

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6586

WEDNESDAY 24 JUNE 2020

VOL CL No 28

## CONTENTS

### Notices

Calendar	471
Discussion on 7 July 2020	471
Discussion of a Topic of Concern on 14 July 2020	471
Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor	471
Decisions taken in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak on non-student-related matters	472
Roll of the Regent House: New provision for membership	477

### Notices by the General Board

Institute of Public Health	477
Changes to governance arrangements for postgraduate students	477
Senior Academic Promotions Committee: Appeals 2020	478

### Reports

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a revised fitness to practise procedure	478
Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a revised fitness to study procedure (Procedure to Support and Assess Capability to Study)	487
Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on revised probationary arrangements for academic and academic-related staff	495

Report of the Council, recommending provisional allocations from the Chest for 2020–21	512
Report of the Council on the period of appointment for members of the Audit Committee	515
Report of the Council on the investment of bond proceeds held for income-generating projects	515
Report of the Council on changes to Special Ordinance concerning Congregations	518
Report of the General Board on Senior Academic Promotions	519
Report of the General Board on the establishment of certain Professorships	523
Report of the General Board on the authority to award doctoral degrees	524

### Graces

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 24 June 2020	529
---	-----

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



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

## NOTICES

### Calendar

- 7 July, *Tuesday*. Discussion deadline, receipt of written submissions by 4 p.m. (see below)  
 14 July, *Tuesday*. Discussion of a Topic of Concern, receipt of written submissions by 4 p.m. (see below).  
 29 July, *Wednesday*. Publication of an extraordinary issue of the *Reporter*, including Graces for submission to the Regent House.

### Discussion on Tuesday, 7 July 2020

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) to submit remarks on the following Reports by **4 p.m. on Tuesday, 7 July 2020**:

1. Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a revised fitness to practise procedure (p. 478).
2. Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a revised fitness to study procedure (Procedure to Support and Assess Capability to Study) (p. 487).
3. Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on revised probationary arrangements for academic and academic-related staff (p. 495).
4. Report of the Council recommending provisional allocations from the Chest for 2020–21 (p. 512).
5. Report of the Council on the period of appointment for members of the Audit Committee (p. 515).
6. Report of the Council on the investment of bond proceeds held for income-generating projects (p. 515).
7. Report of the Council on changes to Special Ordinance concerning Congregations (p. 518).
8. Report of the General Board on Senior Academic Promotions (p. 519).
9. Report of the General Board on the establishment of certain Professorships (p. 523).
10. Report of the General Board on the authority to award doctoral degrees (p. 524).

All Reports are dated 23 June 2020.

Discussions in the Senate-House have been suspended in response to government advice and the Council has agreed that until further notice remarks will instead be accepted for publication as written submissions (see *Reporter*, 6584, 2019–20, p. 449). Submissions, which should comply with the usual rules for Discussion remarks (*Statutes and Ordinances*, pp. 105 and 110), should be emailed to [reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk) by the 4 p.m. deadline above to be eligible for inclusion in the Discussion Report. General information on Discussions is provided at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions/>.

### Discussion of a Topic of Concern on Tuesday, 14 July 2020

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) as well as all employees of the University and the Colleges to submit remarks by **4 p.m. on Tuesday, 14 July 2020** on the following:

- Topic of Concern to the University: Decisions taken in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak (p. 472 and *Reporter*, 6585, 2019–20, p. 454).

The Council has agreed that until further notice discussion remarks will be accepted for publication as written submissions. Submissions on this topic of concern, which should comply with the usual rules for Discussion remarks (*Statutes and Ordinances*, pp. 105 and 110), should be emailed to [reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk) by the 4 p.m. deadline above to be eligible for inclusion in the Discussion Report. General information on Discussions is provided at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions/>.

### Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor

18 May 2020

The Council gives notice that, after consultation with the General Board, and on the recommendation of the Nominating Committee for the appointment and reappointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors, it has reappointed Professor Graham Virgo, *DOW*, as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) for two years from 1 October 2020. The membership of the Nominating Committee comprises the Vice-Chancellor as Chair; Professor Christopher Kelly, Dr Jason Scott-Warren, and Ms Gaenor Bagley (members of the Council); and Professor Christopher Young and Professor Anna Philpott (members of the General Board).

The Vice-Chancellor, after consultation with all those appointed to the office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor, has agreed that Professor Virgo should continue to hold the title of Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

## Decisions taken in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak on non-student-related matters

22 June 2020

Further to its Notice dated 17 June 2020 (*Reporter*, 6585, 2019–20, p. 454), the Council now publishes the second and final part of its list of the decisions taken to manage the University's activities at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The first part concerned student-related matters; this second part concerns other matters. The Council refers members of the collegiate University to the prefatory comments included in its 17 June 2020 Notice, which also cover the decisions below. It also reminds them that it has invited the submission of remarks on a topic of concern on both these and the student-related decisions by 4 p.m. on 14 July 2020 (p. 471).

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 529) to ask the University to make an Order under Statute A II 1 to make an exception to the requirements of Ordinances or General Board Regulations which may have been breached and to validate the decisions and actions taken.

	Matters regulated by the <i>Statutes and Ordinances</i>	Possible breaches of Ordinances / General Board Regulations
<b>16 March 2020:</b>		
<i>Government advice steps up following an initial announcement on 12 March 2020 introducing the first social distancing measures. From 16 March 2020, the advice discourages large gatherings, recommends working from home, the avoidance of non-essential contact, and frequent hand washing, and that anyone with a new persistent cough or fever self-isolates for 7 days. Those with underlying health conditions are encouraged to self-isolate.</i>		
Confirmation that all staff (including temporary workers on assignment) will continue to be paid, including those working at home or at home but unable to work (for example, because of the nature of their work, or because of caring responsibilities).		
Some staff may be asked to work from home. All reasonable requests to work from home (for example, because of caring responsibilities) will be accommodated.		
Some staff may be asked to defer leave to enable business-critical functions to continue.		
Staff abroad on University business on or before 16 March 2020 whose return travel is disrupted can claim reimbursement of reasonable expenses where these cannot be claimed against insurance.		
For those in University accommodation with a tenancy coming to an end but with a continuing need, a commitment is given to take all possible steps to extend the tenancy or find alternative accommodation.		
A special fund is being established to support staff in short-term financial hardship related to the COVID-19 outbreak.		
<b>17 March 2020:</b>		
<i>The Foreign and Commonwealth Office advises British nationals to avoid all non-essential foreign travel.</i>		
Staff are asked to avoid any international travel on University business.		

	Matters regulated by the <i>Statutes and Ordinances</i>	Possible breaches of Ordinances / General Board Regulations
<b>18 March 2020:</b>		
<i>The government announces the closure of schools, colleges and nurseries from 5 p.m. on 20 March 2020 until further notice.</i>		
All staff, except those needed to continue working onsite for business-critical activity, are to work from home from 5 p.m. on 20 March 2020.		
All University libraries are to close to all users from 5 p.m. on 18 March 2020.		
All University buildings are to close to students from 5 p.m. on 20 March 2020.		
These arrangements are to be in place until 30 June 2020 and may be extended.		
<b>19 March 2020:</b>		
All research undertaken on University premises is paused, unless related to COVID-19. Special arrangements are to be made to care for plants or animals that are critical to research.		
<b>20 March 2020:</b>		
<i>The Prime Minister orders all pubs, restaurants, gyms and other social venues to close until further notice.</i>		
<b>23 March 2020:</b>		
<i>The government instructs people to stay at home, only going out for limited purposes. Non-essential shops, businesses and venues are closed, gatherings of two or more people in public are banned, and all social events stopped. Police are given the powers to enforce these new restrictions.</i>		
<b>24 March 2020:</b>		
The Old Schools is closed from 5 p.m. on 24 March 2020. A process is ongoing to classify buildings in order to identify those that are to remain open, but all other buildings are expected to close. The following are subsequently approved under delegated authority:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the categorisation of 600 University buildings into three groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 – open for mission-critical activity or in the national interest;</li> <li>2 – closed apart from routine access for facilities, animal and critical equipment maintenance; and</li> <li>3 – closed, out of operation and made safe for reoccupation;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• a matrix for the maintenance of specific functions within each category of University building;</li> <li>• a Standard Operating Practice (SOP) document establishing a Safe Working Protocol, for issue to facility managers within the Estates Division and locally within departments;</li> <li>• a protocol for the closure of buildings, for issue to heads of institutions and others responsible for buildings within the estate;</li> <li>• a protocol and a process for the phased re-opening of buildings for research purposes, for issue to heads of institutions and others responsible for buildings within the estate.</li> </ul>		
Request from the University Library for £200k for ebooks is approved under delegated authority.		

	Matters regulated by the <i>Statutes and Ordinances</i>	Possible breaches of Ordinances / General Board Regulations
<b>25 March 2020:</b> <i>The Minister for Science, Research and Innovation encourages UK universities and research institutions to continue to consider whether it is possible to continue with science and research programmes, particularly to protect work that is considered of critical urgency or importance, where pausing the activity is not possible or would severely impede research delivery, or where it requires ongoing maintenance and supervision.</i>		
Changes to the process for executing deeds are approved under delegated authority. The changes allow deeds to be executed on behalf of the University on the signature of certain senior officers, without the need to affix the Common Seal of the University (which require two deputies to witness a sealing using equipment in the Old Schools). The senior officers who can execute a deed are the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, the Registrar, the Chief Financial Officer, the Director of Finance, the Director of Estates, the Head of the Legal Services Division, and the Head of the Governance and Compliance Division.		
<b>26 March 2020:</b> Confirmation that the University's classification of buildings is consistent with the message from the Minister for Science, Research and Innovation.		
<b>31 March 2020:</b> Purchase of a one-year subscription to LinkedIn Learning for £104,280 + VAT approved under delegated authority.		
<b>1 April 2020:</b> The Interim Director of Estates is given authority (up to £0.5m in aggregate) to negotiate with individual commercial tenants should they require deferrals or waivers of rent to manage the economic disruption caused by the COVID-19 outbreak.		
	A temporary derogation from the Financial Regulations is approved under delegated authority, to allow the publication of guidance for departments on spending during the period that the University is affected by the COVID-19 outbreak, together with an addendum to the University's expenses policy to deal with additional costs that staff may incur and for which they should be reimbursed.	Normally the Council publishes a Notice confirming any changes to its Financial Regulations (reproduced in <i>Statutes and Ordinances</i> , p. 1051).
<b>3 April 2020:</b> Approval is granted under delegated authority of a funding request for £20k for the Staff Counselling Service to pay for two part-time counsellors (who are currently paid for by Colleges) for six months to support staff at Addenbrooke's Hospital.		

	Matters regulated by the <i>Statutes and Ordinances</i>	Possible breaches of Ordinances / General Board Regulations
<b>6 April 2020:</b> The Council approves a Contracts Extension Scheme to support individuals whose employment contracts or assignments ended, or are due to end, between 16 March 2020 and 31 July 2020, enabling them to receive payment until 31 July 2020, whether or not they are able to work during that period.		
<b>7 April 2020:</b> The provision of £400k and the allocation of space within a University building is approved under delegated authority to set up the new COVID-19 testing laboratory at the Anne McLaren Building in collaboration with AstraZeneca and GlaxoSmithKline. The funding is subsequently increased to £1.5m under delegated authority. Approval is given under delegated authority of a funding request for £18k to transport volunteers to work in the COVID-19 testing facility in Milton Keynes (with the timing of need dependent on volunteer recruitment).		
<b>9 April 2020:</b>	The weekly publication of the <i>Reporter</i> is suspended (a Notice confirming this is published in the first issue of the Easter Term on 16 April 2020).	See Regulation 2 of the Ordinance on the <i>Cambridge University Reporter (Statutes and Ordinances, p. 103)</i> .
<b>16 April 2020:</b> <i>The government announces that lockdown measures will remain in place for another three weeks.</i> Approval is given under delegated authority of the modification of the end date of a retirement extension (also subsequently approved are one further end date extension and two new retirement extensions out of round).		
<b>17 April 2020:</b> Two financial hardship schemes, the Staff Welfare Loan and the Staff Hardship Grant, are launched, offering interest-free loans and one-off, non-repayable and taxable grants to those who have a contract of employment or a worker agreement with the University. Approval is given under delegated authority of a funding request for up to £100k as an initial budget to support the Grant Fund and subsequently for a doubling of the size of the support loan from £500 to £1000 as an extension to the existing scheme. The conferment of degrees by incorporation and of Master of Arts under Statute B II 2 (which require a Grace to be approved) is suspended until further notice.		

	Matters regulated by the <i>Statutes and Ordinances</i>	Possible breaches of Ordinances / General Board Regulations
<b>20 April 2020:</b> <i>The government's Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme goes live. Under the scheme, the government pays 80% of employee wages up to £2,500 a month, plus employer National Insurance and pension contributions for furloughed staff.</i>		
Individual institutions within the University are subsequently asked to report whether they have any furloughed staff so that a claim can be made under the government scheme. The University is to pay the balance of the salary.		
<b>10 May 2020:</b> <i>The Prime Minister announces a roadmap for lifting restrictions, with unlimited outdoor exercise from 13 May 2020 as a first step.</i>		
<b>21 May 2020:</b> Approval under delegated authority of a funding request for £18k + VAT for an online counselling service tool for staff and students (the Big White Wall) to help meet immediate need, but also to trial it to see if it could be used in future to reduce pressure on face-to-face counselling when normal operations resume.		
<b>26 May 2020:</b>	Publication of the <i>Reporter</i> resumes for governance business only and as required. Weekly publication is expected to resume from the beginning of Michaelmas Term 2020.	See above.
	As public gatherings are not permitted and the guidance encourages people to limit meetings with others beyond the members of their household (and the Senate-House is closed), Discussions in the Senate-House are still not possible. Instead, until further notice, members of the University are invited to submit their remarks on Reports by email for publication in the <i>Reporter</i> (confirmed in the <i>Reporter</i> on 27 May 2020).	See Special Ordinance A (i) 2 ( <i>Statutes and Ordinances</i> , p. 65).
<b>28 May 2020:</b> <i>The Prime Minister announces the reopening of primary schools (for children in Reception, Year 1 and Year 6) and nurseries from 1 June 2020.</i>		

## Roll of the Regent House: New provision for membership

Following the approval of amendments to Statute A III 11 by Her Majesty in Council (*Reporter*, 6578, 2019–20, p. 348), the age limit for membership of the Regent House has been removed and will take effect from the next promulgation of the Roll on 6 November 2020. In addition, new Special Ordinance A (i) (e) introduces a provision allowing those who are about to retire, or who have retired, from an office or appointment in the University *which previously qualified them for membership of the Regent House*, to retain their membership of the Regent House. Membership will continue for those individuals on the receipt of written confirmation from their Head of institution<sup>1</sup> that they remain *active participants in the University's affairs*. This confirmation is required **by 15 August** prior to the promulgation of the Roll each year. For inclusion on the 2020–21 Roll, confirmation should be sent by email to [universitydraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:universitydraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk) as soon as possible and no later than 15 August 2020. Heads of institution have been contacted separately to draw attention to this deadline.

<sup>1</sup> 'Head of institution' means the Head of a Department, Chair of a Board of a Faculty not organised into Departments, Director or the authorised deputy or designated nominee, as appropriate within that institution.

## NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD

### Institute of Public Health

28 May 2020

#### With effect from 1 August 2020

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Council of the School of Clinical Medicine and with the support of the Director and Committee of Management of the Institute of Public Health, has agreed to a change to the structure underpinning research and teaching in Public Health within the University. An Interdisciplinary Research Centre in Public Health will bring together those working in the field from across the University, replacing the Institute of Public Health.<sup>1</sup> The IRC will be managed by Joint Directors providing leadership on behalf of the Schools of Clinical Medicine and Technology. The Board has therefore agreed to rescind the General Board Regulations for the Institute in their entirety (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 635).

<sup>1</sup> This Notice concerns the institution of the General Board, not the building on the Forvie site with the same name.

## Changes to governance arrangements for postgraduate students

#### With effect from 1 October 2020

In December 2019 the Regent House approved changes to governance arrangements for postgraduate students, to dissolve the Board of Graduate Studies and move its work to the Postgraduate Committee, a sub-committee of the General Board's Education Committee (*Reporter*, 6570, 2019–20, p. 155).

As detailed in the Report setting out those changes, the Postgraduate Committee is to undertake a review of its work and to consider the most appropriate governance and operational arrangements for postgraduate admissions (as part of the admissions review), fees (in conjunction with the proposed fees review), progress monitoring and student status, and examination and award. In October 2019 the General Board's Education Committee established an Enquiry Group to start this review. The Group made a series of recommendations for activity to move to other sub-committees of the General Board's Education Committee, which were accepted by the Education Committee on 18 March 2020.<sup>1</sup> These changes will take effect from 1 October 2020.

#### *Admissions*

The General Board's Education Committee will provide oversight of academic standards of admission to postgraduate courses. All other matters relating to admission of postgraduate students will be considered by the Postgraduate Admissions Committee.

#### *Examination and assessment of postgraduate taught students*

Matters relating to examination and assessment of postgraduate taught students (i.e. students who are not examined by thesis and oral) currently within the purview of the Board of Graduate Studies shall move to the Examination and Assessment Committee. Applications for examination allowances, examination arrangements and alternative modes of assessment for postgraduate taught students will be considered by the Examinations Access and Mitigation Committee.

<sup>1</sup> See also the Report on p. 524.



## Senior Academic Promotions Committee: Appeals 2020

The procedure for senior academic promotions (Section 12.1) provides that applicants have the right to lodge an appeal against the decision of the General Board's Academic Promotions Committee not to promote.

In accordance with the policy that Committee membership for the senior academic promotions exercise be published, the members of the Appeals Committee for the 1 October 2020 exercise agreed by the General Board are as follows:

Professor Steven Connor (Chair)  
 Professor Natalia Berloff  
 Professor Brian Cheffins  
 Professor Jonathan Crowcroft  
 Professor Fiona Karet  
*Secretary:* Thuy Niven

## REPORTS

### Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a revised fitness to practise procedure

The COUNCIL and the GENERAL BOARD beg leave to report to the University as follows:

1. Providers of courses leading to professional qualifications have a duty to ensure that students on those courses are fit to practise, that is, they have the character, professional competence and health to practise in their chosen profession. This Report proposes the amalgamation of existing University procedures concerning fitness to practise within one new procedure in Ordinance.

2. The review of existing procedures has been prompted by the issue of new guidance for the HE sector. In November 2019, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) published a new chapter of its good practice framework on handling complaints and academic appeals, to cover fitness to practise.<sup>1</sup> From 1 September 2020, the guidance will be used by the OIA in assessing complaints from students about the management of concerns about their fitness to practise.

3. Following the launch of the OIA guidance, consultation took place during Michaelmas Term 2019 and Lent Term 2020 with the Faculty Boards providing professional courses (Biology, Clinical Medicine, Veterinary Science, and Education) and staff involved in the current fitness to practise procedures about potential changes to those procedures. The revised procedure is supported by the General Board's Education Committee.

5. The Council and the General Board recommend:

I. That, with effect from 1 September 2020,<sup>2</sup> the amendments to Ordinances as set out in Annex A be approved.

It reflects the findings of the consultation and subsequent feedback on proposed amendments, including comments made during external legal review.

4. The revised procedure sets out to achieve the following:

- (a) to establish one procedure concerning fitness to practise, to provide consistency of treatment for students on all relevant courses in the University. The new procedure amalgamates the separate procedures in Ordinance concerning the fitness to practise of preclinical and clinical medical students and of preclinical and clinical veterinary students, and also the procedure concerning PGCE students not previously included in Ordinance;
- (b) to ensure compliance with the OIA's good practice framework;
- (c) to ensure the procedure is as accessible and transparent as possible, including specifying what students can expect from the process and timeframes for investigation and decision-making;
- (d) to include reference to the University's general powers for precautionary action while any University investigation is ongoing.

23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> MADELEINE ATKINS GAENOR BAGLEY ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI R. CHARLES STEPHEN J. COWLEY SHARON FLOOD	ANTHONY FREELING NICOLAS GAY DAVID GREENAWAY NICHOLAS HOLMES FIONA KARET CHRISTOPHER KELLY PHILIP KNOX	MARK LEWISOHN EDWARD PARKER HUMPHREYS RICHARD PENTY ANDREW SANCHEZ JASON SCOTT-WARREN MARK WORMALD JOCELYN WYBURD
23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> PHILIP ALLMENDINGER KRISTINE BLACK-HAWKINS ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI ANN COPESTAKE	JOHN DENNIS NICHOLAS HOLMES ALI HYDE PATRICK MAXWELL NIGEL PEAKE	ANNA PHILPOTT RICHARD REX GRAHAM VIRGO MARK WORMALD CHRISTOPHER YOUNG

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/resources-and-publications/good-practice-framework/fitness-to-practise/>

<sup>2</sup> The changes will be backdated to 1 September 2020 if they are approved by ballot (see *Reporter*, 6584, 2019–20, p. 450).

**ANNEX A**

By replacing the Procedures to Determine Fitness to Practise of Preclinical and Clinical Medical Students (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 225) and the Procedures to Determine Fitness to Practise of Preclinical and Clinical Veterinary Students (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 233) with the following:

**FITNESS TO PRACTISE PROCEDURE****1. Glossary of key terms**

**1.1.** In this procedure, the following terms shall have the meanings set out below:

Code of Conduct	The list of behaviours that describe the required standards of behaviour for the individual course of study, with which a student on the course of study must comply
expression of concern	A concern originating from any source relating to a student's fitness to practise
FTP	Fitness to Practise
FTP Committee	The group which considers an expression of concern when initially received and following any investigation determines what action, if any, should be taken, including agreement of actions or referral to an FTP Adjudication Panel
Investigator	A member of the FTP Panel who investigates an expression of concern at the FTP Committee's request
FTP Adjudication Panel	The decision-makers that determine whether a student is fit to practise following a referral from the FTP Committee, including whether the student should remain on the Student Register and/or should be subject to actions
FTP Appeal Panel	The decision-makers who consider a student's appeal of an FTP Adjudication Panel's decision
FTP Panel	A panel appointed by the relevant Faculty Board(s), from which Investigators or members of the FTP Adjudication Panel are appointed
OSCCA	Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals; this Office has the responsibility for maintaining the FTP Procedure
Regulator	The external organisation responsible for the professional standards that registrants and/or students adhere to in order to become or continue to be members or student members of that profession
student	Any person who has accepted an offer to study; or who is currently studying; or who has intermitted or is temporarily suspended from their studies; or a person who had such status at the time of the circumstances about which the expression of concern is being raised, on a relevant course which requires their fitness to practise to be monitored
Student Progress Panel	A group of staff who monitor and, where needed, provide additional support to students who are pursuing professional courses of study; the Student Progress Panel for preclinical and clinical medical and veterinary students is the Medical and Veterinary Student Progress Panel (MVSPP), and for P.G.C.E. students it is the relevant P.G.C.E. examination board
Student Register	A formal list of all students who are considered to be fit to practise, maintained by the Faculty Board

**2. Scope and Principles**

**2.1.** The following procedure shall govern students pursuing courses of study that will require them to register or provisionally register with a Regulator during or following their course of study, so that there can be assurance of their fitness to practise. The relevant courses of study and professional bodies are as follows:

- Preclinical and clinical medical students. The General Medical Council (GMC) has a duty, as a matter of public safety under the Medical Act 1983, to ensure that medical students are fit to practise medicine, as defined in guidance issued by the Medical Schools Council and GMC, when they apply to the GMC for provisional registration.
- Preclinical and clinical veterinary students. The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) has a duty to ensure that veterinary students are fit to practise veterinary medicine when they apply for registration.
- P.G.C.E. students. The Department for Education (DfE) through the Teachers' Regulation Agency has a duty to ensure that P.G.C.E. students are fit to teach.

**2.2.** The University has a duty to ensure that students are fit to practise in the profession leading on from their professional course, or will be when they complete the course. This is in order to:

- (a) protect present or future patients, clients, learners, service users and members of the public;
- (b) safeguard public confidence in the profession;
- (c) comply with the requirements of the Regulator; and
- (d) ensure that students are not awarded a qualification that permits them to practise a profession if they are not fit to do so.

**2.3.** Fitness to practise issues can arise from a student's conduct, health, or performance. Students have a responsibility to report anything that may affect their fitness to practise to the following:

- (a) for medical students, the Director of Medical Education (Clinical) or (Preclinical);
- (b) for veterinary students, the Director of Teaching;
- (c) for P.G.C.E. students, the primary or secondary P.G.C.E. course manager, as appropriate.

**2.4.** A non-exhaustive list of matters that may give rise to concerns about a student's fitness to practise include:

- (a) committing an offence under the criminal law;
- (b) any breach of the University's Rules of Behaviour;<sup>1</sup>
- (c) unsafe or incompetent practice;
- (d) poor communication skills and/or inappropriate communications;
- (e) behaviour likely to undermine the public's trust in the profession;
- (f) failure to seek appropriate help and engage with appropriate treatment in relation to personal health issues;
- (g) failure to engage with any aspect of the course.

**2.5.** Monitoring of a student's academic progress and additional support for students is provided by the Student Progress Panel; these matters can include issues relating to ill health or any other concern that does not merit a referral to the FTP Committee.

**2.6.** The consideration of whether or not a student is fit to practise shall be determined in accordance with the following procedure, which comprises of:

- (a) preliminary consideration by the FTP Committee of an expression of concern;
- (b) an investigation, where commissioned by the FTP Committee, into the concern;
- (c) consideration of the investigation report by the FTP Committee, to determine whether any action is required, or the student would benefit from remedial measures being put in place, or the matter should be referred to the FTP Adjudication Panel;
- (d) where referred, consideration by the FTP Adjudication Panel;
- (e) consideration of any appeal from the student by the FTP Appeal Panel;
- (f) following the conclusion of this internal procedure, students will be informed of the process for raising a complaint with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education, the external ombudsman.

**2.7.** A student must engage fully with this procedure and, where required to do so, attend meetings or hearings (whether in person or virtually), including occupational health or other expert assessments requested by the FTP Committee or FTP Adjudication Panel, and provide information upon request in a timely manner. Any failure to engage or improper engagement with this procedure may result in a student being found not fit to practise if it prevents or limits the collection of information necessary to determine the student's fitness to practise. Where a student does not engage, the process may continue in the student's absence.

**2.8.** Correspondence with the student will be primarily conducted using the student's University of Cambridge email address, where available. It is the responsibility of students to ensure that their contact details on their student record (CamSIS) are accurate. Where a student believes it is not possible to engage with the procedure for medical or other reasons, the Chair of the relevant committee will consider the evidence provided by the student and determine whether the procedure will be suspended and if so, when it will be recommenced.

**2.9.** When applying for provisional registration or registration with a Regulator, or when applying for any role that requires the student to have a professional qualification, students must comply with any request by the Regulator or employer to provide the details of any referral to the FTP Committee and any and all matters that might have a bearing on the student's fitness to practise.

<sup>1</sup> See [p. 191].

**2.10.** All FTP Panel and FTP Committee members will be appointed or re-appointed for terms of three years and receive appropriate training to undertake their role and be appropriately resourced and supported. No decision-maker or Investigator will have any previous material involvement with the matter that they are considering, or material personal knowledge of the people involved. Where a conflict or reasonable perception of conflict arises, or where the appointed members are unavailable, an alternative person will be appointed by the body responsible for appointing that person. It is at the responsible body's discretion whether any objection made by the student is reasonable and requires an alternative person to be appointed.

**2.11.** Some students may find engaging with this procedure worrying or challenging, as it may include consideration of whether they are able to continue with their course of study. The student will receive information on how to access support during the procedure. Support may be delivered by a College, the University, the Students' Union's Advice Service or external support organisations.

**2.12.** Students may bring a supporter of their choosing to any investigatory meetings. It is recommended that this is not a family member. In any FTP Adjudication Panel or FTP Appeal Panel hearing in which the outcome could be career-ending students may bring a supporter or representative with them, and such a person may act (at the student's expense) as the student's legal representative. Students must make the meeting secretary aware of who will accompany them at least 7 days in advance of the meeting.

**2.13.** If students have a disability and require reasonable adjustments to the process, then they should discuss this with the Chair of the FTP Committee or the Chair of the FTP Adjudication Panel or FTP Appeal Panel (as appropriate) who will determine the reasonable adjustments, seeking advice as appropriate. Examples of reasonable adjustments include extensions to timeframes or access to different support or representation in either investigatory meetings or panel hearings.

**2.14.** Where a concern about a student is raised and is already under consideration by the police or another University procedure, the Chair of the FTP Committee will normally wait for that process to be completed before taking action, except in relation to precautionary action as described in Regulation 4.2 and/or as outlined in Special Ordinance D (v)<sup>2</sup> or in other exceptional circumstances.

**2.15.** If at any stage of this procedure the Chair of any of the bodies involved considers that the student may have committed an offence under the criminal law or a breach of University discipline, the Chair may suspend proceedings and refer the circumstances to the police or to the University's Student Disciplinary Procedure for consideration, as appropriate. In any such instances, precautionary action may be taken under Special Ordinance D (v) and/or Regulation 4.2 of this procedure. Any unlawful conduct found by criminal proceedings or any breach of the University's Statutes and Ordinances found under the Student Disciplinary Procedure shall be confirmation of the student having committed the offence or breached the University's Rules of Behaviour.

**2.16.** The Chair of the FTP Committee or Chair of an FTP Adjudication Panel or Chair of an FTP Appeal Panel may seek and receive legal advice to ensure that they are acting lawfully.

**2.17.** Any reference in this procedure to a University officer or other named role-holder includes a deputy appointed by that officer or role-holder to exercise the functions assigned to that officer or role-holder under this procedure.

**2.18.** Throughout this procedure and following any decisions, the relevant decision-makers may share relevant information with placement providers or other external organisations.

### **3. Submitting an expression of concern**

**3.1.** Any expression of concern that a student may not be fit to practise shall be made in writing to the Secretary of the FTP Committee, who is appointed by the relevant Faculty Board.

**3.2.** Expressions of concern will normally be made by the Chair of the relevant Student Progress Panel, or by the student's Senior Tutor, but any person may make an expression of concern. This may include a decision-maker within an alternative procedure, for example, the Student Disciplinary Procedure, or a self-referral from a student.

**3.3.** The expression of concern shall include the author's name, contact details and relationship to the student. Anonymous referrals shall only be acted upon in exceptional circumstances at the discretion of the FTP Committee, having regard to the seriousness of the issues raised and the fairness to any individuals mentioned in the referral. The FTP Committee may also consider that the identity of individuals, although known to the FTP Committee, may need to be withheld from the student in exceptional circumstances.

<sup>2</sup> See [p. 98].

#### 4. Consideration of the expression of concern

4.1. An expression of concern shall be considered by the FTP Committee. The FTP Committee shall comprise of three members, appointed by the Faculty Board aligned to the relevant professional body, except where stated:

- (a) a Chair who shall be a qualified member of the professional body;
- (b) a practising member of the professional body; and
- (c) a member of the Regent House who shall not be registered with the professional body, appointed by the Faculty Board of Biology for medical and veterinary students, and by the Faculty Board of Education for P.G.C.E. students.

4.2. The Secretary of the FTP Committee shall communicate the expression of concern to the Chair of the FTP Committee, who shall decide whether the student shall during the course of any fitness to practise procedures:

- (a) continue with the course of study without limitation;
- (b) continue with the course of study under specified conditions;
- (c) be prohibited from entering specified preclinical and/or clinical facilities as a medical student, or veterinary facilities as a veterinary student, or specified educational facilities as a P.G.C.E. student;
- (d) be provisionally suspended from the relevant Student Register and therefore from the professional components of the course.

4.3. In circumstances where the expression of concern is not made by the Chair of the Student Progress Panel, or by the student's Senior Tutor, the Chair of the FTP Committee may discuss the matter with some or all of the above individuals. The Chair of the FTP Committee may determine that the expression of concern is not of sufficient substance to require consideration under FTP processes (in which case students will not have to declare to the relevant Regulator that they have been referred to FTP). The Chair of the FTP Committee may also refer the concern into an alternative procedure. The student will be informed of this decision.

4.4. Within 7 days of the referral of an expression of concern to a FTP Committee, the Secretary of the FTP Committee shall inform the student and the student's Senior Tutor of:

- the details of the expression of concern;
- the identity of the members of the FTP Committee.

4.5. The student shall have 7 days to object to the membership of the FTP Committee. The Chair or Deputy of the nominating Faculty Board shall consider any representations and shall appoint another person if they consider there is a conflict of interest or bias, or a reasonable perception of a conflict of interest or bias.

4.6. Following consideration of the expression of concern, normally within 14 days of the letter informing the student of the expression of concern, the FTP Committee, by majority decision, shall determine whether the expression of concern shall be:

- (a) dismissed (because it is frivolous, vexatious, insufficiently serious, lacks sufficient evidence or for some other valid reason);
- (b) referred for investigation by an Investigator and/or request the student to undergo specialist assessment by a practitioner appointed by the FTP Committee;
- (c) referred to the police or other recognised investigatory body or to an alternative University procedure, including the Student Disciplinary Procedure;
- (d) referred to an FTP Adjudication Panel.

4.7. The student and the student's College will receive a letter from the Secretary of the FTP Committee within 7 days of the FTP Committee making a determination under Regulation 4.6, setting out its decision and the reasons for its decision. Where an investigation is required, the letter will explain the scope and nature of the investigation and how this relates to the relevant professional standards.

#### 5. Investigating the expression of concern

5.1. Where the FTP Committee determines that an investigation should be conducted, the FTP Committee shall appoint an Investigator from the course-specific FTP Panel (as described in Regulation 5.2), normally within 7 days of informing the student of the investigation. The FTP Committee shall also confirm the scope of the investigation, including specific evidence to be considered and/or the requirement for specialist assessments.

**5.2.** The members of the course-specific FTP Panel are nominated by the relevant Faculty Board(s); for medical and veterinary students, this includes the Faculty Board of Biology in addition to the subject Faculty Board. Each course-specific FTP Panel will include at least six members appointed by each relevant Faculty Board. At least two members must be practising and registered members of the Regulator.

**5.3.** The Investigator shall normally attempt (either in person or virtually) to meet with the student concerned, the author of the expression of concern (unless an anonymous concern has been permitted), and any other relevant persons. It is expected that the Investigator will normally conduct these meetings within four to six weeks of being appointed. The Investigator should give at least a week's notice of the meeting with the student who is the subject of the concern. During the meeting with the student concerned, the Investigator shall invite the student to submit any relevant evidence and the names of any person(s) that the student considers that the Investigator should contact or meet. The student will be given a week following the meeting to submit this information. If the Investigator does not think that contacting or meeting any particular person will be of relevance, the Investigator shall discuss the matter with the Chair of the FTP Committee who will determine whether or not that person should be contacted. Where the student does not agree to meet with the Investigator in a timely way, the Investigator shall proceed with the investigation. As outlined in Regulation 2.7, there may be adverse consequences for any student who does not engage fully with the procedure.

**5.4.** A formal note of each interview shall be prepared by the Investigator (the Investigator may work with a note-taker during the interviews and on the preparation of the notes of each meeting and the final investigation report) and agreed with the person who has been interviewed. In the event that a person does not agree that a note is an accurate record of the meeting, a record of that disagreement will be appended to the note, but the record of the meeting shall not be altered without the agreement of the Investigator. In the event that a person does not respond to the request to agree that a note is an accurate record of the meeting, the Investigator shall proceed to complete their investigation report and shall include the record of the meeting and an explanatory comment that the meeting note has not been agreed. The Investigator shall also take reasonable steps to obtain or receive other relevant evidence, e.g. copies of postings on social media or messages.

**5.5.** A written report shall be prepared and submitted by the Investigator to the Secretary of the FTP Committee, normally within two weeks of the investigation receiving the final piece of evidence. The student will be kept informed if delays occur, which will normally be due to the complexity of the concern raised.

## **6. Consideration of the Investigator's report**

**6.1.** On receipt of the Investigator's report and any specialist assessment requested under Regulation 4.6(b), the FTP Committee, by majority decision and normally within 14 days following receipt of all information, shall take one of the following decisions:

- (a) there is no further action to be taken;
- (b) there is no serious issue to be determined with regard to the student's fitness to practise, but the student would benefit from supportive or remedial measures being put in place; where this is the decision, the Chair of the FTP Committee shall on behalf of the FTP Committee:
  - (i) agree such measures with the student, the student's Senior Tutor, and the Director of Education or Director of Learning and Teaching in the relevant Faculty; or
  - (ii) in the event of failure to agree such measures, the FTP Committee shall refer the matter to a FTP Adjudication Panel;
- (c) there may be a serious issue to be determined concerning the student's fitness to practise and the matter shall be referred to a FTP Adjudication Panel.

**6.2.** The Secretary of the FTP Committee shall inform the student, the Student Progress Panel, and the student's Senior Tutor in writing of the FTP Committee's decision, the reasons for that decision and any agreed measures within 7 days of the FTP Committee decision being made.

**6.3.** Where the FTP Committee decides that a matter shall be referred to a FTP Adjudication Panel, the Secretary of the FTP Committee shall notify OSCCA and the student's Faculty Board Secretary.

## **7. Consideration by the FTP Adjudication Panel**

**7.1.** The FTP Adjudication Panel shall comprise three members of the FTP Panel as set out in Regulation 5.2, and will be appointed by the Chair of the relevant Faculty Board:

- (a) a Chair who shall be a qualified member of the relevant professional body;
- (b) two other members, including at least one external member where this is required by the Regulator.

**7.2.** The Secretary of the student's current Faculty Board or a person appointed by the Secretary shall be Secretary of the FTP Adjudication Panel.

**7.3.** The Secretary of the FTP Adjudication Panel will write to the student and the student's Senior Tutor, providing confirmation of:

- (a) the members of the FTP Adjudication Panel and how the student can object to the membership within 7 days of the date of the letter;
- (b) the documents that will be considered by the FTP Adjudication Panel, including the Investigator's report and any further information or reports requested by the FTP Adjudication Panel;
- (c) the names of any persons who may be asked to attend a FTP Adjudication Panel to give evidence, which will normally include the Investigator and the Chair of the FTP Committee;
- (d) the fact that the student may provide further written submissions or evidence to the FTP Adjudication Panel, and the names of witnesses (if any) that the student would like to attend the FTP Adjudication Panel hearing. If submitting evidence or making requests for new witnesses to attend the hearing, students must explain why they did not submit the evidence or ask the Investigator to interview any witnesses earlier in the process. The FTP Adjudication Panel may decline to consider new evidence or hear witnesses in the absence of a reasonable explanation;
- (e) the deadline for the submission of information set out in paragraph (d), which will normally be two weeks before the date of the hearing; it shall be at the Chair's discretion whether any later submissions or late requests for witnesses to attend will be considered;
- (f) the date, time and place for the hearing, normally between 4–6 weeks from the date of the letter.

**7.4.** Where the student has good cause to object to any member of the FTP Adjudication Panel the action outlined in Regulation 2.10 will be taken.

**7.5.** A FTP Adjudication Panel may, at the Chair's discretion, consider the case in the student's absence. Where the student provides a valid reason for not being able to attend a hearing, the hearing may, at the Chair's discretion, be re-arranged or conducted by video conference. As outlined in Regulation 2.7, there may be adverse consequences for any student who does not engage fully with the procedure.

**7.6.** The student's Senior Tutor (or a deputy appointed by the Senior Tutor) shall be entitled, with the student's consent, to be present at any hearing (as the student's representative or in addition to such a representative).

**7.7.** The Chair of the FTP Adjudication Panel shall determine the procedure for the conduct of a FTP Adjudication Panel hearing, including requiring an adjournment at any time. The procedure shall normally be as follows:

- (a) The Chair shall introduce all those present at the hearing and explain the powers of a FTP Adjudication Panel.
- (b) The Chair shall ask the student whether they accept the investigation findings. Where the student accepts in full the investigation findings, and the Panel is satisfied it has sufficient information regarding the findings, the Chair shall direct the hearing from paragraph (j) onwards. Where the student does not fully accept the investigation findings, the Chair shall continue with the procedure from paragraph (c) onwards.
- (c) The Chair shall invite the Investigator to make an opening statement and shall then invite FTP Adjudication Panel members to ask questions.
- (d) The Chair shall invite the student and/or the student's representative to make a statement and shall then invite FTP Adjudication Panel members to question the student.
- (e) The Chair shall invite any witnesses or other persons called upon to attend the hearing to make a brief statement and shall then invite FTP Adjudication Panel members to ask questions.
- (f) At each stage, the Chair shall have discretion to allow reciprocal questioning by all parties.
- (g) When the Chair is satisfied that the FTP Adjudication Panel has completed its questioning and that the student and other persons present have had a full opportunity to convey information to a FTP Adjudication Panel, the student and/or the student's representative shall have the opportunity to make a final statement. Following this, all other persons not on the FTP Adjudication Panel except the Secretary of the FTP Adjudication Panel shall withdraw. The Secretary of the FTP Adjudication Panel shall remain to provide advice on procedure but shall take no part in the FTP Adjudication Panel reaching its decision on the case itself.

- (h) The FTP Adjudication Panel shall then discuss the case and reach a conclusion on whether the expression of concern has been proven on the balance of probabilities.
- (i) Those attending the first part of the hearing shall all be invited back into the hearing once the FTP Adjudication Panel has concluded its discussions and the Chair shall outline the FTP Adjudication Panel's decision to the student.
- (j) The Chair shall, if appropriate, ask the student to submit any evidence in mitigation and shall then invite FTP Adjudication Panel members to ask questions.
- (k) The student and all other persons not on the FTP Adjudication Panel except the Secretary of the FTP Adjudication Panel shall then withdraw whilst the Panel considers whether the student's fitness to practise has been impaired.
- (l) Where practicable, those attending the first part of the hearing shall all be invited back into the hearing once the FTP Adjudication Panel has concluded its discussions and the Chair shall then outline the FTP Adjudication Panel's decision to the student.

**7.8.** At any point during the hearing the Chair of the FTP Adjudication Panel has the discretion to seek any further clarification the Panel requires, including a request for further materials or information to verify or respond to matters raised, to call for a further adjournment or adjournments to allow that information to be provided. Where this additional material or information comes from a source other than the student, the student will be given an opportunity to comment on such additional material.

**7.9.** The FTP Adjudication Panel, following consideration of the case, may make one of the following decisions on the balance of probabilities and by a simple majority:

- (a) determine that there has been no breach of the Code of Conduct and therefore, no further action should be taken;
- (b) determine that there has been a breach of the Code of Conduct and:
  - (i) declare that the student is fit to practise and may continue on the course with no conditions or other actions;
  - (ii) declare that the student is fit to practise but provide a formal warning that will be added to the student's record;
  - (iii) declare that the student is fit to practise but impose conditions including educative or supportive actions;
  - (iv) declare that there are grounds for concern as to the student's fitness to practise, provide a formal warning and impose other conditions in respect of the student's continuation on a course of study, which may include:
    - that the student be temporarily suspended from the Student Register, specifying the arrangements for monitoring by the FTP Committee of the suspension (including a minimum period if appropriate) and the arrangements for the removal of the suspension;
    - that the student be required to undergo an occupational health assessment or referral to another specialist agency; and/or
    - that the student be required to undertake monitoring and engage with additional support;
  - (v) declare that the student is unfit to practise, that the student be removed from the Student Register and that any relevant professional body, Regulator and the Disclosure and Barring Service be informed of this action. The FTP Adjudication Panel may stipulate further conditions as appropriate to the case, for example whether the student may continue with a non-professional course of study or be awarded an exit qualification.

**7.10.** The student will receive the decision of the FTP Adjudication Panel, the reasons for the decision and information about the right to appeal in writing from the Secretary within 7 days of the FTP Adjudication Panel hearing taking place. A copy of the letter will also be provided to the Student Progress Panel, the FTP Committee Secretary, the student's Senior Tutor and the relevant Director(s) of Education or equivalent.

## **8. Appeal**

**8.1.** A student shall have the right to appeal the decision of the FTP Adjudication Panel by submitting an appeal on the permitted grounds to the Head of OSCCA, who shall be Secretary of the FTP Appeal Panel, alongside all evidence to be considered, within 28 days of the student being informed of the written decision.



**8.2.** An appeal may be made on only one or more of the following grounds:

- (a) the procedures were not followed properly;
- (b) the decision-maker(s) reached an unreasonable decision;
- (c) there is material new evidence that the student was unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process;
- (d) there was bias or a reasonable perception of bias during the procedure;
- (e) the action taken by the FTP Adjudication Panel is disproportionate or not permitted under the procedures.

**8.3.** The FTP Appeal Panel shall comprise of members appointed by the Council to that role and drawn by lot from those who are available, except for the Chair who shall be nominated by the Vice-Chancellor. Membership of the FTP Appeal Panel shall be as follows:

- (a) a Chair, experienced in decision-making relating to misconduct either through legal training or in relation to student, staff or professional procedures, who is not a member of Council;
- (b) a member of the Regent House not in a Faculty linked to the Regulator;
- (c) an external member, who is a qualified/registered and practising member of the relevant professional body.

**8.4.** On receipt of the appeal, where it is within time and within the appeal grounds, as determined by the Secretary of the FTP Appeal Panel, the Secretary of the FTP Appeal Panel shall organise a FTP Appeal Panel to hear the appeal.

**8.5.** During the consideration of the appeal, the decision of the FTP Adjudication Panel shall remain in force.

**8.6.** The FTP Appeal Panel consideration shall take place as soon as possible, and normally within 4 weeks of the date of submission of the appeal.

**8.7.** The student shall have an opportunity to object to the FTP Appeal Panel membership in accordance with Regulation 2.10.

**8.8.** Unless, at the discretion of the Chair of the FTP Appeal Panel, the FTP Appeal Panel requests that a hearing should take place, the appeal will be considered on the basis of the papers provided, which will include the material considered by the FTP Adjudication Panel; the decision of the FTP Adjudication Panel; the minutes of the FTP Adjudication Panel hearing; and the appeal of the student. Where necessary, the FTP Appeal Panel may request further materials or information to verify or respond to matters raised in the appeal. Where this takes place and comes from a source other than the student, the student will be given an opportunity to comment on such additional material.

**8.9.** Where a hearing takes place, the student, the student's representative and the Chairs of the FTP Committee and FTP Adjudication Panel will be invited to attend, with at least 14 days' notice. During the hearing, the Chair of the FTP Appeal Panel will invite each of those in attendance to make a statement and there will be the opportunity for the FTP Appeal Panel to ask questions of those in attendance and, at the Chair's discretion, to allow the parties to put questions to one another. Once the FTP Appeal Panel considers it has sufficient information, the others in attendance will withdraw, except for the Secretary of the FTP Appeal Panel, and the FTP Appeal Panel will consider the case.

**8.10.** Following consideration, the FTP Appeal Panel may confirm, quash, amend, or refer back the decision to the same, or a newly constituted, FTP Adjudication Panel. The outcome of the FTP Appeal Panel or a further FTP Adjudication Panel may result in a more severe or lenient outcome for the student.

**8.11.** The Secretary of the FTP Appeal Panel shall inform the student in writing of the decision and the reasons for the decision within 7 days of the appeal decision being made. Where a case is not being referred back for consideration by a FTP Adjudication Panel, the decision will be accompanied by a Completion of Procedures letter to explain that the student may be eligible to raise a complaint with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education. The decision of the FTP Appeal Panel shall remain in force whilst any complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator remains ongoing. The Secretary to the FTP Appeal Panel shall also inform the Chair of the FTP Adjudication Panel, the Chair of the FTP Committee, the Student Progress Panel, the Senior Tutor of the student's College, the Director of Education at the relevant Faculty Board(s) and, where appropriate, the Regulator and the professional body of the decision of the FTP Appeal Panel.

## 9. Record and declaration

**9.1.** The FTP Committee and the relevant Faculty Board shall make a record of any actions taken by any decision-makers or undertakings provided by a student relating to arrangements for the monitoring or supervision of the student's conduct, health, or performance.

**9.2.** A student upon whom conditions have been imposed or who has undertaken to comply with arrangements for the management and supervision of the student's conduct, health or performance shall be required to confirm compliance with such conditions or arrangements in writing. Any breach of the conditions or arrangements may result in a further expression of concern being considered under this procedure.

**9.3.** As specified in Regulation 2.9, where relevant, students shall inform the Regulator or employer of the details of any referral to the FTP Committee and any and all matters that may have a bearing on the student's fitness to practise. The University shall refer to fitness to practise proceedings in references regarding the student.

## 10. Reporting and monitoring

**10.1.** The Faculty Board shall be responsible for regularly reviewing and publicising the Code of Conduct, as well as publicising the Fitness to Practise Procedure. OSCCA shall have responsibility for reviewing and maintaining the Fitness to Practise Procedure.

**10.2.** The FTP Committee shall submit the minutes of its meetings to the relevant Faculty Board(s), the Education Committees and OSCCA, in addition to complying with any reporting requirements of the Regulator. OSCCA will provide anonymous case figures for the procedure in its annual report to the Council and the General Board.

## Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a revised fitness to study procedure (Procedure to Support and Assess Capability to Study)

The COUNCIL and the GENERAL BOARD beg leave to report to the University as follows:

1. Following a period of consultation during Easter Term and Michaelmas Term 2019, a number of proposed amendments to the Procedure to Determine Fitness to Study have been discussed. This Report reflects the findings of the consultation and subsequent feedback on proposed amendments and submits a revised procedure for approval.

2. The Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals has undertaken consultation with Departments, Colleges, the General Board's Education Committee and its Student Health and Wellbeing Committee, and the Senior Tutors' Committee and its Standing Committee on Student Welfare and Finance, in order to ensure that proposed amendments would be fit for purpose and in line with the needs of students, Departments and Faculties, and Colleges.

3. The proposals set out to achieve the following:

- (a) the inclusion of an informal and entirely supportive stage as part of the procedure, so that concerns can be managed by Departments and Faculties with the benefit of guidance, and a consistent level of support can be provided to students at the earliest opportunity. This change will mostly affect the management of concerns about postgraduate students, as the Colleges will continue to lead on the early management of concerns about undergraduate students;
- (b) the amendment of the title so that the purpose of the procedure can be more clearly understood by students and staff;
- (c) the simplification of the referral pathway from a College fitness to study procedure to the University procedure. Currently, a College can only refer a case for review under the University procedure if it has determined that its own procedure is either not

fit for purpose or has broken down. If these changes are approved, the College's Senior Tutor can agree with the Head of the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals (OSCCA) that the matter should be referred for consideration under the University procedure;

- (d) removal of the explicit powers of precautionary action within the procedure, and replacing these powers with reference to the University's generic precautionary action procedure in Special Ordinance D (v);
- (e) replacing the review stage of the procedure with a right to have a review considered under the generic Review of Decisions of University Bodies Procedure which handles similar reviews of matters concerning students;
- (f) to ensure the relevant case-handling procedures and principles are explicitly referenced throughout the procedure, in order to have a consistent and transparent approach throughout all formal student procedures;
- (g) to confirm in Statute that the right of students to continue on their course (or any course at the University) may be withdrawn or the membership of students removed under the formal part of the procedure. The first would be applicable in cases where it has been determined that students are not capable of continuing to pursue their course of study (or any course of study). The second would be reserved for cases where removal of membership was considered necessary for the safety and/or wellbeing of the Collegiate University community.

## 4. The Council and the General Board recommend:

I. That, subject to the approval of Her Majesty in Council, the Statutes of the University be amended as set out below and that these amendments be submitted under the Common Seal of the University to Her Majesty in Council for approval, to come into effect on a date approved by the Council.

(a) That the first sentence of Statute B I 2 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 14) be amended to read as follows:

Membership of the University is for life, or until resignation, or until deprivation by decision of a University court, disciplinary panel or any body granted authority in Ordinance to assess capability to study.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the Procedure to Support and Assess Capability to Study, [p. 000].

(b) That new sub-paragraph (c) be inserted in Statute B III 4 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 15), to read as follows:

(c) concerning the circumstances in which a University body shall have authority to withdraw the right of a student to continue to study on a given course, or on any course, offered by the University.

II. That, with effect from 1 October 2020, the amendments to Ordinances as set out in Annex A be approved.

23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	ANTHONY FREELING	MARK LEWISOHN
	MADELEINE ATKINS	NICOLAS GAY	EDWARD PARKER HUMPHREYS
	GAENOR BAGLEY	DAVID GREENAWAY	RICHARD PENTY
	ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI	NICHOLAS HOLMES	ANDREW SANCHEZ
	R. CHARLES	FIONA KARET	JASON SCOTT-WARREN
	STEPHEN J. COWLEY	CHRISTOPHER KELLY	MARK WORMALD
	SHARON FLOOD	PHILIP KNOX	JOCELYN WYBURD
23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	JOHN DENNIS	ANNA PHILPOTT
	PHILIP ALLMENDINGER	NICHOLAS HOLMES	RICHARD REX
	KRISTINE BLACK-HAWKINS	ALI HYDE	GRAHAM VIRGO
	ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI	PATRICK MAXWELL	MARK WORMALD
	ANN COPESTAKE	NIGEL PEAKE	CHRISTOPHER YOUNG

## ANNEX A

(a) By replacing the Procedure to Determine Fitness to Study (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 243) with the following:

## PROCEDURE TO SUPPORT AND ASSESS CAPABILITY TO STUDY

## 1. Glossary of key terms

1.1. In this procedure, the following terms shall have the meanings set out below:

Collegiate University community	All registered or formerly registered students, other matriculated persons, all members of the Regent House, and all University and College employees, workers, staff or secondees, visiting scholars and visiting students
Committee	The Study Capability Assessment Committee (see Regulation 6).
Decision-maker(s)	Those who have authority to make decisions concerning capability to study under this procedure (see Regulations 5 and 6)
Department	The University institution at which the student is studying. References to the Head of Department or Departmental staff refer to the Head and the staff of that institution, who may be the Chair of the Faculty Board and the staff of that Faculty
DRC	Disability Resource Centre
OSCCA	Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals
Rules of Behaviour student	Rules of Behaviour for Registered Students and Formerly Registered Students <sup>1</sup> Registered student as defined in Statute A X 2(c) <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See [p. 191].

<sup>2</sup> See [p. 12].

## 2. Scope and principles

### *Introduction*

**2.1.** This procedure sets out the steps that will be taken by the University when there is concern that a student's behaviour or health is adversely impacting upon the welfare or academic progress of the student, or of others within the Collegiate University community, or has the potential to do so.

**2.2.** Where an alleged breach of the Rules of Behaviour is likely to have been caused by an underlying health condition, this procedure should be initiated.

**2.3.** All students should be encouraged to engage fully with their studies. Students should be informed about how to access relevant academic skills support, pastoral support and, for students with disabilities, how to ask for reasonable adjustments that will be offered and put in place unless declined by the student.

**2.4.** Where concerns regarding the student's behaviour or health remain after the actions in Regulation 2.2 have been taken, this procedure should be initiated.

### *Stages*

**2.5.** The procedure has two stages:

Stage 1 – support to study (see Regulation 5)

Stage 2 – assessing a student's capability to study (see Regulation 6)

Students will have the opportunity to ask for a review of a stage 2 decision using the Procedure for Review of Decisions of University Bodies.<sup>3</sup> The decision on the completion of that review will be the final stage of the University's internal procedure and therefore a Completion of Procedures letter will be issued. The Completion of Procedures letter will explain to the student how to raise a complaint with the external ombudsman, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, if the student remains dissatisfied with the University's action or inaction.

### *Engagement with the procedure*

**2.6.** A student must engage fully with this procedure, including responding to emails, adhering to deadlines and attending meetings either physically or virtually. If a student does not engage fully with the procedure, this is likely to lead to escalation within the procedure and for the decision-makers to assess that the risk to the student or the Collegiate University community is high, resulting in precautionary action under Special Ordinance D (v).

**2.7.** Some students may find engaging with the procedure worrying or challenging, particularly stage 2, as it may include consideration of whether the student is currently capable to continue studying. The student will receive information on how to access support during the procedure. The appropriate support will depend upon the student's circumstances but may be delivered by a College, the University, the Students' Union's Advice Service or external support organisations. Decision-makers will take into account the potential effects upon the student made known to them in reaching their decisions.

**2.8.** Reasonable adjustments shall be made to the procedure to allow fair access for students with a disability requiring them. Students are requested to inform their Department of any requests for reasonable adjustments when accessing Regulation 5 of the procedure, or the Head of OSCCA when accessing Regulation 6 of the procedure, where these have not already been anticipated and put in place.

**2.9.** The student and all others involved in the procedure are always required to communicate and act respectfully and reasonably whilst using the procedure. Abusive behaviour will not be tolerated. If, following a warning, someone continues to behave in an unacceptable manner, that person may be subject to separate disciplinary action. Where the student is continuing to behave in an unacceptable manner, this behaviour may lead a decision-maker to consider that the risk the student poses to the Collegiate University community or themselves is high and refer the concern to the Academic Secretary to consider precautionary action under Special Ordinance D (v).

### *Representation*

**2.10.** In order to ensure that a student's views are accurately represented during the procedure, it is preferable for the University to correspond directly with the student. Where this is not in the best interests of the student, for example because the student lacks capacity or requires support to receive correspondence as a result of an underlying health condition, correspondence can be directed through an authorised representative where explicit permission is given by the student.

<sup>3</sup> See [p. 219].

**2.11.** This procedure is an internal process and does not have the same degree of formality as proceedings in a court of law. It is not normally necessary for a student to be legally represented at any meetings that form part of the procedure, other than in exceptional circumstances.

#### *Decision-making*

**2.12.** Any action taken under this procedure will be limited to that necessary and proportionate to protect the best interests of the student, and other members of the Collegiate University community.

**2.13.** The standard of proof when making decisions under this procedure is the balance of probabilities. The burden of proof that some form of action is required to be taken in relation to the student's studies rests with the University. This means that it is necessary to prove that it is more likely than not that behaviour occurred which requires action to be taken. Decisions must be supported by evidence, and will take into account the credibility of evidence.

**2.14.** All decision-makers will receive appropriate training to undertake their role and be appropriately resourced and supported. Decision-makers in stage 2 will not have had any previous involvement with the matter or any personal knowledge of the student.

**2.15.** A student may choose to intermit at any time during this procedure. The decision-maker will normally accept any request for intermission provided criteria for intermission are met.

**2.16.** This procedure can be suspended at any time by a decision-maker to enable a student to intermit from study or for a criminal investigation or proceedings to be completed. When a student intends to return to study after intermission or when the criminal proceedings have been completed or a decision has been taken not to take further action through the courts, the decision-maker may request additional medical evidence or resume this procedure in order to ensure the student is fit to resume study.

**2.17.** Any reference in this procedure to a University officer or other named role-holder includes a deputy appointed by that officer or role-holder to exercise the functions assigned to that officer or role-holder under this procedure.

### **3. Circumstances under which this procedure may be implemented**

**3.1.** A student's capability to study may be brought into question as a result of a wide range of circumstances. These include, but are not restricted to, the following:

- (a) Students who have individual learning plans in place and are struggling to manage their studies or other elements of their course;
- (b) Students who are not attending, submitting work and/or repeatedly not responding to emails;
- (c) Students with complex personal circumstances (for example, health, family or financial issues);
- (d) Students who regularly submit applications for examination allowances as a result of ongoing health concerns;
- (e) Students whose health, wellbeing or behaviour is causing concern to others, although there may be no negative impact on their academic work and progression;
- (f) Students whose behaviour is impacting upon the health and safety of others.

### **4. Raising a concern**

**4.1.** The following individuals and bodies may initiate this procedure:

- (a) the student's Head of Department;<sup>4</sup>
- (b) the student's Senior Tutor;
- (c) the University Advocate or Student Discipline Officer; *or*
- (d) the General Board.<sup>5</sup>

Where the student's Head of Department initiates the procedure and considers that support to study under stage 1 of this procedure is appropriate, the Head of Department shall manage that process and report on any actions taken to the Head of OSSCA, and Regulations 4.2–4.8 shall not apply.

In all other cases, the person or body will initiate the procedure by making a written referral to the Head of OSSCA setting out the grounds for concern and all relevant evidence about the student's capability to study.

<sup>4</sup> In the case of students on inter-departmental courses, referral may be by the Head of any of the Departments teaching the student.

<sup>5</sup> Or bodies acting under powers delegated by the General Board, including the Examination and Assessment Committee and the Postgraduate Committee.

4.2. The Head of OSCCA, following consultation with the student's Head of Department and, where applicable, the student's Senior Tutor, will consider the grounds contained in the referral and shall determine whether to refer the concern:

- (a) to stage 1 of this procedure;
- (b) to stage 2 of this procedure;
- (c) to an alternative procedure where appropriate, for example, an equivalent College procedure, the Student Disciplinary Procedure or one of the University's Fitness to Practise Procedures.

4.3. The Head of OSCCA may in addition refer the concern to the Academic Secretary to consider precautionary action under Special Ordinance D (v) where there are reasonable grounds to consider the student is a risk to themselves, or to the Collegiate University community, and there is a need for immediate action to be taken.

4.4. The Head of OSCCA when making a decision under Regulation 4.2 shall take into account whether the concern is likely to be resolved with additional supportive actions from the Department. Where stage 1 does not appear likely to resolve the concern, or actions equivalent to stage 1 have already been attempted without success, it will be referred to stage 2.

4.5. Where a student is also a member of a College, the College may also have a procedure to support or assess the student's capability to study. There are a number of factors that can determine which procedure is most suitable to use, including whether:

- (a) the behaviour that has prompted the concern is occurring primarily within a College or University setting;
- (b) the College has a procedure sufficient to consider the concern;
- (c) the student's relationship with the College or the University has broken down.

4.6. In some circumstances it may be appropriate for the College to take forward the equivalent of stage 1 of this procedure. Where the concern is not resolved by this action, the College may decide to refer any consideration equivalent to stage 2 into the University procedure by making a written referral under paragraph 4.1.

4.7. The decision regarding which procedure to use will be made jointly by the student's Senior Tutor and the Head of OSCCA.

4.8. The Head of OSCCA shall write to the student within 7 days of the decision being made under Regulation 4.2, outlining the concern and informing the student of the decision and the reasons for the decision.

## **5. Stage 1 – support to study**

5.1. The Head of Department will nominate a member of Departmental staff to undertake the actions under stage 1.

5.2. The student will be required to attend a Support to Study meeting with the nominated Departmental staff member to understand why staff have concerns regarding the student's behaviour and to discuss what supportive actions can be taken to help address the behaviour.

5.3. The student will normally be given at least 7 days' notice of the meeting taking place. The student will be informed of the purpose of the meeting including a summary of the behaviour which has led to the meeting taking place and will be able to bring an appropriate supporter and a College Tutor to the meeting. Where the student has a DRC advisor, this person may also attend to provide expert information in relation to any adjustments or other support options that may be discussed.

5.4. During the meeting, the Departmental staff member will outline the behaviour that led to the meeting taking place and the student will be given an opportunity to provide a response or explanation for the behaviour. Where a student disagrees that the behaviour has taken place then this should be noted, with the student still having the opportunity to agree to engaging with supportive actions.

**5.5.** Supportive actions can be any actions that may assist students in continuing with their courses. Supportive actions must be agreed between the Departmental staff member and the student. Some examples of these actions may include:

- (a) additional meetings with College or University staff to discuss behaviour expectations or academic work;
- (b) additional study skills or language sessions;
- (c) mentoring, which can either be specific mentoring to support a student in managing their studies with a disability or more general mentoring (mentoring should only be carried out by staff, not peers);
- (d) interim milestones or deadlines for academic work to ensure that formal deadlines will be met;
- (e) the student engaging with the DRC, or with counselling or other medical or health professionals, including agreeing to undertake further assessments;
- (f) a review of reasonable adjustments in place;
- (g) the student not contacting or communicating with named staff or students, or to only communicate or contact named staff or students as explicitly defined by the action;
- (h) using named University facilities or buildings as explicitly defined, for example, not using particular spaces out of hours or without supervision.

**5.6.** Any actions that will require the input of staff or a service outside of the Department must be agreed with the relevant staff or service before the supportive action is finalised.

**5.7.** Within 7 days of the meeting taking place, the student will receive from the Departmental staff member a summary of the content of the meeting and a list of the agreed supportive actions, and a date of review to check that the agreed actions have improved matters. The student will be required to confirm agreement to the supportive actions within 7 days of receiving the written copy.

**5.8.** Where a student does not agree to any supportive actions being put in place; or where the student has failed to comply with the actions; or where following the review date the actions have not had the desired impact, the Head of Department may refer the matter to the Head of OSCCA for possible consideration under stage 2 of the procedure.

## **6. Stage 2 – assessing capability to study**

**6.1.** Where a concern is referred to stage 2 of this procedure, a Study Capability Assessment Committee will be appointed by the Head of OSCCA within 21 days of the referral from standing panels appointed annually by the Council. The Head of OSCCA will be Secretary to the Committee.

**6.2.** A Study Capability Assessment Committee shall comprise:

- (a) a member of the Regent House who shall act as Chair;
- (b) a Senior Tutor from a College other than that of the student concerned; *and*
- (c) a medically qualified person.

**6.3.** The Chair will set a date for a formal meeting of the Committee to hear the case, which date may be changed by the Chair if the circumstances require it.

**6.4.** The Secretary of the Committee shall give the student at least 14 days' notice of the date of the meeting of the Committee. The student will also be informed of the time, venue, and purpose of the meeting, and will be provided with any documents, including a summary of the concerns to be considered at the meeting. The student will be invited to provide any documentation which the student wishes the Committee to consider in advance of the meeting. The Secretary of the Committee will ensure that all parties have access to the same documents.

**6.5.** If the student is unable to attend the meeting, or declines to do so, the Committee may agree to proceed in the student's absence.

**6.6.** The student may be supported and/or represented (including in her or his absence) at the meeting by a supporter or representative of the student's choice. A support worker may also accompany a disabled student. The student should notify the Secretary of the Committee at least 7 days in advance of the meeting if the student intends to attend the meeting and if the student will be accompanied and/or represented, and, if so, by whom. Where a student and a representative attend the meeting the student may still be required to answer questions at the Chair's discretion.

**6.7.** The purpose of the meeting will be to consider the information available and to reach an appropriate decision, action plan, or other outcome. The student's Senior Tutor and Head of Department will be requested to provide relevant written evidence to the Committee, and may be requested to attend at the Chair's discretion. The Committee may request other specialist or relevant opinion, including medical reports or reports from other specialist advisers, and may also request to see documents and records resulting from consideration of the student's case by the student's College under its procedures or any other evidence considered necessary and proportionate. The Committee may ask the student to attend a consultation with an expert but the Committee may proceed to consider the student's capability to study notwithstanding a refusal or failure by the student to attend a consultation as requested. Subject to the express provisions of this procedure, the Chair shall otherwise acting reasonably regulate the arrangements for the provision of documentation and other evidence (including adjourning the meeting where necessary so that additional information can be sought), as well as the conduct of the meeting.

**6.8.** The Committee shall make such decisions by a simple majority in respect of a student's capability to study as it considers necessary and proportionate. These decisions may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- (a) to agree that no further action be taken by the University;
- (b) to agree a plan of action(s) with the student;
- (c) to make the student's access to University facilities and premises subject to specified conditions;
- (d) to make such recommendations, including to the student's College, and/or direct such actions, in respect of the student, as the Committee considers fit;
- (e) in the case of a medical or veterinary student, to refer the case for consideration under the University's Fitness to Practise procedures;
- (f) to refer the case for consideration under the University's disciplinary procedures;
- (g) to suspend the studies of the student temporarily and to determine the minimum period after which the University will consider an application to resume study, and what conditions, if any, must be met before an application to resume study may be made;
- (h) to withdraw the right of a student to continue to study on a given course, or on any course, offered by the University;
- (i) to [remove the student's University membership and]<sup>6</sup> exclude the student permanently from the University.

**6.9.** For the purposes of candidature for an examination or competition, any terms during which a student's studies are temporarily suspended by the Committee will be disregarded.

**6.10.** Where the Committee decides that a student's access to University facilities and premises shall be subject to specified conditions, the Committee shall stipulate arrangements for monitoring the student's compliance with those conditions and for dealing with any alleged breach of those conditions on the part of the student.

**6.11.** The student, the relevant Senior Tutor, and the relevant Head of Department shall be notified in writing of the decision of the Committee, with reasons, within 7 days of the meeting of the Committee. The letter shall also include the procedure to be followed where the student wishes to review the Committee's decision.

**6.12.** Where the student asks for review of the Committee's decision using the Procedure for Review of Decisions of University Bodies, the decision will continue to be implemented until such time, if any, that the review results in an alternative decision.

## **7. Return to study**

**7.1.** A student whose studies have been temporarily suspended under this procedure may make an application addressed to the Registry for permission to resume study after such period and subject to meeting such conditions as may have been determined under Regulation 6.8(b) above. Where the Registry considers that the application appears to meet the conditions to return to study, it will be considered at the discretion of the Registry either by the same Committee that made the decision temporarily to suspend the student or by a differently constituted Committee appointed in accordance with Regulation 6.2 above. The application shall be heard at a meeting of the Committee managed in accordance with Regulations 6.3–6.8,

<sup>6</sup> The text in square brackets is subject to the approval of the changes to Statute B I 2.



save that, if, having reviewed the student's application and any documentation submitted with it, the Committee agrees that the student may be permitted to resume study either unconditionally or subject to specified conditions to which the student consents in writing, the Committee may proceed without a meeting.

**7.2.** The Committee shall make such decisions by a simple majority in respect of a student's capability to return to study as it considers necessary and proportionate. These decisions may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- (a) to permit the student to resume study, subject (if the Committee considers it appropriate) to specified conditions, including in the case of a disabled student defining reasonable adjustments, as appropriate, to support the student's studies and examination;
- (b) to make such recommendations in respect of the student, including to the student's College, as the Committee considers fit;
- (c) in the case of a medical or veterinary student, to refer the case for consideration under the University's Fitness to Practise procedures;
- (d) to refuse the application to resume study and to determine the minimum period after which the University will consider a further application to resume study, and what conditions, if any, must be met before such an application to resume study may be made;
- (e) to withdraw the right of a student to continue to study on a given course, or on any course, offered by the University;
- (f) to [remove the student's University membership and]<sup>7</sup> exclude the student permanently from the University.

**7.3.** It may not always be possible for a student to return to exactly the same course following a long period of suspension, as the course may have been discontinued or significantly modified. It may also be necessary for a student to return to the course at a point prior to which they left, if this is necessary for academic reasons or to enable support mechanisms to be set up.

**7.4.** Where a Committee has allowed a student to resume her or his studies, the Committee may, at the request of the student, allow a term of residence, put the student in standing for the purposes of examination, or agree such other academic arrangement as the Committee may think fit.

**7.5.** Where a Committee decides that a student's resumption of studies shall be subject to specified conditions, the Committee shall stipulate arrangements for monitoring the student's compliance with those conditions and for dealing with any alleged breach of those conditions on the part of the student.

**7.6.** The Secretary of the Committee will communicate in writing, within 7 days of the decision being made, the decision and reasons for the decision to the student, the Head of Department, and the Senior Tutor. The Secretary will also confirm the process for reviewing the Committee's decision.

**7.7.** Where the student requests a review of the Committee's decision using the Procedure for the Review of Decisions of University Bodies, the decision will continue to be implemented until such time, if any, that the review results in an alternative decision.

## **8. Reporting and Monitoring**

**8.1.** OSCCA shall monitor all concerns reported using this procedure and shall produce an annual report summarising the anonymised decisions made by the Head of OSCCA and the Study Capability Assessment Committee. The annual report shall be submitted to the General Board through its Education Committee and to the Council.

**8.2.** The purpose of this monitoring shall be to ensure that decisions are made consistently and at the appropriate level, that appropriate action is taken on issues identified and that information gathered is used to improve guidance and support for students and staff using the procedure.

(b) By replacing the references to the Procedure to Determine Fitness to Study with references to the Procedure to Support and Assess Capability to Study and references to the 'Fitness to Study Panel' with a reference to the 'Study Capability Assessment Committee' in the following:

Allowances to Candidates for Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 247), Regulation 1(c);

General Regulations for Admission as a Graduate Student (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 448), Regulation 5(h).

<sup>7</sup> The text in square brackets is subject to the approval of the changes to Statute B I 2.

**ANNEX B**

Changes that will be made by the General Board and the Council if Recommendation II of this Report is approved.

(a) By replacing the references to the ‘Procedure to Determine Fitness to Study’ with references to the ‘Procedure to Support and Assess Capability to Study’ and to ‘fitness to study’ with ‘capability to study’ in the following:

Student Disciplinary Procedure (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 193), Paragraph 2.16;

Student Complaint Procedure (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 212), Paragraph 2.3(d);

Leave for Allowances to Candidates for Examinations: Notice (reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 248), Paragraphs (iv)(a) and (x).

## **Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on revised probationary arrangements for academic and academic-related staff**

The COUNCIL and the GENERAL BOARD beg leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Report proposes that revised probationary arrangements for academic and academic-related staff be introduced, as part of a wider piece of work to revise and combine probationary arrangements for all staff categories. It is intended that the annexed new Probationary Policy and procedures will be implemented with effect from 1 October 2020.

2. The proposals set out in this Report have been developed following consultation with the unions Unite, UNISON and UCU, and key stakeholders within Schools and non-School institutions.

3. This work builds on the current probationary arrangements for staff, which were introduced in recognition of the benefits of a structured probationary scheme.<sup>1</sup> They provide an essential mechanism for the review of performance during the early stages of appointment, and to deal with performance issues and take appropriate remedial action at an early stage.

4. The impetus for the revision of the current probationary arrangements is two-fold:

- (a) to combine, as far as reasonably practicable, the University’s approach to probation across the different staff categories, to ensure fairness and consistency;
- (b) to complement the introduction of the new Academic Career Pathways (ACP) scheme, which will replace the Senior Academic Promotions scheme with effect from the beginning of the academic year 2020–21.<sup>2</sup> The new ACP scheme seeks to provide a more transparent and structured career progression route for both academic and professional staff, in line with the University’s People Strategy, whilst emphasising the importance of inclusivity and standards of conduct as part of the evaluation process. The new probationary arrangements for academic staff have been aligned with the ACP promotions excellence criteria, with confirmation of tenure carried out by the relevant Selection Committee or alternative School-level committee.

5. The new Probationary Policy sets out the overarching principles of probation, including the duration of probationary periods, expectations around induction, mentoring, and the use of the Staff Review and Development scheme after probation has been passed. It applies to all staff categories with the exception of Professors and Readers.

6. The Probationary Policy refers to the relevant procedures for managing probation according to staff category, of which there are now three:

- (a) Probationary procedure for academic-related, assistant and research staff, which combines the University’s approach to these separate staff categories in one single procedure, to achieve consistency in practice across those categories and to simplify University processes;
- (b) Probationary procedure for academic staff, which largely reflects current practice, with some adaptations in light of the new ACP scheme (set out below). Importantly, it remains the case that the probationary period for the holder of an academic office will be five years unless waived or reduced to a period of not less than three years, for example, where officeholders have held a senior academic position at another university and have already acquired the relevant skills and experience. It also remains the case that on confirmation of appointment, holders of an academic office who have met the probationary requirements will hold office, subject to the provisions of Statute C, or any Special Ordinance made under it, until the retiring age or until the end of their tenure, in the case of fixed-term appointments, as long as they satisfactorily perform the duties of the office. Further, the ability to extend probationary periods where there has not been sufficient time to demonstrate suitability due to factors such as absence on account of illness or family commitments, has been retained;
- (c) Probationary procedure for academic staff in the School of Clinical Medicine and clinical academics in other schools, which takes into account that clinicians may hold a co-terminous appointment, as well as the requirement to assess clinical activity during probation in line with the standards expected by the relevant NHS Trust.

7. In terms of content, the new Probationary Policy and associated procedures have not changed significantly and have adopted the style and language of the current probationary arrangements. However, new developments include:

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 5941, 2003–04, p. 206; 5894, 2001–02, p. 1256.

<sup>2</sup> *Reporter*, 2018–19; 6547, p. 562; 6551, p. 668.

- (a) clarification for all staff categories that the probation reviewer will be the Head of Institution, although depending on the size of the institution and the nature of the probationer's role, the Head of Institution may delegate these duties to the line manager, supervisor or Principal Investigator. The Head of Institution will retain overall responsibility for the probationary process and decide (or recommend as appropriate) whether to confirm the appointment;
- (b) renewed emphasis on the responsibilities of the probation reviewer in the management of probation, including induction, support and record-keeping;
- (c) references to induction, professional development, mentoring and the University's Staff Review and Development scheme in one place;
- (d) a new Appointment Support process, to apply to unestablished staff categories. This will permit institutions to apply a less formal support mechanism to existing staff with at least one year's service, who are transferring from one University post to another;
- (e) the application of the ACP evaluative criteria and indicators of excellence and impact to probation, i.e. research; teaching and/or researcher development; and service to the University and the academic community, and the promotion of the University's values of mutual respect. It should be noted that the requirement to demonstrate an 'upward trajectory' during probation has been removed in response to the discussion of the Report of the General Board on arrangements for the implementation of the ACP scheme on 28 May 2019.<sup>3</sup> Further, the requirement for academics to meet the highest international standards of excellence for confirmation of appointment at the end of probation has been removed in recognition of the fact that this would be the standard expected of a Professor or Reader;
- (f) an emphasis on making reasonable adjustments under the Equality Act 2010 for disabled persons and the consideration of wider contextual factors for all staff categories;
- (g) the inclusion of the right to be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague at a final decision meeting considering unsatisfactory performance and the ability to attend by way of video or teleconference call;
- (h) the introduction of a probationary appeal procedure for all unestablished categories (academic, academic-related, assistant and research staff), for consistency and to ensure parity of treatment. At present unestablished academic-related appeals are considered under the relevant disciplinary and grievance procedures;
- (i) a rationalisation of probationary periods for academic-related, assistant and research staff categories, so that they are consistent and in place for no longer than reasonably necessary, after taking into account seniority and the impact on financial security;
- (j) clarification of probationary periods for comparable unestablished academic posts, which take account of the length of the fixed term contract.
8. Approval will be subject to any future minor revisions to take into account operational requirements, for instance the updating of references to training and professional development.
9. Should these proposals be approved, the implementation of the new Probationary Policy and procedures would take effect from 1 October 2020. For staff members currently under probation at that date, the probationary period as set out in their terms and conditions of employment would apply, save that they would be managed under the relevant new procedural arrangements.

10. The Council and the General Board recommend:

- I. That, with effect from 1 October 2020, the Probationary Policy and procedures annexed to this Report be approved, replacing existing probationary arrangements.

23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> MADELEINE ATKINS GAENOR BAGLEY ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI R. CHARLES STEPHEN J. COWLEY SHARON FLOOD	ANTHONY FREELING NICOLAS GAY DAVID GREENAWAY NICHOLAS HOLMES FIONA KARET CHRISTOPHER KELLY PHILIP KNOX	MARK LEWISOHN EDWARD PARKER HUMPHREYS RICHARD PENTY ANDREW SANCHEZ JASON SCOTT-WARREN MARK WORMALD JOCELYN WYBURD
23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> PHILIP ALLMENDINGER KRISTINE BLACK-HAWKINS ANN COPESTAKE JOHN DENNIS	NICHOLAS HOLMES PATRICK MAXWELL NIGEL PEAKE ANNA PHILPOTT RICHARD REX	GRAHAM VIRGO MARK WORMALD CHRISTOPHER YOUNG

<sup>3</sup> *Reporter*, 6550, 2018–19, p. 655.

## ANNEXES

### Annex A – Probationary Policy

#### 1. Contents

1. Contents
2. Statement of policy
3. Eligibility
4. Scope of policy
  - 4.1 Managing probation
  - 4.2 Probationary periods
  - 4.3 Induction and professional development
  - 4.4 Mentors
  - 4.5 Confirmation of probation
  - 4.6 Appraisal following probation
  - 4.7 Appointment support
5. Procedures
6. Guidance and additional sources of information
7. Policy ownership and status

#### 2. Statement of policy

- The University regards its staff as its greatest asset and is committed to ensuring that all staff members reach their full potential in their roles. The probationary period plays an important part in this process and confirmation that probation has been passed is an important milestone for staff members.
- Probation is a formal arrangement at the start of an appointment, during which the probationer has the opportunity to understand the requirements of their role and to demonstrate their suitability within a reasonable timescale. Their performance will be assessed and monitored throughout the probationary period and they should be provided with guidance and support to enable them to become an effective member of the University.
- The probationer is expected to engage fully in this process, ensuring that they complete induction in a timely manner and undertake training where required.

#### 3. Eligibility

- Subject to the exceptions below, this policy (and related probationary procedures) applies to academic, academic-related, research and assistant staff, whether on open-ended or fixed-term contracts, and whether established or unestablished.
- The term ‘academic staff’ used in this policy means all academic offices (established) and comparable unestablished academic posts below the level of Reader, whether open-ended or fixed-term. An ‘academic office’ is one listed in Special Ordinances under Statute C, Schedule C (i) 1.
- This policy (and related probationary procedures) is not applicable to Professors and Readers, as appointment to these offices should only be made in cases where candidates have already achieved international recognition for their academic achievement and contribution.
- There may be occasions where the provision of a probationary period for an appointment is not appropriate (for example, for some fellowships or when appointing an individual to a similar post from a comparable academic institution). In these instances, guidance should be sought from the relevant School HR Team.<sup>1</sup>
- In the case of academic staff, where doubt arises as to which probationary procedure should apply, the matter should be referred to the Director or Assistant Director of Human Resources. If a resolution cannot be found, the matter will be decided by the Chair of the HR Committee on behalf of the General Board or, if circumstances require it, by the General Board on the advice of the HR Committee.
- In the case of academic-related staff, where doubt arises as to which probationary procedure should apply, the matter will be decided by the Council or the General Board, as appropriate, on the advice of the HR Committee.
- Where a member of unestablished staff has already worked for the University for more than one year and is transferring from a post to another within the University, the Appointment Support procedures may be more appropriate than probation (see para. 4.7 below).
- This policy should be read together with the procedures relating to specific staff categories which can be found at Section 5 of this policy.

#### 4. Scope of policy

##### 4.1 Managing probation

- The probationary process is managed by the probation reviewer. This is the Head of Institution,<sup>2</sup> although, depending on the size of the institution and the nature of the probationer’s job role, the Head of Institution may delegate these duties to another member of staff, for instance the probationer’s line manager, supervisor or Principal Investigator. However, in these instances, the Head of Institution will retain overall responsibility for the probationary process and will decide (or recommend as appropriate) whether to confirm the appointment or otherwise.

<sup>1</sup> The term ‘relevant School HR Team’ used throughout this policy (and related probationary procedures) refers to the HR Teams allocated to Schools, UAS and Non-School Institutions.

<sup>2</sup> The term ‘Head of Institution’ used throughout this policy (and related probationary procedures) refers to Heads of Departments and of other academic institutions; Chairs of Faculty Boards not divided into Departments; and the administrative Heads of Institutions.

- At the start of the probationary period, the probation reviewer should draw attention to:
  - the applicable probationary arrangements;
  - the key duties of the role;
  - the standards of work required;
  - goals to be achieved within specified deadlines;
  - particular areas of work to be given priority;
  - the expectation to promote the University’s value of mutual respect;
  - standards expected around time-keeping, attendance, communication, relationship building, strategic focus, people development, innovation and change and negotiating and influencing, as relevant to the role;
  - any areas where particular care or sensitivity is needed.
- Thereafter the probation reviewer is responsible for ensuring that a probationer completes induction in a timely way after taking up their appointment; for providing guidance and support during the probationary period; and for monitoring and assessing performance throughout. They should meet with the probationer at appropriate intervals to discuss progress and identify areas for training and development and they should also ensure that a mentor is identified where appropriate.
- A written record of feedback and any steps required of the probationer, should be kept using the templates where indicated in this policy and procedures.
- For successful completion of probation, there must be clear evidence that the probationer has been performing according to the relevant criteria for the role and at a level appropriate in the University context. The evidence required will depend on the staff category, for instance, holders of an academic office are required to undertake research; teach and/or develop researchers<sup>3</sup> and demonstrate service to the University and to the academic community. Further details on performance criteria can be found in the probationary procedures at Section 5 below.
- It is important that the probationary period is managed effectively to ensure that a probationer is given the best opportunity to succeed in their role. Where a probationer does not complete probation successfully and their appointment is terminated as a result, this is a dismissal in law and the University must be able to demonstrate that the probationary procedure was conducted properly and fairly.
- Accordingly, assessment of performance should be fair, even-handed and evidence-based and the probation reviewer is responsible for ensuring that there is clear documentary evidence of review meetings and appropriate support during the probationary period.
- In assessing performance, consideration should be given to any contextual factors which may have affected the probationer’s ability to perform to their full potential (for instance, caring responsibilities, periods of maternity/paternity/adoption leave, bereavement, ill health or injury, medical treatments, a disability).
- Where the probationer has indicated that they are disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010, the probation reviewer should take care to ensure that reasonable adjustments are made to the workplace and/or working arrangements so that the probationer is not at a substantial disadvantage when compared to a non-disabled person. Probation reviewers should refer to the University’s policies regarding disability and employment for further guidance and information in these circumstances.
- Should a probationer feel that formal and final assessments are not being conducted in a fair or timely manner or that sufficient support has not been available to them during their probationary period, they should raise this with their line manager or with the relevant School HR Team without delay.
- Probation reviewers can find practical guidance on how to support and assess probationers in the University’s *Practical Guidance for Probation Reviewers* [link to be inserted], which is intended to be a toolkit for institutions.
- For the avoidance of doubt, instances of misconduct will usually be dealt with under the relevant disciplinary procedure rather than the probationary procedure, although any disciplinary warnings may be taken into account when assessing the probationer’s overall suitability for a role under the probationary procedure.

#### 4.2 Probationary periods

- Except for specified exceptions (see Section 3 above), all staff should be given a probationary period, which will be confirmed in their individual contract of employment. Probationary periods vary depending on the staff category, seniority and purpose of the role. The probationary period will be as set out below unless otherwise specified in the contract of employment.
- Where a probationer is on secondment during the whole or part of their probationary period, it may be appropriate to adjust the length of the probationary period to allow for assessment of performance in their substantive post.
- Probationary periods may be extended or curtailed, depending on the circumstances. Further details of these arrangements are contained in the probationary procedures referred to at Section 5 below.

<sup>3</sup> This would include post-doctoral researchers where relevant.

*Academic staff*

- The probationary period for the holder of an academic office will be **five years** unless it is reduced (to a period of not less than three years) or waived, on the recommendation of the Selection Committee and subject to the approval of the Head of School. An example of where it may be appropriate to waive probation would be where the holder of the academic office has held a senior academic position at another university and has already acquired relevant skills and experience.
- The probationary period for the holder of a fixed-term academic office will be appropriate to the length of the fixed term.
- Notwithstanding the above, the probationary period of the holder of an academic office in the School of Clinical Medicine, who is appointed for a fixed term of four years, shall be 12 months.
- Probationary periods for comparable unestablished academic posts are set out below:

Appointment duration	Length of probation period
Up to 1 year	6 months
More than 1 year but less than 2 years	1 year
More than 2 years but less than 4 years	2 years
More than 4 years	3 years

*Academic-related and Assistant staff*

- Probationary periods for academic-related and assistant staff are set out below:

Appointment duration	Grade	Length of probation period
Up to 3 months	All (including ungraded)	None
More than 3 months but less than 1 year	All (including ungraded)	3 months
1 year or more	Grade 1–3	3 months
1 year or more	Grade 4–7	6 months
1 year or more	Grade 8+	9 months

*Research staff*

- Probationary periods for research staff are set out below:

Appointment duration	Length of probation period
Up to 3 months	None
More than 3 months but less than 1 year	3 months
1 year or more	6 months

*4.3 Induction and professional development*

- Induction is an essential part of probation and comprises local and central induction as set out below. The probation reviewer is responsible for ensuring that the probationer completes induction within the specified timescales, and that a copy of a completed induction checklist (HR24) is retained.
- *Local induction:* the probation reviewer should arrange a structured local induction programme commencing at the start of the appointment. This is essential to ensure that new staff members settle into their role and it is considered to be a major contributory factor in the retention of new staff. This programme should also assist academic staff to understand the objectives of their individual institution and the expected standards of excellence required to build a successful career at Cambridge.
- *Central induction:* this consists of an online induction programme and attendance at a face-to-face ‘Welcome to Cambridge’ event. The ‘Welcome to Cambridge’ event includes a welcome address from a senior member of the University; information about the collegiate system; informal networking opportunities; and an exhibition of services available to staff. General information on induction can be found on the University’s induction pages <https://www.induction.admin.cam.ac.uk/>
- In addition, a tailored induction programme for new academic staff is provided through the ‘Academic Life at Cambridge’ programme. This includes an annual welcome event and access to key resources and updates via Sharepoint: [link to be inserted]
- Postdoctoral staff will find bespoke induction support at the webpages of the University’s Office for Postdoctoral Affairs at <https://www.opda.cam.ac.uk/further-support/inductions>
- Guidance, templates and checklists to assist institutions in planning and delivering an effective induction programme can be found at the University’s induction webpages at <https://www.induction.admin.cam.ac.uk/guidance-managers>
- Further to induction, the University places great emphasis on the development of its staff and offers a range of opportunities as part of a Development Programme, including an Introductory Seminar on opportunities available. Further information can be found at the University’s Personal and Professional Development webpages at <https://www.ppd.admin.cam.ac.uk/>. The University’s Researcher Development Programme can also be found at <https://www.rdp.cam.ac.uk>

#### 4.4 Mentors

- The probation reviewer should wherever possible assign an appropriate colleague to act as a buddy to the probationer, to help them familiarise themselves with the institution, its procedures, the location of key equipment and sources of help and information.
- A mentor may also be identified at this stage as a means of providing structured support to a member of staff, outside of the probationary review process. It is particularly relevant for academic members of staff to be assigned a mentor, but can also be appropriate for staff in academic-related, assistant and research posts. Please see the University's mentoring web pages at <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/policies-procedures/mentoring-information-new-staff> for more information.

#### 4.5 Confirmation of probation

- The process of managing the probationary period and confirming the appointment or otherwise is contained in the probationary procedures for specific staff categories, set out in Section 5 below.

#### 4.6 Appraisal following probation

- Once probation is successfully completed, the University's Staff Review and Development Scheme sets out a framework for appraisal, and is part of an ongoing review process. The first review should take place within a few months of the end of the probationary period (once a decision has been made to confirm the appointment).
- As this process is intended to be forward-looking, the appraiser will agree an action plan that is in line with the strategic and operational needs of the institution and will address the training and development needs of the individual. Details of the scheme can be found at <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/policies-procedures/staff-review-and-development>

#### 4.7 Appointment Support

- Where an existing unestablished member of staff, who has worked for the University for more than one year and who has successfully completed their probationary period in one role, is transferring to another, it may be appropriate to follow an Appointment Support process rather than apply a further probationary period.
- The Appointment Support process offers a structured approach where that staff member can receive support and feedback on performance and the University can assess their suitability for the post. It is recommended to be between three and six months, depending on the duration of the appointment, in order to fully assess the skills and experience of the staff member and to provide support and training.
- It is the responsibility of the Head of Institution to manage this process, although depending on the size of the institution and the nature of the job role, the Head of Institution may delegate these duties to another member of staff, for instance the staff member's line manager, supervisor or Principal Investigator.
- The Head of Institution, or their delegate should hold a preliminary one-to-one meeting with the staff member soon after they start their new role, at which the duties of the post, mutual expectations and any support and development needs will be discussed.
- The Head of Institution, or their delegate will hold further progress meetings throughout the Appointment Support period; for example two further progress meetings and one final review meeting over the period, provided that progress is satisfactory.
- The Head of Institution, or their delegate will hold a final review meeting at the end of the Appointment Support period, to be recorded on the Appointment Support Review Form.
- On the basis of a successful final review meeting, the Head of Institution, or their delegate, will provide written confirmation of completion of the Appointment Support process.
- Where the staff member has not met the required standard during the Appointment Support period, despite reasonable training and support, the situation will be considered within the context of the relevant capability policy.
- Depending on the seriousness of the concerns around performance and the potential impact on the School or institution, the Head of Institution or their delegate, after consulting with the relevant School HR Team, may curtail the Appointment Support period early, in order to engage the relevant capability policy.

### 5. Procedures

The University has probationary procedures in place for specific staff categories. For the relevant procedure, please click on the links below [links to be inserted]:

*Probationary Procedure for Academic Staff*

*Probationary Procedure for Academic-Related, Assistant and Research Staff*

*Probationary Procedure for Academic Staff in the School of Clinical Medicine and clinical academics in other schools*

### 6. Guidance and additional sources of information

Policies and guidance	Templates and documentation
Practical guidance for Probation Reviewers [link to be inserted]	Appointment Support Review Form [insert number] Confirmation of Appointment Letter (HR30)

### 7. Policy ownership and status

- This policy is not contractual. It will be reviewed by the HR Division on a regular basis and amendments may be made in the light of any changes in legislation or operational requirements.

**ANNEX B – Probationary Procedure for Academic Staff****1. Contents**

1. Contents
2. Eligibility
3. Procedure
  - 3.1 How will the probationary scheme work in practice?
  - 3.2 Performance criteria
  - 3.3 Preliminary meeting and formal assessments
  - 3.4 Third-year formal assessment
  - 3.5 Final assessment
  - 3.6 Decision and subsequent action
  - 3.7 Right of appeal
  - 3.8 Fixed-term posts
  - 3.9 Period of notice required during the probationary period
4. Guidance and additional sources of information
5. Policy ownership and status

**2. Eligibility**

- This probationary procedure applies to academic staff at the University below the level of Reader, as defined in the Probationary Policy, with the exception of academic staff in the School of Clinical Medicine (clinical and non-clinical) and clinical academics in other Schools, for whom there is a separate probationary procedure (a link to this can be found in Section 5 of the University’s Probationary Policy).
- This probationary procedure should be read together with the *University’s Probationary Policy* [link to be inserted].

**3. Procedure***3.1 How will the probationary scheme work in practice?*

- In the case of academic staff, the probation reviewer is usually the Head of Institution. They are responsible for managing the probationary period and ensuring that:
  - the duties of the probationer are clear and understood by the probationer at the outset;
  - the probationer completes local and central induction within specified timescales;
  - the work of the probationer is monitored;
  - the probationer is assigned a mentor;
  - any issues around performance are discussed directly with the probationer as and when they arise;
  - a written record is kept of feedback and any steps required of the probationer, using the templates indicated in this procedure where appropriate; and
  - an overall view of their progress, commitment and general contribution to the work of the Institution is formed during the probationary period.
- The Head of Institution may delegate some of their duties to a nominee where indicated below, provided that the Head of Institution retains overall responsibility for the probationary process and will conduct the final assessment of performance at the end.
- The length of the probationary period is as set out in Section 4.2 of the Probationary Policy.

*3.2 Performance criteria*

- Passing probation is regarded as an important career milestone and a fundamental test of capability to perform the duties of the office. Clear evidence of consistent and sustained satisfactory performance of duties and adherence to the University’s expected standards of conduct is therefore expected.
- Performance will be assessed by reference to research; teaching and/or researcher<sup>1</sup> development; and service to the University and to the academic community. This will include acting as a positive role model and promoting the University’s values of mutual respect and a sense of belonging for all within the University community.
- There must be no doubt that the probationer has been performing according to all the relevant criteria and meets the standards of excellence in their performance and contribution within the Cambridge context.
- Where relevant, College teaching should also be taken into account.
- Guidance on the evaluative criteria applicable to academics during probation can be found in the Report of the General Board on arrangements for the implementation of the Academic Career Pathways scheme.<sup>2</sup> To ensure transparency, all Departments/Faculties are expected to adopt and publish a protocol setting out what is expected of probationers under each of the evaluative criteria, to be approved by School Councils. As there may be differences in the way probation criteria are set across the various institutions, each institution will determine appropriate practice in their respective area, taking into account the relevant norms for the subject discipline.

<sup>1</sup> This would include post-doctoral researchers where relevant.

<sup>2</sup> *Reporter*, 6547, 2018–19, p. 562.



### 3.3 Preliminary meeting and formal assessments

- The Head of Institution or their nominee will hold a preliminary one-to-one meeting with the probationer before the beginning of their first teaching term or within one month of joining, as appropriate, to confirm the duties of the post, mutual expectations, induction requirements and developmental needs. Any other relevant requirements should be discussed and recorded.
- The Head of Institution or their nominee will meet with the probationer at least once a year to conduct a formal assessment, a written record of which will be completed and a copy kept by both parties, using the Probation Assessment Form. They should ensure that induction has been completed within the specified timelines.
- The purpose of each formal assessment is to review the probationer's progress under the general headings of research, teaching and/or researcher development and service to the University and the academic community, and to provide an opportunity for the individual to comment.
- The tone of the assessment should be constructive, giving positive feedback on progress and areas for improvement. Where progress has been unsatisfactory, the probation reviewer should specify the nature of the concerns and the improvements required, together with details of how and by when these need to be achieved. For example, this may involve making appropriate adjustments to the level of supervision and support given to the probationer and/or setting time-bound targets. It would also be appropriate to hold more frequent formal assessments in this case.
- During the probationary period, the Head of Institution or their nominee can seek feedback from senior colleagues regarding the progress of the probationer in terms of their research; teaching and/or researcher development; and service to the University and to the academic community. Feedback from students and peer observation views may also be sought.

### 3.4 Third-year formal assessment

- In the course of the third year of probation, there should be a formal assessment. An overall minimum of three references should be sought, of which at least one should be external, unless there is no duty to undertake research. The probationer will nominate two of these references. The Head of Institution or their nominee may seek additional references, if these are required. Names of referees sought by the Head of Institution or their nominee are not disclosable to the probationer for the purposes of this procedure.
- The Head of Institution may decide at this stage to recommend to the Selection Committee<sup>3</sup> that the appointment be confirmed and should complete a final assessment (see para. 3.5 below). If it is decided that confirmation of tenure is premature, the Head of Institution may hold a final assessment at a later date as set out below. In the interim, they should discuss with the probationer any areas for development or improvement and any training or support required.
- If a concern arises about the probationer's research performance, the Head of Institution or their nominee may seek references sooner rather than later in order to be able to assess progress during the period leading up to the third-year formal assessment.

### 3.5 Final assessment

- The Human Resources Division will send regular reports to institutions, notifying them of probationary periods, so that formal and final assessments can be scheduled in a timely way.
- The Head of Institution will conduct the final assessment in the course of the third, fourth or fifth year depending on the probationer's progress.
- The final assessment should be recorded in the Probation Assessment Form, a copy of which should be supplied to the probationer. The Head of Institution should arrange for references to be updated and/or additional references to be sought, in line with the requirements under para. 3.4 above.

### 3.6 Decision and subsequent action

- Confirmation (or non-confirmation) of tenure by the Selection Committee must occur, if possible, not less than nine months before the end of the five-year period. The recommendation by the Head of Institution to the Selection Committee should be made no earlier than three years into the probationary period.
- Where the probationer has performed to the expected standard, the Head of Institution will recommend to the Selection Committee that the appointment be confirmed, setting out their case in writing, supported by the Probation Assessment Forms, references and the probationer's CV.
- If the appointment is confirmed by the Selection Committee, the Head of Institution will arrange for written confirmation of satisfactory completion of probation to be sent to the probationer and for their central staff record to be updated. On confirmation of appointment by the Selection Committee, a holder of an academic office shall hold office, subject to the provisions of Statute C, or any Special Ordinance made under it, until the retiring age or until the end of their tenure in the case of officers on fixed-term appointments, so long as they satisfactorily perform the duties of the office.
- In the event that performance during probation is judged to be unsatisfactory, the Head of Institution, after consulting with the probation reviewer and the relevant School HR Team, will inform the probationer that they will recommend the extension or termination of the appointment to the Selection Committee.

<sup>3</sup> The Selection Committee is as constituted under Special Ordinance C (x): Selection Committees (Special Ordinance under Statute C XIII 2). Note that this may be the Selection Committee or an alternative School-level committee as set out in the local protocol constituted as a Selection Committee, or in the case of unestablished academic staff the relevant School-level or Departmental committee.

- The probationer will be given an opportunity to make written representations to the Selection Committee and may attend the meeting of the Committee if they wish to do so, in order to present their case. They will have the right to be accompanied at the meeting by a trade union representative or work colleague.
- They must tell the relevant School HR Team who their chosen companion is in good time before the meeting. If their companion cannot attend, they should inform the relevant School HR Team immediately so that an alternative time can be arranged. If the companion is unable to attend within a reasonable period of the meeting, the University may ask the probationer to choose another companion.
- Where a probationer has indicated that they wish to make representations in person, they must make every effort to attend the meeting. If they fail to attend without good reason, or are persistently unable to do so, the University reserves the right to proceed on the evidence available.
- Where circumstances require it, and in particular, to avoid delay, the meeting may be held by way of video- or teleconference.
- The Selection Committee may be supported by a member of the relevant School HR Team at the hearing. The University may also arrange for a note-taker to be present.
- The Head of Institution will supply the probationer's Probation Assessment Forms, together with any supporting documentation, to the Selection Committee ahead of the meeting, with a copy to the probationer.
- The meeting may be adjourned if required to gather further information, provided that any adjournment will not lead to unreasonable delay.
- If a decision to dismiss is made by the Selection Committee, the probationer will be given written notice of termination, including the reasons and a right of appeal.
- Exceptionally, the Selection Committee may extend the probationary period, for instance, where a probationer has not had sufficient time to demonstrate their suitability due to factors beyond their control (e.g. a long leave of absence on account of illness or family commitments) and where there is a realistic prospect of a satisfactory outcome. Usually, extensions will be for up to one year. Heads of Institutions should consult with the relevant School HR Team at an early stage, if they believe that an extension will be required.
- At the end of an extension period, a further final assessment will be conducted as set out under para. 3.5 above.

### 3.7 *Right of appeal*

#### *Established academic staff*

- If the appointment is terminated, the officer will have the right to appeal under the provisions of Special Ordinance C (xiii) (Appeals) and Ordinances Chapter II, Septemviri, which can be found at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/>.
- Where a probationer appeals against dismissal, the date on which dismissal takes effect will not be delayed pending the outcome of the appeal. However, if the appeal is successful the probationer will be reinstated with no loss of continuity or pay.

#### *Unestablished academic staff*

- Where the appointment is terminated, the probationer may appeal in writing within 10 working days of the receipt of the notice of dismissal, setting out the grounds of their appeal. They should direct this letter to the Director of HR.
- The Director of HR will appoint an Appeal Chair, who shall be a University officer of equivalent or greater seniority to the members of the Selection Committee, and who has had no prior involvement in the case.
- The appeal hearing will be arranged within 10 working days of the appointment of the Appeal Chair, or as soon as is reasonably practicable thereafter.
- The probationer and a member of the Selection Committee<sup>4</sup> may make representations in person and/or in writing at the appeal hearing. Copies of the probation assessment forms and supporting documentation, and any written representations should be supplied to all parties in good time ahead of the hearing. The Appeal Chair may be supported by a member of the relevant School HR Team at the hearing. The University may also arrange for a further member of HR to act as note-taker.
- The probationer is entitled to be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague. They must tell the relevant School HR Team who their chosen companion is in good time before the appeal hearing. If their companion cannot attend, they should inform the relevant School HR Team immediately so that an alternative time can be arranged. If the companion is unable to attend within a reasonable period of the original appeal hearing date, the University may ask the probationer to choose another companion.
- Where a probationer has indicated that they wish to make representations in person, they must make every effort to attend the hearing. If they fail to attend without good reason, or are persistently unable to do so, the University reserves the right to proceed on the evidence available.
- Where circumstances require it, and in particular, to avoid delay, the hearing may be held by way of video- or teleconference.
- The Appeal Chair may adjourn the appeal hearing if required to gather further information, provided that any adjournment will not lead to unreasonable delay.

<sup>4</sup> See para. 3.4 for the definition of the Selection Committee.

- The Appeal Chair will inform the probationer of their decision in writing, wherever practicable within 10 working days of the appeal hearing or adjourned appeal hearing, setting out reasons for the decision. There is no further right of appeal.
- The Appeal Chair may vary the procedure above, as necessary, provided that the appeal is dealt with fairly and impartially and without unreasonable delay.
- Where a probationer appeals against dismissal, the date on which dismissal takes effect will not be delayed pending the outcome of the appeal. However, if the appeal is successful the probationer will be reinstated with no loss of continuity or pay.

### 3.8 Fixed-term posts

- The provisions of this procedure (including any timings) will be adjusted to take into account shorter probationary periods for fixed-term academic offices and unestablished academic posts.

### 3.9 Period of notice required during the probationary period

- The period of notice to terminate the appointment during the probationary period, will normally be three months on either side (one month's notice for an appointment of less than one year's duration).

## 4. Guidance and additional sources of information

Policies and guidance	Templates and documentation
Supporting information document on managing performance during probation: Practical Guidance for Probation Reviewers	Probation Assessment Form

## 5. Policy ownership and status

- This procedure is not contractual. It will be reviewed by the HR Division on a regular basis and amendments may be made in the light of any changes in legislation or operational requirements.

## ANNEX C – Probationary Procedure for Academic-Related, Assistant and Research Staff (Annex C)

### 1. Contents

1. Contents
2. Eligibility
3. Procedure
  - 3.1 How will the probationary scheme work in practice?
  - 3.2 Performance criteria
  - 3.3 Formal assessments
  - 3.4 Final assessments
  - 3.5 Unsatisfactory performance
  - 3.6 Right of appeal
  - 3.7 Period of notice required during the probationary period
4. Guidance and additional sources of information
5. Policy ownership and status

### 2. Eligibility

- This probationary procedure is applicable to academic-related, assistant and research staff at the University and should be read together with the *University's Probationary Policy* [link to be inserted].
- This procedure forms part of the Career Management Scheme for research staff (<https://www.cam.ac.uk/research-staff/employment-and-career-management/employment-and-career-management-scheme>).

### 3. Procedure

#### 3.1 How will the probationary scheme work in practice?

- Probation is a formal arrangement at the start of employment where new staff members have the opportunity to confirm their suitability for the role. In order for the probationary period to be used effectively, it is important that:
  - the duties of the probationer are clear and understood by the probationer at the outset;
  - induction is completed and any further training required is arranged in a timely way;
  - the work of the probationer is monitored;
  - any issues around performance are discussed directly with the probationer as and when they arise; and
  - a written record is kept of feedback and any steps required of the probationer, using the templates indicated in this procedure where appropriate.

- The probationary process is managed by the probation reviewer. This is the Head of Institution,<sup>1</sup> although, depending on the size of the institution and the nature of the probationer's job role, the Head of Institution may delegate these duties to another member of staff, for instance the probationer's line manager, supervisor or Principal Investigator. However, in these instances, the Head of Institution will retain overall responsibility for the probationary process and will decide (or recommend as appropriate) whether to confirm the appointment or otherwise.
- The length of the probationary period is as set out in Section 4.2 of the Probationary Policy.

### 3.2 Performance criteria

- Probationers will be assessed with reference to:
  - the role profile;
  - their demonstration of the skills and knowledge required for the role;
  - the performance of their duties to an acceptable standard (with reference to the quality of their work and the volume of their outputs);
  - their ability to work with others, including acting as a positive role model, adhering to the University's expected standards of conduct and promoting the University's values of mutual respect and a sense of belonging for all within the University community;
  - attendance and timekeeping; and
  - their general contribution to projects (if relevant to their role).
- The duties and responsibilities of a research staff member are set out in the Career Management Scheme: Section 2, Researcher's employment: policies and protocols at <https://www.cam.ac.uk/research-staff/employment-and-career-management/employment-and-career-management-scheme/researchers-employment-policies-and-protocols/job-titles-and-duties>
- In the case of clinical research staff:
  - it is recognised that input is required from the probationer's Clinical Director or Deanery at the relevant NHS Trust/body. Accordingly, assessment of performance of clinical activity will be taken into account when making recommendations on probation;
  - if, during the course of the probation, concerns arise regarding the probationer's clinical practice in their NHS Trust/body role, the probation reviewer shall consider the impact of this in assessing the probationer's performance and ability to carry out the full duties of their role for the University;
  - it is a requirement of the relevant NHS Trust that the probationer is subject to NHS appraisals or Annual Reviews of Competence Progression ('ARCP') as appropriate, alongside their probation with the University;
  - if the probationer is employed under a contract with the University which is coterminous with another role, should that role be terminated their employment with the University will also come to an end.

### 3.3 Formal assessments

- The probation reviewer should hold a preliminary one-to-one meeting with the probationer soon after their start date, to confirm the expectations of the post; to set objectives, to arrange induction and to agree any further training required.
- Thereafter, formal assessments should take place at regular intervals; for example two formal assessments and one final assessment over the period, where progress is satisfactory.
- Formal assessments should be a two-way process:
  - The probation reviewer will review progress, addressing competence in particular duties and capability to perform at a level that meets the operational requirements of the institution.
  - The probationer should be invited to comment on progress to date and specify any areas in which further training or development is needed.
  - The probation reviewer will set objectives for the next phase, agreeing the next formal assessment date. They should ensure that induction is being completed in a timely way and identify and agree any further training needs or support.
- The tone of the formal assessments should be constructive, giving positive feedback on what has been done well and helpful advice on how to make improvements and/or develop aspects of the role. They should consider the extent to which the probationer meets the performance criteria as set out at Section 3.2 above.
- It is important that formal assessments are held regularly even where there are no concerns about performance, in order that the probationer may raise any concerns and request further support and to ensure that induction is completed in a timely way.
- Each formal assessment should be documented on the Probation Assessment Form, with copies signed and retained by the probationer and the probation reviewer. Where performance and progress are satisfactory, the record may be less detailed, however it is important to be aware that this documentation will form part of any decision to confirm or terminate an appointment or to extend the probationary period. If, at any stage, a third party contributes formally to the assessment, this should be recorded and signed accordingly.

<sup>1</sup> The term 'Head of Institution' used throughout this policy (and related probationary procedures) refers to Heads of Departments and of other academic institutions; Chairs of Faculty Boards not divided into Departments; and the administrative Heads of Institutions.

- Where progress has been unsatisfactory, the probation reviewer, should set out the nature of the concerns and the improvements needed, together with details of how and by when these need to be achieved. For example, this may involve making appropriate adjustments to the level of supervision and support given to the probationer and/or setting time-bound targets to be reviewed at the next formal assessment. It may also be appropriate to hold more frequent formal assessments in this case.
- If the performance of the probationer is clearly unsatisfactory and is unlikely to improve despite the provision of reasonable support, the probation reviewer may hold a final assessment and may recommend the early termination of the appointment. It is not necessary to wait until the end of the probationary period to do this, provided that the probationer has been made aware of the problems and has been given the opportunity to improve performance or conduct with appropriate support. Details of the final assessment process are set out below.
- Probation reviewers can find practical guidance on how to support and assess probationers in the University's *Practical Guidance for Probation Reviewers* [link to be inserted], which is intended to be a toolkit for institutions.

### 3.4 Final assessments

- The Human Resources Division will send regular reports to institutions, notifying them of probationary periods, so that formal and final assessments can be scheduled in a timely way. Assessments for short fixed-term appointments should be in place from an early stage.
- The probation reviewer will hold a final assessment with the probationer. This is recommended to take place within the last two months of probation and should be documented in the Probation Assessment Form, with copies signed and retained by both probationer and probation reviewer.
- Where performance during probation has been satisfactory, the probation reviewer, in consultation with the Head of Institution, will arrange for written confirmation to be sent to the probationer and for the central staff record to be amended.

### 3.5 Unsatisfactory performance

- Where performance is judged to be unsatisfactory, the Head of Institution, after consulting with the probation reviewer and relevant School HR Team, will consider whether to terminate or extend the appointment, or, in the case of established academic-related staff, where the Head of Institution is not able to confirm that probation has been completed satisfactorily, they will refer the matter to the appointing body<sup>2</sup> who will decide whether the probationary period should be extended or the appointment terminated.
- In each case the probationer and the probation reviewer will be entitled to make representations to the Head of Institution or appointing body (as appropriate) at a decision meeting, although they may supply written representations in the alternative.
- Copies of the probation assessment forms and supporting documentation should be supplied to all attendees in good time ahead of the meeting.
- The probationer is entitled to be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague at the meeting. They must tell the relevant School HR Team, who their chosen companion is, in good time before the meeting. If their companion is unavailable, they should inform the relevant School HR Team immediately so that an alternative time can be arranged. If the companion is unable to attend within a reasonable period of the original meeting date, the University may ask the probationer to choose another companion.
- Where a probationer has indicated that they wish to make representations in person, they must make every effort to attend the meeting. If they fail to attend without good reason, or are persistently unable to do so, the University reserves the right to proceed on the evidence available.
- Where circumstances require it, and in particular, to avoid delay, the meeting may be held by way of video or teleconference.
- The Head of Institution or appointing body (as appropriate) may be supported by a member of the relevant School HR Team at the meeting. The University may also arrange for a further member of HR to act as notetaker.
- The meeting may be adjourned if required to gather further information, provided that any adjournment will not lead to unreasonable delay.
- Where a decision to dismiss is made, the probationer will be given written notice of termination, including reasons and a right of appeal.
- In some instances progress towards successful completion of probation may have been prevented by circumstances beyond the control of the parties, for instance because of a long leave of absence on account of illness or family commitments.
- Where this is the case and there is a reasonable prospect of a satisfactory outcome to probation, the Head of Institution or appointing body (as appropriate) may extend the probationary period usually for a period of up to three months.

### 3.6 Right of appeal

#### *Established academic-related staff*

- Where the appointment is terminated, the probationer will have the right to appeal, under the provisions of Special Ordinance C (xiii), which can be found at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/>.

<sup>2</sup> The body specified in the *Statutes and Ordinances* as having the authority for making an appointment to an office.

*Unestablished academic-related, assistant and research staff*

- Where the appointment is terminated, the probationer may appeal in writing within 10 working days of the receipt of the notice of dismissal, setting out the grounds of their appeal. They should direct this letter to the Director of HR.
- The Director of HR will appoint an Appeal Chair, who shall be a University officer of equivalent or greater seniority to the decision-maker under Section 3.5, and who has had no prior involvement in the case.
- The appeal hearing will be arranged within 10 working days of the appointment of the Appeal Chair, or as soon as is reasonably practicable thereafter.
- The probationer and Head of Institution may make representations in person and/or in writing at the appeal hearing. Copies of the probation assessment forms and supporting documentation, and any written representations should be supplied to all parties in good time ahead of the hearing. The Appeal Chair may be supported by a member of the relevant School HR Team at the hearing. The University may also arrange for a further member of HR to act as note-taker.
- The probationer is entitled to be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague. They must tell the relevant School HR Team, who their chosen companion is, in good time before the appeal hearing. If their companion cannot attend, they should inform the relevant School HR Team immediately so that an alternative time can be arranged. If the companion is unable to attend within a reasonable period of the original appeal hearing date, the University may ask the probationer to choose another companion.
- Where a probationer has indicated that they wish to make representations in person, they must make every effort to attend the hearing. If they fail to attend without good reason, or are persistently unable to do so, the University reserves the right to proceed on the evidence available.
- Where circumstances require it, and in particular, to avoid delay, the hearing may be held by way of video or teleconference.
- The Appeal Chair may adjourn the appeal hearing if required to gather further information, provided that any adjournment will not lead to unreasonable delay.
- The Appeal Chair will inform the probationer of their decision in writing, wherever practicable within 10 working days of the appeal hearing or adjourned appeal hearing, setting out reasons for the decision. There is no further right of appeal.
- The Appeal Chair may vary the procedure above, as necessary, provided that the appeal is dealt with fairly and impartially and without unreasonable delay.
- Where a probationer appeals against dismissal, the date on which dismissal takes effect will not be delayed pending the outcome of the appeal. However, if the appeal is successful the probationer will be reinstated with no loss of continuity or pay.

*3.7 Period of notice required during the probationary period*

- The period of notice during the probationary period will be four weeks on either side.

**4. Guidance and additional sources of information**

<b>Policies and guidance</b>	<b>Templates and documentation</b>
Supporting information document on managing performance during probation: Practical Guidance for Probation Reviewers	Probation Assessment Form

**5. Policy ownership and status**

- This procedure is not contractual. It will be reviewed by the HR Division on a regular basis and amendments may be made in the light of any changes in legislation or operational requirements.

**ANNEX D – Probationary Procedure for Academic staff in the School of Clinical Medicine and clinical academics in other Schools****1. Contents**

1. Contents
2. Eligibility
3. Procedure
  - 3.1 How will the probationary scheme work in practice?
  - 3.2 Performance criteria
  - 3.3 Years 1 and 2
  - 3.4 Year 3
  - 3.5 Years 4 and 5
  - 3.6 Procedure for fixed-term posts
  - 3.7 Right of appeal
  - 3.8 Period of notice required during the probationary period
  - 3.9 Support from the Clinical School HR Team for its academics
4. Guidance and additional sources of information
5. Policy ownership and status

## 2. Eligibility

- This probationary procedure applies to all academic staff in the School of Clinical Medicine and clinical academics in other Schools, taking into account their clinical duties. It should be read together with the *University's Probationary Policy* [link to be inserted].

## 3. Procedure

### 3.1 How will the probationary scheme work in practice?

- The probation reviewer, who is usually the Head of Department, is responsible for managing the probationary period. For the purposes of this procedure, they will be referred to as the probation reviewer. Where the term 'Head of Department' is used, this indicates that the Head of Department should perform that particular function personally.
- The probation reviewer and mentor (as recommended by the Head of Department) will be approved as part of the Selection Committee meeting and recorded in the minutes. If the probation reviewer subsequently leaves or is absent (e.g. due to sabbatical leave), the Head of Department or Chair of the Selection Committee<sup>1</sup> must assign a new probation reviewer.
- The probation reviewer is responsible for ensuring that:
  - the duties of the probationer are clear and understood by the probationer at the outset;
  - the probationer completes central and local induction within specified timescales;
  - the work of the probationer is monitored;
  - the probationer is assigned a mentor;
  - any issues around performance are discussed directly with the probationer as and when they arise;
  - a written record is kept of feedback and any steps required of the probationer, using the templates indicated in this procedure where appropriate; and
  - an overall view of their progress, commitment and general contribution to the work of the Clinical School is formed during the probationary period.
- The probation reviewer will set goals and objectives in consultation with the Head of Department (if the Head of Department is not the probation reviewer).

### 3.2 Performance criteria

- Passing probation is regarded as an important career milestone and a fundamental test of capability to perform the duties of the office. Clear evidence of consistent and sustained satisfactory performance of duties and adherence to the University's expected standards of conduct is therefore expected.
- Performance will be assessed by reference to research; teaching and/or researcher<sup>2</sup> development; and service to the University and to the academic community. This will include acting as a positive role model and promoting the University's values of mutual respect and a sense of belonging for all within the University community.
- There must be no doubt that the probationer has been performing according to all the relevant criteria and meets the standards of excellence in their performance and contribution within the Cambridge context.
- Where relevant, College teaching should also be taken into account.
- Guidance on the evaluative criteria applicable to academics during probation can be found in the Report of the General Board on arrangements for the implementation of the Academic Career Pathways scheme.<sup>3</sup> To ensure transparency, all Departments/Faculties are expected to adopt and publish a protocol setting out what is expected of probationers under each of the evaluative criteria, to be approved by School Councils. As there may be differences in the way probation criteria are set across the various institutions, each institution will determine appropriate practice in their respective area, taking into account the relevant normative standards for their subject discipline. The protocol for the School of Clinical Medicine, can be found at [link to be inserted].
- In the case of clinical academics, it is recognised that input is required from the probationer's Clinical Director at the relevant NHS Trust/body. Accordingly, assessment of performance of clinical activity will be used in addition to research, teaching and/or researcher development and service to the University and to the academic community, when making recommendations on probation. This will be recorded on the summary document, the Probation Assessment Form.
- If, during the course of the probation, concerns arise regarding the probationer's clinical practice in their NHS Trust/body role, the probation reviewer shall consider the impact of this in assessing the probationer's performance and ability to carry out the full duties of their role for the University.
- It is also a requirement of the relevant NHS Trust that clinical academics are subject to NHS appraisals or Annual Reviews of Competence Progression ('ARCP') as appropriate, alongside their probation with the University.
- Please note that if the probationer is employed under a contract with the University which is coterminous with another role, should that role be terminated their employment with the University will also come to an end.

<sup>1</sup> The Selection Committee in this procedure is as constituted under Special Ordinance C (x): Selection Committees (Special Ordinance under Statute C XIII 2). Note that this may be the Selection Committee or an alternative School-level committee as set out in the local protocol constituted as a Selection Committee, or in the case of unestablished academic staff the relevant School-level or departmental committee.

<sup>2</sup> This would include post-doctoral researchers where relevant.

<sup>3</sup> *Reporter*, 6547, 2018–19, p. 562.

### 3.3 Years 1 and 2

- Before commencing the post or within one month, the probation reviewer will hold a one-to-one meeting to discuss the duties of the post, mutual expectations and developmental needs. Any other relevant requirements should be discussed and recorded.
- It is recommended that a probation review is held at the end of the first six months to ensure induction and all mandatory training has been completed. A record will be kept of the meeting and signed by the probationer and probation reviewer using the Probation Assessment Form.
- The probation reviewer will meet with the probationer annually to review the progress under general terms of research; teaching and/or researcher development; and service to the University and to the academic community, focussing on achievements against relevant performance criteria for the role. In advance of the review the probationer will be asked to consider their progress for discussion at the meeting. A record will be kept of the meeting and signed by the probationer and the probation reviewer using the Probation Assessment Form.
- During the probationary period, the probation reviewer can seek feedback from senior colleagues regarding the progress of the probationer in terms of their research; teaching and/or researcher development; and service to the University and to the academic community. Feedback from students may also be sought. For clinical academics, feedback will be sought from the individual's NHS Clinical Director.
- Where concern arises about aspects of the performance of the probationer, more frequent meetings should be held and a record kept.
- Consideration should be given to any special circumstances that may have resulted in a lack of opportunity to perform to their full potential, including any disability.

### 3.4 Year 3

- A formal review and assessment will take place in the third year of the probationary period. An overall minimum of three references should be sought, of which at least one should be external (usually the individual's NHS Clinical Director). The probationer will nominate two of these references. The probation reviewer may seek additional references if these are required. A record will be kept of the meeting and signed by the probationer and the probation reviewer using the Probation Assessment Form [link to be inserted].
- At this point the Head of Department, after receiving the Probation Assessment Form from the probation reviewer, can recommend confirmation of the probation to the Selection Committee at the end of the three year period. All probation documents and references should be reviewed and the final assessment should be completed by the Head of Department, using the Probation Assessment Form.
- If the probationer is performing to the expected standard, the Head of Department will make a positive recommendation, setting out their case in writing, for the confirmation of appointment to the Selection Committee, supported by Probation Assessment Forms, references and the probationer's CV.
- If the appointment is confirmed by the Selection Committee, the probationer will receive confirmation of their successful probation in writing and move to the School of Clinical Medicine's or other relevant annual appraisal scheme.
- On confirmation of appointment by the Selection Committee, a holder of an academic office shall hold office, subject to the provisions of Statute C, or any Special Ordinance made under it, until the retiring age or until the end of their tenure in the case of officers on fixed-term appointments, so long as they satisfactorily perform the duties of the office.

### 3.5 Years 4 and 5

- If the Head of Department assesses that the probation cannot be confirmed at the year 3 stage, or the Selection Committee does not approve the appointment, a further meeting should be set up to provide the opportunity to discuss progress in all areas and to discuss strategy, workload and support required. The probation reviewer will need to draw the probationer's attention to areas for improvement and set clear standards for what is required for the probation to be confirmed. At this stage, the Clinical or other relevant School HR team should be informed of the probation issues raised. Reviews should take place every six months and a record kept, using the Probation Assessment Form.
- The final assessment and recommendation of the Selection Committee can take place in years 4 or 5, depending on progress. The Head of Department shall have discretion as to when the final assessment should take place provided that confirmation (or non-confirmation) of tenure by the Selection Committee occurs, if possible, not less than nine months before the end of the five-year period. In any event the recommendation by the Head of Institution to the Selection Committee should be made no earlier than three years into the probationary period. For the purposes of the final assessment, all probation documents and references should be reviewed and the Probation Assessment Form should be completed by the Head of Department. New references should be sought if required.
- If the probationer is performing to the expected standard, the Head of Department will make a positive recommendation to confirm the appointment to the Selection Committee. All performance records and supporting documentation shall be made available to the Committee.
- If the appointment is confirmed by the Selection Committee, the probationer will receive confirmation of their successful probation in writing following the Selection Committee and move to the relevant appraisal scheme.



- On confirmation of appointment by the Selection Committee, a holder of an academic office shall hold office, subject to the provisions of Statute C, or any Special Ordinance made under it, until the retiring age or until the end of their tenure in the case of officers on fixed-term appointments, so long as they satisfactorily perform the duties of the office.
- If performance during probation is not satisfactory, the Head of Department should detail these concerns on the Probation Assessment Form and ensure that the individual receives a copy. The Head of Department will inform the probationer that the recommendation to the Selection Committee will be to extend or terminate the appointment.
- Exceptionally, the probationary period may be extended where:
  - There is the realistic prospect of a satisfactory outcome on probation;
  - Successful completion of probation has been impacted by factors beyond the probationer's control.
- Usually, extensions will for up to one year. Heads of Department are advised to consult with the Clinical or other relevant School HR Team at an early stage should an extension be likely.
- The probationer must be given the opportunity to make written representations to the Selection Committee and may attend the meeting of the Selection Committee if they wish to do so in order to present their case. They will have a right to be accompanied at the meeting by a trade union representative or work colleague.
- They must tell the Clinical or other relevant School HR Team who their chosen companion is, in good time before the meeting. If their companion cannot attend, they should inform the Clinical or other relevant School HR Team immediately so that an alternative time can be arranged. If the companion is unable to attend within a reasonable period of the meeting, the University may ask the probationer to choose another companion.
- Where a probationer has indicated that they wish to make representations in person, they must make every effort to attend the meeting. If they fail to attend without good reason, or are persistently unable to do so, the University reserves the right to proceed on the evidence available.
- Where circumstances require it, and in particular, to avoid delay, the meeting may be held by way of video or teleconference.
- The Selection Committee may be supported by a member of the relevant School HR Team at the hearing. The University may also arrange for a notetaker to be present.
- The Head of Department will supply the probationer's Probation Assessment Forms, together with any supporting documentation, to the Selection Committee ahead of the meeting, with a copy to the probationer.
- The meeting may be adjourned if required to gather further information, provided that any adjournment will not lead to unreasonable delay.
- The probationer will be informed of the decision of the Selection Committee in writing. If the decision is to extend then a meeting with the probation reviewer will take place to discuss the objectives set for the extension period. A minimum of quarterly meetings with the probation reviewer and a member of the Clinical School HR team will take place thereafter.
- If the decision is to terminate the appointment due to unsatisfactory performance during probation, this is a dismissal in law. The probationer will be given written notice of termination, including the reasons for the dismissal and a right of appeal.
- In cases where there has been an extension at the end of the normal probation period, a final assessment will be conducted at the end of the extension following the process as set out in this section.

### *3.6 Procedure for fixed-term posts*

- The provisions of this procedure (including any timings) will be adjusted to take into account shorter probationary periods for fixed-term academic offices and unestablished academic posts.
- In particular, the probationary period of clinical lecturers who are established for a fixed term of four years will be 12 months.
- Accordingly, the procedure outlined above for managing probation will apply, save that formal probation assessment reviews will take place on a regular basis during the 12-month probationary period, with a final probation assessment prior to the end of the probationary period.

### *3.7 Right of appeal*

#### *Established academic staff*

- If the appointment is terminated, the officer will have the right to appeal under the provisions of Special Ordinance C (xiii) (Appeals) and Ordinances, Chapter II, Septemviri, which can be found at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/>.
- Where a probationer appeals against dismissal, the date on which dismissal takes effect will not be delayed pending the outcome of the appeal. However, if the appeal is successful the probationer will be reinstated with no loss of continuity or pay.

#### *Unestablished academic staff*

- Where the appointment is terminated, the probationer may appeal in writing within 10 working days of the receipt of the notice of dismissal, setting out the grounds of their appeal. They should direct this letter to the Director of HR.
- The Director of HR will appoint an Appeal Chair, who shall be a University officer of equivalent or greater seniority to the members of the Selection Committee under Section 3.5, and who has had no prior involvement in the case.

- The appeal hearing will be arranged within 10 working days of the appointment of the Appeal Chair, or as soon as is reasonably practicable thereafter.
- The probationer and a member of the Selection Committee may make representations in person and/or in writing at the appeal hearing. Copies of the probation assessment forms and supporting documentation, and any written representations should be supplied to all parties in good time ahead of the hearing. The Appeal Chair may be supported by a member of the relevant School HR Team at the hearing. The University may also arrange for a further member of HR to act as note-taker.
- The probationer is entitled to be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague. They must tell the relevant School HR Team, who their chosen companion is, in good time before the appeal hearing. If their companion cannot attend, they should inform the relevant School HR Team immediately so that an alternative time can be arranged. If the companion is unable to attend within a reasonable period of the original appeal hearing date, the University may ask the probationer to choose another companion.
- Where a probationer has indicated that they wish to make representations in person, they must make every effort to attend the hearing. If they fail to attend without good reason, or are persistently unable to do so, the University reserves the right to proceed on the evidence available.
- Where circumstances require it, and in particular, to avoid delay, the hearing may be held by way of video- or teleconference.
- The Appeal Chair may adjourn the appeal hearing if required to gather further information, provided that any adjournment will not lead to unreasonable delay.
- The Appeal Chair will inform the probationer of their decision in writing, wherever practicable within 10 working days of the appeal hearing or adjourned appeal hearing, setting out reasons for the decision. There is no further right of appeal.
- The Appeal Chair may vary the procedure above, as necessary, provided that the appeal is dealt with fairly and impartially and without unreasonable delay.
- Where a probationer appeals against dismissal, the date on which dismissal takes effect will not be delayed pending the outcome of the appeal. However, if the appeal is successful the probationer will be reinstated with no loss of continuity or pay.

### 3.8 *Period of notice required during the probationary period*

- The period of notice to terminate the appointment during the probationary period, will normally be three months on either side (one month's notice for an appointment of less than one year's duration).

### 3.9 *Support from the Clinical School HR Team for its academics*

- The Clinical School HR Team will offer:
  - Advice on selecting an appropriate mentor;
  - Training workshops for all probation reviewers;
  - Cascade information to Business and Operations Managers/Departmental Administrators via HR Forum;
  - Guidance documentation maintained HR and available on Clinical School HR webpages;
  - Support, advice and information on all probation cases where required;
  - Prompt Heads of Departments, Business and Operations Managers/Departmental Administrators and probation reviewers of forthcoming meetings, formal assessments and Selection Committees for all academic staff within the probationary period;
  - Request Clinical Director feedback (for clinical academics);
  - Request references, invite individuals to the Selection Committee (where necessary) and draft successful completion/extension or termination letters for the probationer;
  - Attendance at the Selection Committee where extension or termination is recommended.

## 4. **Guidance and additional sources of information**

<b>Policies and guidance</b>	<b>Templates and documentation</b>
Supporting information document on managing performance during probation: Practical Guidance for Probation Reviewers	Probation Assessment Form
Criteria for the assessment of Academic Probation at the School of Clinical Medicine [link to be inserted]	

## 5. **Policy ownership and status**

- This procedure is not contractual. It will be reviewed by the HR Division on a regular basis and amendments may be made in the light of any changes in legislation or operational requirements.

## Report of the Council, recommending provisional allocations from the Chest for 2020–21

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

### Overview

1. The Council is required ‘before the end of the Easter Term or as soon as possible thereafter,’ to ‘publish a Report on the financial position of the Chest, recommending allocations for the ensuing financial year’.<sup>1</sup> The exceptional circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the far-reaching consequences for every aspect of the collegiate University, present the Council with a challenge that is without recent precedent. The very wide range of potential outcomes related to COVID-19 means that it is difficult at this point to report with clarity on the consequences for the financial position of the Chest, and inadvisable to determine Chest allocations for 2020–21.

2. The Council expects further information to be available early in Michaelmas Term on student numbers, the University’s capacity to carry out on-site research and teaching, and any financial support from the UK government. Collectively these will have a significant effect on the response required by the University and the appropriate Chest allocations for next year. This Report seeks approval for provisional Chest allocations for the financial year commencing on 1 August 2020, so that work may continue over the Long Vacation to assess the financial implications of the COVID-19 pandemic and agree the parameters of the University’s recovery plan. These Chest allocations will be superseded by the recommendations of a substantive Allocations Report to be informed by that work and published as early as possible in Michaelmas Term 2020.

### The University’s response to COVID-19

3. The University’s strategic, operational and financial response to the COVID-19 crisis is overseen by the Council, which has taken immediate actions including the introduction of a recruitment pause and a freeze on capital expenditure on new building projects, other than those funded externally and bond-funded projects that can deliver a commercial return. The Council made further decisions on 15 June 2020 to limit the use of its reward and progression schemes in 2020–21, to implement a voluntary pay reduction scheme for staff earning over £100k, and not to continue the Contract Extension Scheme beyond 31 July 2020.<sup>2</sup> It also asked the HR Committee to consider how the University might continue to exercise restraint on recruitment.<sup>3</sup>

4. The Council is supported in its work by a Recovery Task Force, which is assessing the potential impact on the University under four scenarios intended to frame and inform the Council’s decision-making.<sup>4</sup> The financial

9. The Council recommends:

I. That provisional allocations from the Chest for the year 2020–21 be as follows:

- (a) to the Council for all purposes other than the University Education Fund: £129.5m.
- (b) to the General Board for the University Education Fund: £378.7m.

II. That any supplementary grants from the OfS and UKRI (through Research England), which may be received for special purposes during 2020–21, be allocated by the Council, wholly or in part, either to the General Board for the University Education Fund or to any other purpose consistent with any specification made by the OfS or UKRI, and that the amounts contained in Recommendation I above be adjusted accordingly.

<sup>1</sup> *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 1082.

<sup>2</sup> The recruitment pause has been applied until 31 July 2020 in the first instance.

<sup>3</sup> See: <https://www.cam.ac.uk/coronavirus/news/finance-message-from-the-vice-chancellor-to-university-employees>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.cam.ac.uk/coronavirus/news/update-from-the-vice-chancellor-16>

<sup>5</sup> The distribution of funds across Schools, non-School institutions and central administered funds is not identical to the previous Allocations Report; this reflects a number of cost neutral transfers itemised below.

implications under any scenario are significantly detrimental, causing the collegiate University a reduction in cash-flow of several hundreds of millions of pounds. This assumes a drop in the expected number of international students; lower income from research (because of physical restrictions to the University’s research capacity), from the University endowment, and from Cambridge University Press and Cambridge Assessment; and additional expenditure on pension contributions and on current capital projects disrupted by the COVID-19 crisis.

5. Further analysis of options to save costs and develop new income streams will be presented to the Council at its meeting on 20 July 2020. Some of these options are likely to be implemented under all circumstances; some will be implemented only to the extent of financial necessity, because of their impact on the University’s ability to deliver its core mission.

### Provisional allocations for 2020–21

6. In recognition of these exceptional circumstances, the Council has agreed that publication of a final Allocations Report for 2020–21, reflecting the fullest possible assessment of the financial position of the Academic University and recommending Chest allocations in light of the work undertaken by the Recovery Task Force, will be postponed until the beginning of Michaelmas Term 2020. That Report is also expected to demonstrate initial progress towards a comprehensive Budget process for the Academic University, based on total income and expenditure and tied into a ten-year financial model, as agreed by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 4 March 2020.

7. The new University financial year begins on 1 August 2020, and Schools and institutions require interim Chest allocations in order for them to continue their normal operations for at least the first quarter of 2020–21. The Council has accordingly accepted a recommendation from the Finance Committee that provisional Chest allocations for 2020–21 are unaltered from those previously approved for 2019–20. These are set out in Table 1 below.<sup>5</sup>

8. For the avoidance of confusion, the Chest allocations recommended by this Report are wholly provisional and are intended to enable the effective operation of the University during this unusual period of transition. They will be superseded by the Chest allocations recommended in the final Allocations Report for 2020–21, which will be published early in Michaelmas Term 2020.

23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	NICOLAS GAY	MARK LEWISOHN
	MADELEINE ATKINS	DAVID GREENAWAY	EDWARD PARKER HUMPHREYS
	GAENOR BAGLEY	JENNIFER HIRST	RICHARD PENTY
	ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI	NICHOLAS HOLMES	ANDREW SANCHEZ
	R. CHARLES	FIONA KARET	MARK WORMALD
	SHARON FLOOD	CHRISTOPHER KELLY	JOCELYN WYBURD
	ANTHONY FREELING	PHILIP KNOX	

## NOTE OF PARTIAL DISSENT

At its meeting on 3 June 2020 the Finance Committee, of which I am a member, was asked to support a two-stage approach to setting the 2020–21 Budget Allocations, in which the first stage consisted of a pre-COVID-19 base budget with a Chest deficit of £43m, and a COVID-19 contingency budget of £5m. The second stage leading to a final budget was to include further details of the extraordinary support expenditure related to COVID-19. The Finance Committee advised against publishing an Allocations Report reflecting only the first stage of the process.

The reason why I did not support the first stage of the process at Finance Committee nor at the Council meeting in June was that the pre-COVID budget did not reflect the financial envelope requested by the Finance Committee in July 2019 that, as a minimum, the Chest out turn should be no worse than -£17m. The plot at this point becomes slightly complicated since, after an oral report on 6 March 2020, the Finance Committee agreed to modify the financial envelope to require that the cash flow deficit for 2020–21 ‘be no worse than the 10 year model’s Year 2 operational cash flow deficit figure’ (at that stage -£12m, but updated to -£17m in April). This change was a mistake, since at the 3 June 2020 meeting the Finance Committee was asked to establish an appropriate revised target envelope, given the cash flow deficit target was no longer realistic (with hindsight setting an envelope by reference to a particular deficit in the 10 year model was nonsense once there was predicted to be a major reduction in revenues). Three changes in the envelope in as many months is not good planning (with hindsight it would have been better to have kept with the -£17m figure from July 2019). Unfortunately this lack of clarity seems symptomatic, and I argued at the Council meeting of 15 June 2020 that there has not been a clear, transparent planning and resource allocations process for the last two/three years, which is a necessity if the University is to manage itself out of the current situation with an agreed and transparent gathered field approach to the consideration of short and long term financial commitments.

If the planning timetable pre-2015 had been followed, there would have been a draft budget by mid-March, i.e. before the COVID-19 crisis escalated. There should have been a realisation by that stage that the Chest deficit was on course to be of the order of £40m, i.e. over £20m too much. For context, the three largest Chest deficits I have been able to track down (RPI adjusted to July 2019) were £25.9m in 2018–19, £22.7m in 2017–18, and £19.1m in 2002–03. But in 2002–03 the Non-Chest deficit was £0m, whereas in the two aforementioned years it was £14.4m and £17.0m respectively. The three largest combined Chest and Non-Chest deficits were in the last three years: £39.9m, £40.3m and £39.7m respectively. No Non-Chest figures have been provided to the Finance Committee or the Council for the coming year, and nor was a statement of the receipts of the Chest and payments from the Chest during the preceding financial year and a revised estimate of the corresponding figures for the current financial year (both of which are required by Ordinance).

In pre-COVID terms, the University is spending too freely, and it is not making quick enough progress to reduce the overspend. I believe this is why the Finance Committee ‘advised against publishing an Allocations Report reflecting only the first stage of the process’. The University is selling the family silver to support structural deficits, and for every £25m spent, there will be £1m less income from the endowment fund for recurrent expenditure in subsequent years.

By necessity I support the provisional allocations from the Chest and the delay in publication of a final Allocations Report for 2020–21. However, the COVID-19 crisis should not obscure the fact that progress to reduce the Chest (and Non-Chest) deficit is, if not in reverse, proceeding at a snail’s pace. Further, it is important that the financial sacrifices requested of staff outlined in paragraph 3 (which of necessity I support), should only be used to alleviate the COVID-19 induced deficit, not the underlying structural deficit. I and others suggested at the Council meeting in June that if the COVID-19 deficit is less than the financial savings from salaries and stipends then the difference should be reimbursed to staff.

23 June 2020           STEPHEN J. COWLEY

TABLE 1

## Interim Chest Allocations for 2020–21

	2019–20 Allocations per 2019 Budget Report	Cost Neutral Transfers	Note	Interim Allocations 2020–21
	£m	£m		£m
School of Arts and Humanities	24.4	0.5		24.9
School of the Humanities and Social Sciences	38.2	0.8		39.0
School of the Physical Sciences	42.3	0.6		42.9
School of Technology	33.1	0.5		33.6
School of the Biological Sciences	37.1	0.4		37.5
School of Clinical Medicine	22.7	0.3		23.0
<b>Total Schools</b>	<b>197.8</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<i>i</i>	<b>200.9</b>
Academic institutions and services <sup>1</sup>	54.1	3.3	<i>ii</i>	57.4
Staff and student services <sup>2</sup>	1.5	0.0		1.5
Unified Administrative Service (UAS)	44.2	0.5	<i>iii</i>	44.7
University-wide initiatives <sup>3</sup>	4.9	(4.9)	<i>iv</i>	0.0
<i>Administered Funds</i>				
Teaching and research funds <sup>4</sup>	126.7	0.3	<i>v</i>	127.0
Contingency funds	5.9	0.3	<i>vi</i>	6.2
HR-related funds <sup>5</sup>	2.9	0.0		2.9
Operational funds	4.7	0.0		4.7
Estates-related funds <sup>6</sup>	58.0	0.0		58.0
General funds	7.5	(2.6)	<i>vii</i>	4.9
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>508.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>		<b>508.2</b>

## Notes

- i £3.3m transfer from Contingency in respect of increased USS employer contributions, offset by £0.2m transfer of departmental libraries from the Schools of the Physical and Biological Sciences to the University Library.
- ii £2.6m transfer to the UIS of an Administered Fund formerly managed by the Information Services Committee (ISC); £0.6m transfer from Contingency in respect of increased USS employer contributions; and £0.2m transfer of departmental libraries into the University Library.
- iii £0.7m transfer from Contingency in respect of increased USS employer contributions, offset by a £0.3m transfer from the Academic Division to Administered Funds to consolidate funding for examinations and assessments.
- iv £4.9m allocated for University-wide initiatives, currently managed within the Contingency fund.
- v £0.3m transfer from the UAS (Academic Division) to Administered Funds to consolidate funding for examinations and assessments.
- vi £4.9m transfer to Contingency from University-wide initiatives, offset by a £4.6m transfer to Schools and institutions in respect of increased USS employer contributions.
- vii £2.6m transfer of the ISC Administered Fund to the UIS.

1 *Academic institutions and services*: University Library (UL), University Information Services (UIS), Institute for Continuing Education (ICE), Fitzwilliam Museum, Kettle's Yard, Cambridge University Development and Alumni Relations (CUDAR), Cambridge in America (CAm).

2 *Staff and Student Services*: Careers Service.

3 *University-wide initiatives*: Principally initiatives relating to the University's People Strategy.

4 *Teaching and research funds*: Includes fee transfers to Colleges of ~£75m.

5 *HR-related funds*: Principally funding for in-year costs of reward schemes.

6 *Estates-related funds*: Includes allocations for business rates, maintenance and utilities.

## Report of the Council on the period of appointment for members of the Audit Committee

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Report proposes an amendment to the period of appointment of members of the Audit Committee.

2. There is a vacancy for an external member of the Audit Committee from 31 July 2020 (*Reporter*, 6560, 2019–20, p. 6). The standard period of appointment for a member of the Audit Committee in class (c) (external members appointed by the Council) is four years from 1 January. In the event of a casual vacancy before the end of that period (when, for example, a serving member steps down before the end of their term), the period of appointment of the new member is the remainder of the period served by the previous member. The reason for these arrangements, which are common to many University committees, is to maintain staggering in the appointments of members, so that only some of the members are expected to leave – and new members join – at predictable intervals.

4. The Council recommends that Section 2 of Special Ordinance A (iv) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 68) be amended to read as follows:

2. Members in classes (a), (b), and (c) shall be appointed in the Michaelmas Term to serve for four years from 1 January next following their appointment or for the same period plus the remainder of the term of the departing member if that remainder is less than one year. In the event that Council membership ceases, Audit Committee membership will expire simultaneously. No member may serve for more than two consecutive periods of appointment or eight consecutive years, whichever is the longer. Co-opted members shall serve for such period as the Committee shall determine at the time of their co-optation.

23 June 2020

STEPHEN TOOPE, *Vice-Chancellor*  
MADELEINE ATKINS  
GAENOR BAGLEY  
ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI  
R. CHARLES  
STEPHEN J. COWLEY  
SHARON FLOOD  
ANTHONY FREELING

NICOLAS GAY  
DAVID GREENAWAY  
JENNIFER HIRST  
NICHOLAS HOLMES  
FIONA KARET  
CHRISTOPHER KELLY  
PHILIP KNOX  
MARK LEWISOHN

EDWARD PARKER HUMPHREYS  
RICHARD PENTY  
ANDREW SANCHEZ  
JASON SCOTT-WARREN  
MARK WORMALD  
JOCELYN WYBURD

## Report of the Council on the investment of bond proceeds held for income-generating projects

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. In May 2018, the Council agreed to exercise the authority granted by the Regent House by Grace 2 of 10 May 2018 and proceed with a bond issue of up to £600m. It also agreed that it wished to be bound by a Special Ordinance that would restrict the use of those proceeds to income-generating projects, as envisaged by its October 2018 Report (*Reporter*, 2018–19, 6522, p. 63). Special Ordinance A (viii)<sup>1</sup> sets out the criteria that are to be met in order for a project to qualify as income-generating. These criteria include the project forming part of the University's non-operational estate and providing returns that are expected to meet an appropriate threshold of commerciality.

2. The April 2018 Report anticipated that 'a significant proportion (currently forecast at £300m–£400m) would be invested in North West Cambridge Phase 2 if approved (in

early 2019)'. It also noted a number of other projects to which the funds could be applied, including the redevelopment of the Royal Cambridge Hotel, commercial development of the old Cambridge Assessment buildings and the Old Press Mill Lane site, the commercial research development strategy at West and North West Cambridge, and projects targeting environmental benefits. Since the publication of that Report, progress has been made on all of these projects. However, the plans for most of the projects are not yet sufficiently mature to require significant funding (whether from bond proceeds or otherwise). Decisions have been taken to slow the progress of North West Cambridge Phase 2 plans in order to wait for feedback from market testing and to suspend work on the development of the Old Press Mill Lane site, largely in response to market conditions. The COVID-19 outbreak

<sup>1</sup> Approved by Grace 1 of 5 December 2018.

has resulted in further delays in the development of these projects. In addition, for a number of the larger projects, there is a possibility (not originally envisaged) of co-financing with partners to reduce risk and bring in external expertise. As a result, only a small proportion of the £600m has been applied to income-generating projects to date and it is likely to be some years before the full proceeds are invested in projects, if ever.

3. This Report proposes that the scope of projects that are eligible for bond funding is broadened under a strictly defined framework that ensures investments remain fully aligned to the fundamental objectives of the original borrowings. It also recommends that the Finance Committee of the Council be given authority to determine the interim investment strategy for the 2018 bond proceeds, pending their application to income-generating projects.

4. The Finance Committee has identified potential projects that have the capacity to generate returns that are expected to meet appropriate thresholds of commerciality (being the same or greater returns as projects in the external market that are comparable in their risk and return profile), but which would not meet all of the eligibility criteria set out in the Special Ordinance. For example, investments in Cambridge Enterprise seed funds are not expected to be 'income-generating with a high degree of confidence in associated cashflows' but are expected to deliver high investment returns (through capital growth) commensurate with the associated risk of the investment. Conversely, loans to parties connected to the University (e.g. to Colleges) may deliver lower returns that are commensurate with the low risk of that investment.

5. It is the Council's view that certain requirements should be considered across the portfolio of all projects funded through bond proceeds, rather than on an individual project basis. These requirements are:

- (a) to meet the interest and repayment liabilities of the Bond under reasonable downside scenarios; and
- (b) to deliver a cash return over and above that required to service interest and capital repayment requirements of the Bond under a reasonable base case scenario, and consistent with the overall investment risk of the portfolio.

This approach would allow the University to benefit through limited investments in high- or low-risk opportunities that both directly support the University's mission and are expected to meet the threshold of commerciality.

6. Pending investment in income-generating projects, the Finance Committee has determined the initial strategy for the interim investment of bond proceeds. This has been influenced by the Council's request for a low-risk appetite when holding funds for projects that are likely to require funding in the next 5–7 years (and a desire to minimise counterparty risk). A conscious outcome of this approach is a modest 'cost of carry', whereby the returns achieved to date on financial assets are below the external coupon (interest) payable to bondholders and the liability growth resulting from index-linking. On receipt of the bond proceeds in 2018,

the Finance Committee agreed that up to £150m would be invested in 'higher-risk' assets,<sup>2</sup> with the remaining £450m held in highly liquid, low-risk but low-interest-bearing cash / money market investments. The delay that is now anticipated in investment of the full bond proceeds in projects (described in paragraph 2) means that the mix of investments in financial assets should be kept under review. This will enable the balance to be optimised between a desire to achieve higher returns through investment in more volatile assets (where those assets can be held over the medium term) against the requirement to hold funds necessary for nearer-term investment in projects in lower-risk investments. It is proposed that the strategy for investment of bond proceeds in financial assets should be determined and closely monitored by the Finance Committee.

7. If the recommendations of this Report are approved, the following changes will be made to the way in which the bond proceeds are used:

- (a) the Finance Committee of the Council will be given authority to determine the investment strategy for the 2018 bond proceeds in financial assets, pending their application to income-generating projects. The Committee would keep the Council and the wider University informed through existing reporting structures, including the Financial Statements; and
- (b) the eligibility criteria for the investment of bond proceeds will be amended to provide for:
  - (i) investment in non-strategic financial assets, pending their application to income-generating projects;
  - (ii) investment in projects that are expected to generate income through realised capital gains rather than or in addition to income from interest or dividends (such as Cambridge Enterprise seed funds);
  - (iii) investment in parties connected to the University (such as the Colleges) or departments of the University engaged in trading activities (such as Cambridge Assessment and Cambridge University Press);
  - (iv) the requirement that there should be a high degree of confidence in the cash inflows to be modified such that the level of confidence is appropriate to the risk of the investment; and
  - (v) investments in projects that meet the conditions of commerciality and form part of an overall portfolio of investments (projects and non-strategic financial investments) that is reasonably expected to:
    - deliver a cash return over and above that required to service interest and capital repayment requirements of the bond under a reasonable base case scenario; and
    - meet the interest and repayment liabilities of the bond under reasonable downside scenarios.

<sup>2</sup> The Finance Committee agreed that up to £20m could be placed with Cambridge Innovation Capital (CIC) and the balance invested in the Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF).

8. The Council recommends:

I. That Special Ordinance A (viii) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 71) be revised to read as follows:

SPECIAL ORDINANCE A (viii)  
*Application of bond proceeds arising from the authority granted  
by Grace 2 of 10 May 2018*

1. By Grace 2 of 10 May 2018, the Regent House gave the Council authority to arrange external finance for income-generating projects up to a total amount of £600m. Pursuant to such authority, two bonds (the Bond) were issued in June 2018 by the University in the total sum of £600m (the Bond proceeds). One of these bonds has a fixed-rate coupon and the other a coupon that is linked to the Consumer Price Index.

2. Income-generating projects shall comprise strategic investment opportunities which are expected to generate a positive return on investment in the form of interest, dividends or capital gains (Projects).

3. Projects will be eligible to receive funds arising from the Bond proceeds if, in the opinion of the Council on the advice of its Finance Committee, they:

- (a) form part of the non-operational estate or involve departments within the University engaged in trading activities or parties connected to the University;
- (b) are income-generating including through interest, dividends or realised capital gains with a confidence in the associated cash inflows to a level that is appropriate to the risk of the investment;
- (c) are expected to meet appropriate thresholds of commerciality, delivering either:
  - (i) the same or greater returns (after transaction costs) as projects in the external market that are comparable in their risk and return profile, with a minimum return of 2.35% (being the coupon on the fixed-rate bond issued in 2018); or
  - (ii) a limited reduction to such returns that is expressly identified and justified on strategic grounds and approved as such by the Council;
- (d) have a well-defined and stress-tested business case;
- (e) have clarity of responsibilities, appropriate resourcing, and well-defined governance, monitoring, and reporting arrangements; and
- (f) are consistent with the reasonable expectation that the income generated by the portfolio of all Projects (actual or prospective), taken with the return on investment of Bond proceeds pending their investment in Projects, will:
  - (i) meet the interest and repayment liabilities of the Bond under reasonable downside scenarios; and
  - (ii) deliver a cash return (a) over and above that required to meet the interest and capital repayment requirements of the Bond under a reasonable base case scenario, and (b) consistent with the overall investment risk of the portfolio (taking into account any limited reduction in a Project's return consistent with paragraph (c)(ii) of this section).

4. In advance of investment in Projects in accordance with this Special Ordinance, Bond proceeds will be invested in a range of financial assets which, in the opinion of Finance Committee, offer in aggregate an appropriate balance of risk and return which is consistent with realisation of those investments in accordance with the anticipated timeframes for investment in potential Projects.

5. Projects and financial assets in which the Bond proceeds are invested will be monitored under the existing processes for the review and oversight of capital and other projects, with regular reports on the use of the Bond proceeds provided to the Finance Committee.

23 June 2020

STEPHEN TOOPE, *Vice-Chancellor*

GAENOR BAGLEY

ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI

R. CHARLES

STEPHEN J. COWLEY

SHARON FLOOD

ANTHONY FREELING

NICOLAS GAY

DAVID GREENAWAY

JENNIFER HIRST

NICHOLAS HOLMES

FIONA KARET

CHRISTOPHER KELLY

PHILIP KNOX

MARK LEWISOHN

EDWARD PARKER HUMPHREYS

RICHARD PENTY

ANDREW SANCHEZ

JASON SCOTT-WARREN

MARK WORMALD

JOCELYN WYBURD



## Report of the Council on changes to Special Ordinance concerning Congregations

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. In light of the decisions taken in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak (*Reporter*, 6585, 2019–20, p. 454), the Council is proposing some changes to Special Ordinance to confirm that Congregations can be held in the event that physical meetings are not possible.

2. Special Ordinance A (vii) 3 enables members of a University body to participate in a meeting by any means of communication which permits all members simultaneously to hear one another, unless expressly excluded. Special Ordinance A (i) 2 states that Congregations of the Regent House, for the transaction of University business, and meetings of the Regent House, for the discussion of Reports and other matters, shall be held in the Senate-House or elsewhere within the Precincts of the University. Regulation 18 of the Ordinance on Graces and Congregations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) further states that certain officers must be present in order to constitute a Congregation.

Regulation 24 of the same Ordinance already allows members to give written notice of their intention to oppose a Grace in advance of the Senior Proctor reading out that Grace for approval at a Congregation.

3. A Congregation took place on 27 March 2020 at which the relevant officers were present via videoconference in (separate) locations within the Precincts of the University and therefore the requirements for a Congregation were met. However, for the sake of certainty, and to ensure that a Congregation can take place even if the relevant officers are in locations outside the University Precincts, a change to Special Ordinance A (i) 2 is being put forward. A similar amendment is also being proposed to Special Ordinance C (iii) 1 concerning the admission of the Proctors. The Council wishes to confirm that these provisions would only be used in circumstances when a physical meeting is not possible.

4. The Council recommends:

I. That Special Ordinance A (i) 2 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 65) be amended to read as follows:

2. Congregations of the Regent House, for the transaction of University business, and meetings of the Regent House, for the discussion of Reports and other matters, shall be held in the Senate-House or elsewhere within the Precincts of the University, or exceptionally by any means of communication which permits all those participating simultaneously to hear one another, on such dates and at such times as may be appointed by the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor or the Council. The manner of holding a Congregation and of transacting business at a Congregation shall be prescribed by Ordinance from time to time.

II. That Special Ordinance C (iii) 1 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 75) be amended to read as follows:

1. (a) The election of the Proctors shall be held on the first weekday of the Michaelmas Term each year at 10 o'clock in the morning, the Proctors for the previous year vacating their offices immediately beforehand. At the election the two Esquire Bedells shall stand in scrutiny and shall take their own votes and those of other voters by the words *placet* or *non placet*. If each of the persons nominated is approved by a majority of those voting, the Esquire Bedells shall declare her or him to be elected. When the Proctors have been elected, the election of the deputy Proctors shall be held without delay.

(b) Exceptionally, the election of the Proctors and their deputies and the necessary public declarations may take place by any means of communication which permits all those participating simultaneously to hear one another, and the Registry may in advance of the election confirm by Notice the arrangements for voting in those circumstances.

(c) If after the election a Proctor desires to nominate an additional person for election as deputy Proctor, he or she shall request the Council to submit a Grace to the Regent House for the approval of the person nominated.

23 June 2020

STEPHEN TOOPE, *Vice-Chancellor*

MADELEINE ATKINS

GAENOR BAGLEY

ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI

R. CHARLES

STEPHEN J. COWLEY

SHARON FLOOD

ANTHONY FREELING

NICOLAS GAY

DAVID GREENAWAY

JENNIFER HIRST

NICHOLAS HOLMES

FIONA KARET

CHRISTOPHER KELLY

PHILIP KNOX

MARK LEWISOHN

EDWARD PARKER HUMPHREYS

RICHARD PENTY

ANDREW SANCHEZ

JASON SCOTT-WARREN

MARK WORMALD

JOCELYN WYBURD

## Report of the General Board on Senior Academic Promotions

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

1. The senior academic promotions exercise in respect of promotions to take effect from 1 October 2020 has been completed. The General Board, at its meeting on 3 June 2020, considered recommendations from the Vice-Chancellor's Senior Academic Promotions Committee in respect of promotion to personal Professorships, Readerships and Senior Lectureships. With the recommendations the Board received an extensive report, which provided the Board with an account of the procedure followed for the evaluation and comparison of the evidence for all applicants. The Board was able to see how recommendations had been arrived at so that, without repeating the entire exercise, it could either approve the recommendations or, if it so wished, consider the basis on which any of the recommendations had been made.

2. The contents of the report were as follows:

- minutes of the Vice-Chancellor's Committee and School Committees;
- summary lists of Faculty Committee and School Committee evaluations and bandings, indicating adjustments and any special or non-standard aspects of applications;
- summary tables giving names of applicants in priority order by School Committee for each of the senior academic offices;
- funding and statistical information;
- equal opportunity report on all applications received;
- feedback statements.

8. The General Board recommends:

- I. That, *with effect from 1 October 2020*, **Professorships** be established for each of the following named persons for one tenure, placed in the Schedule to Special Ordinance C (vii) 1, and assigned to the Faculty, Department, or Institution named in each case, as follows:

### *School of Arts and Humanities*

Dr SIMON GATHERCOLE, *F*, assigned to the Faculty of Divinity

Dr RICHARD DANCE, *CTH*, assigned to the Faculty of English

Dr PRIYAMVADA GOPAL, *CHU*, assigned to the Faculty of English

Dr JAN-MELISSA SCHRAMM, *TH*, assigned to the Faculty of English

Dr RODRIGO CACHO, *CL*, assigned to the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics

Dr NIGEL COLLIER, *MUR*, assigned to the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics

Dr HENRIETTE HENDRIKS, *LC*, assigned to the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics

Dr BRECHTJE POST, *JE*, assigned to the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics

Mr RICHARD CAUSTON, *K*, assigned to the Faculty of Music

Dr CLARE CHAMBERS, *JE*, assigned to the Faculty of Philosophy

### *School of the Biological Sciences*

Dr THOMAS MICKLEM, *PEM*, assigned to the Department of Genetics

Dr KRISTIAN FRANZE, *JN*, assigned to the Department of Physiology, Development and Neuroscience

Dr JULIA DAVIES, *DAR*, assigned to the Department of Plant Sciences

Dr IAN HENDERSON, *CAI*, assigned to the Department of Plant Sciences

Dr ANDREW WELCHMAN assigned to the Department of Psychology

3. The Board now recommends the establishment of 42 Professorships from 1 October 2020, as set out in Recommendation I. The establishment of these Professorships is proposed on condition that in each case where the person currently holds a permanently established office, that office should be placed in abeyance during the tenure of the Professorship.

4. The Board also proposes the establishment of 57 Readerships from 1 October 2020, as set out in Recommendation II. The establishment of these Readerships is proposed on condition that in each case where the person currently holds a permanently established office, that office should be placed in abeyance during the tenure of the Readership.

5. In order to avoid delay in publishing the Report, the Board has put forward its recommendations before the titles of the Professorships and Readerships have been agreed. The Board will announce these titles at a later date, after consultation with the individuals concerned.

6. The Board has also agreed, in accordance with Special Ordinance C (ix) 1 and the special regulation for University Senior Lectureships (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 772) to appoint the 19 individuals listed in the Schedule to this Report to University Senior Lectureships.

7. The estimated total additional cost to central funds in the first year of the proposals for promotion to personal Professorships and Readerships and of the appointments to University Senior Lectureships of the persons named in this Report will be approximately £756,057.

*School of Clinical Medicine*

Dr MARC TISCHKOWITZ assigned to the Department of Medical Genetics  
 Dr JAMES BRENTON assigned to the Department of Oncology  
 Dr CHARLOTTE COLES assigned to the Department of Oncology  
 Dr DOUGLAS WINTON assigned to the Department of Oncology  
 Dr FERDIA GALLAGHER, *CAI*, assigned to the Department of Radiology

*School of the Humanities and Social Sciences*

Dr RICARDO SABATES AYSÁ, *HH*, assigned to the Faculty of Education  
 Dr BRENDAN BURCHELL, *M*, assigned to the Department of Sociology  
 Dr ELISABETE SILVA assigned to the Department of Land Economy

*School of the Physical Sciences*

Dr JOHN MACLENNAN, *EM*, assigned to the Department of Earth Sciences  
 Dr STEPHEN EGLÉN, *M*, assigned to the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics  
 Dr OSCAR RANDAL-WILLIAMS assigned to the Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics  
 Dr PETER VARJU assigned to the Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics  
 Dr SILVIA VIGNOLINI assigned to the Department of Chemistry  
 Dr SARAH BOHNDIEK, *CC*, assigned to the Department of Physics  
 Dr CLAUDIO CASTELNOVO, *T*, assigned to the Department of Physics  
 Dr ALEXANDER MITOV, *EM*, assigned to the Department of Physics  
 Dr NIKOLAOS NIKIFORAKIS, *SE*, assigned to the Department of Physics

*School of Technology*

Dr TIMOTHY GRIFFIN, *K*, assigned to the Department of Computer Science and Technology  
 Dr RICHARD MORTIER, *CHR*, assigned to the Department of Computer Science and Technology  
 Dr ANDREW RICE, *Q*, assigned to the Department of Computer Science and Technology  
 Dr MICHAEL DE VOLDER, *JN*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
 Dr COLM DURKAN, *G*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
 Dr GRAHAM PULLAN, *TH*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
 Dr KEITH SEFFEN, *CC*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
 Dr RICHARD ERIC TURNER, *CHR*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
 Dr GLENN VINNICOMBE, *CAI*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
 Dr ROISIN OWENS, *N*, assigned to the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology

II. That, *with effect from 1 October 2020*, **Readerships** be established, as follows, and that the General Board be authorised to appoint to each Readership the person for whom its establishment is proposed:

*School of Arts and Humanities*

Dr YUET CHAU, *JN*, assigned to the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies  
 Dr CHRISTOPHER WHITTON, *EM*, assigned to the Faculty of Classics  
 Dr SARAH DILLON assigned to the Faculty of English  
 Dr SUBHA MUKHERJI, *F*, assigned to the Faculty of English  
 Dr EMMA GILBY, *SID*, assigned to the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics  
 Dr DAVID TRIPPETT, *CHR*, assigned to the Faculty of Music  
 Dr BENJAMIN WALTON, *JE*, assigned to the Faculty of Music

*School of the Biological Sciences*

Dr MARTIN WELCH assigned to the Department of Biochemistry  
 Dr HEIKE LAMAN, *CL*, assigned to the Department of Pathology  
 Dr MATTHEW MURRAY assigned to the Department of Pathology  
 Dr GRAHAM LADDS, *JN*, assigned to the Department of Pharmacology  
 Dr SANDER VAN DER LINDEN, *CHU*, assigned to the Department of Psychology  
 Dr JASON HEAD assigned to the Department of Zoology

*School of Clinical Medicine*

Dr CHRISTOPHER RODGERS, *PET*, assigned to the Department of Clinical Neurosciences  
Dr CEDRIC GHEVAERT assigned to the Department of Haematology  
Dr JAMES NATHAN assigned to the Department of Medicine  
Dr MICHAEL WEEKES assigned to the Department of Medicine  
Dr KAREN ERSCHKE, *CLH*, assigned to the Department of Psychiatry  
Dr JAMES WOODCOCK assigned to the Department of Public Health and Primary Care  
Mr VINCENT GNANAPRAGASAM assigned to the Department of Surgery

*School of the Humanities and Social Sciences*

Dr NACI AYTEK ERDIL, *K*, assigned to the Faculty of Economics  
Dr SARA BAKER, *DAR*, assigned to the Faculty of Education  
Dr ZOE JAQUES, *HO*, assigned to the Faculty of Education  
Dr ANDREW ARSAN, *JN*, assigned to the Faculty of History  
Dr HELEN MCCARTHY, *JN*, assigned to the Faculty of History  
Dr METTE EILSTRUP-SANGIOVANNI, *SID*, assigned to the Department of Politics and International Studies  
Dr DENNIS GRUBE, *G*, assigned to the Department of Politics and International Studies  
Dr ALICIA HINAREJOS PARGA, *DOW*, assigned to the Faculty of Law  
Dr KATHLEEN LIDDELL, *DOW*, assigned to the Faculty of Law  
Dr BARAK ARIEL assigned to the Institute of Criminology  
Dr XIAOHUI BAO, *N*, assigned to the Department of Land Economy  
Dr SHAILAJA FENNELL, *JE*, assigned to the Department of Land Economy  
Dr SHAUN LARCOM, *SE*, assigned to the Department of Land Economy  
Dr EMMA LEES, *F*, assigned to the Department of Land Economy

*School of the Physical Sciences*

Dr ALEXANDER COPLEY, *R*, assigned to the Department of Earth Sciences  
Dr ALEXANDER PIOTROWSKI, *MUR*, assigned to the Department of Earth Sciences  
Dr MICHAEL HERZOG assigned to the Department of Geography  
Dr CHARLOTTE LEMANSKI assigned to the Department of Geography  
Dr RICHARD CHARLES POWELL, *F*, assigned to the Department of Geography  
Dr ALICE REID, *CHU*, assigned to the Department of Geography  
Dr MACIEJ DUNAJSKI, *CL*, assigned to the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics  
Dr CHRISTOPHER EDWARD THOMAS, *CHR*, assigned to the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics  
Dr ROLAND BAUERSCHMIDT assigned to the Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics  
Dr HUGO BRONSTEIN, *PEM*, assigned to the Department of Chemistry  
Dr STEVEN LEE assigned to the Department of Chemistry  
Dr NICHOLAS JONES, *PEM*, assigned to the Department of Materials Science and Metallurgy  
Dr BENJAMIN BERI assigned to the Department of Physics  
Dr ANDREW JARDINE, *F*, assigned to the Department of Physics  
Dr CHRISTINA POTTER, *N*, assigned to the Department of Physics

*School of Technology*

Dr DAVID STILLWELL assigned to the Judge Business School  
Dr THOMAS SAUERWALD, *EM*, assigned to the Department of Computer Science and Technology  
Dr ROBERT WATSON assigned to the Department of Computer Science and Technology  
Dr NATHANIEL CRILLY assigned to the Department of Engineering  
Dr STUART HAIGH, *T*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
Dr EVGENI SHWAGERAU, *HH*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
Dr RAMJI VENKATARAMANAN, *TH*, assigned to the Department of Engineering  
Dr GABRIELE KAMINSKI SCHIERLE, *R*, assigned to the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology

23 June 2020	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	NICHOLAS HOLMES	GRAHAM VIRGO
	PHILIP ALLMENDINGER	PATRICK MAXWELL	MARK WORMALD
	KRISTINE BLACK-HAWKINS	NIGEL PEAKE	CHRISTOPHER YOUNG
	ANN COPESTAKE	ANNA PHILPOTT	
	JOHN DENNIS	RICHARD REX	

*SCHEDULE*

The General Board has agreed to appoint the following to **University Senior Lectureships**, with effect from 1 October 2020 to the retiring age.

*School of Arts and Humanities*

Dr REBECCA LAEMMLE, <i>PEM</i>	Faculty of Classics
Dr NICHOLAS ZAIR, <i>PET</i>	Faculty of Classics
Dr ANKUR BARUA	Faculty of Divinity
Reverend Dr ANDREW DAVISON, <i>CC</i>	Faculty of Divinity

*School of the Biological Sciences*

Dr PIER D'AVINO	Department of Pathology
Dr SAMUEL BROCKINGTON	Department of Plant Sciences
Dr OLIVIER RESTIE, <i>R</i>	Department of Veterinary Medicine

*School of the Humanities and Social Sciences*

Dr KAREN FORBES, <i>HO</i>	Faculty of Education
Mr WILLIAM NICHOLL	Faculty of Education
Dr ENRICO CREMA	Department of Archaeology
Dr DACIA VIEJO ROSE, <i>SE</i>	Department of Archaeology
Dr PERVEEZ MODY, <i>K</i>	Department of Social Anthropology
Dr JEFFREY SKOPEK, <i>HH</i>	Faculty of Law
Dr STELIOS TOFARIS, <i>G</i>	Faculty of Law
Dr MARY BRAZELTON	Department of History and Philosophy of Science
Dr MARTA HALINA, <i>SE</i>	Department of History and Philosophy of Science
Dr THIES LINDENTHAL, <i>MUR</i>	Department of Land Economy

*School of Technology*

Dr KAN CHU	Judge Business School
Dr GRAHAM CHRISTIE, <i>PET</i>	Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology

*STATISTICAL SUMMARY*

Attached as Annex A to this Report is a statistical summary of the number of successful and unsuccessful applications for promotions by Professorships, Readerships and Senior Lectureships.

**Senior Academic Promotions, 2020 – Annex A:**  
**Statistical summary of outcomes**

*Professorships*

School Committee	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
Arts and Humanities	10 (5M 5W)	6 (4M 2W)	16 (9M 7W)
Biological Sciences	5 (4M 1W)	5 (3M 2W)	10 (7M 3W)
Clinical Medicine	5 (4M 1W)	1 (1M 0W)	6 (5M 1W)
Humanities and Social Sciences	3 (2M 1W)	5 (4M 1W)	8 (6M 2W)
Physical Sciences	9 (7M 2W)	3 (2M 1W)	12 (9M 3W)
Technology	10 (9M 1W)	3 (2M 1W)	13 (11M 2W)
<b>Total</b>	<b>42 (31M 11W)</b>	<b>23 (16M 7W)</b>	<b>65 (47M 18W)</b>

*Readerships*

School Committee	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
Arts and Humanities	7 (4M 3W)	7 (6M 1W)	14 (10M 4W)
Biological Sciences	6 (5M 1W)	3 (2M 1W)	9 (7M 2W)
Clinical Medicine	7 (6M 1W)	1 (1M 0W)	8 (7M 1W)
Humanities and Social Sciences	17 (6M 11W)	7 (3M 4W)	24 (9M 15W)
Physical Sciences	12 (11M 1W)	3 (3M 0W)	15 (14M 1W)
Technology	8 (7M 1W)	3 (2M 1W)	11 (9M 2W)
<b>Total</b>	<b>57 (39M 18W)</b>	<b>24 (17M 7W)</b>	<b>81 (56M 25W)</b>

*University Senior Lectureships*

School Committee	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
Arts and Humanities	4 (3M 1W)	2 (1M 1W)	6 (4M 2W)
Biological Sciences	3 (3M 0W)	2 (1M 1W)	5 (4M 1W)
Clinical Medicine	0 (0M 0W)	0 (0M 0W)	0 (0M 0W)
Humanities and Social Sciences	10 (5M 5W)	2 (2M 0W)	12 (7M 5W)
Physical Sciences	0 (0M 0W)	0 (0M 0W)	0 (0M 0W)
Technology	2 (1M 1W)	0 (0M 0W)	2 (1M 1W)
<b>Total</b>	<b>19 (12M 7W)</b>	<b>6 (4M 2W)</b>	<b>25 (16M 9W)</b>

**Report of the General Board on the establishment of certain Professorships**

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

1. The General Board recommends the establishment of a Royal Academy of Engineering Research Professorship of Materials Physics and a Professorship of Applied Mathematics. The funding arrangements for these professorships, as set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 below, were approved by the Chair of the Resource Management Committee on behalf of the Committee on 27 March 2020.

2. The Faculty Board of Physics and Chemistry and the Council of the School of the Physical Sciences propose the establishment of a Royal Academy of Engineering Research Professorship of Materials Physics, assigned to the Department of Physics. The holder of the Royal Academy of Engineering Research Professorship of Materials Physics will be Dr Jacqui Cole. The full salary costs of the Professorship will be met from the funding for an existing Royal Academy of Engineering Research Chair Fellowship held by Dr Cole, which runs to 30 September 2023. The term of the Professorship will be coterminous with the external funding; it will initially be established

from 1 June 2020<sup>1</sup> until 30 September 2023, with the possibility of extension from 1 October 2023 should further funding be agreed.

3. The Faculty Board of Mathematics and the Council of the School of the Physical Sciences propose the establishment of a Professorship of Applied Mathematics for a single tenure from 1 October 2021 in the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics. The salary costs of the Professorship will be shared equally between the Department and the School from existing resources. The holder of the Professorship will be Professor David Abrahams, the current N. M. Rothschild & Sons Professor of Mathematical Sciences and Director of the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences. When Professor Abrahams was appointed in October 2016, the contractual terms of his employment included the establishment of an *ad hominem* Professorship when his five-year tenure as Rothschild Professor and Director of the Isaac Newton Institute concluded on 30 September 2021.

4. The General Board recommends:

- I. That a Royal Academy of Engineering Research Professorship of Materials Physics be established in the University for Dr Jacqui Cole from 1 June 2020 until 30 September 2023 or for the duration of the external funding if extended beyond that date, placed in the Schedule to Special Ordinance C (vii) 1, and assigned to the Department of Physics.
- II. That a Professorship of Applied Mathematics be established in the University for Professor David Abrahams from 1 October 2021 for a single tenure, placed in the Schedule to Special Ordinance C (vii) 1, and assigned to the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics.

23 June 2020

STEPHEN TOOPE, *Vice-Chancellor*  
 PHILIP ALLMENDINGER  
 KRISTINE BLACK-HAWKINS  
 ANN COPESTAKE  
 JOHN DENNIS

NICHOLAS HOLMES  
 PATRICK MAXWELL  
 NIGEL PEAKE  
 ANNA PHILPOTT  
 RICHARD REX

GRAHAM VIRGO  
 MARK WORMALD  
 CHRISTOPHER YOUNG

<sup>1</sup> If the proposal is approved, the establishment of the Professorship will be backdated to 1 June 2020.

## Report of the General Board on the authority to award doctoral degrees

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

1. This Report proposes changes to the authority to approve doctoral degrees.<sup>1</sup>

2. In Michaelmas Term 2018 the General Board, through its Education Committee, initiated a review of governance arrangements for postgraduate and graduate students. Following the review, proposals for changes to current governance arrangements were approved by the Regent House by ballot, to take effect from 1 October 2020 (*Reporter*, 6570, 2019–20, p. 155).

3. The Board of Graduate Studies will be dissolved on 30 September 2020 and its work will transfer to a new Postgraduate Committee, a sub-committee of the General Board's Education Committee. The Postgraduate Committee, under the direction of the Education Committee, is to undertake a review of its work to identify the most appropriate governance and operational arrangements for postgraduate student matters.

4. In October 2019 the Education Committee established an Enquiry Group to start the review of the work of the Postgraduate Committee. The Enquiry Group considered, *inter alia*, the transfer of the authority to award doctoral degrees from the Board of Graduate Studies (Postgraduate Committee) to Degree Committees.

5. The Enquiry Group consulted Degree Committees about the proposed transfer of the authority to award, or not award, doctoral degrees. All but one of the Degree Committees were in favour of assuming the authority to award doctoral degrees. A number of Degree Committees (9 out of 14 Degree Committees who responded to this question) indicated a preference for decisions not to award

a degree or to award a lower degree (e.g. Master of Science or Master of Letters) to be ratified by a central University committee.

6. The Enquiry Group recommended to the Education Committee a transfer of the authority to award doctoral degrees from the Board of Graduate Studies (Postgraduate Committee) to Degree Committees, to take effect on 1 October 2020. The Education Committee approved this recommendation on 18 March 2020.<sup>2</sup>

7. The General Board endorses the transfer of degree-awarding authority to Degree Committees, subject to ratification by the General Board of decisions not to award a degree or to award a lower degree. In practice, this ratification would be delegated to the Board's Education Committee. The General Board supports this change on the following grounds:

- (a) it will speed up the degree-awarding process, a key benefit for students;
- (b) it removes an unnecessary stage of oversight. The Board of Graduate Studies does not currently review recommendations from Degree Committees for the award of a degree.

8. If this change is approved, the General Board shall make the changes to General Board Regulations set out in Annex A. Management of thesis submissions, confirmation of necessary corrections to theses and confirmation of the award of degrees will continue to be carried out within the Student Registry.

9. The General Board recommends:

- I. That, with effect from 1 October 2020, the authority to award doctoral degrees passes to Degree Committees.

23 June 2020

STEPHEN TOOPE, *Vice-Chancellor*  
PHILIP ALLMENDINGER  
KRISTINE BLACK-HAWKINS  
ALESSANDRO CECCARELLI  
ANN COPESTAKE

JOHN DENNIS  
NICHOLAS HOLMES  
ALI HYDE  
PATRICK MAXWELL  
NIGEL PEAKE

ANNA PHILPOTT  
RICHARD REX  
GRAHAM VIRGO  
MARK WORMALD  
CHRISTOPHER YOUNG

<sup>1</sup> Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Philosophy (Special Regulations), Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Medicine (Special Regulations), Doctor of Business, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Engineering, Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.

<sup>2</sup> See the Notice on p. 477 for details of other Enquiry Group recommendations that the Education Committee has approved.

### ANNEX A

#### Proposed changes to General Board Regulations with effect from 1 October 2020.

(1) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Business (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 458) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 12 to read as follows:

**12.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners on the examinations specified in Regulation 6, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the student's work is of the requisite standard for the degree, its decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(b) by amending Regulation 13 to read as follows:

**13.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee considers that a student's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the Bus.D. Degree, the Degree Committee may permit the student to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(c) by amending Regulation 14 to read as follows:

**14.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee considers that a student's work is not of the standard requisite for the Bus.D. Degree, but that it is of the standard requisite for the M.Sc. Degree, its recommendation to that effect shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could properly be approved for the award of the lower degree, the Registry shall ask the candidate whether he or she is willing to be approved for the award of the M.Sc. Degree. The deadline for receipt of the candidate's agreement shall be the last day of the term following the term or vacation in which the decision on her or his candidature was made. If the Registry receives the candidate's agreement by the deadline or the General Board at its discretion decides to accept it after the deadline, the General Board shall approve the candidate for the award of that degree. The Registry shall publish a notice of such approval unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(d) by amending Regulation 15 to read as follows:

**15.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all decisions that candidates be approved for the award of the Bus.D. or that they be allowed to submit revised theses. The General Board shall be the deciding authority on all recommendations communicated to it by Degree Committees that candidates not be approved for the award of the Bus.D. or be approved for the award of M.Sc. Degree. The Board shall not approve a candidate for the award of a degree unless the Degree Committee has recommended the award of that degree; before refusing an award so recommended, the Board shall give a representative appointed by the Degree Committee an opportunity of explaining the Committee's reasons for its recommendation.

(2) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Education (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 471) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 13 to read as follows:

**13.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the candidate's work is of the requisite standard for the degree, its decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(b) by amending Regulation 14 to read as follows:

**14.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee considers that the candidate's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree, the Degree Committee may permit the candidate to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(c) by amending Regulation 15 to read as follows:

**15.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee considers that the candidate's work is not of the standard requisite for the Ed.D. Degree, but that it is of the standard requisite for the M.Litt. Degree, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decide that the candidate could properly be approved for the award of the lower degree, the Registry shall ask the candidate whether he or she is willing to be approved for the award of the M.Litt. Degree. The deadline for receipt of the candidate's agreement shall be the last day of the term following the term or vacation in which the decision on her or his candidature was made. If the Registry receives the candidate's agreement by the deadline or the General Board at its discretion decides to accept it after the deadline, the General Board shall approve the candidate for the award of that degree. The Registry shall publish a notice of such approval unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.



(d) By amending Regulation 16 to read as follows:

**16.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all decisions that candidates be approved for the award of the Ed.D. or that they be allowed to submit revised theses. The General Board shall be the deciding authority on all recommendations communicated to it by Degree Committees that candidates not be approved for the award of the Ed.D. or be approved for the award of M.Litt. Degree. The General Board shall not approve a candidate for the award of an M.Litt Degree unless the Degree Committee has recommended the award of that degree; before refusing an award so recommended the Board shall give a representative appointed by the Degree Committee an opportunity of explaining the Committee's reasons for its recommendation.

(3) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Engineering (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 474) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 13 to read as follows:

**13.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners on the examinations specified in Regulation 7, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the student's work is of the requisite standard for the degree, its decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(b) by amending Regulation 14 to read as follows:

**14.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee consider that a student's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree, the Degree Committee may permit the student to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(c) by amending Regulation 15 to read as follows:

**15.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee considers that a student's work is not of the standard requisite for the Eng.D. Degree, but that it is of the standard requisite for the M.Sc. Degree, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could properly be approved for the award of the lower degree, the Registry shall ask the candidate whether he or she is willing to be approved for the award of the M.Sc. Degree. The deadline for receipt of the candidate's agreement shall be the last day of the term following the term or vacation in which the decision on her or his candidature was made. If the Registry receives the candidate's agreement by the deadline or the General Board at its discretion decides to accept it after the deadline, the General Board shall approve the candidate for the award of that degree. The Registry shall publish a notice of such approval unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(d) by amending Regulation 16 to read as follows:

**16.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all decisions that candidates be approved for the award of the Eng.D. or that they be allowed to submit revised theses. The General Board shall be the deciding authority on all recommendations communicated to it by Degree Committees that candidates not be approved for the award of the Eng.D. or be approved for the award of M.Sc. Degree. The Board shall not approve a candidate for the award of an M.Sc. Degree unless the Degree Committee has recommended the award of that degree; before refusing an award so recommended they shall give a representative appointed by the Degree Committee an opportunity of explaining the Committee's reasons for its recommendation.

(e) by amending Regulation 17 to read as follows:

**17.** If after considering the reports of the Examiners the Degree Committee resolves that a candidate's work is not of the requisite standard for any degree, and if the Committee does not recommend that the candidate be allowed to submit a revised thesis, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could not properly be approved for the award of degree, the Registry shall communicate this decision to the candidate.

(4) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Medicine (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 491) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 14 to read as follows:

**14.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all recommendations for the award of the degree. If, after considering the reports of the Examiners on a candidate's thesis and performance in the oral examination, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the candidate's work is of the requisite standard for the degree, showing evidence of significant original contribution to the advancement of the science, art, or history of medicine, its decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(b) by amending Regulation 15 to read as follows:

**15.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners of a thesis, the Degree Committee is of the opinion that a candidate's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree, the Degree Committee may permit the student to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(c) by amending Regulation 16 to read as follows:

**16.** If after considering the reports of the Examiners the Degree Committee resolves that a candidate's work is not of the requisite standard for the degree, and if the Committee does not recommend that the candidate be allowed to submit a revised thesis, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could not properly be approved for the award of the degree, the Registry shall communicate this decision to the candidate.

(5) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Medicine (Special Regulations) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 495) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 15 to read as follows:

**15.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all recommendations for the award of the degree. If, after considering the reports of the Examiners on a candidate's thesis and performance in the oral examination, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the candidate's thesis and performance are of the requisite standard for the degree, its decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(b) by amending Regulation 16 to read as follows:

**16.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners of a thesis, the Degree Committee is of the opinion that a candidate's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree, the Degree Committee may permit the student to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(c) by amending Regulation 17 to read as follows:

**17.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee is of the opinion that a candidate's work is not of the requisite standard for the degree (and if the Committee does not recommend that the candidate be allowed to submit a revised thesis), its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could not properly be approved for the award of degree, the Registry shall communicate this decision to the candidate.

(6) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Science, Master of Letters, and Master of Philosophy by thesis (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 507) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 16 to read as follows:

**16.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all decisions that candidates be approved for the final award of the Ph.D., M.Sc., M.Litt. and the M.Phil. Degree by thesis or that they be allowed to submit revised theses. The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority not to award the M.Phil. Degree by thesis. The General Board shall be the deciding authority not to award the Ph.D., M.Sc. or M.Litt. Degrees and, in the case of candidates for the Ph.D., to award a lower degree.

(b) by amending Regulation 17 to read as follows:

**17.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners on a student's thesis and performance in the oral or other examination, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the student's work is of the requisite standard for the Ph.D. Degree for which he or she is a candidate, its decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(c) by amending Regulation 19 to read as follows:

**19.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee considers that a student's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree for which he or she is a candidate, the Degree Committee may permit the student to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(d) by amending Regulation 20 to read as follows:

**20.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee considers that a student's work is not of the standard requisite for the Ph.D. Degree, but that it is of the standard requisite for the M.Sc. or M.Litt. Degree, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could properly be approved for the award of the lower degree, the Registry shall ask the candidate whether he or she is willing to be approved for the award of the M.Sc. or M.Litt. Degree. The deadline for receipt of the candidate's agreement shall be the last day of the term following the term or vacation in which the decision on her or his candidature was made. If the Registry receives the candidate's agreement by the deadline or the General Board at its discretion decides to accept it after the deadline, the General Board shall approve the candidate for the award of that degree. The Registry shall publish a notice of such approval unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(e) by amending Regulation 21 to read as follows:

**21.** If after considering the reports of the Examiners for the M.Phil. Degree by thesis the Degree Committee resolves that a candidate's work is not of the requisite standard for any degree, and if the Committee does not recommend that the candidate be allowed to submit a revised thesis, the Degree Committee shall communicate its decision to the student. If, after considering the reports of the Examiners for the Ph.D., M.Sc., or M.Litt., the Degree Committee resolves that a candidate's work is not of the requisite standard for any degree, and if the Committee does not recommend that the candidate be allowed to submit a revised thesis, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could not properly be approved for the award of degree, the Registry shall communicate this decision to the candidate.

(7) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (Old Regulations) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 582) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 12 to read as follows:

**12.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all decisions that candidates be approved for the award of the Vet.M.D. or that they be allowed to submit revised theses. If, after considering the reports of the Examiners on a candidate's thesis and performance in the oral examination, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the candidate's work is of the requisite standard for the degree, its decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(b) by amending Regulation 13 to read as follows:

**13.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee is of the opinion that a candidate's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree, the Degree Committee may permit the student to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(c) by amending Regulation 14 to read as follows:

**14.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee is of the opinion that a candidate's work is not of the requisite standard for the degree, and if the Committee does not recommend that the candidate be allowed to submit a revised thesis, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could not properly be approved for the award of the degree, the Registry shall communicate this decision to the candidate.

(8) By amending the Regulations for the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (Revised Regulations) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 584) as follows:

(a) by amending Regulation 11 to read as follows:

**11.** The Degree Committee shall be the deciding authority on all decisions that candidates be approved for the award of the Vet.M.D. If, after considering the reports of the Examiners on a candidate's thesis and performance in the oral examination, the Degree Committee is satisfied that the candidate's work is of the requisite standard for the degree, the Committee's decision shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. The Student Registry shall publish a notice of the candidate's approval for the award of the degree unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

(b) by amending Regulation 12 to read as follows:

**12.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee is of the opinion that a candidate's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree, the Degree Committee may permit the student to submit a revised thesis. The decision of the Degree Committee shall be communicated to the Student Registry, together with the reports of the Examiners. A student shall not be allowed to submit a revised thesis on more than one occasion.

(c) By inserting new Regulation 13 as follows and renumbering all subsequent regulations:

**13.** If, after considering the reports of the Examiners, the Degree Committee is of the opinion that a candidate's thesis is not of the requisite standard for the degree, but that it is of the standard requisite for the M.Sc. Degree, its recommendation shall be communicated to the General Board, together with the reports of the Examiners. If after receiving such communication the Board decides that the candidate could properly be approved for the award of the lower degree, the Registry shall ask the candidate whether he or she is willing to be approved for the award of the M.Sc. Degree. The deadline for receipt of the candidate's agreement shall be the last day of the term following the term or vacation in which the decision on her or his candidature was made. If the Registry receives the candidate's agreement by the deadline or the General Board at its discretion decides to accept it after the deadline, the General Board shall approve the candidate for the award of that degree. The Registry shall publish a notice of such approval unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

## GRACES

### Grace submitted to the Regent House on 24 June 2020

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, 3 July 2020. Exceptionally and given the closure of the Old Schools, any request by members of the Regent House for a ballot or the amendment of this Grace should be made to the Vice-Chancellor by email to [registry@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:registry@admin.cam.ac.uk). Emails should be sent from a personal University account and ideally include the CRSid of the signatory.

**1.** That the University by Order approves and declares valid as from the time they occurred the actions and decisions taken as set out in the Council's Notice dated 22 June 2020 (p. 472), notwithstanding that there may be, in the case of any such action or decision, inconsistency or conflict with Ordinances and General Board Regulations, whether as described in the Notice or otherwise.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registry*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'