

## Fly-sheets reprinted

The following fly-sheets, etc., are reprinted in accordance with the Council's Notice on Discussions and fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 117).

### REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON GOVERNANCE BALLOT ON GRACES 1–6 OF 20 NOVEMBER 2002

Votes are to be taken by ballot on Graces 1–6 of 20 November 2002. Graces 1–4 are for the approval of the recommendations set out in the Council's Notice of 18 November 2002 (*Reporter*, p. 306) for amendments to Statutes relating to membership of the Regent House, to the Council and the Audit Committee, to the office of Vice-Chancellor, and to the office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor. Graces 5 and 6 are for amendments to the number of signatures required to call for ballots on Graces, etc. (see the Council's first Notice on p. 306).

The Graces at present read as follows:

**Grace 1.** That the recommendation set out in the Council's Notice, dated 18 November 2002, be approved in respect of:

Amendments of Statute A, III; B, I (portion designated A) (the Regent House).

**Grace 2.** That the recommendation set out in the Council's Notice, dated 18 November 2002, be approved in respect of:

Amendments of Statutes A, IV; A, V; and B, I (portion designated B); and Statute T (the Council and the Audit Committee)

subject to the result of voting in relation to class (c) (decision between text in square brackets and text in angular brackets).

**Grace 3.** That the recommendation set out in the Council's Notice, dated 18 November 2002, be approved in respect of:

Statute D, III (the Vice-Chancellor).

subject to the text in angular brackets in sections 5(a) and 7 being inserted only if Grace 2 is approved.

**Grace 4.** That the recommendation set out in the Council's Notice, dated 18 November 2002, be approved in respect of:

Statute D, IV (the Pro-Vice-Chancellors).

**Grace 5.** That the regulations for Discussions be amended in accordance with the result of voting in relation to the options set out below:

Regulation 1(b).

By replacing in line one the words 'ten members' by the words 'twenty-five members' (Option 1) or 'fifty members' (Option 2).

**Grace 6.** That the regulations for Graces and Congregations of the Regent House be amended in accordance with the result of voting in relation to the options set out below:

Regulation 8 (call for a ballot).

By replacing in line one the words 'ten members' by the words 'twenty-five members' (Option 1) or 'fifty members' (Option 2).

Regulation 9 (amendments).

By replacing in line one the words 'ten members' by the words 'twenty-five members' (Option 1) or 'fifty members' (Option 2).

The Council's Report on Governance was published in the *Reporter* on 26 June 2002 (pp. 945–1143, see also pdf on <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2001-02/weekly/5890/>). It was discussed on two occasions, 9 July 2002 and 8 October 2002, with the remarks being published in the *Reporter* on 17 July 2002 (pp. 1233–1245, <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2001-02/weekly/5893/19.html>) and 16 October 2002 (pp. 82–93, <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5898/19.html>).

**Amendments**

Amendments to Graces 2, 4, 5, and 6 have since been proposed by members of the Regent House. These amendments are as follows:

*Amendment to Grace 2:*

- (i) By amending the proposed Statute A, IV, 2 (a) to read:
  - (a) four members elected from among the Heads of Colleges, Bursars, and Senior Tutors;
- (ii) By amending the proposed Statute A, IV, 2 (b) to read:
  - (b) four members elected from among the Officers specified in Schedule J;
- (iii) By adding to the end of the proposed sentence for Statute A, IV, 5, 'The tenure of a member in classes (d) or (e) may be terminated by Grace on the recommendation of the Council' the words 'or by a Grace of the Regent House under Statute A, VIII, 7.'

*Amendment to Grace 4:*

- (iv) That the wording in D.IV, 2 ('2. Each appointment or reappointment to an office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall be made by the Council') be replaced by 'Each appointment to an office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall be made by Grace of the Regent House'.

*Amendment to Grace 5:*

- (v) By replacing the words 'submit a written request' by the words 'submit a request on paper, by fax or by electronic mail from addresses within the cam.ac.uk domain'

*Amendments to Grace 6:*

- (vi) In Regulation 8: By replacing the words 'submit a written request' by the words 'submit a request on paper, by fax or by electronic mail from addresses within the cam.ac.uk domain'
- (vii) In Regulation 9: By replacing the words 'submit a written request' by the words 'submit a request on paper, by fax or by electronic mail from addresses within the cam.ac.uk domain'

The amendments specified above have been proposed by the following members of the Regent House (not all those listed below support every amendment but each amendment is supported by at least ten of the signatories):

A. C. AITCHISON	N. A. DODGSON	N. J. HOLMES	N. M. MACLAREN
BEN ARGYLE	D. R. DE LACEY	ABRAHAM KARPAS	H. REYBURN
M. R. CLARK	G. R. EVANS	A. P. KELLY	R. RODD
J. L. DAWSON	R. P. GORDON	B. J. KEMP	JOHN SMITH

In accordance with arrangements approved by the Council, fly-sheets relating to this ballot are appended.

THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSED REFORM OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY

By any measure Cambridge is a successful university. Its quality of education, scholarship, and research has been enhanced while it has expanded considerably the number of its students and staff. The University has undertaken a major programme of refurbishment and development of its buildings and estate. Its sources of funding and support are more complex and diverse than ever before, and the number of constituencies and interests which have concern for the University have multiplied.

Cambridge's continued success in a more demanding environment must now be accompanied by changes in the way in which the University is governed and administered. After prolonged and painstaking consultation, the Council have proposed a number of measures which they commend to the University for acceptance. These clarify the position of the Vice-Chancellor and give that office additional support by increasing the number of Pro-Vice-Chancellors; provide for amendment of the composition of the University Council, allowing for three external members (to include the chairman); make the Council more representative of groups within the University; and extend membership of the Regent House to embrace more unestablished academic and academic-related staff.

We consider that the Council has responded well to the arguments that have been put during the debates about constitutional reform, and in this respect we particularly welcome their decision (Council's Notice, *Reporter*, 20 November 2002, p. 307) to ask the Regent House to vote on the option that there should remain eight members of the Council directly elected in class (c) from amongst all the members of the Regent House as an alternative to the original proposal for four class (c) members.

We recognise that there are many opinions about the ideal constitutional structure of the University. We believe that there is a strong case for reform along the lines set out in the Council's Report and Notice and we urge you to vote *placet* in the Ballot on Graces 1, 2, 3, and 4 of 20 November 2002.

Z. G. BARANSKI	M. J. GILLINGS	A. M. LONSDALE	M. SCHOFIELD
P. J. BAYLEY	S. D. GOLDHILL	D. MACDONALD	D. N. SEDLEY
J. BECK	D. GOOD	JAMES MAYALL	S. K. SMITH
TIM BLANNING	P. A. GOODING	P. A. MCNAUGHTON	RAINER SPIEGEL
MARTIN BOBROW	M. J. GRANT	MARTIN MILLETT	KOEN STEEMERS
JOHN BOYD	HANNELORE HÄGELE	A. MINSON	MARILYN STRATHERN
WILLIAM BROWN	D. E. HANKE	H. L. MORALES	VERONICA SUTHERLAND
NICHOLAS BULLOCK	LINDA HARGREAVES	J. S. MORRILL	S. E. SWAFFIELD
PAUL CARTLEDGE	D. W. HOLTON	S. J. MORRIS	JULIA SWINDELLS
H. A. CHASE	G. C. HORROCKS	ANDREW POLLARD	LIBA TAUB
PETER CLARKE	T. JAMES	J. N. POSTGATE	PHILIP TOWLE
ANDREW CLIFF	BRIAN F. G. JOHNSON	J. K. H. REES	S. TYRELL SMITH
JOHN DANESH	GORDON JOHNSON	ANDREW REID	R. WARDY
M. J. DAUNTON	C. A. JONES	G. A. REID	JAMES WARREN
D. W. DUNNE	E. A. S. KEELER	M. E. RICHARDSON	R. S. WELLS
S. EFSTATHIOU	E. C. KERRIGAN	DUNCAN ROBINSON	D. G. WHITEBREAD
EDITH ESCH	R. A. LEIGH	EKHARD SALJE	JOAN M. WHITEHEAD
DAVID F. FORD	PETER LIPTON	J. K. M. SANDERS	A. K. WILSON
PETER K. FOX	M. S. LONGAIR	G. A. W. SAUNDERS	ANDREW H. WYLLIE
B. GANDER			

## GRACES 5 AND 6 OF 20 NOVEMBER 2002

At present any ten of the 3,500 members of the Regent House can call for a ballot on a Grace, or propose an amendment to a Grace once published which also triggers a ballot.

The holding of a ballot leads to delay in decision-making in the University of at least a month, and sometimes considerably longer. During the Council's consultation on the future governance of the University, representations were made that the small number of signatories required to call a ballot gave undue weight to the interests of individuals or tiny sectional groups. Moreover, the threat of a ballot had sometimes inhibited decision-making by the University, even after business had been subjected to thorough consultation. The procedure is also seen as one of the factors which made Cambridge appear inefficient. At an early stage in the consultation, proposals were floated that the number of signatories should be increased to fifty or even more – say 10% of the membership of the Regent House. There was no desire to take away from the Regent House a final say on any Grace, but simply a wish to ensure that when ballots were called for it was for good reason and represented the desire of more than a few individuals.

On the other hand, it was argued equally strongly that members of the Regent House have a duty to check the progress of Graces and that it should not be made difficult for anyone to ask that an item of business be put to a vote, whatever the consequences. It was pointed out that, in fact, very few ballots were called, and that the members of the Regent House had not in the recent past abused their constitutional rights.

As a result of these representations, the Council decided that in their final Report they would offer the University a free vote on this matter, proposing the maintenance of the *status quo*, or increases in the numbers required to 25 or to 50. The Council have not expressed a preference, but we hope that, when voting on the number of signatories required to call for a ballot or an amendment of a Grace, members of the Regent House will consider opting for 50 or at least 25, believing that such a modest increase will have the effect of improving the flow of business while in no way reducing the ultimate power of the Regent House. Professor Grant, in his contribution to the Discussion on 8 October (*Reporter*, 16 October 2002, p. 92), pointed out that recent changes at Oxford require at least 125 members of Congregation (the equivalent body to our Regent House) to force a ballot, thus striking a fresh balance between the responsibilities of the Oxford Governing Council and the powers of Congregation; and our own Board of Scrutiny have commended the new Oxford arrangements as having 'apparently led to much improved governance'.

Grace 5 concerns the number of signatories required to call for a Discussion. Here the arguments are rather different, and we ourselves hold different views on the best option among the choices offered by the Council. What we would remind members of the Regent House is that formally speaking this Grace and Grace 6 (on Graces) are procedural: their purpose is simply to give effect to the outcome of the ballots on the numbers of signatories required for a ballot, or for a Discussion on a topic of concern to the University, whatever those outcomes are. We urge you to vote *placet* on Graces 5 and 6 of 20 November.

JOHN BOYD	GORDON JOHNSON	A. M. LONSDALE	J. K. M. SANDERS
PETER K. FOX	IAN LESLIE	D. MACDONALD	M. SCHOFIELD
M. J. GRANT	PETER LIPTON	ONORA O'NEILL	LIBA TAUB

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON GOVERNANCE  
GRACES 1–6 OF 20 NOVEMBER 2002

If these six Graces are approved this collegiate University will have acquired a Council modelled on that of a chartered non-collegiate university, and the Regent House will become an increasing irrelevance. The majority of British universities are chartered institutions which possess a Court, superior to their Council, and an Academic Senate, usually a large body of the senior academic staff which meets regularly. They do not have constituent colleges with their own statutes.

Cambridge is quite different. There is no Court to act as an ultimate body of trustees and no Academic Senate. The Regent House, by centuries-old tradition strengthened by Acts of Parliament, performs both these functions, but it can only do so if led by a Council that understands its duty to bring the most important issues affecting the University before the Regent House in timely fashion.

We would not welcome these changes even if they were accompanied by proposals for a Court and an Academic Senate to balance the power of the proposed Council. But without such safeguards the changes (put forward, it may be noted, by the Council itself) must be rejected. We believe instead that it is both desirable and possible to promote an evolution of the Cambridge constitution out of the basic democratic structure we have inherited. It is largely a matter of having the will to make it work.

The present Council fell prey to the mantra that the Regent House is not an executive body (what then is a Grace?) and proceeded from this false premise to develop these inappropriate proposals. When challenged it simply repeated the refrain, referring to the Regent House not as the governing body (Statute A, III, 1) but as the ‘governing legislative body’.

We suggest you vote *non-placet* on all the Graces. An exception might be made for Grace 4 which deals with the separate matter of the Pro-Vice-Chancellors. As to the others, the change to the Regent-House Statute (Grace 1) is incorrectly drafted because it assumes the passage of Grace 2, while Grace 2 itself concerns the composition of the proposed Council. The description of the Vice-Chancellor as ‘the principal officer of the University’ (Grace 3) is not only vacuous but conflicts with the first sentence of Statute D which lists the University officers in order of seniority as ‘Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellor’, etc. Graces 5 and 6 are proposals to make it more difficult for the Regent House to hold Discussions, call votes, and put amendments.

It is important not to be beguiled by the tone of the Council’s Notice into thinking that the proposals are minor adjustments to a scheme already agreed: this is the first and only opportunity to vote on the fundamental principles it embodies.

Please vote *non-placet*.

DAVID ABULAFIA	N. DODGSON	C. J. JARDINE	K. M. O’SHAUGHNESSY
MANTAS ADOMENAS	M. DÖRRZAPF	E. G. KAHRIS	B. J. PARKER
N. F. B. ALLINGTON	J. P. DOUGHERTY	A. KARPAS	M. C. PAYNE
J. E. J. ALTHAM	P. J. DUFFETT-SMITH	FRANK H. KING	J. S. PEATFIELD
C. A. ANSORGE	D. M. DUMVILLE	P. F. KORNICKI	DAVID W. PHILLIPSON
RICHARD BARNES	R. P. DUNCAN-JONES	TREVOR LAMB	C. J. POUNTAIN
E. C. BASSOULS	IAIN DUPERE	CHRISTEL LANE	DAVID PRATT
R. BEADLE	A. W. F. EDWARDS	S. W. LAY	M. R. E. PROCTOR
DANIEL BEER	J. M. EDWARDSON	A. N. LEDGEWAY	OLIVER RACKHAM
THOMAS P. BLYTH	G. R. EVANS	P. C. LEE	M. RICHARDS
DAVID E. BOWYER	B. J. EVERITT	W. Y. LIANG	IAN G. ROBERTS
J. BROWNE	JOHN E. FFOWCS WILLIAMS	P. A. LINEHAN	PETER ROBINSON
N. P. BUTTERFIELD	P. R. GLAZEBROOK	SUSAN LINTOTT	J. G. ROBSON
BRIAN CALLINGHAM	S. F. GULL	J. R. LISTER	J. SAXL
R. H. S. CARPENTER	R. D. HARDING	I. N. MCCAVE	A. G. SMITH
JOHN CASEY	E. M. HARPER	N. M. MACLAREN	JOHN D. SMITH
EUGENIA CHENG	PETER HAYNES	J. S. L. MCCOMBIE	M. C. SMITH
M. R. CLARK	B. D. HEDLEY	D. L. McMULLEN	P. J. F. STACEY
T. W. CLYNE	R. M. HENDERSON	S. H. P. MADDRELL	R. J. STIBBS
SIMON CONWAY MORRIS	J. HERBERT	AMALA MAHADEVAN	ROGER STRATFORD
S. J. COWLEY	ROBIN HILEY	L. MAHADEVAN	D. K. SUMMERS
B. D. COX	E. J. HINCH	M. J. MAYS	CHRISTOPHER E. THOMPSON
STUART DALZIEL	JOHN HOPKINS	ROBIN MILLER	B. J. USCINSKI
R. D. DAWE	R. R. HORGAN	PAUL MILLETT	GRAHAM VIRGO
J. L. DAWSON	J. A. HUDSON	J. D. MOLLON	DAVID WALES
D. R. DE LACEY	H. P. HUGHES	S. W. MOORE	RENATE WOUDHUYSEN
N. R. M. DE LANGE	ARIEH ISERLES	A. MYCROFT	
J. A. D. DICKSON	IAN JAMES	F. ORSINI	

## REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON GOVERNANCE: GRACE 3 OF 20 NOVEMBER 2002

The proposed reforms in governance include changes to the Statutes designed to 'empower' the Vice-Chancellor by giving him greater executive powers, and by extending the period of office from the current five years (extensible by a further two years) to an immediate seven.

There may indeed be a strong case for giving the Vice-Chancellor greater executive authority and a longer tenure. However we believe it is acceptable to do this only upon two conditions. The first is that that it should be plain that the Vice-Chancellor's authority is exercised subject to the control and direction of the elected Council. The second is that there should be some practicable means of removing the Vice-Chancellor if he proves incompetent, or turns out to be a dictator who is less than benign. (Such problems do not belong purely to the world of fiction, as happenings in other universities should remind us.) The proposals at present before the University satisfy neither of these conditions, and we therefore oppose them.

As regards the balance of power between the Vice-Chancellor and the Council, the current proposal is that the Vice-Chancellor 'shall be responsible for ... the direction of University business within the framework of approved policies, and subject to the responsibilities of the Council and other bodies established by or under the Statutes and Ordinances.' How may a person be 'subject to' the 'responsibilities' of another body? What the proposal surely ought to say is that the Vice-Chancellor is 'subject to the authority' of the Council and other bodies (so making clear the hierarchy of accountability within the University, as Professor Shattock advocated should be the case in his CAPSA report), and that the Vice-Chancellor is responsible for the implementation of the approved policies and decisions of the Regent House, Council, and other bodies.

The ambiguous formula the Regent House is invited to approve appears to be a recipe for confusion and administrative impasse. This is further illustrated by the proposal that 'the Vice-Chancellor shall be responsible for the management of the University and its finances', while according to Statute the Council already has 'general responsibility for the management of [the University's] resources' and has a duty 'to exercise general supervision over the Chest and over the finances of all institutions in the University'.

As far as removability is concerned, we note that in the corporate world, from which we believe the notion of an 'empowered' Vice-Chancellor with executive authority derives, it is regarded as an essential safeguard that the shareholders are able to vote the managing director out of office at any time. With this in mind, section 303 of the Companies Act 1985 goes so far as to provide that the shareholders may remove all the directors in this way, irrespective of any contrary provision on the company's constitution. However, no such provision is made in the current proposals, and the new 'empowered' Vice-Chancellor, like his disempowered predecessors, would only be removable under the difficult and lengthy procedures laid down in Statute U. We strongly believe that extended executive powers in tandem with a lengthened period of office should only be granted together with some workable procedure under which a Vice-Chancellor who turns out to be unsatisfactory can be removed from office; and if this condition cannot be met, it should not be done at all.

The under-signed, who are current or former members of the Board of Scrutiny, conclude that the proposed Statute is deficient, and urge you to vote *non-placet*.

DAVID J. CHIVERS  
STEPHEN J. COWLEY  
C. F. FORSYTH  
DAVID HOWARTH  
FRANK H. KING

TREVOR LAMB  
E. S. LEEDHAM-GREEN  
SUSAN LINTOTT  
D. LOWTHER

MICHAEL A. MESSAGE  
OLIVER RACKHAM  
JENNIFER M. RIGBY  
DAVID L. SMITH

A. M. SNODGRASS  
J. R. SPENCER  
R. J. STIBBS  
HELEN THOMPSON

## GRACES 5 AND 6

Despite claims to the contrary made in the course of the governance debates, the figures indicate that the current level of signatories required for Discussions, calls for ballots, or amendments has not led to abuse. On the contrary, there is reason to believe that people who wish to support such calls are prevented by fear from letting their names appear. To increase the number of signatures required without allowing considerably more time to collect them will have the direct effect of making it much more difficult to call the administration to account.

At the same time there has been no attempt to take cognizance of modern methods of communication. Faxes are currently permitted, but not electronic mail messages (although it would be significantly more difficult to forge an e-mail). The signatories would prefer the number of signatures required to remain at ten, but in any event invite you to support the amendments to Graces 5 and 6 to allow those signatories to express their concerns in the most convenient manner now available.

M. R. CLARK  
J. L. DAWSON  
N. A. DODGSON  
G. R. EVANS

ROGER GRIFFIN  
N. J. HOLMES  
ABRAHAM KARPAS

ADRIAN KELLY  
D. R. DE LACEY  
O. J. PADEL

H. T. REYBURN  
R. RODD  
R. L. TAPP

## BALLOT ON AMENDMENTS TO GRACES 2, 5, AND 6 OF 20 NOVEMBER 2002

Amendments have been proposed to Grace 2, regarding the future composition of the Council, (i) to substitute in class (a) four members elected from among the Heads of College, Bursars, and Senior Tutors for the proposed composition of four members elected from among the Heads of College; and (ii) to substitute in class (b) four members elected from among the officers specified in Schedule J for four members elected from among the Professors and Readers, two from group A of the Schools and two from group B of the Schools, each School being assigned to a group by Ordinance.

We urge members of the Regent House to vote against those amendments. The composition of class (a) was proposed following consultation with the Colleges' Committee, the Bursars' Committee, and the Senior Tutors' Committee and is the form of representation desired by the Colleges. Class (b) reflects the present limitation to Professors and Readers. It would be ironical if, with the greater number of holders of those offices providing strong academic leadership to the University, their voice on the Council were to be diminished.

Amendments have been proposed to Graces 5 and 6 to substitute, in relation to requests for Discussions and ballots and amendments for Graces, for requirements for a written request by requirements for a request on paper, by fax or by e-mail.

We urge members of the Regent House to vote against those amendments. It may be that those would be more convenient methods for some members of the Regent House. However, the matter was not raised in the earlier consultation on the governance proposals, and it is unsatisfactory that it should be proposed now with no safeguards suggested to guard against a person subsequently disowning, as being unauthorised, a request that he or she had not signed.

I. M. HUTCHINGS  
GORDON JOHNSON  
JOHN A. LEAKE

PETER LINEHAN  
A. M. LONSDALE  
KATHARINE B. PRETTY

MARTIN REES  
G. A. REID  
JEREMY SANDERS

M. SCHOFIELD  
A. R. THOMPSON  
JOAN M. WHITEHEAD

## FLY-SHEETS ON GRACES 5 AND 6 OF NOVEMBER 20TH 2002

*Grace 5*

Introducing an additional topic to Discussions essentially costs nothing. We have recently approved new regulations for Discussions which will allow 'irrelevant remarks' to be ruled out of order and excluded from the record. We should be encouraging Regent House members to propose topics for Discussion where they cannot get adequate responses to their concerns elsewhere, to do this a limit of 10 must be preserved.

Whatever the outcome on the vote on numbers however, we need to update our methods of 'signing' requests to include e-mail which is now the routine medium for many Regent House members. We urge you to support this amendment.

*Grace 6*

There is no evidence that the existing limit of 10 is being abused. Ballots are not being frequently requested (despite appearances of late, in fact only 2 ballots were called by Regents in 2002). Those ballots which are held at the request of members of Regent House are not resulting in a low proportion of *non placets*. It is true that certain members of Regent House are particularly active in calling ballots. We believe that reflects the relatively small proportion of Regent House members who closely follow the business of Council. Our rare ballots are almost always matters of real concern to a significant proportion of Regent House, once it is drawn to their attention. An example will illustrate this point. When the Report of the Council on the Principal Administrative Officers came up for Discussion only 2 people spoke; only 11 people signed the request for a ballot. Yet the arguments of the few were so convincing that the Grace was rejected by a majority of 113 with 570 voting *non placet*.

It is important to remember that, unless the majority of Regent House disagree with the Grace proposed, implementation of proposals is only delayed by a ballot. The real limitation on collecting signatures is time. In reality, there is just over a week even for an avid reader of the *Reporter*. The signatories urge you to pass amendments (vi) and (vii) and thus make the process of signing easier, but collecting signatures will still depend on members feeling sufficiently informed in time to make the decision.

The ability of members of Regent House to call for a ballot acts as a very important check on the power of the executive, whose power will increase if the present proposals are approved. We urge all members of Regent House to preserve this vital constitutional check in reality not just in theory by voting for the option of 10 signatures.

NABEEL A. AFFARA  
J. W. AJIOKA  
DAVID BOWYER  
T. D. K. BROWN

ANNE COOKE  
J. L. DAWSON  
D. R. DE LACEY  
F. P. HAYWARD

N. J. HOLMES  
ADRIAN KELLY  
I. B. KINGSTON  
N. M. MACLAREN

C. G. PRINT  
R. RODD  
JOHN TROWSDALE

## BALLOT ON GRACES 1–6 OF 20 NOVEMBER 2002

**Graces 1–4 (Governance)**

The fly-sheet signed by D. Abulafia and others argues that approval of Graces 1–4 will radically change the nature of Cambridge's constitution by making it more akin to that of a chartered non-collegiate university.

The Council do not agree: they believe that the changes represent an evolution of Cambridge's special governmental arrangements, adapting them to meet urgent needs of our future. The position of the Regent House is not impaired by the proposals.

With regard to the office of Vice-Chancellor, the Council do not find credible the analogy drawn between that office and the Managing Director of a plc, as advanced by the fly-sheet signed by D. J. Chivers and others.

The Council's proposals for the Vice-Chancellor (Grace 3) define clearly the responsibilities of this office.

Therefore, I urge you to *vote in favour* of Graces 1–4.

*Amendments*

Amendments have been proposed to Grace 2 (the Council) and Grace 4 (the Pro-Vice-Chancellors).

*Grace 2 (The Council)*

Amendment (i) would allow for the election of Bursars and Senior Tutors as well as Heads of Houses in class (a) of the Council, and amendment (ii) would open class (b) to the University Teaching Officers besides Professors and Readers.

There are options set out in the ballot paper for an open election of either four or eight members in class (c). The Council have recommended that this number should be four, but have allowed for eight. If this were approved, there would be no need to broaden the membership of the Council in classes (a) and (b). I therefore urge you to *vote against* amendments (i) and (ii).

Amendment (iii) proposes the removal of external members of the Council by Grace initiated by fifty members of the Regent House. The Council believe their proposal for removal of an external member by Grace on the recommendation of the Council to be sufficient. I therefore urge you to *vote against* amendment (iii).

*Grace 4 (Pro-Vice-Chancellors)*

This amendment proposes appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors by Grace rather than by the Council. On balance, appointment by the Council seems reasonable and I therefore suggest that you *vote against* amendment (iv).

**Graces 5–6 (number of signatures)**

These Graces give effect to the result of voting on the number of signatures required to call for a Discussion on a topic of concern to the University (Grace 5) or to call for a ballot on or amendments to a Grace (Grace 6).

The Council have made no recommendation on the substantive point, that is, the *number* of signatures required to call a Discussion or to force a ballot. They have offered members of the Regent House a choice between the *status quo* (ten signatures), twenty-five, or fifty.

The Council adheres to their position: they simply invite members of the Regent House to choose between the options put forward.

*Amendments*

The amendments proposed to the Graces have been described in the *THES* under the headline 'Cambridge rebels hold up rejig' as 'a series of wrecking amendments'. The fly-sheet concerning Graces 5 and 6 signed by N. A. Affara and others implies that the amendments simply hold to the present arrangement of requiring only 10 signatures to call for a Discussion or a ballot. In fact, the amendments taken together undermine the whole of the carefully conceived package of reforms which has been the object of intensive consultation.

The fly-sheet signed by I. M. Hutchings and others gives the reasons why the amendments should be rejected.

I urge you to *vote against* the amendments.

GORDON JOHNSON  
*on behalf of the Council*