

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6567

WEDNESDAY 13 NOVEMBER 2019

VOL CL No 9

CONTENTS

Notices		Graces	
Calendar	111	Grace submitted to the Regent House on 13 November 2019	117
Discussion on Tuesday, 19 November 2019	111		
Proposed University nursery building on Harrison Drive	111	<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Election of a member of the Council's Finance Committee in class (b)	111	Report of Discussion: 5 November 2019	
Discipline Committee	111	Twenty-fourth Report of the Board of Scrutiny	118
Vacancies, appointments, etc.		College Notices	
Elections, appointments, and grants of title	112	Vacancies	121
		Other Notices	121
Form and conduct of examinations		Societies, etc.	
Chemical Engineering Tripos, Part IIB, 2019–20	113	Society for the History of the University	121
Economics Tripos, Part IIA, 2019–20	113		
Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery:		External Notices	
Final M.B. Examination, 2019–20	114	Oxford Notices	121
Economics for the M.Phil. Degree, 2019–20	117		
Obituaries			
Obituary Notices	117		



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES**Calendar**

- 19 November, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. (see below).
 29 November, *Friday*. End of third quarter of Michaelmas Term.
 30 November, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 2 p.m.
 6 December, *Friday*. Full Term ends.

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

- 19 November
 10 December

Congregations (Saturdays unless otherwise stated)

- 30 November, *at 2 p.m.*

Discussion on Tuesday, 19 November 2019

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House on Tuesday, 19 November 2019 at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Report of the General Board, dated 5 November 2019, on the establishment of certain Professorships (*Reporter*, 6566, 2019–20, p. 106).

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

Proposed University nursery building on Harrison Drive

13 November 2019

Approval was sought for a new nursery building on Harrison Drive, off Hills Road, during 2018. A Report on the proposal was published in April 2018, and its recommendations were approved by Grace 3 of 10 May 2018 following a ballot and discussion of a topic of concern (*Reporter*, 2017–18; 6502, p. 516; 6511, p. 707; 6513, p. 770).

The 2018 Report noted that the project would follow a new financial model, with tenders invited from nursery providers/developers to build a 100-place nursery at cost in return for a lease to occupy the building and provide nursery services to the University. However, the proposal has not proved attractive to providers. As the expansion of nursery services remains a priority for the University, the Finance Committee and the Planning and Resources Committee have agreed that the project should continue to be supported, but with a change to the way in which it will be funded. It is now proposed that the University fund the full costs of the project. Funding is expected to be met by a combination of existing reserves and the Capital Fund or other eligible funding. The estimated cost for the construction of the building in a single phase has risen to £3.69m from £3.1m in the intervening period, due to inflation in construction costs and design development as the proposal has evolved from RIBA Stage 2 to 3. Other details of the project remain the same.

The Council is publishing a Grace (Grace 1, p. 117) to seek approval for these changes.

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

13 November 2019

The Head of the Registry's Office has received the following nomination for the Council's Finance Committee, for election in class (b) by the Representatives of the Colleges:

Mr STEVEN MORRIS, *M*, nominated by Ms C. H. L. Foord, *M*, and Professor T. Spencer, *M*.

No other candidates having been nominated, Mr Morris is duly re-elected to serve as a member of the Finance Committee in class (b) from 1 January 2020 for three years.

Discipline Committee

The Discipline Committee met on 18 September 2019 to consider a charge brought by the University Advocate against a student member of the University. The Committee consisted of: Dr M. W. Gehring, *HH* (Chair), Dr P. J. Barrie, *EM*, Ms N. Blanning, *JN*, Ms F. E. Duncan, *W*, and Dr D. F. Wood, *ED*. Ms N. Bannister acted as Secretary to the Committee, with Ms S. d'Ambrumenil, *EM*, assisting. On the application of the student concerned, the Committee consisted of senior members only and sat in private.

The student was charged with three counts contrary to Regulation 6 of the General Regulations for Discipline,¹ namely that no member of the University shall engage in the harassment of: (i) a member, officer, or employee of the University or a College; or (ii) any other person where the harassment takes place either within the Precincts of the University or in the course of a University or College activity. Harassment shall include single or repeated incidents involving unwanted and unwarranted conduct towards another person which is reasonably likely to have the effect of (i) violating that other's dignity or (ii) creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that other.

¹ *Statutes and Ordinances*, 2018, p. 193.

The student submitted a guilty plea. The Committee noted the guilty plea. The University Advocate outlined the circumstances of the case in relation to penalty and the student's representative also addressed the Committee on matters and mitigation in relation to penalty.

Taking all factors into account, the Committee determined that in accordance with Special Ordinance D (ii) 3,² appropriate action should be taken in relation to the student, to include providing formal written apologies to the complainants, attendance of an educative workshop and engagement with relevant services. The student is required to undertake these actions before they are permitted to graduate and is prevented from attending cohort departmental graduation events.

² *Statutes and Ordinances*, 2018, p. 94.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Elections, appointments, and grants of title

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

ELECTIONS

Professor Rochelle Cooper Dreyfuss, B.A., *Wellesley College, USA*, M.Sc., *Berkeley, California*, J.D., *Columbia*, Pauline Newman Professor of Law, *New York*, elected Arthur Goodhart Visiting Professor in Legal Science, assigned to the Faculty of Law, from 15 October 2019 until 30 September 2020.

Professor Sir Nicholas Beaver Penny, K, *CTH*, M.A., *CLH*, M.A., Ph.D., *London*, Professor of Art History, *Hangzhou, China*, elected Slade Professor of Fine Art, assigned to the Department of History of Art, from 1 January 2020 until 31 March 2020.

Professor Angel Luis Vilorio Petit, B.Sc., *Maracaibo, Venezuela*, Licenciada of Biology, *La Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela*, Ph.D., *London*, Senior Researcher (Investigador Titular), *Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Cientificas, Centro de Ecologia, Laboratorio de Biologia de Organismos*, elected Simón Bolívar Professor of Latin-American Studies, from 3 October 2019 until 30 June 2020.

APPOINTMENTS

University Lecturers

Earth Sciences. Dr David Wallis, M.Sci., *Durham*, Ph.D., *Leeds*, appointed from 1 April 2020 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Materials Science and Metallurgy. Dr Bartomeu Monserrat Sanchez, Ph.D., *R*, M.Sci., *London*, appointed from 1 January 2020 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Assistant Registry

Office of External Affairs and Communications. Dr Lucinda Jane Spokes appointed from 1 July 2019 until the retiring age.

Departmental Secretary

Language Centre. Pedram Badakhchani, B.Sc., *Sheffield*, M.Sc., M.Sc., *London*, appointed from 1 November 2019 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of nine months.

GRANTS OF TITLE

Affiliated Lecturers

Biology. Ms María Matilde Goodall has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 November 2019 until 31 October 2021.

Classics. Dr Moreed Ahmad Richard Arbabzadah, *PEM*, Dr Adrian Popescu, Dr Philipa Mary Steele, *M*, Dr Jeremy Peter Toner, *CHU*, and Dr Joanna Clare Willmott, *CC*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 for a further two years.

Computer Science and Technology. Dr Jagmohan Chauhan, Dr Guy Edward Emerson, *CAI*, Dr Steven John Herbert, *CHU*, Dr Heidi Ann Howard, *TH*, Dr Martin Alexander Kleppman, *CC*, and Dr Ian James Lewis, *G*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 until 30 September 2020. Dr Miltiadis Allamanis, *DAR*, Dr Marc Brockschmidt, Dr Richard Neil Clayton, *DAR*, Dr Jennifer Cobbe, Dr Timothy Lawrence Harris, *CHU*, Dr Heleen Louise Janssen, Dr Graeme Craig Jenkinson, *F*, Dr Ekaterina Kochmar, *JN*, Mr Jack Lang, *EM*, Dr Athanasios Theodore Markettos, *CAI*, Dr Jean Yves Alexis Pichon-Pharabod, *TH*, Dr Nicolas Andres Rivera Aburto, Mr Conrad Watt, *CTH*, Dr Jeremy David Yallop, *JE*, Dr Eiko Yoneki, Dr Luca Zanetti and Dr Noa Zilberman have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 for a further year.

History. Dr Renan Baker, *ED*, and Dr Arnold Conway Hunt, *G*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 until 30 September 2020. Dr Nicholas John Barrie Evans, *CL*, Dr Clare Louise Elizabeth Foster, Reverend Dr John Millington Munns, *M*, Dr Keith Sugden, Dr Daniel Trocme-Latter, *HO*, and Dr Felix Emil Waldmann, *CHR*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 until 30 September 2021. Dr Thomas David Rowland Hopkins, *SID*, *CHR*, Dr Michael Humphreys, Dr Matthew Richard James Neal, *F*, and Dr David Anthony Woodman, *R*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 for a further two years.

Law. Dr Laura Bradford, Dr Jodi Gardner, *JN*, Dr Julius Grower, *JE*, Mr Thomas Charles Hawker, *CHR*, Dr Michael Edward Rice, *PEM*, and Mr Chris Simms have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 until 30 September 2020. Ms Zoe Louise Adams, *K*, Dr Geoffrey Carroll Barnes, Professor Peter Frederic Cane, *CHR*, Professor Christopher Forbes Forsyth, *R*, Ms Sarah Fraser Butlin, *SE*, Mr Leslie Kosmin, Dr Christopher Phillip Stephen Markou, *JE*, Mr Nicholas John McBride, *PEM*, Dr Colm Peter McGrath, *CC*, Dr Rose Anne Melikan, *CTH*, Sir Dennis O'Connor, Mr Gavin Robert, Dr Yvonne Patricia Salmon, *CC*, Mr Mark Scott Smith, *G*, Dr Benjamin Spagnolo, *T*, Dr Martin Henry Steinfeld, *HH*, Dr Alex James Trinidad, *W*, and Dr Rumiana Vladimirova Yotova, *CAI*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 for a further year.

Psychology. Dr Hana D'Souza, *N*, Dr Sarah Elizabeth Foley, *N*, and Dr Meredith Allaire Shafto have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 November 2019 until 31 October 2021.

Social Anthropology. Dr Hildegard Diemberger, *PEM*, has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 until 30 September 2021. Ms Natalie Camille Morningstar, Ms Priscilla Pereira Vieira Da Costa Garcia, Ms Ana Sofia Pflingsthorst and Dr Kelly Elizabeth Fagan Robinson have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 until 30 September 2020.

Sociology. Dr Jorge Antonio Saavedra Utman and Dr Marissa Quie, *LC*, have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2019 until 30 September 2021.

FORM AND CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS

Notices by Faculty Boards, or other bodies concerned, of changes to the form and conduct of certain examinations to be held in 2019–20, by comparison with those examinations in 2018–19, are published below. Complete details of the form and conduct of all examinations are available from the Faculties or Departments concerned.

Chemical Engineering Tripos, Part IIB, 2019–20

The Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology Syndicate gives notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2020, the form of the examinations for Part IIB of the Chemical Engineering Tripos will be changed as follows:

The written examination papers for Group B and Group C modules will each contain two questions, and candidates must answer all questions.

All other parts of the examination remain unchanged.

Candidates may obtain full information about the examinations for 2020 on the Tripos website at: <https://www.ceb.cam.ac.uk/undergraduates/current-students>.

Economics Tripos, Part IIA, 2019–20

The Faculty Board of Economics gives notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2020, the form of the examinations for the following papers for Part IIA of the Economics Tripos will be amended as outlined below.

Paper 3. Theory and practice of econometrics project

Previously, there were five questions set for the project, with students being asked to select one title.

The project will now have four questions set, with students being asked to select one title.

Paper 7. Labour

Previously, the paper was sectioned, with students required to answer four questions in total, with: two out of three questions on Supply and Demand, Human Capital [50%]; one out of two questions on Signalling, Wage Structure, and Unions [25%]; one out of two questions on Family, the State and the Labour Market [25%].

The paper will now be a sectioned paper, with students required to answer four questions in total, with: two out of three questions on Supply and Demand, Human Capital [50%]; two out of three questions on Signalling, Job Search, and Family Structure [50%].

Paper 8. History and philosophy of economics

Previously this paper was examined by a three-hour unseen exam with students required to answer a total of three questions from a sectioned paper, with at least one question from each section.

The paper will now be examined by a two-hour examination paper and an essay. The paper will examine the Philosophy of Economics, and Social Ontology, where students will be required to answer two out of four questions. Each question will have equal weight. The essay will be set on the History of Economics. In 2020 the dates of the essay will be 21 to 27 April. The examination paper and essay will be weighted 50/50%.

Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery: Final M.B. Examination, 2019–20

The Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine gives notice that, with effect from the assessments to be held in 2019–20, the form of the examination for the Final M.B. Examination for Parts I, II and III (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 483) will be as follows:

FINAL M.B. EXAMINATION, PART I

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

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

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

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

The examination comprises two components:

Component 1

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

Component 2

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

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

FINAL M.B. EXAMINATION, PART II

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

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

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

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

The examination comprises three components:

Component 1

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

Component 2

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

Component 3

<i>Clinical Examination</i>	Marks:	50% of the Part II total
	Length:	Two circuits, each lasting up to 75 minutes (total examination time up to 2.5 hours)
	Structure:	Two circuits, each comprising six stations of up to 12 minutes' duration, testing history-taking, clinical reasoning and other interpersonal communication skills and core clinical/physical examination skills, using real and simulated patients. One circuit will focus on Paediatrics, and the other on Women's Health (the latter may require the assessment of major adult systems, e.g. cardiovascular, respiratory, abdominal, neurological). <i>To pass:</i> students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher. In addition, candidates must achieve a pass in at least three of the Paediatric examination stations and in at least three of the Women's Health examination stations. Where a station is made up of two sub-stations, a pass in both sub-stations is required to achieve an overall pass on that station.

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

FINAL M.B. EXAMINATION, PART III

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

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

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

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

The examination has three components, two written and one clinical.

Component 1: This component is made up of two elements

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

Component 2

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

Component 3: This component is made up of two elements

3A: Simulated Clinical Encounter Examination (SCEE)	Length:	Up to 2.5 hours
	Structure:	Up to nine stations of up to 16 minutes each, assessing history-taking, clinical reasoning and other interpersonal communication skills using simulated patients/professionals
3B: Clinical Examination (CE)	Length:	Up to 2.5 hours
	Structure:	Up to nine stations of up to 16 minutes each, testing core clinical and physical examination skills using real patients. Candidates may also be asked to interpret radiographs and scans, electrocardiograms, clinical photographs and other data.
<i>To pass:</i> marks for 3A and 3B will be combined and students must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher. In addition, candidates must achieve a pass in at least four of the SCEE stations and in at least four of the CE stations. Where a station is made up of two sub-stations, a pass in both sub-stations is required to achieve an overall pass on that station.		

Note: to achieve a pass in the Final M.B. Part III Examination, students must pass all components. One resit opportunity will be permitted for the written components within the same academic year. Any candidate failing the clinical assessment (comprising SCEE and CE elements) will be required to repeat the final year of the course before resitting the clinical component.

Economics for the M.Phil. Degree, 2019–20

The Faculty Board of Economics gives notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2019–20, the form of the following papers for the examination in Economics for the degree of Master of Philosophy will be as follows:

E101. Applied microeconomics

Previously the paper was sectioned. Section A: four out of six questions; Section B: one compulsory question. Each section carried equal weight, and questions within Section A carried equal weight.

The paper will now have four mandatory questions in Section A, and one mandatory question in Section B. Each section carries equal weight, and questions within Section A carry equal weight.

S180. Labour economics

Previously the paper was a two-hour paper with candidates required to answer three out of four questions (70% of the marks) and a presentation of a paper (30% of the marks).

The paper will now be unsectioned, with students required to answer four compulsory questions (70%) and a presentation of a paper in class (30%). Each question carries equal weight.

OBITUARIES

Obituary Notices

Dr GLEN TILBURN CAVALIERO, M.A., Ph.D., FRSL, Fellow Commoner of St Catharine's College and member of the Faculty of English, died on 28 October 2019, aged 92 years (see p. 121).

Mr JOHN RICHARD PAYNE, M.A., of Christ's College, formerly Secretary of the School of Physical Sciences, died on 28 October 2019, aged 86 years.

GRACES

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 13 November 2019

The Council submits the following Grace to the Regent House. This Grace, unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 22 November 2019.

1. That the proposal for a nursery building on Harrison Drive, as approved by Grace 3 of 10 May 2018 by ballot and amended by the Council's Notice dated 13 November 2019 (p. 111) be approved.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 5 November 2019

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor Simon Franklin was presiding, with the Registrar's deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Junior Proctor and eight other persons present.

The following item was discussed:

Twenty-fourth Report of the Board of Scrutiny

(*Reporter*, 6563, 2019–20, p. 42).

Mr D. J. GOODE, Faculty of Divinity, Wolfson College, and Chair of the Board of Scrutiny for 2018–19:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Board of Scrutiny is central to the governance of the University. It is the University's chief internal mechanism for ensuring transparency and accountability in all aspects of University operations. The primary role of the Board is to examine the way in which the University is run and to comment on this to the University's governing body, the Regent House.

Each year the Board is required to scrutinise the following on behalf of the Regent House: (i) the accounts of the University; (ii) the Annual Report of the Council (including the Annual Report of the General Board to the Council); and (iii) any Report of the Council proposing allocations from the Chest.

The Board may investigate any matters that arise from these documents and in so doing is empowered to consult any official document, to make inquiries of any officer, to examine the policies of the University, and the arrangements made for the implementation of those policies, and to report thereon to the Regent House.

It is the last of these activities that has brought us here today, to discuss the Board of Scrutiny's Twenty-fourth Report.

Even though Reports of the Board of Scrutiny for a given academic year are often put down for Discussion at the beginning of the following academic year – after a change of Chair – it is customary for the Chair of the academic year being reported upon to introduce the Discussion, which is why it is I, and not the present Chair, making these remarks.

You will be relieved to hear that I am not going to talk you through the Report paragraph by paragraph, but I am going to recommend that any members of the University who have not yet read it should do so.

I am also going to touch briefly on the six recommendations scattered through the Report, and summarised for convenience at the end of it. With the exception, possibly, of the fifth recommendation, they are all about information. Or, rather, the lack of it.

Recommendation 1: The Board recommends that the University develop and publish internally a more detailed financial model to illustrate the trends and issues associated with cost recovery on externally-funded research, a long-term strategic issue for the University.

Paragraph 12 of the Report notes that research income was, last year, both the largest single, and the fastest-growing, source of income for the University. If that trend continues, improved cost recovery becomes even more important, otherwise the more we do, the more we lose, and that is not sustainable.

Recommendation 2: The Board recommends that the presentation of the Allocations Report and other budgeting information is improved so as to provide analysis at a more meaningful and, in budgetary terms, logical level of granularity. This might mean developing a standard reporting format at the level of a School or Non-School Institution.

Paragraph 28 of the Report contains a table showing the allocations from the Chest for this year, and the following three, and is the way in which Chest allocations are currently reported to the University. There is a huge difference in granularity, as pointed out in paragraph 32, with some very broad categories of allocation, such as 'Schools', or 'Estates'. These large categories need to be broken down to allow more accurate tracking of the changes in allocations over time.

Recommendation 3: The Board recommends that the University's capacity to measure and assess quantifiable performance data on individual Institutions (particularly non-academic Institutions) is reviewed, and further it is considered whether sufficient formal objectives are being set and systematically reported on.

During the year, the Board looked at Cambridge University Development and Alumni Relations (CUDAR). We asked for what we thought was going to be pretty basic financial information about CUDAR's performance in its day-to-day activities, but it soon became clear that the Finance Division was struggling to reconcile its system and CUDAR's system, and it took a surprisingly long time – months, not days – to get that information. The Board is concerned that this problem is not peculiar to CUDAR or the Finance Division.

Recommendation 4: The Board recommends that the Council publishes a Notice setting out the new Health and Safety compliance methodology, including both the governance structure for monitoring it and the timetable for its full implementation.

The most recent Annual Report of the Council, which was one of the things scrutinised by the Board in the present Report, made passing reference to some compliance issues in the University's estate. Upon scrutiny, these turned out to be major failings in compliance that are a significant concern to the University, and the Council needs to respond as a matter of urgency.

Recommendation 5: The Board recommends that the Council publish a timetable for the Governance Review Working Group to conclude its work.

Even by Cambridge standards, progress has been slow, and the Governance Review – set up by the University Council two and a half years ago, in May 2017 – appears to have ground to a halt. The Council should ensure that sufficient resource is put into the Review, and a timetable defined for its completion.

Recommendation 6: The Board recommends that the Council, the supervisory body for the UAS, takes steps to satisfy itself that the UAS is appropriately structured and staffed to provide the necessary skills and expertise.

The Board is concerned that more and more is being expected of UAS staff, many of whom are already overloaded. The *ourcambridge* initiative will, we hope, help to deliver improvements over time, but the Council needs to be sure that the UAS is working effectively and efficiently now.

In conclusion, it is the Board's hope that all six recommendations will be addressed by the University Council, as they are, we believe, essential for equipping the University to face the challenges of the next few years.

For those hardy readers who have made it to the eighty-eighth, and penultimate, paragraph of this Report, it will come as no surprise to see the areas on which the Board will be focusing its attention this academic year. In the meantime I commend this – the Twenty-fourth Report of the Board of Scrutiny – to the University.

Ms J. MARCHANT, Fitzwilliam Museum and President of Cambridge University and College Union (UCU), read by Ms C. Benton:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the work of the Board of Scrutiny to provide oversight is greatly appreciated and this year's report is no exception. Speaking in my capacity as President of the Cambridge branch of UCU, I will pick out some of the areas within this Report that impact upon staff financial and psychological wellbeing.

Inevitably, the financial position of the University and the continued multi-million pound net surplus is of interest. As noted in previous Board of Scrutiny Reports, this has been the case for several years,¹ whilst at the same time staff remuneration has suffered multiple rounds of below-inflation pay awards. The 6% increase in staff costs in 2017–18 (para. 15) needs to be viewed within this context, and it must be understood that this increase has not been applied across all staff and does not do anything to halt or reverse the real-term financial losses seen by University staff across a ten-year period.

It is of note that many areas of recent increased expenditure on staff costs are associated with promotional or reward schemes, such as the Academic Career Pathway. Whilst these improvements are to be welcomed, it should not be necessary to achieve a promotion to keep up with rises in living costs. We are repeatedly told that staff are central to the University's mission, but tangible action on pay is required to make this more than just warm words of concern.²

This brings me to another significant issue raised by this Report, that of staff and student wellbeing. Like the Board of Scrutiny, I welcome such increases in resources to the Disability Resource Centre (DRC) and University Counselling Services as have been made available, but it is of significant concern that demand still outstrips supply in the area of mental health support. This impacts on the quality of the University experience for students and also pushes additional strain onto teaching and support staff – on top of the enormous workloads that University staff are already struggling under.³ It is therefore of no surprise to me that the Staff Counselling Service is also seeing significantly higher use and that work-related concerns are by far the greatest cause.

It is in the context of these areas of hardship and concern that Cambridge UCU (along with many Union branches across the country) last week won two ballots for industrial action – in their simplest terms one on pay and the other on pensions. Notably, the ballots also called for commitments and action to deal with untenable workloads, the race and gender pay gaps, and the ever-increasing casualisation of University staff. It is hoped that the University of Cambridge will use its not inconsiderable influence to shift the positions of UUK and UCEA,⁴ and that they will acknowledge that staff have suffered from continued cuts to the quality of their pensions and their overall pay for too long.

¹ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2018-19/weekly/6521/section6.shtml#heading2-11>

² <https://www.staff.admin.cam.ac.uk/general-news/vice-chancellors-message-on-pay-negotiations>

³ https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/8195/Workload-is-an-education-issue-UCU-workload-survey-report-2016/pdf/ucu_workloadsurvey_fullreport_jun16.pdf

⁴ Respectively 'Universities UK' and the 'Universities and Colleges Employers Association'.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor,

There is a long history of the central bodies wanting to better understand the University's financial position, beginning in the 1990s with the Disaggregation Analysis, the evolution of a Resource Allocation Model, and more recently, a model of the University's finances commissioned from external consultants,

says the Report at para. 25.

The Board comments that 'delivering useful reform in these areas, whilst a very worthwhile objective, may prove to be more complex and challenging than expected'. Indeed it may. I remember a previous Registrar new to office ambitious to map the University's committees in hopes of achieving a comprehensive overview of how it all works. A series of unsuccessful attempts could subsequently be seen on his wall.

The truth is that the University is an organism too complex to understand itself fully, in which, as in a human body, a great deal of the machinery operates without conscious control until it is realised that it is going wrong. In its now nearly a quarter of a century of existence, the Board of Scrutiny has become highly successful at spotting both signs and symptoms of sickness developing. But it is somewhat impeded by the incompleteness of the information available. This year's Report makes an exceptionally significant case for doing something about that. In the present Report (at para. 13) there is mention of 'improved levels of cost recovery on certain categories of externally-funded research' but that 'limited further quantified detail is provided'.

The story this Report tells is of a lack of sufficient information to make it possible to spot organisational inadequacies early or at all:

[C]oncerns exist in relation to some of the management structures within Estates, particularly in relation to Health and Safety compliance matters. The Board hopes that the proposed investment will lead to improvements in this important area over the next few years. A programme is in development to create an effective maintenance organisation which will establish links between buildings and works required to achieve defined levels of performance (para. 29).

And there has been 'a significant number of departures' from Estates' 'senior management team' (para. 57).

It is not clear that we have the capacity to deliver such a programme, or how it will be implemented and managed, or what the governance of such a process will be, or who will be responsible for auditing its progress and success (para. 58).

Is it necessarily enough to throw money at such problems or even to 'develop' a more satisfactory 'structure' without setting baseline requirements of transparency, and accountability to the Regent House?

A noticeable trend of recent years has been to foster ‘University-wide initiatives’ supported, the Board notes, by mounting Chest allocations. ‘[T]he ‘People Strategy’ initiative (such as Senior Academic Pathways and Professorial Pay Review)’ is ‘expected to grow from a recurring cost of £575k in 2019–20 to £4.15m in 2022–23’ (para. 30). This expectation seems rather open-ended:

There are also significant additions to the categories of ‘Human Resources’ and ‘Operational’ which reflect some projected increases of certain pay and reward schemes (para. 31).

The Board points to another flaw noticeable in the Financial Statements, that ‘some of the categorisation seems slightly strange – ranging from tiny allocations’ to very broad ones. Its recommendation is the provision of ‘budgeting information’ at ‘a more meaningful and, in budgetary terms, logical level of granularity’. That could certainly provide useful warnings about the reliability of the calculations behind a grand initiative and its speculative future costs, and make it easier to work out later what happened, and why, when projected costs overran.

While the successes of Cambridge University Development and Alumni Relations (CUDAR):

are often claimed in terms of a broad range of positive outcomes, historically there has been no straightforward financial account of its functions to help form a view of the return on the University’s investment in it (para. 34).

That enlarged investment ‘started shortly before the arrival of a new Executive Director of Development and Alumni Relations in 2013’ and some ‘major planned expansion’ of fundraising (para. 35). The Report includes ‘some interesting long-term data’ (para. 36) on this. But ‘it took a surprisingly long time to obtain relatively basic historical financial information from the University’s financial systems’. CUDAR proved to be using its ‘own systems’ and ‘when the Finance Division was asked to produce figures, it was found that there were difficulties reconciling the Finance systems’:

The Board is left with a sense that the University does not always have the capacity and systems in place to assess the performance and activities of individual institutions, even one such as the Development Office, a non-academic institution where performance data should be comparatively easy to obtain and targets comparatively easy to set (para. 48).

If things are so uncertain when it comes to balancing the University’s investment against the improved ‘takings’ from fundraising, how much more worrying should be the risks attached to the spending of the bond issue’s £600m? The Board ‘understands’ that the Council ‘is developing plans for the University to establish its own property company’ to ‘oversee’ the ‘income-generating projects approved for the development of the non-operational estate using the proceeds of the bond, and other sources of finance’ (para. 50). It points to immediate concerns about the ‘scope and remit of such an organisation and to its governance’ (para. 51). What is meant by adding to the promise that income will be generated with talk of ‘significant indirect benefits’? The Board wants that ‘clarified’ (para. 52). And how is the governance to work?

Should the Council decide to proceed, the Board would expect to see further details of the plans and ambitions for the property company, as well as clarification on the above points when the Council reports to the University (para. 54).

The Regent House does not approve an overall Strategic Plan for the University which means that major initiatives may be agreed piecemeal and at a lower level than a decision of the Regent House. The plan ‘to increase postgraduate student numbers by 13.1% over 2017–22’ (para. 60) was framed at the General Board’s Away Day in Easter Term 2017, and the Board of Scrutiny is able to refer readers of its own current Report only to the Annual Report of the General Board for 2016–17. That simply states that:

A Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the Colleges on postgraduate student numbers has been approved, which sets out the aim for a 13.1% growth in postgraduate student numbers over the next four years.¹

The Board expresses its concern about ‘the impact on the resourcing of Departments and central support services’ and in particular the potential increase such an expansion of student numbers would impose on the already alarmingly heavy load now being carried by Student Counselling and other Student Support Services (para. 60). Again it has looked at the ‘management’ of this area giving figures for the mounting level of student demand (and the related increase in staff needing support) (paras. 61–67).

Another ‘strategy’ led by the General Board, formerly the Teaching and Learning Strategy, then an Education Strategy, is now a five-year Education Framework (para. 74). This takes the form of ‘an internal working document’. ‘Noticeably lacking in the Framework’ says the Board of Scrutiny:

is significant consideration of how the University proposes to support this increasing number of international students, particularly those on postgraduate taught programmes.

It is of the first importance that the Board can invite University officers to its meetings (and that they are not members of the Board, merely its guests) (para. 4). Such ‘conversations with University Officers’, says the Board of Scrutiny:

have led us to believe that many of the administrative systems and processes are viewed as suboptimal and in some cases the cause of deep structural problems for service delivery (para. 88).

It points a finger especially at ‘the University’s disparate financial management systems and the lack of an effective asset information management system for Estates’.

It may be that the University of Cambridge is ultimately too complex to understand itself fully. But surely it could try harder to rectify the elementary failures of management which are undermining its governance and putting it at financial and reputational risk? It should certainly be better at doing its sums.

¹ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6489/section3.shtml>

Mr D. J. GOODE, Faculty of Divinity and Wolfson College: Deputy Vice-Chancellor, having spoken earlier as the former Chair of the Board of Scrutiny, I now wish to make some remarks in a personal capacity.

In paragraph 81 of the Twenty-fourth Report, the Board of Scrutiny says this about pensions:

The Council's Annual Report offers a summary of the extended dispute between HE institutions and the University and College Union about the future benefit structure of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS). While registering concern at this state of affairs, the Report provides little reassurance about the Council's long-term commitment to maintaining an adequate pension provision.

In his address to the University on 1 October 2019, the Vice-Chancellor said:

It troubles me to note that we begin this academic year with the prospect of industrial action over pay and over pensions at a critical juncture for the country and for the University. On pay, we will keep exploring options to enhance our staff's total compensation package through the targeted improvement of benefits, including childcare support and housing assistance. On pensions, we will strive to find creative solutions to reach an agreement.

On 31 October 2019, participating Cambridge UCU members delivered their verdict in two ballots: one on pay and equality matters, and one on pensions. In the ballot on pay and equality matters, almost nine out of ten voted to take industrial action consisting of action short of a strike up to and including a marking and assessment boycott, and three quarters to take strike action.

In the ballot on pensions, more than nine out of ten voted to take industrial action consisting of action short of a strike up to and including a marking and assessment boycott, and more than four out of five to take strike action. The message is clear, and the Vice-Chancellor and the Council are left in no doubt that academic, academic-related, and research staff in Cambridge do not want 'targeted improvements' that will benefit some staff and not others, such that within the same grade – for work of equal value, or even for two people on exactly the same spine point, in exactly the same grade, doing exactly the same job – one will find themselves rewarded while the other gets nothing, something which in any other context would rightly be condemned as divisive and discriminatory.

Neither do we want 'creative solutions' for pensions. No, these are just smokescreens: empty phrases and fake benefits. What we want is simple: an end to pay cuts, an end to pension cuts, fair pay now while we work, and a fair pension when we retire.

COLLEGE NOTICES

Vacancies

Downing College: Senior Bursar; tenure: from 1 October 2020; salary: negotiable; closing date: 25 November 2019; further details: <http://www.saxbam.com/appointment/downing-college-cambridge/>

Newnham College: Development Director; salary: £72,689 plus benefits; closing date: 9 January 2020 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.newn.cam.ac.uk/about/vacancies/>

Trinity Hall: Bursar and Steward; tenure: from March 2020; salary: £97,500 plus benefits; closing date: 22 November 2019; further details: <https://www.trinhall.cam.ac.uk/about/vacancies/academic-vacancies/>

Other Notices

St Catharine's College

The funeral for Dr Glen Cavaliero (see p. 117) will take place in the College Chapel on Friday, 22 November 2019. The Chapel Service begins at 2 p.m. and will be followed by the Committal (attended by family and close friends, at Cambridge Crematorium) and then high tea in St Catharine's College SCR from 4 p.m.

SOCIETIES, ETC.

Society for the History of the University

The next meeting of the Society for the History of the University will be held at 5.30 p.m. in 1 Newnham Terrace, Darwin College, on Thursday, 28 November 2019. Dr Gillian Sutherland, of Newnham College, will give a paper entitled '*House histories: some highs and lows*'. Refreshments will be served from 5 p.m.

EXTERNAL NOTICES

Oxford Notices

Balliol College: Outreach Assistant; salary: £22,417–£28,331; closing date: 6 December 2019; further details: <https://www.balliol.ox.ac.uk/balliol-people/vacancies/2019/november/outreach-assistant>

Merton College: Senior Tutor/Senior Academic Registrar; tenure: from 1 May 2020; salary: £55,750–£64,605 plus additional benefits; closing date: 13 December 2019 at 5 p.m.; further details: <https://www.merton.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

The Queen's College: Professorship or Associate Professorship in Early Medieval History; tenure: from 1 October 2020; salary: £48,114–£64,605 plus additional benefits; closing date: 16 December 2019 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.queens.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>