

ANNEX

The Council received 106 written responses to the consultation paper. Various respondents have requested that their comments remain confidential. The remaining responses are published below together with the results of the Web poll.

Professor Peter Bayley
Chairman

M P Chalk MA
Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

Council of the School of Arts
and Humanities

When replying please quote:
SAH.0203.30

Registry
The Old Schools
Trinity Lane
Cambridge

18 March 2002

Dear Registry

University Governance

At their meeting on 8 March 2002, the Council of the School of Arts and Humanities considered the Notice concerning University Governance published in *Reporter* upon which comments were invited to reach you by 20 March 2002.

The Council of the School decided to concentrate on those aspects of the Notice that had implications for the School and its Council since it was open to individuals to comment direct to you on other issues, and it was agreed that the following points should be drawn to your attention:-

- The suggested relief to Chairs of the Schools of at least one third of their duties (para 8.3iv) was considered insufficient and that they should receive exactly the same relief as proposed for Pro-Vice-Chancellors, with the same reference to support of their personal research activity (para 5.5).
- The issue of the metamorphosis of Chairs into Deans gave concern and the Council of the School assumed that it was American rather than English Deans that seemed to be envisaged.
- Paragraph 8.3(i) ambiguously implies that the Chairs might in future be responsible for resource allocation within their Schools. It was agreed that it was the Council of the School that should be responsible, as is the present case with resources. It would place the Chairs in an intolerable position to allocate resources without the consent of their Council.
- The relation between the Chairs of the Schools and the University Council introduced the wider debate as to whether the Council should be primarily a gathering of managers or an elected body representative of the Regent House to whom the managers of the University are responsible. But since the Chairs are indeed both managers of substantial part of the University's daily business and, in a special way, representatives of the life of the Faculties, it was agreed that they should be "in attendance" at the University Council.

Yours sincerely

M P Chalk (Miss)

SCHOOL OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

CONSULTATION ON GOVERNANCE

- A. The Council recognises the need for changes in governance and broadly welcomes the proposals in the consultation document. Indeed, we consider the proposals to be relatively conservative. Specifically:-
1. We strongly support the widening of the membership of Regent House to include the broad academic community. We think future consideration should be given to the inclusion of non-academic staff.
 2. We support the proposal for increasing the number of signatures required to amend or challenge a grace.
 3. We welcome the proposal that the Vice-Chancellor should be recognised as the principal academic and administrative officer of the University. We support the appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors to deputise for the Vice-Chancellor, although we should appreciate more details of their roles.
 4. We strongly support the modified constitution of University Council and the inclusion of external members.

B. Concerns:

1. The proposed enhancement of the position of Chairmen of Schools, particularly in the matter of resource allocation, implies that senior, altruistic figures can be found from within the School. It is not clear that this will be possible, particularly given the expanding level of committee attendance and administration involved. For example, it is unlikely that a head of a department would take on the role.

The School of Biology is a large and complex constituency which, in the view of the CSBS, requires leadership by a full-time 'Dean of Biology'. The status and conditions of employment of such a post should be sufficient to attract eminent external candidates.

2. We are not certain of the need to retain the General Board. The G.B. committee acts largely as a coordinating body for its sub-committees and most of its members will also be members of Council. It is not clear why sub-committees should not report directly to Council. This should be considered.

A C Minson
19 March 2002

K.B. Pretty, M.A., Ph.D.
Chairman

C.C. Hewetson, M.A.
Secretary



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

Council of the School of the
Humanities & Social Sciences

25 March 2002

Dr T Mead
Registrary
The Old Schools
Cambridge

Dear Dr Mead

CSHSS meeting 8 March 2002: Consultation on University Governance

At the meeting of the Council of the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences held on 8 March 2002 the consultation paper on University Governance was considered. Discussion followed a seminar attended by 38 people mainly from the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences, which was chaired by Dr Pretty and led by Professor Gordon Johnson and Professor Malcolm Grant, in Mill Lane Lecture Rooms on Thursday 28 February.

In discussion the Council gave particular consideration to the proposals outlined in Section 8 of the consultation paper which concerned the General Board and the Chairs of the Councils of the Schools. The Council wished me to bring the following points to your attention:-

- (1) The Council of the School agreed that it was of central importance to the university that academics should continue to be in key positions in the governance of the university. While it was important to have a strong administrative arm within the university, it was also important to maintain the perspective that was supplied by academic staff in the decision making process.
- (2) The Council of the School was particularly interested in the further development of the proposals about the role and responsibilities of the Chairs of the Schools alluded to in paragraph 8.2.
- (3) It was agreed that it was important that the Chairs (or Deans) of the Councils of the Schools should sit on the General Board *ex officio* and it was also agreed that they should attend the Council, although not necessarily as voting members. The point had been made at the seminar by two members of the School that the proposed membership of the Council was too large.

22, Trumpington Street
Cambridge
CB2 1QA

Telephone: 01223 338161/766238
Fax: 01223 766221
Email: cch1000@cam.ac.uk

- (4) The Council of the School and individual members speaking at the seminar were also anxious that proposals about governance should make more explicit the nature of the relationship, in terms of authority and responsibility, of the Faculties and Departments and the Schools. This was particularly relevant in the context of the current discussions about the proposed Resource Allocation Model.
- (5) The Council of the School also hoped that equal opportunities principles would be adhered to in making elections to the senior positions proposed.

We hope that these comments will be helpful when you report on the consultation paper next term.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Celia C. Hewetson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line at the end.

Celia C Hewetson
Secretary
Council of the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor A D Cliff FBA *Chairman*
Dr. A T Winter *Secretary*



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

The Registry
The Old Schools

School of the Physical Sciences

19th March 2002

Governance Consultation

Agreed response by the Council of the School for the Physical Sciences

Dear Tim,

CSPS would first like to thank members of the Joint Committee on Governance for the very considerable effort they have devoted to preparing the consultation paper. In particular we are grateful to Professor Grant and Dr Johnson for having made themselves available to members of the School at a public meeting. We consider this unusual method of consultation to be consistent with the great weight and importance of the matters which are under discussion.

1. CSPS considered explicitly whether it is advisable to engage up to eleven senior and active academics in the Governance of the University, occupying up to two thirds of the time of each. We consider that this is a reasonable level of engagement provided the engagement is genuine. We think it is very important for active academics to be closely involved in the University's governance, alongside professional, full-time administrators. We consider that it is important to facilitate their return to full-time academic work (teaching and research) at the end of their periods of office, and so we support the suggestions which have been made for administrative and research support. Special study leave at the end of the term of office would be an additional arrangement which it would be sensible to offer.
2. Many members of CSPS consider that the mode of interaction among the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, and the Chairs of Schools needs to be articulated in much more detail before the proposal can be assessed. We see the starting point as being the present arrangements for the Chairs of the major committees (Personnel, Finance, etc.), but we would like to see much more detail about the structure and the roles proposed for individuals.
3. We note that the standard term of office for the Chair of the Council of the School of Physical Sciences is four years (two years renewable). We suggest that it is reasonable to expect something similar from the Pro-Vice-Chancellors. We consider it essential that the appointments should be for fixed terms, even if

19 Trumpington Street,
Cambridge CB2 1QA

Telephone: Int + 44 1223 334199
Fax: Int + 44 1223 764301
E-mail: aw21@cam.ac.uk

appointments renewable, therefore that "objective grounds" will need to be established in the context of the recent Fixed Term Working consultation.

4. We consider it essential that all six Councils of Schools should be formally represented on the University Council. Our own representative might well be our Chairperson who is not appointed but elected by the members of CSPS from among all members of the School. Members of the CSPS are themselves elected either by the Faculty Boards or during the process of becoming Heads of Department. We consider this to be an entirely proper way of achieving elected representation for members of the School, given that further members of the Council will be elected directly by the Regent House. We consider the proposed size and balance of the Council to be appropriate.
5. We are concerned, however, at the increased load which our Chairperson might be asked to carry. Therefore we suggest as an alternative to *ex-officio* membership that the Council of each School should be allowed to elect one person to the General Board and one to the Council. One person might combine both appointments. For our own School we believe that the people representing us at the Council and at the General Board ought to have current experience and responsibility of management at a high level within the University.
6. CSPS welcome the proposal that University Council be chaired by a person external to the University, and we understand that it is obligatory under HEFCE's rules for the Chair of the Audit Committee to be both external and a member of Council.
7. CSPS welcome very much the closer involvement of the Assistant Staff and Contract Research Staff in the governance of the University, and the continued involvement of students.
8. CSPS welcome the proposals for making explicit the function and accountability of the Vice-Chancellor.
9. CSPS welcome the proposals for the Chairs of Councils of Schools, although in our own case we expect that relief of one-third f.t.e. will be adequate, that is we do not expect to request relief for more than a third. The reason for this is that we attach great importance to our Chairperson maintaining an active academic profile.
10. CSPS support the proposal to increase to 50 (better still 100) the number of members of the Regent House required to call for a ballot. We suggest that an electronic method for gathering signatures could be devised so as to make the mechanics of the process easier in compensation for the increased number.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Bluff
Chair, CSPS

Professor Steve Young
Chairman of the Council of the School

Dr S.T. Lam
Secretary of the School of Technology

The Registry,
The Old Schools
Trinity Lane



19 March, 2002

Dear Tim,

Consultation paper on Governance

I am writing on behalf of the Council of the School of Technology in response to the consultation paper on Governance.

At the meeting on 8 March 2002, the Council of the School of Technology discussed this far-reaching consultation paper. The Council of the School of Technology is supportive of the development of the role of the Chairmen of the Councils of the Schools. Putting the Chairmen on the Council is considered a positive move as then the people responsible for carrying out policy would be involved in making policy; though obviously this would increase the workload of the Chairmen. The Council of the School was also of the opinion that an external Chairman of the Council would be a positive step forward.

The Council of the School agreed not to comment on issues not of such direct reference to the School, for example, the membership of the Regent House and the appointment method and term of the proposed Pro-Vice-Chancellors.

I hope you find these comments constructive.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shui".

Shui T. Lam

cc. The Council of the School of Technology

School of Technology
The Old Press Site
Silver Street
Cambridge CB3 9EW

Telephone: 01223 332795
Fax: 01223 332994
E-mail: stl10@cam.ac.uk



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
FACULTY OF ARCHAEOLOGY
AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Downing Street
Cambridge
CB2 3DZ

Dr Kate Pretty, Chair, Faculty Board

Mr Howarth Penny, BA, Secretary, Faculty Board

Telephone: (01223) 333500
(01223) 339001
Fax: (01223) 333503
E-mail: kp10002@cam.ac.uk
hip20@hermes.cam.ac.uk

The Registry
The Old Schools
Trinity Lane
Cambridge

14 March 2002

Dear Registry,

The Faculty Board of Archaeology and Anthropology discussed the consultation paper on Governance at their meeting of the 4th March 2002. The Faculty Board decided that they would restrict their points to matters directly concerning the Faculty as an Institution within the University.

The Board were principally concerned with the relationship between the Chairs of the Schools and the Central Bodies and agreed with Dr Meek's comments at the open consultation meeting for the School on the 28th of February, that a second document detailing the relationship between the School, its Chair and the Faculty would be needed as soon as there was some definition of the role of the Chair. A matter that they would like discussed at that stage would be expansion of membership of the Council of the School. They felt that the roles and duties of each School Chair should be equal rather than having the possibility of variance between the Chairs.

There was some discussion of the relationship between the Administration and the Executive. That is, a feeling that further definition needed to be made between those who governed and those who offered a service within the system which is a further matter picked up in the open consultation meeting.

Although the Board did not offer any objection to the proposal that fifty signatories would be needed in a request for a ballot, they were clear that they would resist and diminution in the involvement of the Regent House in any reorganisation of the University's governance.

Yours sincerely,

Howarth Penny
Secretary, Faculty Board



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE AND HISTORY OF ART

1 SCROOPE TERRACE, CAMBRIDGE CB2 1PX

TELEPHONE 01223 332951

FAX 01223 332960

Dr T J Mead
Registrary
The Old Schools

14 March 2002

FB 1403.01

Dear Dr Mead,

Consultation Paper on University Governance (4 February 2002)

The Faculty Board of Architecture and History of Art at its meeting on 5 March 2002 discussed the Consultation Paper on University Governance (4 February 2002). It expressed a view that the Consultation, whilst welcome, is being conducted without regard to the other fundamental developments in the running of the University which are anticipated in the short term.

The consequence of the introduction of a Resource Allocation Model will be that the Schools have a greater degree of autonomy. The expansion of the remit of the Councils of the Schools and of their respective Chairs is taken for granted rather than explored in the context of the proposed new framework for the governance of the University. The composition and pivotal role of the Planning and Resources Committee in this context also merits examination.

The Faculty Board is concerned that the activities of the Councils of the Schools should be regulated in the interests of the University as a body. It would be a missed opportunity if the current moves to modify and modernise the governance of the University were to frustrate the development of policy for the University as a whole and to open up the way to even more conflicts of interest than currently exist within it. The likely consequences of the introduction of the RAM for the balance of disciplines across the University illustrates the concerns of the Arts and Humanities Faculties in particular.

The Faculty Board also wishes to raise the issue (not addressed in the Consultation Paper) of the need to develop an authoritative Central Administration in order to provide support for the proposed new system of governance.

The meeting went on to discuss the remit of the Pro-Vice Chancellors, which it felt needed to be clarified, and the role of the proposed external members of Council, which should be explored in more depth. The Faculty Board agreed that it is desirable to secure the involvement of a representative range of employees of the University in its governance. However, it cautioned that

extending membership of the Regent House might lead to a predominance of certain subject areas and interests to the detriment of others.

We hope that the views of the Faculty Board will be taken into consideration.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Judith Drinkwater', with a horizontal line underneath it.

Judith Drinkwater
Secretary of the Faculty Board

cc. Professor D. J. Howard
Professor C.A. Short
Dr N. Bullock

Dear Tim,

The Faculty Board of Classics considered the Consultation paper at their meeting on 7 March 2002. The Board supported the proposals, in principle, but asked me to pass on the following comments:

- (a) The inclusion of the Chairs of the Schools on the Council might be viewed as a failure to keep separate the executive and non-executive (monitoring) functions,
- (b) The reduction in the representation from Heads of House does not reflect the distinctive collegiate nature of the University. This is particularly important to the Faculty in view of its close links with the Colleges.
- (c) The increase in the number of members in the Regent House required to call a ballot etc. reflects the proposed increase in the membership of the Regent House. However, the introduction of new categories of staff will not necessarily make it easier for a ballot to be called. Requiring only 10 members, as now, has meant that a very small group can regularly impede the process of a Grace. However, it may be that increasing the number to 50 is excessive and that a figure somewhere between the two would be best.

Best wishes

Tamsin

.....
Tamsin James
Administrative Officer/Secretary of the Faculty Board
University of Cambridge
Faculty of Classics
Sidgwick Site
Cambridge
CB3 9DA

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE SCHOOL OF CLINICAL MEDICINE**COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY - CONSULTATION ON GOVERNANCE -
NOTICE IN REPORTER, 6 FEBRUARY 2002**

1. The Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine wish to record their appreciation of the way in which the consultation has been conducted and they hope this will create a model for the future. Communication, and communication in the right form, remains a major issue and this applies equally within the Schools, Faculties and Departments. Improvements could do much to enhance active discussion ahead of formal proposals being made and fostering of routes for issues to be raised from the bottom up.

2. The paper refers throughout to the Councils of the Schools. It is to be noted that actions are in hand to create a new Council for the Clinical School, thereby putting it on an equal footing with the Councils of the School of the Biological Sciences, Technology, Physical Sciences, Arts and Humanities, and Humanities and Social Sciences. The consultation paper has been reviewed, therefore, in that context.

3. The Vice-Chancellorship and Pro-Vice-Chancellors (para 5)

The need to define the role of, and therefore the support needed for, the Vice-Chancellorship is acknowledged. However, the proposals for up to 5 Pro-Vice-Chancellors in the context of the recent creation of the posts of Academic Secretary, Administrative Secretary, Directors of services, revision of the roles of Secretary General and Treasurer, and the proposals concerning the roles of Chairs of Councils of Schools require further discussion to elucidate the roles, boundaries and working methods.

4. The Council and the General Board (paras 6 and 7)

The recognition of the need to clarify the respective responsibilities and accountability of the Council and General Board is welcomed. With regard to membership, it is timely to enlarge the Council by adding new constituencies and the proposals are supported. It will have to be recognised that such a large body will need the support of effective committees. It is essential that the work done by, and proposed for, these bodies including the General Board and by their current joint or other supporting committees is analysed and steps taken to effect the optimum supporting committee structure, which may mean the loss of long-standing bodies. Otherwise, inter alia, membership of these important bodies will not be attractive.

The Faculty Board support the involvement of external members on Council.

5. The General Board and the Chairs of the Councils of the Schools (para 8)

The status of the post of Regius Professor of Physic as academic head of the Clinical School will be unchanged by the proposed creation of a Council for this School.

The draft Report on the latter proposes that the Regius shall be Chairman of the Council *ex officio* and normally the person appointed by the Council of School to serve on the General Board under the present arrangements. However, under the governance proposals, it is proposed that Chairmen shall be *ex officio* members of the General Board and of Council and be appointed to serve as Chairmen for a fixed-term, renewable once. It is essential, therefore, to ensure the special provisions for the Regius are not affected by the new proposals, ie head of School and *ex officio or normally* Chairman of the School Council.

The proposals make clear that the system of Deans of Schools or Faculties does not exist in the Cambridge context but that the role of Chairs of the Councils is evolving into something similar. The proposals anticipate that staff will need to be relieved of at least 1/3rd of their University duties, the proportion varying from School to School. It is also implied that the period of appointment can be varied from School to School which seems satisfactory.

The provisions should allow for a School to define the role of the Chairman as also embracing the concept of the role of Dean in the wider context.

In the case of the role of Regius, it should be recorded that a role is fulfilled externally on behalf of the University in representing Medicine in its widest sense.

From what was said at the seminar on 14 March by Professor Grant, it will be open to each School to determine the optimum arrangements for that School.

A **major concern** generally, however, is the already expanding demands on the Chairmen and the new demands in prospect. There are serious concerns about recruiting to these roles which need to be discussed specifically.

6. Regent House (para 9)

The Faculty Board support fully the proposals for extending membership of the Regent House and suggest that extending this to all members of the University should be considered in due course. The Board also welcome the removal of the quota of Associate Lectureship available to the Clinical School implied by the extension of membership to other categories of staff.

Clinical School
19 March 2002
compref:staf; univgovernance1

University of Cambridge
FACULTY BOARD OF CLINICAL VETERINARY MEDICINE

Telephone: (01223) 337632
Secretary: (01223) 337694
Fax: (01223) 337671
E Mail: jht1000@cam.ac.uk



DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL VETERINARY MEDICINE
MADINGLEY ROAD
CAMBRIDGE
CB3 0ES

Chairman: Professor R W Carrell
Secretary: Mr J H Tossell

JHT/RD

25 March 2002

Dr T J Mead
Registrary
The Old Schools

Dear Dr Mead

Consultation Paper on Governance

I am sorry that this response to the above is a little late. The Faculty Board of Clinical Veterinary Medicine supports strongly the broad thrust for change outlined in the consultation paper and believes that the proposals will provide a necessary strengthening to the governance of the University. While welcoming the proposals the Faculty Board hopes to see before long detailed proposals for the roles to be undertaken by the expanded team of Pro-Vice-Chancellors and in particular how they will interact with the enhanced roles to be undertaken by the Chairmen of the Councils of the Schools.

The Faculty Board has some concerns about how these enhanced arrangements will be funded given the arrangements for "top-slicing" and "strategic reallocation" in the proposed RAM. There are concerns that the funding required will be found at the expense of the Councils of the Schools at a time when funding available is to be squeezed even harder than hitherto.

Finally, the Faculty Board expressed concern that although putting things right at the Centre for governance, administration and accountability there is also a pressing need to consider the position of administration at Department/Institution level where the ever increasing press of requirements bears heavily on existing administrative staff. There is not a little envy at "the coalface" for the recent increases in staff at the Centre.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J H Tossell".

J H Tossell

Cc: Professor L B Jeffcott

The Registry
Registry Division
The Old Schools



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

**Faculty of Economics
and Politics**

When replying please quote:

Reference here

14 March 2002

Dear Registry

The Faculty Board of Economics and Politics has received and considered the letter from the Vice-Chancellor dated 5 February 2002 concerning University Governance and also the consultation paper. On the whole the Faculty Board welcome the proposals. They appreciate particularly the proposals to improve the interaction between academics, administrators and external advisers.

The Board recognise the chronic difficulties in managing the link between academics and administrative staff. On the one hand, they recognise the frustrations for over-worked administrators who have to implement unwelcome external demands and are often subjected to meddling and sniping by academics who then tend to shirk responsibility for management. On the other, they are concerned when, as with the recent appraisal proposals, the administration gets out of step with the needs of Faculties and Departments. Although some were concerned about encroaching on the time of senior academics, many of the Board believes that the proposal to extend the role of Pro Vice Chancellors, active academics who take responsibility for an area of administration or policy development, is a very constructive response which would help coordinate administrative and academic activities. They also hope the University will go rather further than the present proposals suggest, and assign PVCs to particular areas (e.g. personnel, finance) on a regular basis, not just at the discretion of the VC. They also see a role for ad hoc PVCs to tackle particular issues as they arise just as (without the PVC title or support) Dr Reid tackled College Fees and Dr Johnson governance, both with considerable success). It should be possible to achieve this with around five PVCs.

The Board are divided on the desirability of external members in key voting positions on the Council. Everyone welcomes the very positive contribution which outsiders make to the University (e.g. on departmental advisory committees, at the Careers Service, on the University Court, at the Commonwealth Trust, and on College Investment Committees), and would like to see this extended, especially on the Audit Committee. But while some Board members welcome the change to having externals as members and even chairmen of committees controlling academic policy, others, while

Austin Robinson Building
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge CD3 9DD
UK

Telephone: 01223 330153
Fax: 01223 335475
E-mail: ruth.fenton@econ.cam.ac.uk

acknowledging that this could sometimes work to our advantage, are anxious about the risks of handing power to people whose experience is of very different organisations. They remember many examples where the abrupt transition between spheres has been unhappy. The majority of the Board favoured the co-option of outsiders. This would give the Council the opportunity to experiment with externals, and the freedom to choose an outsider as chairman (in the same way as Colleges can opt for a Master from outside) - but it would not at this stage bind the University for ever to this transfer of control.

The Board are particularly anxious that the selection of PVCs and of external Council members should be independent of the Vice Chancellor. They are concerned about the possibilities of excessive centralisation of power, or the perception of such concentration.

The Board noted the proposal that the Statutes be amended so that, with a reasonable provision for a qualifying period of service, academic staff such as those who are employed on unestablished contracts would qualify for membership. The Board noted that if such a change were adopted, the size of the Regent House would significantly increase and that it would be sensible to increase the minimum number of Regent House members required to call a ballot. The Board agreed that in the interests of smaller Faculties and Departments, it preferred to increase the minimum just to 25.

The Board look forward to contributing to the next phase of governance reform, focussing on the relations between Faculty Boards, their Chairs, Councils of the Schools, and their Chairs. They hope this can be initiated before the RAM is fully implemented.

Yours sincerely



Professor R.E. Rowthorn
Chairman of the Faculty Board

Board
letters\universitygovernance

FACULTY OF ENGLISH

Response to the Consultation Paper on University Governance

At its meeting of 14 March, the Faculty Board of English considered the Consultation Paper on Governance. The Board noted that individual and collective views were being sought and had circulated the document to members of the Faculty to invite individual responses. The following response from the Faculty Board is independent of the views of any individual response from a member of the Faculty.

1. The main issues considered were: the timing of the review; the perceived need for change; the role of the review in respect of the University's strategic plan and other HEFCE requirements; the juxtaposition of a review of governance and the introduction of the RAM; the inclusion of external members of Council and the appointment of an external Chair of Council; the proposed increase in the number of Pro Vice-Chancellors; the role and appointment of Chairs of Schools and the role of the Schools more generally; the lack of any mention of the role of Faculties and Departments; the widening of membership of the Regent House and increase in the number of signatories required to challenge a Grace; and the desire to maintain a balance between effective government and democratic participation in decision making. Detailed comments on these issues are given below.

2. There are, however, two overarching comments: firstly, the language used in the document suggests that it is not so much a consultation document as a statement of decisions made by the review committee; secondly, the length of time for consultation, and the manner of it, is such that there is no time or forum for effective debate, and for the formulation of alternative solutions. If the proposed changes are being brought about in response to government pressure, following the problems of CAPSA, and if the timetable has been imposed by external bodies, then this should be made clear at the outset. If there are no such constraints, then due time should be given to allow for a full debate and the consideration of other schemes for reform.

Response of the Faculty Board to issues listed in paragraph 1.

- (i) Timing of the Review. The review of governance is taking place at the same time as the 'bedding down' of the CAPSA system, and debates over the possible implementation of a RAM. While it is clear that the three issues are linked, the experience of CAPSA might suggest that the University does not have the capacity, at present, to deal with more than one major change at a time. If the introduction of RAM and the proposed changes in governance were considered in tandem, as part of one strategic planning exercise, implementation of both schemes would be more effective. A clear statement of the strategic need or strategic direction of the University in relation to either RAM or changes in Governance would be helpful.
- (ii) Perceived need for change. To re-state earlier comments/questions: in what ways does our present system of governance not work; why does it not work; from which direction has the impetus for change come; how radical does that change need to be; what sort of structure does the University need to be a well-managed academic democracy in the 21st century; how have other universities dealt with similar issues; what is the feedback at University and departmental level of similar changes in Oxford and other Russell Group

- universities? How will the proposed changes deal with the present problems of maintaining freedom of discussion while curtailing the abuse of this freedom?
- (iii) The inclusion of external members on Council. The Faculty Board was concerned that this proposal should not lead to inappropriate appointments, made without due consultation, of those without knowledge and appreciation of the overriding importance of maintaining academic excellence.
 - (iv) External chair of Council. How would names of possible Chairs emerge; how would the appointment be made; what would be the statutory relationship of an external chair to the Council; what, if any, role would the Chair play in respect of funding bodies and in political debates concerning the future funding or strategic direction of the University.
 - (v) Proposed increase in the number of Pro Vice-Chancellors. What will their functions be; how will they be appointed; what are the proposed sources of funding for their remuneration; what arrangements will be made for replacement teaching and administration; what effect will their appointment have on their department's research profile?
 - (vi) Role and Appointment of Chairs of Schools. This proposal has important consequences for the functioning and funding of faculties and departments across the University. It is probably the most important proposal in the document, and it would be helpful if there was clear indication of the powers to be given to appointed Chairs, and for the funding of their appointments and for their replacements at faculty and departmental level.
 - (vii) RAM. There is no discussion of the role of Chairs of the Schools in relation to the proposed RAM; the consultation on governance and the consultation on RAM should be part of the same strategic exercise.
 - (viii) Faculties and Departments. Faculties and Departments manage research and teaching (the *raison d'être* of the University); they are the point of direction and intellectual exchange for the majority of members of the University; they are the first and most important unit of governance in terms of academic excellence, expenditure and income, prestige and innovation, yet the document does not seem to recognise their role and importance.
 - (ix) Widening of Membership of Regent House. The increase in membership of the Regent House will produce a damaging imbalance in numbers between the Arts and Sciences.
 - (x) Number of Signatories Required. Clearly there is a need to deal with problems in the present system, but it is not clear that an increase in the number of signatories is the way to do so. In addition, the increased requirement seems out of proportion to the proposed increase in the size of Regent House.
 - (xi) Membership of the Committees. The Board noted that there are no female members on the Committees to consider governance.

While the Faculty accepts that there may be need for change in some areas, it is concerned that the solutions proposed by this document may not be effective. It hopes that there will be more time for the consideration of alternative models, drafted following due consultation.

15 March 2002

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
FACULTY OF HISTORY



Professor M J Daunton
Chairman
email: mjd42@cam.ac.uk

West Road
Cambridge
CB3 9EF
Tel: (+44) 01223 335307
Fax: (+44) 01223 335968
<http://www.hist.cam.ac.uk/>

14 March 2002

Memorandum

To: The Registry
c.c. Ms C C Hewetson, School of Humanities
Mr J G Evans

From: Professor M J Daunton

Response to the Consultation Paper on Governance

The Faculty Board of History, at its meeting on the 12 March 2002, considered the Consultation Paper on Governance.

It noted that both individual and collective institutional views were sought and, to this end, the Chairman had consulted all members of the Faculty in advance of the Board seeking contributions to the collective view, without in any way impinging on the ability of members of the Faculty to respond individually.

The main issues discussed were: the inclusion of external members on the Council; the proposed increase in the number of Pro-Vice Chancellors; the role and appointment of the Chairs of the Schools; the widening of the membership of the Regent House and increase in the number of signatories required to challenge a Grace; and the desire to maintain a balance between effectiveness and democracy.

The Board were particularly concerned about the following matters:

1. the case for change has not been fully addressed in the proposals. Though CAPSA is cited as an example of how we have got it wrong in the past it is not clear how the proposed changes would ensure that such a mistake is avoided in the future; there are other reasons for ineffectiveness in the operation of the University which are not addressed in this paper - for example, democracy is abused in our current procedure for discussions;
2. the costs of the proposed changes, and how they would be met, do not appear to have been considered. This is particularly important in view of the Resource Allocation Model which does not specify clearly how the costs of central administration will be 'capped';
3. the addition of large numbers of contract researchers to the Regent House, though in some ways laudable, could potentially upset the balance of the university, for many such researchers are not Fellows of colleges; indeed, the relationship between colleges and the University is not adequately addressed, and this is a matter of considerable concern for the Humanities and Social Sciences;
4. it could well be that external non-academic members would make a valuable contribution to the Council, especially if selected where particular expertise is lacking, and that an external chair would offer benefits for the Vice Chancellor and the University as a whole, but, again,

- the case for these changes had not been made clearly and the type of expertise and background of external members has not been specified; the choice might affect the balance of the university;
5. the proposed size of the Council brings into question its potential effectiveness;
 6. the document does not specify clearly the powers and mode of appointment of Chairs and Councils of Schools - these Chairs and Councils will have considerably more power within the proposed RAM, and the Governance paper needs to be considered in association with the discussions of the RAM.

Generally the Faculty Board welcomes the initiative and sees it as a positive start, but feels that it needs further justification. The close connection with the other major consultation currently in progress, on the subject of the Resource Allocation Model, should be recognised and made explicit. There is a need for these two changes to progress together mindful of each other as part of a single strategic decision.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. J. Dent', is positioned in the lower right quadrant of the page.

Professor J Beatson QC, FBA
Rouse Ball Professor of English Law
Chairman, Faculty Board of Law

Mr T Mead
The Registry
University Offices
The Old Schools
Trinity Lane
Cambridge
CB2 1TN



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

Faculty of Law

15 March 2002

Dear Tim

The Faculty Board of Law considered the consultation paper on University Governance at its meeting last week. It asked me to offer the following comments on the paper.

First, and fundamentally, the paper appears to be unclear as to whom executive functions are to be given. In particular, there is a conflict between what is proposed as the responsibilities of the Council and what is proposed as the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor. A governance structure with lack of clarity on this fundamental point is, in the Board's view, unsatisfactory.

Secondly, the Board does not support the proposal to enlarge the membership of the Regent House. The comment was made that the proposal to do so is a classic example of 'divide and rule'.

Thirdly, while the presence of external members on the Council was thought to be a good thing, members of the Board, in particular those with experience of Corporate Governance structures, considered that the key question of how such external members were to be identified and appointed was left open. It is important for there to be an open mechanism for appointment so that appointments are not and are not seen to be too closely associated with those who are in positions of executive responsibility within the University.

There was support for the proposals about the allocation of pro-Vice-Chancellors to defined areas. The Board considered that it was a good idea to have senior academic input of this sort. It also considered that it would be an advantage for the Chairs of Schools to be full members of Council provided that they had the resources (support and freedom from other duties) to function effectively in what is bound to be an

Faculty of Law
10 West Road
Cambridge CB3 9DZ

St John's College
Cambridge CB2 1TP

Telephone: 01223 330036
Fax: 01223 330055
E-mail: J.Beatson@law.cam.ac.uk

onerous job. Some concern was expressed about the way Chairs of Schools are currently selected. The view was expressed that if Chairs of Schools were to be given much greater power there should be a more democratic method of selecting them.

Finally, although not directly related to the governance proposal, the Board considered that it was vital for the academics (be they members of Council, the General Board, Chairs of Schools, or pro-Vice-Chancellors) to be well supported by an efficient civil service. It considered that it is important to make it attractive for academics to serve on central bodies. This involves the relevant committees being well supported, not over-loaded, and attractions, perhaps in the form of additional sabbatical leave for those who give up time to serve the University in this way.

In conclusion, while there are a number of positive features in the consultation paper, the Faculty Board considered that it read like a compromise document and that a system based on it would have serious flaws.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gaur Beaton".



From the Master: Dr Alan Munro
THE MASTER'S LODGE, CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE CB2 3BU

The Registry
Registry Division
The Old Schools
Cambridge

18 March 2002

Dear Registry,

The Management Studies Syndicate has considered the University Consultation Paper on Governance and wishes to comment as follows.

The Syndicate expressed support in principle for the proposed changes to the governance of the University. Members agreed that reform would be beneficial, particularly if it resulted in more efficient and speedy decision-making. Support was also given to the proposals to extend the membership of the Regent House, in particular to include contract research staff.

The proposal that the position of the Chairs of the Councils of the Schools should be reviewed was welcomed. However, the Syndicate felt that, since Chairmanship of the Council of a School was likely to be a full-time job, departments should be offered a 100% replacement for any member of staff who was appointed as Chair of the Council of one of the Schools.

I would be grateful if these points could be brought to the attention of the Joint Committee on Governance.

Yours sincerely,

A.J. Munro
Chair, Management Studies Syndicate

Subject: Governance

Dear Vice-Chancellor

The Faculty Board of Oriental Studies discussed the proposed scheme for University Governance at their meeting of 12 February 2002. They made several observations, which are of course preliminary. Individuals have also been encouraged to make their own representations.

In general they welcomed the proposed changes, especially from the point of view of clarity and simplification. However, there were some areas where mixed feelings also emerged. One of these was the proposal to widen membership of the Regent House. This was welcome from the point of view of democracy, but concern was expressed whether in practice it would simply increase the preponderance of scientists among its membership. This might not be intentional, but it could still be a cause for unease.

Another uncertain area was the relationship between the General Board and the proposed Pro-Vice Chancellor for academic affairs; here it was felt that more definition would be required.

There was also concern about the exact role of the Chairmen of the Schools. In practice, such officers could soon cease to be *primi inter pares*, and start to become managerial figures. This was not seen to be an unmixed blessing.

Finally, the question was raised about the costing of the various teaching replacements for such officers, and the implications for the budgets of the individual Schools. This was felt to be particularly serious in view of the proposed RAM model, which, if adopted, could well prove disastrous for the Arts in Cambridge.

As we said, these observations are preliminary, but it was still felt worthwhile to air them at this stage.

Yours sincerely

John Ray

Chairman, Faculty board of Oriental Studies

The Registry
University Offices
The Old Schools
Cambridge
CB2 1TN



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

**Faculty of Social and
Political Sciences**

20 March 2002

Dear Dr Mead

University Governance: A Consultation Paper

Thank you for giving the SPS Faculty Board the opportunity to comment on the above consultation paper published in *the Reporter* dated 6 February 2002.

I enclose a response which has been circulated to and has been approved by the members of the SPS Faculty Board, with the exception of Dr David Good who is a member of the Joint Committee on Governance.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Barber".

John Barber
Chair of the Faculty Board

Free School Lane
Cambridge CB2 3RQ
Office: 01223 334520
Fax: 01223 334550
E-mail: sps-admin@lists.cam.ac.uk

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences: Response to the Consultation Paper on University Governance

The Faculty Board agrees that this is an appropriate moment for the University to think hard about how it governs itself and to take appropriate steps to overhaul its decision making structures. Too much has happened over the past decade, both within the University and in the outside world, for us to take for granted that academic self-governance can be effectively realised within the existing constitutional framework. We should be clear as to where executive responsibility lies and we should have confidence that those who discharge any aspect of that responsibility can be held accountable. We must also be clear, however, that in moving from one constitutional structure to another we understand just what the argument is for each particular change, and, as far as it is possible to do so, the general consequences of such changes when taken together.

The proposals in the consultation paper are, at least in part, presented as a response to the problems that emerged during the introduction of CAPSA. (3.1 and 3.4) However, the paper does not explain just how the CAPSA debacle would have been avoided if the governance structure proposed had been in place. If, as was suggested at the seminar for the Council of the Humanities and Social Sciences on governance, there is no reason to believe that it would have been, then what is the case for believing that CAPSA makes such changes desirable? The absence of any attempt to address these proposals to an analysis of the specific problems of governance in the University over the past decade can only create scepticism as to just what the rationale for the proposals is.

The grounds for increasing the power of the Chairs of the Council of the Schools are also unclear in the consultation document. Paragraph 8.2 observes that since we are 'steadily evolving' towards a 'system of deans' and that this process will be enhanced by the implementation of the proposals, we should 'further develop' this development. Again, the consultation paper does not explain why a system of deans would be a good thing, or justify the existing evolution towards them, or show why giving the Chairs of the Councils of the School more powers would improve academic self-governance. More particularly, the paper offers no arguments as to why the Chairs should sit on both the Council and the General Board when, the Vice-Chancellor excepted, these bodies are presently constituted by different memberships.

Viewed from the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, the general consequences of some of the proposals in the consultation document are dismaying. The Chairs of the Council of the Schools would become very powerful individuals, especially if and when RAM is implemented. They would be the major players in determining the distribution of funds within each School and they would be represented in the General Board and the Council. In any school, it is difficult to see how these responsibilities would be compatible with the Chairs retaining up to two-thirds of their University duties. (8.3 iv) The incentives for them to opt out of ever more university duties and become professional 'deans' would certainly grow over time. The more they did so, the more the Chairs would become divorced from the academic activities of Faculties, and the more power would have escaped academic control. In the inevitable horse-trading that would ensue between them, the two councils for the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences would in be a permanent minority.

The political weakness of the Faculties in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences would be compounded if membership of the Regent House were to be extended to research staff on unestablished contracts given the massively disproportionate numbers of such individuals employed on the Science side of the University. The consequences of this would be particularly pernicious in elections to the restructured Council. If six members of the Regent House were to be elected from a constituency of which half are unestablished research staff predominantly from the sciences, and if, as would be likely, candidates appeal to sectional constituencies, the chances of a UTO from the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences being successful would be slight. Meanwhile, in an institution in which academic self-government is supposed to retain its importance (4.1.(i)), there would be three students and three members of the assistant staff on the Council. There may be considerable merit in the claim that those on unestablished contracts who have worked within the University for a long-period of time should be treated as equals with established with members of the academic staff on matters of University policy. But such an argument about fairness on one aspect of the franchise of the Regent House cannot be accepted without considering other arbitrary injustices that are created in so doing.

All of this might be less worrying in circumstances in which RAM, with its serious and permanently adverse consequences for the Councils of the Arts and Humanities and the Humanities and Social Science, was not also under discussion. Taking the proposals on University Governance and RAM together, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Arts Faculties within the University are under grave medium- to long-term threat. In these circumstances, to amend the Statutes so that the number of members of the Regent House required to call a ballot on a Grace, or for an amendment to a Grace, or for a request for an Discussion is increased to 50 would remove one of the few remaining safeguards that protect smaller and minority interests in the University.

Professor W B R Lickorish ScD
Head of Department

14 March 2002

The Registry
Registry Division
The Old Schools
Trinity Lane
Cambridge CB2 1TN



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

Department of
Pure Mathematics and
Mathematical Statistics

Dear Dr Mead,

Governance

At the request of the Vice-Chancellor I asked all UTOs in the Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, by e-mail, for comments that might constitute a departmental view on the recent consultation paper about 'Governance'. The result is that this paper is not seen as having any direct predictable impact specifically on the teaching, learning and research in mathematics. There seems to be no way of knowing whether the new proposals might affect DPMMS for good or for ill. The Department does not contain many people with much experience of the politics of the central committees of the University nor of their concomitant administrative structures. The UTOs of this Department are academics. We work long and hard at teaching and research because that is our vocation; had we wished to enter administration we would have chosen other paths. Our success has been quantified by the HEFCE's QAA and in its RAE; more valued is the continuing respect of the international academic community.

With that said, let me emphasize that DPMMS certainly appreciates the need for, and greatly values, an efficient well planned central University administration sympathetic to the needs, both material and psychological, of those who study, teach, and conduct research in this great University. There is a perception that on certain matters, both great and small, things in the Old Schools have in recent years gone somewhat awry. We value access to democratic processes should we perceive the Department to be unfairly treated. That has however seldom been the case, though too often the infliction of politically correct dogma in the guise of 'guidance' and 'training' has caused irritation. Concerning the present proposals, we cannot tell, for example, if five Pro-Vice-Chancellors will be an improvement upon the present two. So much will depend upon the quality of the people chosen for all the central positions and their dedication to the well-being of the University of Cambridge.

Yours sincerely,

W. B. R. Lickorish

W.B.R. Lickorish

Centre for Mathematical Sciences
Wilberforce Road
Cambridge CB3 0WB
England

Telephone: +44 (0)1223 337995
Fax: +44 (0)1223 337920
E-mail: wbrl@dpms.cam.ac.uk

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE



PROFESSOR PETER LIPTON
 HEAD OF DEPARTMENT
 DIRECT LINE: (01223) 334551
 EMAIL: PETER.LIPTON@KINGS.CAM.AC.UK

FREE SCHOOL LANE
 CAMBRIDGE CB2 3RH
 TEL: (01223) 334540
 FAX: (01223) 334554

20 March, 2002

The Registry
 The Old Schools
 Dear Tim,

University Governance

On 4 March the HPS Board considered a consultation document on suggested changes to University Governance. A Number of the proposed changes were welcomed, but there was some feeling that the package taken whole would poses a threat to the University's strongly democratic system of governance. Here are the main specific points endorsed by the majority of the members of the Board:

- The Council should have as chair someone external to the University.
- Making the Vice-Chancellor the principal academic and administrative officer of the University runs the risk of creating a concentration in power that may not be in the University's overall interest.
- The membership of the Regent House should be increased in the way the document suggests.
- The membership of the Council should be made more representative of the University as a whole, but the proposed membership does not include enough 'GVAs' (Garden Variety Academics), and there should only be one or two members from Assistant Staff.
- The majority of places on the Council should continue to be elected by members of the Regent House, and the current role of Regent House should be retained.
- Chairs of the Council of the Schools should probably be members of the Council and the General Board and their functions should be defined and their roles enhanced making them in some ways more like deans, but there is a concern that they not become barons. It is important to find proper academics who are seconded but know they will return to academic life, rather than generating a professional deanish caste.
- Requiring 50 signatories to initiate an amendment or ballot is too stiff: 20 or 25 signatories ought to be sufficient.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Lipton

Dr Gordon Johnson
President, Wolfson College
Barton Road
Cambridge
CB3 9BB



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**
**DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC HEALTH AND
PRIMARY CARE**

21 March 2002

Dear Gordon

We're writing on behalf of the Department of Public Health and Primary Care first to thank you very much for your clear exposition last week at the Clinical School of the proposed changes to the governance structure of the university and secondly to provide a little feedback from our own senior academic staff.

We'd like to re-inforce the comments made at the Clinical School meeting about how relaxation of the limited number of Associate Lecturer titles would bring us in line with other institutions and provide a much greater incentive to potential teachers and collaborators to assist us with training and research, recognising the special care status that clinical teaching has.

Also, although we agree that there is a need for additional Pro Vice Chancellors, we're not sure how these posts will attract (or be feasible) for some sectors of university staff. For example, the Clinical School might need the Regius to be a Pro Vice Chancellor, but it might be difficult for others to take on such duties due to its impact on clinical and research commitments.

Yours sincerely

John Danesh
Professor of Epidemiology and Medicine

Carol Brayne
Professor of Public Health Medicine

Institute of Public Health
University Forvie Site
Robinson Way
Cambridge, CB2 2SR

Telephone: 01223 330300
Fax: 01223 330330
E-mail: jd292@medschl.cam.ac.uk

Subject: Careers Service comments

Apologies for the delay in getting these comments from the Careers Service to you and I hope that they can still be taken into account.

1. Extension of membership of the Regent House.

This is welcomed and we hope that it will be possible to include those in part-time posts with appropriate limitations about minimum amount of time worked and a pro-rata length of service if there is a requirement for a period of service for eligibility.

2. Pro-Vice-Chancellors

Although we are conscious that the Council is already large, we are unhappy that with the proposal that only one PVC will be on the Council whilst the Chairs of the Schools will be ex officio on both the Council and the General Board. This seems to downgrade the role of the PVCs. For those parts of the University which might be managed by a PVC it also seems to reflect on their relative importance vis a vis the academics. Given that PVCs are often likely to be senior academics it would not weaken the influence of academics on University policy to have the PVCs on Council as well.

3. We echo concerns expressed elsewhere about lack of clarity about where ultimate responsibility lies.

Tony Raban
Director
Cambridge University Careers Service
Stuart House

Management Board of the Unified Administrative Service
Comments on the consultation on governance

The Board welcomes the proposals. They see them as providing a framework in which a professional, objective administration can support the University's academic objectives. The proposed clarification of the committee structure is a positive development. It is necessary and appropriate that policy formulation happens through committees but that implementation is an executive function in which the administration (as well as others) have a key role. In this context, the Board hopes that decisions will be delegated through the committee structure to the lowest appropriate level.

The Board supports the development of the role of the Vice-Chancellor but notes that under the proposals, the Vice-Chancellor would be both the Senior Academic and Administrative Officer of the University. The Board notes that specialist, professional responsibility within the Unified Administrative Service lies with the Directors. The Board hopes that increasing recognition can be given to the role of Directors whilst noting the need for additional Pro-Vice-Chancellors to support the vice-chancellor, the Board believes it would be inappropriate for the Pro-Vice-Chancellors to assume management responsibility for parts of the administration.

I hope these brief comments are helpful.