

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6645

WEDNESDAY 2 FEBRUARY 2022

VOL CLII No 16

## CONTENTS

<b>Notices</b>		<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Calendar	235	<b>Report of Discussion: 25 January 2022</b>	
Discussion on Tuesday, 8 February 2022	235	Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2020–21	250
Office of Vice-Chancellor: Consultation survey	235	Annual Report of the General Board to the Council for the academic year 2020–21	251
Annual Report of the Audit Committee for the financial year 2020–21	236	Joint Report on an extension to the General Board's authority to amend or suspend certain arrangements for the examination and assessment of taught courses	251
<b>Vacancies, appointments, etc.</b>		<b>College Notices</b>	
Electors to the Professorship of Architecture	245	Elections	252
<b>Obituaries</b>		Vacancies	252
Obituary Notice	246	Events	252
<b>Graces</b>		Memorial Service	252
Graces submitted to the Regent House on 2 February 2022	246	<b>External Notices</b>	
<b>Acta</b>		Oxford Notices	252
Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 19 January 2022	246		
Congregation of the Regent House on 29 January 2022	246		



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

## NOTICES

### Calendar

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

13 February, *Sunday*. Lent Term divides. Preacher before the University at 10 a.m., Professor Karen Kilby, Bede Professor of Catholic Theology in the University of Durham (Hulsean Preacher).

#### Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

8 February

22 February

8 March

22 March

#### Congregations (Saturdays unless otherwise stated)

26 February, 10 a.m.

25 March (Friday), 10 a.m.

26 March, 10 a.m.

1 April (Friday), 10 a.m.

2 April, 10 a.m.

### Discussion on Tuesday, 8 February 2022

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) to attend a Discussion **in the Senate-House**, on Tuesday, 8 February 2022 at 2 p.m. The following item will be discussed:

1. Report of the General Board, dated 25 January 2022, on the establishment of a Professorship (*Reporter*, 6644, 2021–22, p. 231).

Those wishing to attend should refer to the Council's Notices of 28 September 2021 and 6 January 2022 on arrangements for attending Discussions (see *Reporter*, 6642, 2021–22, p. 207). Contributors who are unable to attend in person may email remarks to [contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk](mailto:contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk), copying [ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk), by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion, for reading out by the Proctors,<sup>1</sup> or ask someone else who is attending to read the remarks on their behalf. General information on Discussions is provided on the Governance site at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions/>.

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

### Office of Vice-Chancellor: Consultation survey

2 February 2022

Further to its Notice of 21 January 2022 (*Reporter*, 6644, 2021–22, p. 224), the Advisory Committee invites members of the collegiate University to complete a survey as part of the University-wide consultation on the strategic priorities for and attributes of, the next Vice-Chancellor. The link to the online survey has been circulated by email to staff and students of the University and Colleges but is also available from <https://www.staff.admin.cam.ac.uk/survey-on-priorities-and-attributes-for-the-next-vice-chancellor> (Raven required); a Word version of the survey is available on request (email: [vc-search-consultation@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:vc-search-consultation@admin.cam.ac.uk)). The deadline for responses is **5 p.m. on Wednesday, 9 February 2022**.

The feedback received from the consultation, including the survey responses, will inform the Advisory Committee's deliberations in the search for the next Vice-Chancellor. It is anticipated that the Advisory Committee will report back to the University later in the Lent Term 2022.

## Annual Report of the Audit Committee for the financial year 2020–21

The Council has received the Annual Report of the Audit Committee for the financial year 1 August 2020–31 July 2021. The report is published below for the information of the University. Appendices A, C, E and F to the report are provided as a separate pdf file at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2021-22/weekly/6645/AuditReport-Appendices.pdf>. Appendices B, D and G are not reproduced.

### Introduction and executive summary from the Chair of the Audit Committee

The Audit Committee has a key role in providing public assurance in regard to financial and management governance arrangements at the University. This Annual Report sets out how that has been achieved in the financial year 2020–21, and the conclusions the Committee reached from its work.

The Committee conducted its work against the backdrop of significant uncertainty and change, fashioned by both external factors such as the Covid-19 pandemic, and internal factors including major transformation programmes aimed at improving operational efficiency and effectiveness.

Against this backdrop we sought assurance from a number of sources. At the forefront is the work conducted by Internal Audit. As was the case last year, Internal Audit worked to six month plans. Although the proximate reason for this was ongoing disruption and uncertainty caused by Covid, all audit planning and activity continued to be closely referenced to the University's Risk Register and its Priorities Framework. In addition to the planned cycle of audits reported on below, Internal Audit also conducted a number of assurance reviews, fact-finding exercises, and monitoring to ensure legacy audit actions were kept under review and closed out.

The Committee also gains assurance through reports at every meeting from Senior Officers of the University, regular scrutiny of the University's Risk Register and actions to mitigate risk, as well as from the External Auditor's Management Letter.

Having evaluated this body of evidence, Audit Committee is able to provide assurance on the adequacy and effectiveness of the University's arrangements for: risk management, control and governance; economy, efficiency and effectiveness; and the management and quality assurance of data submitted.

Our Annual Report again highlights two key challenges which feature regularly in reports and discussions. The first is tensions between institutional autonomy and the need for compliance with policies and procedures. The second is consideration of how far the University's historical governance model is fit to address areas of growing financial and reputational risk, such as cyber security. Both are a product of the University's highly devolved departmental structure, which the Committee recognises is core to Cambridge's sustained academic excellence. However, it does emphasise the need for greater transparency over where responsibilities and accountabilities lie and the need to identify opportunities to support the devolved academic model by driving operational efficiencies in underlying support processes such as finance, purchasing and contract management.

A full year internal audit plan for 2021–22 is now in place, and is well aligned with key risks and strategic priorities. That and other activity will be delivered against ongoing Covid uncertainty, the challenges of progressing several University wide transformation programmes concurrently, and preparations for a leadership transition.

Finally, the Committee would like to acknowledge the excellent support provided by the secretariat in facilitating its work.

Professor Sir David Greenaway  
*Chair of the Audit Committee, University of Cambridge*

### 1. Background

The Audit Committee is required to submit an annual report to the Council.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of the report is to set out the current membership and constitution of the Audit Committee, to report on its work and activity over the last financial year and to provide the Committee's and the auditors' opinions on the adequacy and effectiveness of the University's systems of risk management, control, governance and value for money. The report is informed by the internal audit annual report (see Appendix B [not reproduced]).

This Audit Committee Annual Report is for the 2020–21 financial year (1 August 2020–31 July 2021), and is delivered in four sections:

- an introduction and executive summary from the Chair of the Audit Committee;
- an overview focusing on key themes arising from the work of the Audit Committee during 2020–21;
- the opinion of the Audit Committee on the reliance to be placed on the internal control and reporting systems of the University; and
- a description of the University's arrangements for internal and external audit, including the overall opinion of the internal auditor and the findings in the external auditor's annual report.

A copy of this report will be published in the University's official journal, the *Reporter*, for the information of the University.

<sup>1</sup> Specified in Chapter XIII of the University's *Statutes and Ordinances* (2020, p. 1069).

## 2. Overview of the Audit Committee and its work

### 2.1. Role and membership of the Audit Committee

The Constitution of the Audit Committee is set out in the *Statutes and Ordinances of the University of Cambridge*. Further information on the Committee's membership, terms of reference and meetings are provided in Appendix A.

### 2.2. Audit providers

The University's internal auditor is Deloitte LLP and its external auditor is PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC). Further information on the University's arrangements for internal and external audit are provided in Section 4 of the report.

### 2.3. How the Audit Committee gains assurance

The Audit Committee is required to provide an opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the University's arrangements for:

- risk management, control and governance;
- economy, efficiency and effectiveness (value for money); and
- the management and quality assurance of data submitted to the Higher Education Statistics Agency, the Student Loans Company, the OfS, Research England and other bodies.

The Audit Committee's opinion is based on the Committee's consideration of the University's Risk Register and its role in assessing and managing risk, the internal auditor's annual report, the external auditor's Management Letter, other work commissioned by the Committee during the year and on discussions at its meetings and workshops. The Committee routinely invites senior officers in particular areas of operation to present to the Committee and answer questions. Workshops are held outside formal meetings to enable more in-depth discussion on a particular topic. The Committee receives further reports from the audit sponsors (the senior officer responsible for the area of audit) of internal audit reports which carry limited assurance ratings.

In addition to oral reports, the Committee receives a range of written reports throughout the year. These include annual reports on value for money, research grants audits, the University's anti-bribery and corruption policy and an annual report from the Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs.

### 2.4. Covid-19 pandemic

The Covid-19 pandemic continues to have a significant impact on the day-to-day operations of the University, particularly in relation to teaching and learning activities. A Covid-19 Recovery Programme was developed and identifies key strategic opportunities to support the University's recovery both in the short and longer term.

The Audit Committee has continued to meet virtually during 2020–21, and the Committee receives a report on the University's Covid response and recovery at each meeting. Internal audit activity focused on the University's response to Covid-19 during the first half of the year but moved back towards 'business as usual' during the latter half of the year, albeit with internal audit activity taking place remotely.

### 2.5. Specific areas of work

In the first six months of 2020–21, the Audit Committee discussed the findings of internal audits focused on the University's response to Covid-19, including communications during the pandemic, financial processes, the recovery programme itself and a desktop exercise to rehearse the University's plans, processes and decision-making in the case of a resurgence of Covid-19. The second half of the year saw a return to the usual programme of internal audits based on the University risk register. This included audits on key areas of operational risk including risk management, software asset management, Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF) investment management and the University's approach to managing its subsidiaries.

Of the fifteen internal audits carried out in 2020–21, five carried substantial assurance, four were advisory, unrated pieces, one was given an amber readiness rating, and five carried limited assurance. A full list of internal audit reports considered by the Audit Committee during 2020–21 is provided in Appendix A.

#### (i) Research recovery rate

In October 2020, the Committee received an advisory report designed to support the University in understanding how to improve recovery of the cost of delivering research. This touched directly on financial sustainability, one of the University's key areas of risk. The report did not carry an assurance rating, but identified 37 recommendations, including four Priority 1 recommendations. The Committee noted that much of the responsibility for cost recovery lay with Departments and Faculties.

The Research Office developed an action plan in response to the findings, which was considered by the Committee in March 2021. The structure of the action plan reflected the complexity of addressing the risks identified in the report within the devolved nature of the University, in that it was not possible for one division or office to be responsible for all of the recommendations. A number of actions would need to be addressed through the Finance Transformation Programme (FTP) and associated Enhanced Financial Transparency (EFT) project.

The Committee agreed that Deloitte would follow up on progress of a number of actions with the Research Office during Michaelmas Term 2021 to confirm that these had been addressed. A further review of actions to be addressed through FTP and EFT would be reported to the Audit Committee during Easter Term 2022.

(ii) *CUFS penetration system*

In October 2020, the Committee received an audit report in relation to CUFS Penetration Testing management, which carried limited assurance. The report highlighted the need for a defined schedule for further penetration testing and a defined re-testing process for the University's finance system.

The University welcomed the findings and acknowledged that there had been an *ad hoc* approach to penetration testing previously. The Finance Division and UIS were working closely together to ensure processes were strengthened in the future. The Committee stressed the importance of scheduling external penetration testing, which would be vital to uncover weaknesses and vulnerabilities in the system.

(iii) *Data quality (HE-BCI)*

In November 2020, the Committee received an audit report relating to management controls in place to address the key risks related to the Higher Education Business and Community Interaction (HE-BCI) statutory data return, which carried limited assurance. The audit had identified seven recommendations, including one Priority 1 recommendation. These related to the need for clarification of roles and responsibilities for the data return, improved awareness, understanding and engagement, improved data collection and collation and validation checks for the data. It was noted that the HE-BCI data would form the backbone of the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF), which presented a potentially significant reputational risk if the data return inadequately captured the scale of the University's business and community interactions due to incomplete data.

A working group had been established to take forward the recommendations and improve the data included in the return. The Committee noted that much of the data was owned at a devolved level, and that engagement from colleagues across the University would be required. It was also noted that the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) was undertaking a review of the HE-BCI return and that the outcome of that review would need to be taken into account.

The Committee received an update on progress towards addressing the recommendations from the HE-BCI data return in May 2021, following the outcome of the 2020 KEF, in which the University's performance was considered to be underwhelming in most areas when compared to its key peers. The Committee welcomed the update on progress, and acknowledged that it would take some time for improvements in the data return to translate into better performance in the KEF, as the metrics were based on a three-year rolling average.

(iv) *Departmental IT Controls, Cyber Security and Software Asset Management*

During the 2020–21 academic year, the Committee received three audit reports relating to IT controls (Departmental IT Controls, Cyber Security and Software Asset Management), all of which carried limited assurance.

The Committee noted that there were strong similarities between the findings of these audits, namely that the devolved nature of IT infrastructure of the University created challenges in terms of implementing appropriate controls and providing assurance over the effectiveness of these controls. In January 2021, the Director of University Information Services set out the proposed direction of travel for the University, through the Digital Workplace programme, which aimed to create a unified approach to IT infrastructure across the University. The Committee noted that the Covid-19 pandemic had created some opportunities to move this programme forward more quickly.

The Committee strongly agreed that the current fragmentation of IT infrastructure prevented the implementation of appropriate controls to mitigate the risks to the University. The Committee will continue to receive regular updates on progress with the Digital Workplace programme, with a view to making specific recommendations if required to help move the programme forward.

(v) *Recovery Programme readiness*

In May 2021, the Committee received a report concerning the Recovery Programme's state and preparedness to operate as a programme. The assignment was designed as an in-flight review to consider the set-up of the Recovery Programme and identify recommendations to support the University in maximising the likelihood of successful implementation. An amber 'readiness rating' had been provided. Four recommendations had been identified, including one Priority 1 recommendation, concerning project set-up and timelines, project monitoring and reporting, benefits realisation and project documentation.

The Chair of the Recovery Programme Taskforce gave a presentation to the Committee, outlining the vision, objectives and benefits of the Recovery Programme and highlighting the substantial progress made against the recommendations since the fieldwork for the assignment had completed. The Committee noted that a number of the projects relied on cultural and behavioural changes across the University, and therefore required careful implementation.

The Committee noted that whilst the readiness assignment had been helpful, the fast-moving nature of the Recovery Programme did not lend itself well to a traditional internal audit approach, particularly in relation to agreeing audit actions and follow up on those.

## 2.6. Risk management

The new risk management framework continued to be embedded throughout 2020–21. In accordance with the University's Risk Framework, the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) carried out two comprehensive reviews of the University's Risk Register. The first, in October 2020, focused on updating the risk register in light of the Covid-19 pandemic, whilst the second review, in January 2021 focused on a review of School and Non-School Institution (NSI) risk registers alongside the University Risk Register.

The Committee noted common areas of risk between School and NSI risk registers and the University Risk Register (financial sustainability, research excellence and valuing our people), and also areas of risk on the University Risk Register that had not been identified at devolved level (partnerships, community, contribution to society and the environment). The Committee agreed that it should receive a review of School and NSI risks on an annual basis.

No risks were added or removed from the Risk Register during 2020–21. The latest version of the revised Risk Register was approved by the Audit Committee and the Council in March 2021, and was published for members of the University on the Governance and Compliance Division webpages.<sup>2</sup>

Risk update meetings, which were paused during the first few months of the Covid-19 pandemic, resumed in February 2021, and have continued to provide the opportunity for risk owners meet to discuss and review a particular University risk in detail. Starting in Michaelmas Term 2021, the Audit Committee will receive a termly report summarising key changes to University risks made as a result of the risk update meetings, including detail on emerging and escalated risks.

An internal audit of the University's risk management processes was undertaken in March 2021, which carried substantial assurance. The audit found that the University has made steps in progressing the overall risk management maturity and capability since the implementation of the new Risk Management Policy in 2019. Areas of improvement were identified, specifically in relation to further embedding good risk management activities, enhancing the risk register and reporting format, and building an approach for emerging risks and lessons learnt. These recommendations are being taken forward for implementation by the Governance and Compliance Division during 2021–22.

### *2.7. Implementation of the recommendations of the Internal Audit Provisions Working Group*

During the 2020–21 academic year, progress has been made towards implementing the recommendations of the Internal Audit Provisions Working Group. In October 2019, the Audit Committee agreed that the University should develop its current outsourced audit function into a hybrid model, comprising a single external internal audit firm and a dedicated senior University member with a broad understanding of the University and of internal audit acting as facilitator. Full implementation of the recommendations was subject to a small increase in resources, and the implementation of the recommendations was paused during the initial stages of the Covid-19 pandemic. The required increase in resources was approved in July 2021, and the University is now working to establish the hybrid model with effect from 1 August 2021.

The University went out to tender for its internal audit provider during 2020–21, and reappointed Deloitte LLP as the internal auditor with effect from 1 August 2021 for a four-year term until 31 July 2025, with provision for a one-year extension. The outsourced internal audit function will be facilitated by the Senior Assurance and Regulatory Compliance Manager, based in the Governance and Compliance Division. Recruitment of a small, internal assurance team is underway to further support the development of the hybrid model and to deliver a more risk-targeted and effective internal audit function as part of a maturing risk management process and three-line model of assurance.

### *2.8. Challenges for 2021–22*

As predicted in last year's annual report, the University has continued to operate under the shadow of the Covid-19 pandemic during 2020–21. Whilst some aspects of University business have returned to a steady state of operations, other areas remain in a state of transition. The Recovery Programme seeks to identify strategic opportunities for the University as it responds to the challenges of the Covid-19 pandemic. It consists of thirteen projects, and is aligned with the University's Priorities Framework, adding to or accelerating work identified as strategically important. There are a number of projects under the Recovery Programme that seek to transform key elements of University business: Enhanced Financial Transparency, Strategic Procurement and Purchasing, Reimagining Professional Services and Digital Workplace. A key challenge for the Audit Committee in the coming year will be to determine how it receives assurance over the management of risks in these areas during a period of significant change.

The two main challenges highlighted in the Committee's last two Reports, in 2018–19 and 2019–20, continue to stand out in the findings and information provided to the Audit Committee. The first is the tension between institutional autonomy under the University's devolved structure, and the need for compliance by those institutions with central policies and procedures. The second theme is the consideration of how far the University's culture of academic freedom extends into non-academic areas, particularly in relation to areas of growing reputational risk to the University such as cyber security and international engagement.

A key element in addressing the challenges highlighted above will be to provide clear frameworks and principles of compliance through (1) providing greater clarity around expectations, (2) systematic training for staff at different levels across the University, (3) consideration of where resource should be deployed in order to be the most effective for compliance and (4) establishing appropriate methods to seek assurance over compliance. The further development of the University's internal audit and assurance function will be key to tackling these challenges. During 2021–22, the Committee will receive further information on what assurance mechanisms the University already has in place and consider what other methods might be required to seek assurance over compliance.

Echoing recent comments by both the Council and the Board of Scrutiny, the Audit Committee acknowledges the challenges presented by the transfer of leadership, following the Vice-Chancellor's decision to complete his term of office at the end of September 2022. The Committee will remain mindful of the need to avoid disruption to the University's priorities over the next 24 months or so, as the new Vice-Chancellor is chosen, an Acting Vice-Chancellor is put in place (as is likely to be necessary) and then the new Vice-Chancellor takes up office and establishes her- or himself. The Committee will be particularly watchful of the potential impact on the large transformation programmes, which depend on sustained commitment from the senior leadership over a number of years.

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.governanceandcompliance.admin.cam.ac.uk/audit-regulatory-compliance/risk-management/university-risk-register>.



### 3. Audit Committee's opinions 2020–2021

#### 3.1. Opinion: Risk management, control and governance arrangements

The Audit Committee keeps under review the University's risk management strategy and implementation, and effectiveness of the University's systems of financial and other internal controls and governance as follows.

##### (i) Risk management

The University is committed to ensuring it has a robust and comprehensive system of risk management in line with the requirements of the Office for Students, and follows good practice in risk management. A summary of how risks are identified and evaluated, and how risk management is embedded in ongoing operations is provided below.

- (a) The University's Senior Leadership Team is responsible for identifying and managing risks across the University's activities, within the context of the University's priorities and objectives. The review of risks encompasses business, operational, compliance, financial and reputational risks.
- (b) All identified risks are evaluated using a common framework for scoring that considers both the likelihood and impact of risks becoming a reality. The scoring guidance for evaluating risks prompts risk owners to consider the following categories of impact: finance, compliance, safety, service delivery (operational), reputation and people.
- (c) The risk management framework applies across the University's institutions, with further guidance and information provided to those who own or manage University, School, Faculty or Departmental risks (primarily through web-based resources and training). Risk assessment underpins the University's programme of internal audit and is embedded as part of the University's annual planning processes.
- (d) The University's Risk Register identifies those risks that are considered to have a fundamental impact on the University's ability to deliver its mission or to operate effectively. The Risk Register is considered and formally approved by the Council at least annually, enabling it to receive direct updates on the evaluation and management of risks.
- (e) From June 2019 onwards, a discussion on the status of each risk on the University Risk Register and progress with mitigating actions has taken place with risk owners as part of a schedule of monthly meetings.

Under the new risk management framework introduced during 2018–19, the Audit Committee will continue to consider risk management as a standing item in its meetings to ensure routine monitoring. The Audit Committee will report to the Council on internal controls and alert the Council to any emerging issues as necessary. In addition, the Audit Committee will formally review the University Risk Register at least twice a year, and make a recommendation to the Council as to whether the Risk Register and the management of risks is appropriate.

An internal audit of the University's risk management processes was undertaken in March 2021, which carried substantial assurance. The audit found that the University has made steps in progressing the overall risk management maturity and capability since the implementation of the new Risk Management Policy in 2019. At the current time, University management are content with the University's maturity in relation to its approach to risk management processes, and this is the first step of a process that is expected to develop and evolve over time. The next step is to map out and understand how the University gets assurance over the processes and controls that it has put in place to mitigate risk, and this work is being prioritised for 2021–22.

The online risk management training course, which was launched in October 2019, continues to be made available for all University staff. A further 35 members of the University completed this course during the 2020–21 academic year, bringing the total to 89 since October 2019. Face-to-face risk management training seminars were paused during 2020–21 as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

##### (ii) Corporate governance and internal control

The Council is responsible for ensuring that a sound system of internal control is maintained. The Statement of Internal Control, included in the Financial Statements and provided in Appendix C, sets out the University's arrangements for the prevention and detection of corruption, fraud, bribery and other irregularities. It also includes an account of how the principles of internal control have been applied.

The Council is also responsible for reviewing the effectiveness of the system of internal control. The Audit Committee supports the Council in this role as described below.

- (a) The Chair of the Audit Committee provides periodic reports to the Council concerning internal control and risk management.
- (b) Risk management is a standing item on the Audit Committee agenda and is the driving element in the design of the annual internal audit programme of work. The Audit Committee considers the effectiveness of the risk management framework and reports on this annually.
- (c) The Council receives minutes of all meetings of the Audit Committee.
- (d) The Audit Committee receives regular reports from the University's internal auditor, which includes the internal auditor's independent opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the University's system of internal control and risk management, together with recommendations for improvement.
- (e) The Audit Committee reviews and reports on the implementation of actions in response to recommendations for improvement made as part of the regular audit cycle and other investigations as required.
- (f) The Audit Committee reviews the University's Policy against Bribery and Corruption on an annual basis and considers the effectiveness of the University's arrangements for the prevention and detection of corruption, fraud, bribery and other irregularities.

Through the consideration of reports from the internal auditor and other investigations, the Audit Committee is assured that the University's system of internal control is currently effective and is able to report its reassurance to the Council for the year 2020–21.

(iii) *Fraud, bribery and corruption*

The Audit Committee oversees the University's Policy against Bribery and Corruption. Under the Financial Regulations, any member of staff must report immediately to the Registrar and the Director of Finance any suspicion of bribery, fraud or other irregularity. Instances of bribery and fraud that involve sums of over £25,000 must be reported to the OfS under its terms and conditions of funding for higher education institutions.

In the 2020–21 academic year, across the University, the Colleges and the University's subsidiaries, there have been reports of a theft of physical artefacts, one potential fraud (for which no evidence of wrongdoing was found) and one fraud which resulted in a minor financial loss.

In June 2021, the Committee received an annual review of the University's policy against bribery and corruption. Bribery Act training is conducted through the University's online Anti-Bribery and Corruption training module. The Committee noted that participation in the online Anti-Bribery and Corruption training module over the last two years had improved slightly, helped by a marked uptake during 2019–20. Further work is planned for the next academic year to simplify the current training course with the aim of increasing participation.

(iv) *Cambridge University Press and Cambridge Assessment*

Cambridge University Press (CUP) is governed by the Press Syndicate, and Cambridge Assessment (CA) by the Local Examinations Syndicate. Both Syndicates have delegated their powers to the joint Press and Assessment Board (PAB) which has various sub-committees including the PAB Regulatory Compliance Committee and the PAB Audit Committee. From 1 August 2021, the two organisations will be integrated into a single organisation called Cambridge Press and Assessment.

The PAB Audit Committee has oversight of the internal audit arrangements for CUP and CA and reviews the findings of internal audit reports and the management responses. A full list of internal audits considered by the PAB Audit Committee during 2020–21 is provided in Appendix G [not reproduced]. The Chair of the PAB Audit Committee attends the University Audit Committee to provide assurance on the respective governance, control and risk management practices of both the Press and Assessment.

At each Audit Committee meeting, the Chair of the PAB Audit Committee provides an oral update on the business of Cambridge Assessment and Cambridge University Press and the items of discussion at the latest PAB Audit Committee meeting. In addition, a written annual report of the PAB Audit Committee is received at the Audit Committee's November meeting, and a half-year report at a meeting in Easter Term. Under the PAB Audit Committee's Terms of Reference, the Chair of the PAB Audit Committee has direct access to the Chief Financial Officer as Chair of the PAB and to the Vice-Chancellor as Chair of both the Press Syndicate and Local Examinations Syndicate.

A report on each of the organisations' activities and controls in relation to their Anti-Bribery and Corruption policies is incorporated within the University's annual Bribery Policy report.

In last year's annual report, it was reported that proposals to amend the Audit Committee's Terms of Reference and membership to further strengthen the link between the Committee and the Press and Assessment Board would be put to the Regent House for approval in 2020–21. This work was unavoidably delayed, but will be taken forward during 2021–22.

The Audit Committee continues to acknowledge the significant income stream that CA and CUP provide to the University.

***Audit Committee Opinion: Risk management, control and governance:*** *The Audit Committee has monitored and considered the effectiveness of the University's risk management, control and governance arrangements throughout 2020–21. These arrangements support the University in fulfilling its policies, aims and objectives, enabling the University to identify, understand and manage its principal risks, and to be accountable and transparent in its governance. The Committee considers that the University and subsidiary companies have continued to make clear and sustained efforts to understand, communicate and incorporate best practice in risk management, governance and internal controls.*

*The Audit Committee has agreed that the Statement of Corporate Governance and the Statement of Internal Control provided in Appendix C and included in the Financial Statements for 2020–21 is an accurate reflection of the risk management, control and governance arrangements in place. The Committee is satisfied that these arrangements are adequate and effective.*

3.2. *Opinion: Economy, efficiency and effectiveness (value for money)*

The Audit Committee considers whether arrangements adopted throughout the University for promoting economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of public funds and other resources are satisfactory, by monitoring the following financial controls, systems and management structures. The Committee is required to relay its view on the University's arrangements for achieving value for money to the Council in its annual report.

(i) *Value for money*

The Resource Management Committee (RMC) is responsible, on behalf of the Council, for overseeing the University's arrangements to obtain best value for money (VFM) in its expenditure and use of resources. The RMC provides advice to the Council on VFM matters, and for keeping the Council and the Audit Committee advised of VFM issues.

The University's Value for Money Strategy<sup>3</sup> sets out how the University plans to demonstrate to those to whom it is accountable that it is economic, efficient and effective in its use of resources. This is supported by the Value for Money Policy,<sup>4</sup> which explains the University's underlying approach to value for money. The Strategy and Policy are reviewed and endorsed annually by the RMC.

<sup>3</sup> See <https://www.afpa.admin.cam.ac.uk/resource-allocation/value-money/value-money-strategy>.

<sup>4</sup> See <https://www.afpa.admin.cam.ac.uk/resource-allocation/value-money/value-money-policy>.



At its meeting in November 2021, the Audit Committee received the VFM annual report, which provided updates on a number of VFM-related initiatives that are enabling, or will enable, the achievement and measurement of value for money. This included: Enhanced Financial Transparency, Strategic Procurement and Purchasing, Reimagining Professional Services and Reshaping the Estate.

In addition to the internal VFM report, economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources are considered as part of each system audit undertaken by the University's internal auditor, with recommendations made as part of the individual audit reports as appropriate.

Efficiency and value for money also continue to be promoted through both local level and University-wide initiatives and the University also collaborates with the Colleges through the Bursars' Committee to ensure value for money across the collegiate University.

(ii) *Assurance on Colleges' use of student fees for educational purposes*

The Committee has agreed a protocol enabling the Director of Finance, on an annual basis, to provide assurance to the Audit Committee that the public funds received by the University from the Student Loans Company and transferred between the University and Colleges are used by the Colleges for the intended educational purposes. An annual meeting takes place between the Chair of the Audit Committee, the Chair of the Colleges' Committee, the Head of the Governance and Compliance Division (as Deputy for the Registry), the Group Financial Controller (as Deputy for the Director of Finance) and the Chair of the Bursars' Committee to review the total expenditure on education by Colleges against their total educational income including the College fee. This year's meeting took place in September 2021 and a note of the meeting was provided to the Audit Committee at its meeting in October 2021. The Committee agreed that the analysis provided reasonable assurance that the money was spent for the purposes intended.

The Committee also received the annual report by the General Purchasing sub-Committee to the Bursars' Committee on Value for Money (see Appendix D [not reproduced]). The report described (1) how the Colleges worked together to maximise value for money through information sharing and collective purchasing arrangements and (2) collaborative projects between the University and Colleges. The Colleges and the University worked collaboratively in areas such as IT, student support and procurement.

***Audit Committee Opinion: Economy, efficiency and effectiveness (value for money):*** *The Committee has monitored the effectiveness of the University's financial controls, systems and management structures in place for promoting efficiency, effectiveness and economy in the use of public funds and other resources.*

*The Committee has noted the continuing adoption of and improvement in financial procedures and management practices designed to support the achievement of value for money and institutional effectiveness. The Committee is satisfied that these arrangements are appropriate and effective.*

3.3. *Opinion: Management and quality assurance of data returns*

The Audit Committee monitors the effectiveness of the University's management and quality assurance of data returns submitted to the Higher Education Statistics Agency, the Student Loans Company, the OfS, Research England and other bodies through its programme of internal audit.

Internal audit reviews of various aspects of data management form part of the three-year cycle of audits. In 2020–21, fieldwork was completed for two internal audits on data quality, with respect to the annual HESES return and TRAC. The outcome of these audits will be reported to the Audit Committee during 2021–22. The table below summarises the results of data quality audits undertaken over the past six years.

Academic year	Audit area	Assurance rating
2020–21	HESES Return	To be reported during 2021–22
	TRAC process	To be reported during 2021–22
2019–20	HE-BCI	Limited
2018–19	HESA Staff Return	Substantial
2017–18	Research Costing and Time Allocation (TAS and TRAC processes)	Full
2016–17	Museum Data Quality	Substantial
2015–16	HESA Return	Substantial

***Audit Committee Opinion: Management and quality assurance of data returns:*** *The Audit Committee is satisfied that the management control and quality assurance of data returns submitted to the Higher Education Statistics Agency, the Student Loans Company, the OfS, Research England and other bodies are adequate and effective.*

#### 4. Audit arrangements and auditor opinions

##### 4.1. Internal audit

###### (i) Provider

Deloitte LLP is the University's internal auditor. Deloitte was reappointed as the internal auditor for the University with effect from 1 August 2014 for a three-year term until 31 July 2017. It was reappointed for a further two years until 31 July 2019, which was subsequently extended until 31 July 2021, pending the outcome of a review of the University's internal audit provision.

The performance of the internal auditor and their lead partner is considered annually by the Committee.

The fees paid for internal audit work completed in the financial year 2020–21 are shown in Appendix E.

###### (ii) Internal audit programme

The internal audit programme provides independent and objective assurance on the University's operations in order to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the University's internal control systems. A draft internal audit plan is developed around the University's objectives and assessment of its fundamental risks, as identified by the University's Senior Leadership Team.

The internal audit plan for 2020–21 comprised a programme of cyclical audits and thematic audits. Different teams of auditors were assigned to undertake the work depending on the level of specialism required, and audits typically involved visits to a range of departments and institutions to follow up on particular functions. The 2020–21 plan was a six-month rolling plan, with the first half of the year focusing on the University's response to the Covid-19 pandemic, and the second half of the year returning to a focus on key areas of business.

Previously, assurance over departmental controls was primarily provided via an annual departmental self-assurance survey, which addressed a range of key topic areas from compliance with financial processes and HR policies to departmental management planning activity and IT controls. The survey findings were validated by selected on-site testing and face-to-face meetings. In October 2020, the Audit Committee approved a proposal to run the Departmental Assurance Survey every two years, as part of, and alongside work to develop an integrated assurance framework.

A full re-evaluation of the approach to departmental assurance is included in the first six months of the 2021–22 internal audit plan and will be considered by the Audit Committee in Michaelmas Term 2021.

###### (iii) Internal audit reports and assurance ratings

Deloitte LLP provide an assurance rating for each internal audit report, based on their assessment of the adequacy and effectiveness of the system of internal control. The assurance ratings given are as follows:

Full	There is a sound system of internal control designed to achieve the University's objectives. The control processes tested are being consistently applied.
Substantial	While there is a basically sound system of internal control, there are weaknesses, which put some of the University's objectives at risk. There is evidence that the level of non-compliance with some of the control processes may put some of the University's objectives at risk.
Limited	Weaknesses in the system of internal controls are such as to put the University's objectives at risk. The level of non-compliance puts the University's objectives at risk.
Nil	Control processes are generally weak leaving the processes / systems open to significant error or abuse. Significant non-compliance with basic control processes leaves the processes / systems open to error or abuse.

Where recommendations are made as part of the internal audit process, Deloitte LLP classifies their recommendations as follows:

Priority 1	Issues that are fundamental to the University, for the attention of senior management and the audit committee.
Priority 2	Issues that are fundamental to the area subject to internal audit, for the attention of senior management and the audit committee.
Priority 3	Important issues to be addressed by management in their areas of responsibility.
Priority 4	Housekeeping issues or good practice suggestions.

Deloitte LLP introduced a 'readiness' assurance report during 2020–21, intended to provide an indication of the University's readiness to implement or operate a particular process. The readiness ratings given for this type of report are provided below:

Green	The process / activity is operational in a steady state and ready for imminent transition. Key risks are identified and controls are in place to manage risks.
Amber	The process / activity should be operational and in a steady state for transition. There may be gaps in the identification of key risks or the implementation of controls to manage the risks, but an action plan has been defined to address the gaps with agreed implementation dates.
Red	It is highly unlikely that the process / activity will be operational and in steady state for transition. There are significant gaps in the identification of key risks and/or the implementation of controls to manage the risks, and no action plan is in place to address the gaps.

(iv) *Audit Committee review of internal audit reports*

The Audit Committee is provided with access to all internal audit reports through its online portal and the internal auditor summarises the findings of those reports in a progress report provided to each meeting of the Audit Committee. However, the Committee only discusses in detail those reports that carry limited or nil assurance ratings. In such cases, the audit sponsor is invited to attend the meeting in which the report is discussed, to enable them to respond to the report and answer questions that members of the Committee may have.

During 2020–21, the Committee has received and considered fifteen internal audit reports. Where a rating was ascribed, 50% of reports were given Substantial or Full assurance. This is down from 72% in 2019–20. This report refers only to those final internal audit reports that have been received and considered by the Audit Committee between 1 August 2020 and 31 July 2021.<sup>5</sup> A full list of internal audit reports considered by the Audit Committee during 2020–21 is provided in Appendix A.

(v) *Internal auditor opinion*

The annual report for the period 1 August 2020 to 31 July 2021 was received by the Audit Committee at its meeting of 22 November 2021 (see Appendix B [not reproduced]). The internal auditor's annual report refers to internal audits where the fieldwork took place during 2020–21. However, the final reports for all audits were not all considered by the Audit Committee during the 2020–21 academic year and so the number of completed assignments may differ to the figure provided in 4.1(iv). A full list is provided in Appendix A. Subject to the limitations of the work described in Deloitte LLP's report, the internal audit opinion given was as follows:

*'Subject to the scope of the work described above and taking into account the proposed actions to rectify the control weaknesses identified in our internal audit reports, we provide **reasonable** assurance that the University has an adequate and effective system of governance, risk management and internal control for the year ending 31 July 2021, except for:*

- ***One limited assurance report** in relation to Software Asset Management and one amber-rated Readiness Assessment for Recovery Programme Readiness. In 2019/20, there were seven limited assurance reports.*
- *There has been a concerted effort during the year to re-assess priority actions to manage risks across the institution. Of the refreshed actions, 26 are currently overdue as at November 2021, compared to 77 in October 2020. There needs to be a continued focus on implementing the outstanding actions in a timely manner to further reduce the number of overdue actions.*
- *Internal audit coverage has primarily been focussed on centrally operated controls and there has been less coverage this year on control activities that operate at a devolved level within the University. This is due in part to the pressures of Covid-19 on devolved institutions at the University, and a focus on delivery of refreshed control frameworks in areas of previously identified weakness. In 2020/21, devolved controls have been considered on a sample basis at the School level as part of the Risk Management audit and at a Departmental level in the Emergency and Continuity Planning Departmental audit and Budget Management and Monitoring audit.'*

(vi) *Review of assurances received*

The Audit Committee accepts the internal auditor's opinion and agrees that the effectiveness of controls in some areas needs to be improved.

The Committee notes the significant progress made over the past twelve months in reducing the number of overdue internal audit actions, from 77 in October 2020 to 26 in November 2021. A new process was introduced in 2020–21, whereby the status of internal audit actions is reported on a monthly basis to Senior Officers. This has encouraged discussion in relation to resolving complex overdue internal audit actions. It is noted that the University's decision-making and resource allocation processes make it challenging to implement some internal audit actions in a timely manner. Continuing to demonstrate the importance and benefit of internal audit across the University will play an important part in addressing this challenge.

Under the new hybrid approach to internal audit, the Head of Assurance in the Governance and Compliance Division will continue to work closely with administrative leads to support implementation of internal audit actions. In addition, a new internal audit tracking tool (TRACE) will be introduced during 2021–22. The tool will increase transparency over the status of open internal audit actions and allow colleagues to provide updates to the internal auditors directly.

Although internal audit coverage has primarily been focused on centrally operated controls during 2020–21, the Audit Committee notes the continued challenges that arise from the University's devolved operating model. In March 2021, the Committee informed the Council of its concerns that the devolved nature of IT infrastructure in the University created challenges in terms of implementing appropriate controls and providing assurance over the effectiveness of these controls. The Committee will continue to draw the Council's attention to areas of its operations where the tension between the University's devolved structures and risk mitigation are of particular concern.

The Audit Committee notes that the Council acknowledges that the University needs to develop more effective ways of ensuring that controls across the devolved University are properly implemented and monitored. As highlighted in the Chair's introduction and section 2.8, a key element in addressing this will be to provide greater clarity around where responsibility and accountability lies, and to establish appropriate methods to seek assurance that these responsibilities are being discharged as expected. A small internal assurance team is being established within the

<sup>5</sup> This includes any reports that were issued in draft during 2019–20, but which were not finalised for the Committee's consideration until 2020–21. It does not include any 2020–21 reports that have been finalised recently by internal audit, but were not considered by the Audit Committee during 2020–21.

Governance and Compliance Division and will lead on the development of an integrated assurance framework for the University over the next few years. The challenges of the devolved operating model should also be taken into account in the context of the various projects under the Recovery Programme. The Committee will be kept informed of the work to develop an assurance framework throughout 2021–22.

#### 4.2 External Audit

##### (i) External audit provider

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) was reappointed as the external auditor for the University for the financial year 2020–21. External audit informs the Audit Committee on the operation of the internal financial controls reviewed as part of the annual audit.

The fees paid for work completed in the financial year 2020–21 are shown in Appendix F.

##### (ii) Review of appointment

In accordance with the OfS's terms and conditions of funding for Higher Education Institutions, the external auditor is appointed or reappointed annually. The *Statutes and Ordinances of the University of Cambridge* also require that the accounts of the University are audited annually by qualified accountants appointed by Grace on the nomination of the Council.<sup>6</sup>

Following a market testing exercise in 2018, PwC was reappointed to provide the external audit provision (subject to annual reappointment). However, the University agreed that PwC would discontinue the audits of low materiality subsidiaries as this work was more suitable for a smaller firm. It was agreed that for the 2020–21 audit, the audit of these subsidiaries would be undertaken by a local firm, Peters Elworthy & Moore.

At its January 2021 meeting, the Committee received feedback from the University and its subsidiary organisations in regard to the performance of the external auditor. The Committee agreed to recommend to the Council that a Grace be promoted for the annual reappointment of PwC as the external auditor for the Financial Year 2020–21.

##### (iii) Details of non-audit services

During 2020–21, the external auditor and PwC international affiliates firms carried out non-audit work in the following areas for the University: Financial Conduct Authority client asset work on behalf of Cambridge Investment Management Limited; tax audit work for Cambridge Assessment India Private Limited; and provision of assurance of environmental sustainability data. In each significant case the engagement was subject to the Audit Committee's policy on non-audit services to ensure that the external auditor's independence was not placed at risk.

##### (iv) External auditor's annual report to the Audit Committee

The Audit Committee received PwC's external audit annual report 2020–21 at its meeting on 22 November 2021.

The Audit Committee considered the report and was satisfied with the remarks on auditing and accounting matters, detailed control observations and other observations from around the University group. The Audit Committee was also satisfied with the University's management responses, which were embedded within the report.

<sup>6</sup> See Statute F 15 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 46).

## VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

### Electors to the Professorship of Architecture (1970)

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Professorship of Architecture as follows:

Ms Bridget Kendall, *PET*, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy

#### (a) on the nomination of the Council

Professor Marilyne Andersen, *École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne*

Professor Andrew Clancey, *Kingston University*

#### (b) on the nomination of the General Board

Professor Harry Charrington, *University of Westminster*

Professor Diane Davis, *Harvard University*

Professor Chris Young, *PEM*

#### (c) on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Architecture and History of Art

Professor James Campbell, *Q*

Professor Barbara Campbell-Lange, *University College London*

Professor Koen Steemers, *JE*

## OBITUARIES

### Obituary Notice

Dr JOHN TUDOR, M.A., LRCP, MRCS, FRCR, Emeritus Fellow and former Treasurer of St Edmund's College, sometime Associate Lecturer in the Faculty of Clinical Medicine, Consultant Radiologist and Chair of the Department of Radiology, formerly Associate Editor of the British Journal of Radiology, died on 14 January 2022, aged 88 years.

## GRACES

### Graces submitted to the Regent House on 2 February 2022

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, 11 February 2022**. 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.<sup>§</sup>

1. That Ms ELEANOR VERONICA ELIZABETH SHARPSTON, QC, M.A., *K*, be appointed Chair of the Septemviri, to serve with immediate effect until 31 December 2025.
2. That the recommendations in paragraph 8 of the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 11 January 2022, on an extension to the General Board's authority to amend or suspend certain arrangements for the examination and assessment of taught courses (*Reporter*, 6642, 2021–22, p. 214) be approved.

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

## ACTA

### Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 19 January 2022

The Grace submitted to the Regent House on 19 January 2022 (*Reporter*, 6643, 2021–22, p. 221) was approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 28 January 2022.

### Congregation of the Regent House on 29 January 2022

A Congregation of the Regent House was held at 10 a.m. All the Graces submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6644, 2021–22, p. 232) and the Supplicat for degrees were approved.

The following degrees were conferred in absence:

*This content and pages 247 and 248 have been removed as they contain personal information.*



*This content has been removed as it contains personal information.*

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

**END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'**

## REPORT OF DISCUSSION

**Tuesday, 25 January 2022**

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

The following Reports were discussed:

***Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2020–21, dated 14 December 2021***

(*Reporter*, 6641, 2021–22, p. 185).

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, in a Notice in the *Reporter* of 21 July 2021 the Council noted the need 'to put in place formally a scheme governing strategic decision-making in a crisis situation'. It accepted that:

Advance approval of this scheme by the Regent House would provide certainty as to who has authority to make decisions and would confirm how those matters would be reported to the Regent House.<sup>1</sup>

I looked in vain for any mention of this in the Report we are discussing.

It plunges straight into 'the main strategic developments' of the year, which engaged 'the Council and its committees' in a 'Recovery Programme', adding that it delegated responsibility for the Recovery Plan to the General Board. The General Board's own Annual Report, also for Discussion today, notes that it 'provides strategic oversight for the Programme' but says it also 'acts as the decision-making body'. The General Board is 'responsible for the academic and educational policy of the University' but it may only 'advise' the University on questions relating to such policy' (Statute A V 1).

With nothing further said about the 'scheme' to consult it over 'strategic decision-making' in this crisis-related operation, the Regent House was merely informed of the Recovery Plan as a done deal towards the end of a miscellaneous Notice entitled 'Matters relating to pay restraint and the University's post COVID-19 recovery plan', in the belated carpet-bag catch-up *Reporter* of 29 July 2020.<sup>2</sup> A link in that Notice merely took the reader with Raven access to a set of slides.

Approaching a year after the Council had approved the Programme, a 'Recovery Programme Overview', not a Report, was put up for Discussion by the Council on 4 May, a Notice was published on 21 July 2021 in reply to remarks made in that Discussion.<sup>3</sup> The Overview itself was able to list by way of further communication only a short Notice in the *Reporter* of 24 March 2021,<sup>4</sup> but promised that 'the project team led by Professor Andy Neely will keep all members of the community updated on, and where appropriate involved in, its development'. The Report we are now discussing mentions:

a number of communications to the University as part of the PMO's plan for ensuring that the collegiate Cambridge community was informed about, and able to engage with, the Recovery Programme.

The *Reporter* does not seem to have been offered these communications to publish.

In its own Annual Report<sup>5</sup> the Audit Committee simply 'welcomed' the 'fact that the University's Recovery Plan includes three substantial, University-wide programmes', listing 'Reimagining Professional Services', 'Enhanced Procurement, Purchasing and Contract Managements', and 'Reshaping the Estate'. The Audit Committee promises to 'consider how best to address' these 'challenges', including 'how to monitor and support the large-scale change programmes of the University's Recovery Plan'. It does not enquire after the views of the Regent House or ask what makes this 'the University's plan' if it has not been Graced.

Is this not in reality a Strategic Plan and as such most certainly something of appropriate concern to the Regent House as 'manager' of the University's 'affairs' (Statute A II)? On 11 August 2004 the Review of the Personnel Division report mentioned the 'lack of a University strategic plan' as having been 'commented upon in the Robson Rhodes internal audit report of July 2003'.<sup>6</sup> That reproach did not lead to the framing of the missing Strategic Plan. A variety of plan-of-action 'strategies' for parts of the University are mentioned in the *Reporter* from time to time but no overarching Strategic Plan has emerged since. The Council's present Annual Report is littered with mentions of miscellaneous 'strategic priorities' including the five portrayed in the Report we are discussing in coloured boxes as lying 'within the Recovery Programme'.

The Council now explains that the 'academic sponsor for the Programme', the Pro-Vice Chancellor for Enterprise and Business Relations is:

supported by a small Programme Management Office (PMO). The PMO team provides project management support and guidance to those working on individual projects, as well as coordinating the Programme as a whole.

Is this part of the UAS or an academic committee? The only clue seems to be a link to 'staff' dated 21 October 2021 giving some sort of update on its 'progress so far'.<sup>7</sup> The Council assures us that it has 'continued to monitor the progress of the Programme closely via twice termly reports from the PMO':

In July 2021, the PMO's update to the Council included the Programme's vision and objectives, a benefits realisation map and a risk register.

It adds that the PMO also reports to the General Board twice each term, providing an update on the projects, including progress, budget, risks and mitigations, and outcomes and benefits. The PMO 'has worked closely with the Project Sponsors and Operational Leads to maintain a collaborative way of working across the projects, managing communication, ensuring alignment and coordination across the University and providing consistent reporting to the Board'.

The General Board may publish a Report to the University. Why did it not do so sooner than in the Annual Report for discussion today, so as to provide some of those missing 'communications'? In the General Board's present Annual Report we learn briefly that:

Business cases for nine projects have been approved by the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC), and one project, Rebalancing the Industrial Portfolio, has now concluded. For more information on the Recovery Programme, see the Council's Annual Report.

But perhaps the Regent House would not be interested? Council seems confident in its own Report that ‘enterprise and business relations may not be of direct relevance to all academic members of the University’. On that in May 2021, ‘the Council discussed a draft vision’, ‘produced by the Strategic Partnerships Office and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Enterprise and Business Relations), in consultation with key stakeholders across the University.’ The Regent House, not expected to find this of relevance, was not even a ‘key stakeholder’ then?

The present Report says that Council ‘will now use the vision to encourage colleagues across the collegiate University to identify opportunities to align ambitions, resources and action plans to help make the vision a reality’. This is to meet the ‘five objectives of the University’s Priorities Framework’. Of these ‘Rebalancing our industrial portfolio’ is ‘already completed’ but, the Overview noted, ‘no summary available’. Industrious searching finds no occasion when the Regent House was invited to approve its ‘Priorities Framework’.

The Recovery Programme with its ‘thirteen projects that seek to enhance the University’s performance and effectiveness in education, research and staff and community support until 2023 (and in some cases longer)’ will use considerable sums which will not be available for other purposes, ‘currently estimated at no more than £28m’:

Of that, the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC) has approved the business cases for approximately £17m, with approximately £11m available for future business cases.

This is policy-making on a grand scale. It is surely high time the Regent House was allowed its proper constitutional place in framing, monitoring and approving what is clearly a Strategic Plan in disguise? And in the context of the ‘scheme’ promised in July last year but not heard of since?

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 6627, 2020–21, p. 768.

<sup>2</sup> *Reporter*, 6587, 2019–20, p. 542.

<sup>3</sup> See *Reporter*, 2020–21: 6613, p. 470, 6616, p. 560 and 6627, p. 769.

<sup>4</sup> *Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 445.

<sup>5</sup> *Reporter*, 6604, 2020–21, p. 306.

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix B of the Review Committee report, *Reporter*, 5972, 2003–04, p. 1035 at p. 1041.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.staff.admin.cam.ac.uk/general-news/the-recovery-programme-progress-so-far>.

***Annual Report of the General board to the Council for the academic year 2020–21, dated 14 December 2021***

(*Reporter*, 6641, 2021–22, p. 195).

No remarks were made on this Report.

***Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 11 January 2022, on an extension to the General Board’s authority to amend or suspend certain arrangements for the examination and assessment of taught courses***

(*Reporter*, 6642, 2021–22, p. 214).

No remarks were made on this Report.

**COLLEGE NOTICES****Elections***Pembroke College*

Elected to an Honorary Fellowship with effect from 12 October 2021:

Professor Gail Davey, OBE  
Dr Karan Thapar

Elected to a Fellow Commonership with effect from 30 November 2021:

Lucien Farrell, M.A., *PEM*

Elected to a William Pitt Fellowship with effect from 12 October 2021:

Richard Rawcliffe, B.Sc., *Nottingham*

Appointed as an Associate (PDRA) with effect from 30 November 2021:

Hadia Almahli, B.Sc., *Aleppo*, M.A., Ph.D., *Paris XI*

Appointed as an Associate (PDRA) from 1 January 2022:

Angkur Shaikkea, B.Tech., *NIT India*

*St Edmund's College*

Elected to a Research Fellowship from 1 January 2022 for two years:

Jiachen Jiang, B.Sc., *Fudan University*, Ph.D., *W*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship from 1 January 2022 for two years:

Gemma Long, B.Sc., *Cardiff*, M.A., *Bath*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship from 1 January 2022 for three years:

Isabella Buono, M.A., *M*, B.C.L., *Oxford*

David A. Friedman, B.A., *Yale*, M.A., *UCL*,  
M.Phil., D.Phil., *Oxford*

John F. Mueller, B.A., *Sussex*, M.Phil., Ph.D., *F*

Sarah Steele, B.A., M.A., *Flinders University*,  
D.Phil., *Oxford*

**Vacancies**

*Selwyn College*: Bursar; tenure: permanent, full-time, from 1 September 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 1 March 2022; further details: <https://www.sel.cam.ac.uk/jobs/bursar>

*Wolfson College*: Development Director; full-time, permanent; salary: £65,000–£75,000; closing date: 28 February 2022; further details: <https://www.wolfson.cam.ac.uk/about-wolfson/vacancies>

**Events***Downing College***The XIII Oon Lecture**

The XIII Oon Lecture, entitled, *Mitochondria: From molecules to medicine*, will be delivered by Professor Patrick F. Chinnery, FMedSci, and Professor Sir John E. Walker, FRS, FMedSci, and Nobel Prize winner, in the Howard Theatre, Downing College, on Tuesday, 15 February 2022 at 6 p.m. Further details are available at <https://www.dow.cam.ac.uk/events/xiii-oon-lecture>.

**Memorial Service***St John's College*

A Memorial Service for Dr Peter Anthony Linehan, M.A., Ph.D., FBA, Fellow and former Dean of St John's College, who died on 9 July 2020, aged 76 years, will be held in St John's College Chapel on Saturday, 5 March 2022 at 12 noon.

For tickets, please apply online at <https://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/memorial-service-dr-peter-linehan>, or by phone on 01223 339363, or in writing to The Chapel Clerk, St John's College, Cambridge, CB2 1TP, by Friday, 18 February 2022.

**EXTERNAL NOTICES****Oxford Notices***Department of Economics and New College:*

BP Professorship of Economics; closing date: 28 February 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk/>, vacancy ID: 155782

*Nuffield Department of Surgical Sciences and Green*

*Templeton College*: Professorship of Surgical Sciences; closing date: 21 February 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk/>, vacancy ID: 155775

*Brasenose College*: Nicholas Kurti Junior Research Fellowship in the Sciences and William Golding Junior Research Fellowship in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; non-stipendiary, but include Senior Common Room membership with free meals, and research and hospitality allowances; tenure: three years from 1 October 2022 (non-renewable); closing date: 28 February 2022 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.bnc.ox.ac.uk/vacancies/academic-vacancies>

© 2022 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

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

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

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

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