leading up to June 2020, CUEF’s performance has been less strong than previously, and it has actually lagged behind its ‘65:35’ benchmark over 1, 3 and 5 years and has also lagged behind its official CPI plus 5.0% target return over 1 and 3 years.

30. The Board is conscious that measurement of shorter term investment performance can be very sensitive to the start and end dates chosen. However, considered in the round, the Board concludes that CUEF has generated respectable but not spectacular returns since its inception, with a weakening trend in the years leading up to June 2020.

31. However, it is not clear to the Board exactly how CUEF’s investment returns were achieved, nor exactly how much risk was taken in the process, as CUEF provides very limited disclosure on its investment activities. In particular, it publishes almost no information at all on (a) the individual securities / collective investment vehicles (i.e. stocks, shares, bonds and funds) in its portfolio, and (b) the identity of the external managers it engages. Remarkably, it does not even reveal this fundamental information to members of the University Council.

32. CUEF does provide a breakdown of its asset allocation into broad categories such as ‘Public equity’ (46% of the fund at 30 June 2020), ‘Fixed interest/ cash’ (16%), ‘Private equity’ (16%), ‘Real assets’ (9%), ‘Absolute return’ (8%) and ‘Credit Strategies’ (5%) – but these are very broad descriptors and provide no insight into what companies the CUEF is actually invested in and what those companies do to generate profits.

33. Since about 2015, there has been growing pressure from students and staff in the University for CUEF to do more to take into account Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) matters in its investment process. In particular, there has been notable pressure to divest the fund from fossil fuel companies. Initially there appeared to be resistance from the University to consider any change of investment strategy at CUEF.

34. In 2017, the University set up a Divestment Working Group to look into this issue in more detail. In 2018, most of the previous management team at CIML resigned from their roles to take on similar roles in a private family office.

35. A new Chief Investment Officer took up her post in January 2020 and subsequently appointed a new investment team. The new team included a ‘Sustainable Investment Officer’ for the first time. In October 2020, CUEF announced its strategy for addressing environmental sustainability. The strategy included an objective to cease all meaningful investment in fossil fuels by 2030, and a target to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions from the CUEF portfolio by 2038. The latter objective is in line with the broader operational targets of the University.

36. As well as the net-zero commitment, CUEF's new strategy included two other significant elements. Firstly, an objective to reduce CUEF's previous allocation to 'Public Equity' and 'Credit Strategies' and increase its allocation to 'Private Equity' and 'Absolute Return'. Secondly, an objective to establish an 'Endowment Fund Supervisory Board' (EFSB) which was intended to take over the function of Fund Trustee from the University's Council. This re-organisation was explained to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6601, p. 259) as intended to 'address the conflicts of interest arising from the CUEF's current governance arrangements' and to 'provide enhanced oversight of the Fund to the benefit of all investors'.

37. However, not all members of Regent House were persuaded by these arguments and, following a ballot on the proposal in April 2021, the Grace to establish the EFSB was not approved by the Regent House.

38. A particular area of concern, raised in the *non-placet* flysheets, related to the extent to which the EFSB would really engage with matters that were important to the wider University beyond the singular focus on maximising financial returns. In particular, scepticism was expressed as to whether CUEF would ever have embraced a net-zero strategy in 2020 if it had operated under the oversight of an EFSB rather than the University Council.

39. The failure of the Regent House to support the EFSB proposal highlights a tension in the management of CUEF. On the one hand, there is growing interest in Environmental, Sustainability and Governance (ESG) issues within the University community and also within the wider investment world. On the other hand, CUEF continues to pursue a strategy which is opaque and involves significant (and growing) investment in high-fee, low-transparency asset classes such as private equity and hedge funds, neither of which have, as asset classes, been associated with a positive ESG offering in the past.

40. CUEF's opaque, high-fee strategy has historically been justified as a performance-focused approach which carried with it the promise of superior investment returns. When members of Regent House and Council have asked for disclosure of the identity of the external managers and/or underlying holdings, senior University Officers have cited commercial confidentiality as the grounds for withholding this fundamental information and suggested that the consequence of such a disclosure might be lower investment returns in the future.

41. The Board is not persuaded that CUEF's track record to date obviously justifies this commitment to opacity. In the Board's view, the evidence available so far is not consistent with the claim that it is impossible to generate a similar (or better) investment result in a more transparent (and lower fee) way. Furthermore, the Board does not feel that the low level of disclosure offered by CUEF sits comfortably with a serious commitment to the ESG agenda.

42. The Board recognises that it is still early days for the new management team at CUEF, and welcomes the engagement so far with the University's net-zero strategy. The Board also understands that there will be further significant announcements from CUEF in relation to these matters which it looks forward to.

43. In the meantime, however, the Board questions whether the University can consider itself a truly accountable institution if its official Trustees (i.e. the University Council) are not given access to fundamental information on 60% of the net assets of the institution for which they are responsible. It also questions whether CUEF will ever be able to offer a best-in-class ESG strategy without proper transparency in relation to the individual companies and other assets that the University is invested in.

44. The Board recommends that the Council carries out an independent review into the Environmental, Social and Governance performance of CUEF. The Board further recommends that the terms of reference for this review should be broad-ranging and include an analysis of the level of transparency within the reporting and operations of CUEF and a comparison with other, similar, institutions with market-leading ESG strategies both in the UK and abroad.

SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES

45. The Board's 25th Report (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6597, p. 159) commented in some detail about the inefficient administrative systems and processes supporting many administrative operations of the University. At the time, the Board recommended that 'the University streamlines and standardises its key financial and HR processes so that it can effectively invest in procuring and deploying modern, fit-for-purpose IT systems ...'

46. The Board notes that, in some areas, rapid progress has been made, including where driven in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. For example, the Board anticipates that the widespread deployment and uptake of productivity tools such as Zoom and Microsoft Teams is likely to have an ongoing positive effect in providing new ways for the University to conduct its business. Similarly, the widespread uptake of online and hybrid methods of delivery of teaching increases the range of ways in which students can learn.

47. However, the Board notes that this deployment of technology was done at speed, under great pressure, in response to a global pandemic. While the outcomes may well be valuable in the long-term, it is vital that they be objectively assessed now that the initial impetus towards them seems to have passed. It is important to understand the consequences of these changes across a range of fronts lest the University ends up enacting significant policy changes through unthinking configuration and deployment of technology. Indeed, this may already have begun to happen: the use of pre-recorded lectures accessible via Moodle, coupled with the current configuration of access controls for Moodle, means that the right of students of the University to attend any lecture in any subject once they have matriculated (Regulation 4 of the regulations for University Composition Fees, *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 149) is being denied by default (and remedying it currently requires manual intervention by administrators).

48. As well as obvious inefficiencies in University systems and processes, the Board has also commented in the past on the relatively poor levels of financial transparency and apparent lack of meaningful management information in relation to some core activities. The University has acknowledged the existence of shortcomings and historic under-investment in these areas, and has launched two significant (and partially overlapping) initiatives to try to address some of the associated issues.

Enhanced Financial Transparency (EFT) – part of the Finance Transformation Programme

49. This is, in principle, an ambitious and laudable project to improve the transparency, timeliness and usefulness of financial information within the University. However, its scope is defined in a rather high level way and, at times, the Board found it difficult to pinpoint specific tangible improvements that the University might expect to see, compared to what has been done at various points in the past.

50. The Board understands that the most significant area of immediate focus for the EFT project is around the financial information that informs the resource allocation process and the role of the Chest in that process. It appears that an alternative financial model for the University's internal budgeting could be proposed in 2022, and would be presented alongside the existing Chest Allocation model. Exactly how this alternative model would differ is still slightly unclear but it seems that key elements include the following:

- A. Income from student fees, Research overheads and other sources would be directly attributed to individual Schools and Departments. At the moment, the core resource allocation process shows these income streams coming into 'the Chest' and then out to Schools via Chest allocations.
- B. Certain centralised costs would be charged to Schools / Departments using an activity-based costing methodology such as TAS and TRAC.
- C. Consideration may be given to moving away from an allocations-based approach (with the associated significant reserves at School level) to an approach which sees more budgetary involvement from the centre and a review of the framework around School-level reserves.

51. The developments described above could result in a very different-looking central budgeting process compared to the current Chest allocations structure. It should be noted that changes in the way the Chest works would, in principle, impact on a range of important and sensitive issues, including the cross-subsidisation between Institutions within the University.

52. However, on further reflection, the Board was left unsure whether the proposed additional financial information would, in practice, amount to anything very different from the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) which was generated annually for the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC). The RAM, which was last produced for 2018–19, already provided an attribution of Chest income streams to individual Schools and was also a way of charging centralised costs to Schools.

53. A move away from an allocations-based approach to budgeting could be a radical and controversial change – and one which might require approval by the Regent House if it were to be proposed. If it is perceived to result in a significant transfer of budgetary control from the Schools / Departments to the centre, reversing the policy direction of the last twenty years, the Board suspects that it may be hard to build broad support for any approach.

54. The Board will be able to comment more fully on these matters once a specific alternative financial model is produced. In the meantime, it notes that the challenge to the University in considering a new financial budgeting model is political as well as financial – any new model would have to be comprehensible and acceptable to the Regent House and would also need to provide appropriate incentives to Heads of Institutions.

55. The Board remains unsure whether the root of the financial transparency problem the University is trying to solve really relates to the nature of the existing financial model or whether it is actually more a question of implementing better financial systems and generating higher quality financial management reports in order to make the existing model work more satisfactorily for the University.

Re-imagining Professional Services (RPS)

56. RPS is also, in principle, an ambitious and extremely broad-ranging process improvement programme taking forward and building on bottom-up process improvement work which was started by the 'ourcambridge' initiative and is now one of thirteen projects in the Recovery Programme (*Reporter*, 6613, 2020–21, p. 470).

57. The Board was initially unclear about the specific changes that it might expect to see in the years ahead from the high level description of RPS. However, the Board's understanding was greatly assisted in a discussion with the Academic Secretary under whose remit the programme sits, which clarified what the various specific initiatives which currently reside underneath the RPS umbrella are seeking to achieve. RPS seems to be a fairly diverse collection of much smaller individual initiatives, each of which is actually defined relatively precisely and with reasonably clear deliverables. There are currently three pilot initiatives which are at various stages of development:

- A. A review of the service delivery model for the University's HR in Schools and NSIs, and streamlining and standardising existing processes prior to the implementation of a new HR system.
- B. A review of Research contracts in a specific School with a view to bringing to bear some consistency and best practice to what is currently a less joined-up activity than it could be.
- C. Consideration of whether certain professional services and shared facilities should be provided at a Departmental, School or central level.

58. The RPS programme is not solely about generating cost savings but is intended to deliver quality improvements as well. Nonetheless, as reported in paragraph 23, RPS has an (ambitious) recurrent cost savings target of 5% over 3–5 years and the Board understands that medium-term savings of this order should hopefully be achievable even if the exact sources of the savings have not been specifically identified yet.

59. The Board considers that the RPS programme, if delivered effectively over a sustained period of time, could result in worthwhile improvements in a range of administrative activities. At this stage, it is not possible to identify meaningful successes but the Board will continue to monitor the progress of the programme in the years ahead.

60. The Board notes that the success of an incremental process-improvement programme like RPS will depend on sustained commitment from the Council and UAS, including adequate resourcing, matched by active engagement by institutions over a period of years. The challenge for senior University Officers, particularly the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellors, will be to maintain momentum and direction when the benefits from many aspects of this programme may not be realised until beyond the end of their expected terms of office.

61. The Board recommends that the Council takes steps to ensure that major systems (and other) transformation programmes (such as the RPS and EFT) are effectively resourced, monitored and sponsored on an on-going basis. This sponsorship will potentially need to be immune to the turnover of senior officers viz Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellors, and needs to be accompanied by the delivery of tangible and specific achievements to an agreed timetable.

ESTATES

62. The Board reiterates concerns first raised in its 24th Report, and again in its 25th Report about the Council's awareness of the urgent need for improvements in the management, governance and assurance of building compliance. Earlier assurances about progress in resolving compliance short-comings appear to have been over-optimistic. However, we understand that the work should finally be completed by the end of the year.

63. The Board's 24th and 25th Reports referred to emerging ideas under consideration by the Council to form a property company or other entity to oversee the development of the non-operational estate. This extended consideration came to fruition early in the Michaelmas Term 2020 with the publication (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6590, p. 30) of a Report of the Council on the establishment of a Property Board to 'oversee the development, management and stewardship of the University's non-operational estate including the West and North West Cambridge sites'. The Report's recommendations were approved by Grace 1 of 18 November 2020.

64. There are clear risks in vesting these responsibilities in a Property Board, with a majority of external members and supported by a Director of Property Development. It is understood that an immediate priority for the Property Board will be pursuing commercial opportunities such as the sale or rental of assets with the promise of significant financial return. The University will need to be vigilant to ensure that achievement of this short-term objective does not restrict opportunities for future academic developments.

65. Good communication with the Regent House is also important. In that context, the announcement on the University website on 29 July 2021 of planning approval for a major expansion at West Cambridge including a 'West Cambridge Innovation District' employing up to an additional 11,000 staff should ring some alarm bells.

66. Although it recognises that the timing of this announcement in the Long Vacation was a consequence of the planning process, the Board is concerned, given the scale and nature of the development, that it was not the subject of a Report in advance of seeking planning approval. The Board accordingly urges the Council to inform the University of such proposals through the timely publication of a Report outlining the case for the development, funding arrangements, governance, etc.

EDUCATION

67. In recent Reports, the Board has focused its attention on the impact of the increase in postgraduate numbers on the resourcing of central support services, notably the Disability Resource Centre (DRC), the University Counselling Service (UCS), and in last year's Report, the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals (OSCCA). Before commenting on the areas that the Board has considered specifically this year – the move to online provision of teaching and examinations in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, and the launch of the Cambridge Advance Online suite of courses as part of its Recovery Programme – we first provide a brief update on the DRC and the UCS, in the light of the Mental Health and Wellbeing Review, and on OSCCA.

Central Support Services

68. There has been an increase in mental health disclosures handled by the DRC from 3,262 in 2020 to 3,569 in 2021, which has taken the advisor to student ratio to 1:800. Whilst in previous years, this number was broadly split 70:30 between undergraduates and postgraduates, the percentage distribution is equalising to be broadly the same.

69. During the year a Strategic Review of Mental Health Provision and Services at the University was undertaken, with the support of external consultants, which delivered an interim Report in April 2021, with a second Report due after completion of Phase Two in September 2021. The interim report identified six key findings in the following areas: (1) governance and decision making; (2) central services demand and provision; (3) College demand and provision; (4) the role of Faculties, Schools and Departments; (5) interfaces across the collegiate University and with the NHS; and (6) costs. It would be inappropriate for the Board to comment on the Strategic Review until the final report has been published, and this will therefore be a focus of the Board's work next year. However, within the context of an update on central services, the positive impact that the Interim Report may have on the DRC, by which the creation of a more coherent and consistent approach across the collegiate University, is noteworthy. Initial findings look promising for the DRC in particular, and the Board looks forward to the publication of the full report in due course.

70. In the interim, however, the DRC acknowledges that whilst the direction of travel is more positive in the medium to long term, in the short to medium term there will need to be changes and efficiency improvements in the way in which the DRC works, e.g. by progressing proposed changes to streamline the submission of Student Support Documents.

71. The Board was unable to follow up on the situation at the UCS this year due to the fact that the Head of the UCS left the University in March 2021 and the Head of Staff Counselling became the UCS's Acting Head. The Board will therefore be following up with the UCS in the coming year once there is a new Head of the service in post.

72. With respect to OSCCA, the Board notes that an additional investigative officer has been timely given the increase in cases.

Impact of the move to online provision of education – teaching and assessment

73. In its 25th Report, the Board recommended that Council carry out a formal review of ‘the move to online provision in Easter Term 2020 to understand how successful it has been so as to inform the University’s future digital strategy, both in the short-term in response to Covid-19 and in the longer term’ (*Reporter*, 6597, 2020–21, p. 159, at p. 166). We noted that this should specifically consider ‘the implications on workload management, student experience, intellectual property, reputational risk, and financing’.

74. In response (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6612, pp. 447–451), the Council referred to four strands of work that ‘will inform planning around the future use of online teaching and learning provision’ (p. 449) as follows: (1) a pulse survey of students conducted at the end of Michaelmas Term 2020; (2) a follow-up survey planned later in the year to understand what has been delivered well; (3) three focused research projects conducted by Ph.D. students at the Faculty of Education on student and staff perceptions of online teaching, including its impact on workload; and (4) an information-gathering exercise conducted by the temporary Technology-Enabled Learning (TEL) team, in consultation with the University Information Services (UIS) and the Cambridge Centre for Teaching and Learning (CCTL) on what support academics need and more generally on aspirations for the future.

75. Whilst worthwhile in their own right, neither individually nor collectively do these ‘four strands’ provide a robust formal review of the move to online provision as a consequence of the pandemic. The four strands ignore three of the five areas that the Board recommended such a formal review should consider: namely, workload management, reputational risk, and financing. On the matter of intellectual property, the response referred to the revised guidance for Faculties and Departments which was completed by the Education Committee in Michaelmas Term 2020.³ Yet despite the absence of lessons learned, the University has launched a suite of online courses as part of its Recovery Programme (see below). It is questionable how this can be achieved, albeit for short courses of eight weeks in length and at a cost per course of c. £2,200, so roughly comparable to the home fee for a full-time undergraduate course, without a thorough understanding of what has worked well, and not so well, in our core programmes, both at undergraduate and postgraduate level. The Council notes that ‘[t]he outcomes of their four pieces of work will be brought together in a report for the Education Committee, with a particular emphasis on the technical and pedagogic support that will be needed to develop technology-enhanced teaching and learning’ (p. 450). The Board awaits the publication of this report.

76. The other key area where the University needed to respond quickly given the circumstances of the pandemic has been in undergraduate assessment. The move to the exclusively online format for examinations in 2020 saw some closing of attainment gaps for ‘good honours’ (but not for numbers gaining Firsts), although the use of the safety net in 2020 and other mitigations in 2021 may have played a part. The impact of online assessment on attainment gaps warrants further investigation.

77. This externally necessitated move to online assessment provided the Examination and Assessment Committee (EAC), the successor to the former Board of Examinations, which was set up in 2018–19, with a timely opportunity to prioritise and investigate diversified modes of assessment. In May 2021 the General Board’s Education Committee agreed a Framework of Assessment for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes 2021–22, which drew on the lessons learned from the Covid-19 pandemic and also the preference of many Faculties and Departments to move away from the traditional three-hour written examination format. This is, however, only the first part of a wider Future of Assessment Programme, which will look at enabling fairer and more creative assessments that are delivered efficiently and effectively. It is anticipated that these approaches will help to close the awarding gaps between different student groups and promote positive wellbeing. The success of the project is dependent on Faculties and Departments engaging with it. Ensuring engagement across the University is a not insignificant challenge, and one (it is hoped) that GBEC will address as neither the EAC nor CCTL have the remit to do so.

78. In addition, the Board wishes to draw attention to the lack of additional resource to carry out what is in effect a root and branch review of undergraduate assessment. Whilst the Strategic review of Mental Health and Wellbeing has been supported by a substantial six-figure budget, the EAC may receive partial FTE personnel support to assist in its work. This is not at all to query the investment in a review of mental health and wellbeing, but the comparative lack of support for what is without doubt a core area of teaching and learning on which the University’s reputation rests is concerning. It is hoped that Council will fully support the provision of the necessary resources to conduct a systematic and thorough review of the important matter of diversified modes of assessment at the University.

79. The Board reiterates its recommendation from last year that the Council carries out a formal review of the externally necessitated move to online provision in Easter Term 2020 to understand how successful it has been so as to inform the University’s future digital strategy, both short-term in response to Covid-19 and in the longer term. The review should specifically consider the implications on workload management, student experience, intellectual property, reputational risk, and financing.

Cambridge Advance Online

80. As part of the Recovery Programme, the University has launched thirteen projects in the areas of Outstanding Education, Impactful Research, Staff and Community, Financial Sustainability, and Efficiency and Effectiveness (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6613, p. 470–471). Cambridge Advance Online (CAO) is a programme which seeks to provide financial sustainability and enhance the University’s reputation, whilst better utilising the University’s resources and improving our resilience to cope with future shocks.

81. The project is a collaboration between the academic University and Cambridge University Press & Assessment, where the University will provide the academic side of the venture, whilst Press & Assessment will focus on the digital realisation, learning design and commercialisation. The plan is to have fifty short courses over the next five years, which will be aimed at mid-career graduate professional learners. The courses will not be award-bearing, but participants will receive a course completion/attendance certificate.

³ <https://www.educationalpolicy.admin.cam.ac.uk/supporting-students/policy-recordings>

82. Notwithstanding the possible additional revenue and potential enhancement of the University's academic reputation by formally venturing into the delivery of online courses, (something which many parts of the University have hitherto been reluctant to do), questions of scrutiny, reputation, and accountability arise from the speed this project was launched. On the Cambridge Advance Online website, for example, it is stated that '[o]ur courses feature the latest in learning design theory and best-in-class learning technology'.⁴ It is difficult to fully ascertain how this might be the case when the University has yet to publish its review of the 'four strands' referred to above of the University's externally necessitated move to online teaching and assessment.

83. This aspect aside, however, it is also unclear how this new project will tie in with diverse, somewhat fragmented provision already offered across the University by such bodies as the Institute of Continuing Education (ICE), the Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership (CISL), Institute for Manufacturing Engage (IFM Engage), and by the Judge Business School (JBS). The Board was informed that Cambridge Advance Online will operate alongside other University providers of such courses, with a medium-term view to creating a landing page for all such provision, with established providers 'hopefully' moving their courses to the CAO platform. Discussions have been had with established online providers in the University and some collaborative projects are in the pipeline, but the speed at which this Recovery Project has been launched raises questions as to both the thoroughness of these discussions as well as to what the University learned from these established providers in terms of providing such online courses. It seems that the University has simply created an online platform, which it is hoped that established providers will join in due course. It is also worth noting, given the Board's concerns about the impact on workload for staff being asked to deliver courses online, that it is expected that the academics who will design the courses for Cambridge Advance Online will do so in addition to their other work (yet will receive no additional remuneration) whilst it is envisaged that the programmes themselves are taught by post-docs and postgraduates at the supervision rate.

84. Whilst it is only to be hoped that this new venture will be as successful as anticipated by the Recovery Programme, the Board remains concerned that it has not yet been fully thought through.

85. Accordingly, the Board recommends that the Council and General Board publish a Report setting out the case for setting up Cambridge Advance Online, its resourcing and governance arrangements, including the protection of the Cambridge brand.

RESEARCH

86. This year, the value of new grants awarded will be of the order £475m, a significant reduction from in excess of £600m that has been seen in recent years, largely as result of a reduction in new grants from research charities whose resources have been seriously depleted as a consequence of the pandemic. At the same time, research income through UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) has been growing, surpassing a number of the University's competitors. However, the University's recent performance has not been as strong in winning the largest grants, a component worthy of the University's strategic attention.

87. The University's return to REF (Research Excellence Framework) 2021 has been submitted, with an outcome expected in spring 2022. The process has highlighted the valuable role of experienced senior staff with institutional memory, which has greatly benefited some Units of Assessment, and ways should be found to incentivise and sustain that in the next REF round.

88. The wider research landscape is not going to remain static and will demand continued reflection and versatile response. The UK's post-Brexit associate membership of the European Research Council (ERC) is encouraging news; experience has shown that ERC approaches have mapped well onto Cambridge research objectives. The agendas of REF and UKRI will continue to evolve and move. Two likely elements anticipated within that movement are an increased prominence of the 'impact agenda' (however labelled), and an enhanced interest in the larger cross-disciplinary, cross-sector initiatives.

89. Within this changing research landscape, Cambridge continues to perform well in several sectors, but an area in which its performance could be enhanced relates to the largest category of grants, sizable projects that typically cross disciplines and involve partnerships inside and outside the institution. There is a sense that a wide range of funding bodies are moving in that direction, and the University needs to be poised and equipped to respond, not just in participatory roles, but more often in lead roles.

90. In relation to such large initiatives, the University's roll-out of Strategic Research Initiatives has made good progress. It may be time to review how flexibly they are resourced.

91. For many parts of the University, assembling impact evidence for REF remains a rather novel skill, but nonetheless the collection of impact case study evidence for REF 2021 appears to have proceeded well. The Board explored in its discussions the potential place of centralised, proactive measures to support and enhance our impact profile, potential areas being in lateral connections, time depth, and research culture. Impact is important not just in relation to REF and KEF (Knowledge Exchange Framework) but also in the direct relationship between universities and the Treasury.

92. The Board recognises a strong argument for central support to facilitate lateral connections, both within academia, and between academia and its 'users' / beneficiaries. There is also a sense that an optimal response to the impact agenda is to build that philosophy into the institution's research culture (rather than a 'tiresome' add-on). The University has a series of valuable instruments in place to facilitate that, under the purview of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Enterprise and Business Relations and the Strategic Partnerships Office.

93. In a university with an outstanding global prominence in core fundamental research, the time depth of full impact is crucial: some of the most compelling impact of the University's research comes ten years or more after the primary research publication (something the REF assessment system already accommodates). Tracking longer term impact is not

⁴ <https://advanceonline.cam.ac.uk/>

an easy task, particularly for individual Principal Investigators (PIs), but one deserving the University's attention if the University is to remain competitive with institutions with a historically stronger 'applied' profile. One valuable example of how this might be achieved comes from the portfolio of Cambridge Innovation Capital (CIC), from which longer term impact pathways have been successfully adduced.

94. Key to tracking full impact is the quality of the University's data capture. The University can greatly benefit from getting better at recording and accessing our underlying research and impact data.

95. Figures for the real cost of research need to shift from a disincentive message to a useful tool to be used in different ways at different levels. Heads at each level are balancing those costs, not against immediate income but against investment in their forward plan. At leadership level, this may entail applying pressure for a rebalance of the Charity Research Support Fund (CRSF). At the centre and School levels, those plans concern, for example, estates and infrastructure. For Heads of Department they concern research quality and assessment, and staff development. For PIs they concern adherence to internal guidelines on direct costs. For the desired outcome at each of these levels, full clarity on research costing and its component parts is key. The principle of 'cost recovery' needs to be placed in the context of 'investment recovery', something not fully achieved until Cambridge's position at the top of world research rankings is retained.

96. The Board continues to believe that a transparent Research costing tool is a key resource, welcomes the Council's commitment to deliver this as part of the Enhanced Financial Transparency Programme (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6612, p. 450), and looks forward to seeing further progress in that area over the next couple of years.

97. The Board recommends that the University should have the necessary infrastructure (systems and people) for optimal data capture for future impact case studies in place well in advance of the next REF round.

98. The Board recommends that, with a view to improving success rates, strategic partnerships, cross-disciplinary ventures, and high value grants should receive priority support.

HUMAN RESOURCES

99. As part of its response to the pandemic the Council introduced a number of measures to control salary expenditure (*Reporter*, 6587, 2019–20 p. 542). In particular, a 'recruitment protocol' which imposed additional procedural hurdles for approving the filling of vacant posts, and the suspension of certain pay and promotion schemes, including senior academic promotions. A voluntary pay reduction scheme was also launched to encourage higher paid staff (over £100k) to forego a proportion of salary for a period of six months. At the same time, the University also funded extensions of the contracts of research staff to provide a degree of security to staff whose contracts were due to expire.

100. In relation to the pay restraint measures, we were told by the senior officers that, in Spring 2020, the financial consequences and duration of the pandemic were so uncertain that such emergency action was justified. The Board accepts that the recruitment protocol was a proportionate response to control expenditure but it questions the wisdom of pausing the recognition and pay progression of staff, who the University regularly claims are its 'greatest asset' and on whom the University would be heavily dependent throughout the duration of the emergency. It is also difficult to reconcile those knee-jerk measures to control expenditure with up to £15m of unbudgeted expenditure to support the extensions for research staff.

101. The Board understands that the salary sacrifice saved £230k; according to the most recent financial management information, there are 352 staff paid over £100k a year which suggests an average sacrifice of £653 of salary per 'higher paid' employee i.e. around 0.6% of salary.

102. In a Notice (*Reporter*, 6625, 2020–21, p. 735), the Council announced the lifting of the pay restraint measures.

Senior Salaries

103. The Board's 25th Report commented on the apparent ranking of the Vice-Chancellor's salary at the top of those of Vice-Chancellors of other Russell Group universities. In responding, the Council drew attention to Cambridge as 'one of the top two UK higher education institutions in terms of turnover' and added that 'it would be surprising if the remuneration of the Vice-Chancellor of the University did not appear at the top of its peer group'.

104. This sort of argument has been used frequently by many organisations to explain away the status quo i.e., endless growth in top salaries relative to those of other employees. If unchallenged it will continue to be used to give a veneer of justification to an unacceptable and unnecessary trend. The Board notes that, since the inception of the full-time Vice-Chancellorship, Cambridge has appointed a succession of internationally distinguished individuals without necessarily paying the highest salary.

105. Furthermore, the Board notes that University turnover of *c.* £2bn includes *c.* £700m attributable to Cambridge Assessment and Cambridge University Press, the management of which operate with a high degree of independence and also receive salaries which are commercially competitive. The Board doubts that the Council would suggest that the Vice-Chancellor's salary should reduce if at some future date these associated bodies were to be sold.

106. The Board also notes that, presumably, a more important and pertinent objective for the University would be to be 'one of the top UK higher education institutions in terms of quality of research and teaching' (rather than 'turnover'), in which case it would seem surprising that Council does not place more emphasis on ensuring that rank-and-file staff are well remunerated (i.e. those who actually deliver the teaching and research).

107. The Financial statements for 2020–21 report the Vice-Chancellor's total remuneration as £468k, or 11.2 times the median pay of academic staff. This multiple has expanded significantly on the last two occasions (at least) that a Vice-Chancellor has been recruited. The Board thinks that, before the recruitment of the next Vice-Chancellor, the Council should take the lead and develop a systematic rationale for dealing with this sensitive and difficult matter, and not simply continue to 'leave it to the market' – a strategy which has been employed by much of the Higher Education sector over the last twenty years and has consistently delivered outcomes that are widely considered to be unacceptable.

108. The Board recommends that, in advance of the recruitment of the next Vice-Chancellor, the Council reviews the basis for determining the salary by setting an upper limit as a multiplier of the median salary (e.g. x10). This would be known to potential candidates at the outset and define the scope (and limits) for negotiation once a preferred candidate had been identified. Such a methodology might reasonably be expected to bring an end to the continued growth in certain senior salaries relative to those of the median academic at Cambridge.

Unestablished Posts

109. The Board has previously expressed concern about the increasing use of unestablished posts and, in its 23rd Report, recommended the Council to clarify the criteria for determining whether a post should be established or unestablished (*Reporter*, 6521, 2018–19, p. 42). The Council, in its response, declined to do so, stating that ‘[t]here is currently no plan to develop a new policy or criteria to dictate to institutions whether a post should be created and filled on an unestablished or established basis’ (*Reporter*, 2018–19, 6528, p. 129). The view that this was a matter for Departments was confirmed in the Board’s recent discussions with the senior officers concerned.

110. However, there have been significant developments in the last year. First, the Council’s consultative report on Membership of the Regent House (*Reporter*, 2020–21, 6609, p. 396) observed in paragraph 10 that ‘[a]cademic-related staff are increasingly being recruited on an unestablished basis’, and that ‘[t]here 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 report continued – ‘There has also been a more modest, but still noteworthy, growth in unestablished academics’. These considerations were cited in favour of moving to grade as the qualifying criterion for membership of the Regent House.

111. Secondly, the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, on the introduction of an academic (teaching and scholarship) career path (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 454), laid out a complete academic career path for the holders of unestablished posts, presumably to provide recognition for the modest growth referred to above. Meanwhile there have been numerous advertisements for vacant posts which were formerly filled as University offices.

112. The Board has several concerns about the unregulated proliferation of unestablished posts: the risk to the University of employing individuals doing the same job on different terms and conditions, undermining the University office as the career path of staff delivering core teaching, research and professional services, and possible decline in academic standards as the workforce is casualised.

113. The Board recommends, again, that the Human Resources Committee be instructed to devise a policy and criteria for determining whether a post should be established or unestablished and that such a policy be published.

GOVERNANCE

Communication with the Regent House

114. In its 25th Report the Board expressed concern about the suspension of the University’s normal governance arrangements during the pandemic. The Board stated (in paragraph 96) that ‘The Board fully acknowledges the necessity for pragmatism ... but this cannot be at the expense of open and transparent governance and accountability to Regent House’. The Council called a Discussion on 14 July 2020 on a Topic of Concern to the University: Decisions taken in response to the coronavirus (Covid-19) outbreak, which was conducted through written submissions (*Reporter*, 6587 2019–20, p. 563). A response by the Council which was promised ‘early in the Easter Term 2021’ (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 447) was published on 21 July 2021 (*Reporter*, 6627, 2020–21, p. 768). The delay in publishing this response was attributed by the Council to ‘staff shortages’. While this may be true, the lack of priority is at the least discourteous to the members of the Regent House, all the more so as the Council itself called the Discussion. The Board returns to this below.

115. Publication of weekly numbers of the *Reporter* resumed in the Michaelmas Term 2020 and arrangements were made for Discussions to be conducted using Microsoft Teams; these were significant improvements over the unauthorised emergency measures taken in the previous academic year. However, serious gaps remain in timely communication and transparency of official information – some of the Special issues of the *Reporter* have either been published too late to be useful or not at all (also attributed to staff shortages). The Board is perplexed that in an age of greater transparency and digital technology, it has become more difficult for members of the Regent House to access basic information about the running of the University, its staffing and finances. While some information is now available online, availability is patchy, navigation of the numerous websites is not intuitive and updating is inconsistent.

Reports and Ballots

116. Two notable ballots took place during the year: on the University Statement on Freedom of Speech (*Reporter*, 6601, 2020–21, p. 280) and the Establishment of an Endowment Fund Supervisory Body (*Reporter*, 6615, 2020–21, p. 540). In both cases the Graces for the approval of the Council’s recommendations were rejected. The rejection of two Reports in a year, though not unprecedented, deserves some further consideration.

117. First, in relation to the content of Reports – these should provide sufficient (i.e. not the minimum the Council might get away with) clear evidence to enable a member of the Regent House, as a member of the Governing Body, to understand and come to a view on proposals. This has not always been the case and Reports, which appear legalistic or excessively risk averse, have not served the Council well.

118. Secondly, remarks made in Discussion should receive serious consideration and a response, normally within four weeks of Term. When substantive reservations are expressed by a number of speakers in Discussion, it is surely preferable that the Council amend or withdraw a Report than press on and lose a ballot (and then claim that this is ‘democracy in action’).

119. The Regent House entrusts the Council with a wide range of responsibilities and it is reasonable for the Council to listen to the Regent House when serious concerns are expressed. The exercise of political nous is sometimes called for. The Board urges the Council to make greater use of the Regent House as a consultative sounding board on proposals that may prove to be controversial, as was done successfully in the case of voting on the outline proposals for membership of the Regent House.

120. The Board recognises the commitment and resourcefulness of the small number of staff concerned who have not only kept the wheels turning during an extended period of unprecedented disruption but have responded and adapted, often under great pressure. However, the Board reiterates a concern expressed in its 24th Report – whether the Unified Administrative Service (UAS) is adequately resourced to discharge the functions expected of it – in this case the self-government of the University which is at the heart of the Council’s responsibilities to the Regent House.

121. These factors lead the Board to encourage the Council to undertake a review of the resourcing and operation of Governance and Compliance, particularly in relation to the timeliness and adequacy of communication with the Regent House and the scope for making greater use of digital means to improve efficiency and access by the Regent House to up-to-date information about the University.

Effectiveness of Committees

122. Two episodes in the course of the year attracted much criticism internally and found the University the subject of extensive negative coverage in the national press. Firstly, two worthy initiatives to refresh the University’s policies on Dignity at Work (to be known as Mutual Respect) and Grievance, both of which had been developed through the HR Committee by an iterative consultative process, were launched as part of a ‘Change the Culture’ campaign. This included a ‘Report and Support’ system for the anonymous reporting of inappropriate behaviour (by staff and students). Significant concerns were raised about defects in the process by which these materials had been approved, in particular the Report and Support System, the quality and accuracy of some supporting documentation, and potential incursion on freedom of expression.

123. Eventually the website was taken down and the campaign suspended. Subsequently the Council set up a Working Group to advise the HR Committee on anonymous reporting and related matters. A notice published on the University website on 7 June 2021 announced that the Change the Culture Campaign had been withdrawn to allow time for ‘a wider debate’ and recognising the importance of ‘widespread engagement and support’ in the University. New proposals would be considered by the General Board and Council in the light of the conclusions of the Working Group. In the meantime, procedural changes for the ‘signing off of documents and website’ have been adopted in the HR Division.

124. Secondly, on 7 July 2021 the University published a statement on its website, noting ‘Cambridge and UAE in talks over pioneering collaboration’. This appeared after details of the potential partnership had appeared in the student and national press raising concerns about human rights in the UAE and the source of funds being at odds with the University’s divestment policy. The Board understands that, at the Council meeting on 19 July, it was agreed that the proposals would be referred back to the Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs (CBELA). A subsequent statement posted on the University website on 4 August stated that ‘we will be reflecting over the next few months before further evaluating our long term options with our partners and with the University Community’. The Board is doubtful about the value of such opaque statements as a means of informing the University about University business.

125. The Board recognises that the University paused these activities once they came to the attention of the Council. However, the Board questions the rigour and timeliness of the internal scrutiny processes through the Committee structure and the extent of reporting to the Council and General Board.

126. The Board recommends that the Audit Committee be asked to undertake a review of the robustness of the Council’s Committee structure and that the Council should itself review the nature and timing of the reports about potential funding partners it receives from the CBELA.

Summary of recommendations

1. **The Board recommends that Council insists on recommending a balanced Allocations budget from now on, i.e., one that returns the University to a sustainable financial framework. Only in exceptional circumstances should the Council recommend an Allocations budget that is materially out of balance and, in such circumstances, the Council should explain to the Regent House what those exceptional circumstances are and how it will ensure that the Chest will be brought back into balance within a reasonable timeframe.**
2. **The Board recommends that the Council carries out an independent review into the Environmental, Social and Governance performance of CUEF. The Board further recommends that the terms of reference for this review should be broad-ranging and include an analysis of the level of transparency within the reporting and operations of CUEF and a comparison with other, similar, institutions with market-leading ESG strategies both in the UK and abroad.**
3. **The Board recommends that the Council takes steps to ensure that major systems (and other) transformation programmes (such as the RPS and EFT) are effectively resourced, monitored and sponsored on an on-going basis. This sponsorship will potentially need to be immune to the turnover of senior officers viz Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellors, and needs to be accompanied by the delivery of tangible and specific achievements to an agreed timetable.**
4. **The Board reiterates its recommendation from last year that the Council carries out a formal review of the externally necessitated move to online provision in Easter Term 2020 to understand how successful it has been so as to inform the University’s future digital strategy, both short-term in response to Covid-19 and in the longer term. The review should specifically consider the implications on workload management, student experience, intellectual property, reputational risk, and financing.**
5. **The Board recommends that the Council and General Board publish a Report setting out the case for setting up Cambridge Advance Online, its resourcing and governance arrangements, including the protection of the Cambridge brand.**

6. The Board recommends that the University should have the necessary infrastructure (systems and people) for optimal data capture for future impact case studies in place well in advance of the next REF round.
7. The Board recommends that, with a view to improving success rates, strategic partnerships, cross-disciplinary ventures, and high value grants should receive priority support.
8. The Board recommends that, in advance of the recruitment of the next Vice-Chancellor, the Council reviews the basis for determining the salary by setting an upper limit as a multiplier of the median salary (e.g. x10). This would be known to potential candidates at the outset and define the scope (and limits) for negotiation once a preferred candidate had been identified. Such a methodology might reasonably be expected to bring an end to the continued growth in certain senior salaries relative to those of the median academic at Cambridge.
9. The Board recommends, again, that the Human Resources Committee be instructed to devise a policy and criteria for determining whether a post should be established or unestablished and that such a policy be published.
10. The Board recommends that the Audit Committee be asked to undertake a review of the robustness of the Council's Committee structure and that the Council should itself review the nature and timing of the reports about potential funding partners it receives from the CBELA.

7 October 2021	GRAHAM ALLEN (<i>Chair</i>) DAVID BUTTERFIELD GILLY CARR JOHN FAWCETT	GAVIN FLYNN D. J. GOODE MARTIN JONES RICHARD MORTIER	ANNAMARIA MOTRESCU-MAYES KAREN OTTEWELL MARK SMITH IAN WRIGHT (<i>Secretary</i>)
----------------	--	---	---

GRACES

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 20 October 2021

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, unless they are withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105), will be deemed to have been approved at **4 p.m. on Friday, 29 October 2021**. Further information on requests for a ballot or the amendment of Graces is available to members of the Regent House on the Regent House Petitions site.[§]

1. That paragraph (i) of the Ordinance on membership of the Regent House under Special Ordinance A (i) (f) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 104) be amended to read as follows, with the text in brackets to be added from the beginning of Lent Term 2022 and the text in angular brackets to be removed if the changes to Statute approved by Grace 1 of 12 May 2021 are approved by Her Majesty in Council:¹

- (i) holders of the appointments of Director of Research, Principal Research Associate, Senior Research Associate, Lecturer (unestablished), Assistant Professor <(unestablished)>, Associate Professor (Grades 9 and 10) <(unestablished)>[, Senior Teaching Associate, Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor];²

2. That paragraph 14 of the Report of the General Board, dated 22 July 2021, on major modifications to the Education Tripos (*Reporter*, 6628, 2020–21, p. 806) be approved.

3. That paragraph 14 of the Report of the General Board, dated 22 July 2021, on the introduction of a Design Tripos and Master of Design Degree in the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art (*Reporter*, 6628, 2020–21, p. 810) be approved.

¹ The Council is proposing this Grace to revise the membership of the Regent House to reflect the changes in the titles of unestablished roles following the adoption of a new academic office structure and a teaching and scholarship pathway (*Reporter*, 2020–21; 6628, p. 787; 6629, p. 834). Appointments to Assistant Lectureships (unestablished) have not been made since the office of Assistant Lecturer was abolished in February 2004 (*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 47), and there are no current holders of this appointment, therefore the reference to them is being removed. If the Grace is approved, these changes will take effect from the promulgation of the Roll in November 2021. If the recommendations of the Report published on 13 October 2021 are approved (*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 47), they will supersede these changes with effect from the promulgation of the Roll in November 2022. The transitional arrangements in the latter Report would be applied to those holding the appointment of Senior Teaching Associate at Grade 8 (the other roles are at Grade 9 or above and therefore would be eligible for membership under the Report's recommendations).

[§] See <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/key-bodies/RH-Senate/Pages/RH-Petitions.aspx> for details.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 22 October 2021

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on 22 October 2021:

That the following person be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts by incorporation:

1. BENJAMIN PERRY SENNITT, Assistant Director in the University Press, Master of Arts of the University of Oxford (2011).

That the following persons be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts under the provisions of Statute B II 2:

2. LORRAINE HEADEN, Fellow of King's College.
3. PAUL GLYN HUMPHREYS, Assistant Treasurer in the Finance Division of the University Offices.
4. MARK DAVID OAKLEY, Fellow of St John's College.
5. ANDREW LEIGH PAGE, Director in the University Press.
6. JOHN RICHARD BRADBURY PERRY, Fellow of King's College, Professor of Molecular Endocrinology in the Department of Clinical Biochemistry.
7. MARK SLACK, Associate Lecturer in the Faculty of Clinical Medicine.
8. JIAN YUAN, Departmental Secretary in the Department of Physics.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 23 October 2021

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on 23 October 2021:

That the following person be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts by incorporation:

1. RICHARD NICHOLAS HEATON, Warden of Robinson College, Master of Arts of the University of Oxford (2021).

That the following persons be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts under the provisions of Statute B II 2:

2. DOROTHY BYRNE, President of Murray Edwards College.
3. ANNE CARLA FERGUSON-SMITH, Fellow of Darwin College, Arthur Balfour Professor of Genetics in the Department of Genetics, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and International Partnerships.
4. ROBERT JOHN HOPWOOD, Fellow of Murray Edwards College.
5. KAMAL AHMED MUNIR, Fellow of Homerton College, Professor of Strategy and Policy (Grade 11) in the Judge Business School, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for University Community and Engagement.
6. SIMON ANDREW, Baron WOOLLEY OF WOODFORD, Principal of Homerton College.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION**Tuesday, 12 October 2021**

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor Dame Madeleine Atkins was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Junior Proctor and five other persons present.

The following Reports were discussed:

Report of the General Board, dated 22 July 2021, on major modifications to the Education Tripos

(*Reporter*, 6628, 2020–21, p. 806)

No remarks were made on this Report.

Report of the General Board, dated 22 July 2021, on the introduction of a Design Tripos and Master of Design Degree in the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art

(*Reporter*, 6628, 2020–21, p. 810)

No remarks were made on this Report.

COLLEGE NOTICES**Elections***King's College*

Elected to a Life Fellowship from 1 October 2021:

Dr Thomas Keith Carne, M.A., Ph.D., *T*
Mr Peter Jones, M.A., *Oxford*, Pg.Dip., *K*

Elected to a Professorial Fellowship from 1 October 2021:

Dr Anna Alexandrova, B.Sc., *Intercollege, Nicosia*,
M.Sc., *LSE*, Ph.D., *California, San Diego*
Dr Matei Candea, M.A., Ph.D., *EM*
Dr Francesco Colucci, M.D., *Bari*, Ph.D., *Umeå, Sweden*
Dr Aytek Erdil, B.S., *Bilkent, Turkey*, M.S.,
Ph.D., *Chicago*
Dr Chryssi Giannitsarou, B.Sc., *Athens*, M.Sc., *LSE*,
Ph.D., *London Business School*
Dr Ingo Gildenhard, B.A., *Pomona College*,
Claremont, California, Ph.D., *Princeton*
Dr Henning Grosse Ruse-Khan, Ph.D., *Muenster*
Dr Cesare Hall, M.A., M.Eng., Ph.D., *K*
Dr Bert Vaux, Ph.D., *Harvard*
Dr Darin Weinberg, B.A., *California, San Diego*,
M.Sc., *LSE*, M.A., Ph.D., *California*

Elected to an Ordinary Fellowship from 1 October 2021:

Dr Scott Melville, M.Phys., *Oxford*, Ph.D., *Imperial*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship from 1 September 2021:

Professor Richard Jozsa, B.Sc., *Monash, Australia*,
M.Sc., D.Phil., *Oxford*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship from 1 October 2021:

Dr Rebecca Buxton, B.A., *KCL*, M.Sc., D.Phil., *Oxford*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship from 1 January 2022:

Dr John Filling, B.A., M.Phil., D.Phil., *Oxford*

Vacancies

Downing College: 2021 Arnell Fellowship in Climate Repair; subject focus: the physics and biogeochemistry of shelf seas; salary: up to £52,559; tenure: as soon as possible for five years in the first instance; closing date: 29 November 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.dow.cam.ac.uk/join-downing/academic-vacancies>

EXTERNAL NOTICES**Oxford Notices**

St Antony's College: Alistair Horne Fellowship 2022; to support the writing of a significant book of non-fiction for a general readership; tenure: academic year 2022–23; expenses allowances and generous College benefits plus full use of College facilities; closing date: 13 December 2021; further details: <https://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/current-members/senior-members/visiting-fellowships/alistair-horne-visiting-fellowship>

St Benet's Hall: Master; salary: competitive; tenure: from the start of the 2022–23 academic year; closing date: 1 November 2021 at 5 p.m.; further details: <https://candidates.perrettlaver.com/vacancies/2525/master/>