

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. 112).

Grace 3 of 15 June 2011: Fly-sheet

The appropriate way for the University to comment on the higher education (HE) policies of the Government is to respond to the imminent HE White Paper through the consultative mechanism. At the time of writing, the White Paper is expected either shortly before or after the vote on this Grace and we therefore ask you to vote *non placet*.

PETER AGAR
R. J. ANDERSON
J. H. BAKER
N. BAMPOS
J. C. BARNES
RICHARD BARNES
JEREMY BAUMBERG
MASSIMO BEBER
B. A. BLACKLAWS
MARK BLAMIRE
R. BOLTON
S. R. R. BOURNE
P. J. BRINDLE
WILLIAM BROWN

R. G. BRYAN
N. J. BUTTERFIELD
D. A. CARDWELL
H. A. CHASE
DAVID J. CHIVERS
DAPING CHU
JAMES CLACKSON
JOHN R. A. CLEAVER
M. J. DAUNTON
JANE DAVIES
A. K. DIXON
N. A. DODGSON
R. J. DOWLING
N. J. A. DOWNER

CATERINA DUCATI
PAUL FOLKES DAVIS
PETER K. FOX
R. H. FRIEND
ANDREW GAMBLE
D. A. GOOD
MICHAEL J. C. GORDON
A. L. GREER
S. F. GULL
FRANCES C. HALL
R. D. HARDING
MARTIN HARRIS
P. N. HARTLE
D. P. HEARN

PHILIP HOBDAJ
 PATRICIA HODGSON
 ALAN HUGHES
 C. J. HUMPHREYS
 R. HUNT
 JAMES JACKSON
 S. JACKSON
 ANDREW JEFFERIES
 J. KEELER
 D. P. KENNEDY
 ANN-LOUISE KINMONTH
 M. KUHN
 S. LAING
 IAN LESLIE
 ROBERT LETHBRIDGE
 M. LEVITT
 SUSAN LINTOTT
 P. B. LITTLEWOOD
 D. LOWTHER
 STUART MARTIN
 M. MELLOR

S. J. MORRIS
 A. MYCROFT
 C. NIGHTINGALE
 K. M. O'SHAUGHNESSY
 S. G. OLIVER
 MICHELLE L. OYEN
 RACHAEL PADMAN
 R. V. PENTY
 C. L. M. PRATT
 M. R. E. PROCTOR
 MARTIN REES
 G. A. REID
 IAIN REID
 DUNCAN ROBINSON
 S. O. SAGE
 J. K. M. SANDERS
 MALCOLM SCHOFIELD
 M. J. SEWELL
 J. G. P. SISSONS
 CHARLES G. SMITH
 J. R. SPENCER

F. STAJANO
 W. JAMES STIRLING
 SIMON SUMMERS
 RICHARD TAPLIN
 N. E. TAYLOR
 R. THOMPSON
 M. J. TILBY
 G. TITMUS
 MARY VICKERS
 D. J. WALLACE
 ANDREW WALLACE-HADRILL
 JOACHIM WHALEY
 I. H. WHITE
 S. WITHINGTON
 C. WOODFORD
 M. G. WORSTER
 ANDREW H. WYLLIE
 A. D. YATES
 S. J. YOUNG

Grace 3 of 15 June 2011: Fly-sheet

It is not contradictory to oppose “sweeping cuts to the HE budget, the trebling of tuition fees, and incoherent access policies, all decided on without adequate consultation”, but still to vote against this partisan, political and divisive Grace.

The Grace attempts to summarise the wide range of opinions within the Regent House, on a complicated issue, in a single statement criticising a single individual. It attempts to recruit Cambridge's reputation and standing to a cause outside our institutional competence. It is framed to conceal and suppress the legitimately held opinions of those Regents who disagree with it. The Grace will not bring down the Government. It *will* however confirm to many in the public that Cambridge academics are out of touch with financial reality, and that we are indulging in gesture politics when we should be working to protect excellence and access. The substance of this Grace is better suited to the Union debating chamber.

In March of this year, 681 Oxford and Cambridge academics exercised their right of free speech to express no confidence in the policies of the Government, and wrote to Mr Willetts, opposing the cuts. They wrote as individuals, and did not claim, as they could not, to speak for those who had not signed. That was both appropriate and effective. The corporate University on the other hand cannot have or express confidence in anyone, but can nonetheless comment on the policies of the Government *via* its response to the White Paper, which is expected shortly. Regents can help shape that response via the consultative mechanism.

The initiated Grace mechanism was not designed to be used in this way, and those now in favour might do well to consider their reaction to a future vote in which they were in the minority. A vote against this Grace is not a vote in favour of the Government, and we therefore urge you to vote *non placet*.

P. ALEXANDER
 R. J. ANDERSON
 J. C. BARNES
 J. S. BELL
 WILLIAM BROWN
 N. J. BUTTERFIELD
 DAVID J. CHIVERS
 DAPING CHU
 N. A. DODGSON
 R. J. DOWLING
 P. J. FORD

PETER K. FOX
 ANDREW GAMBLE
 D. A. GOOD
 S. F. GULL
 R. D. HARDING
 C. J. HUMPHREYS
 J. KEELER
 M. KUHN
 IAN LESLIE
 A. MYCROFT
 RACHAEL PADMAN

J. RALLISON
 S. O. SAGE
 J. K. M. SANDERS
 M. J. SEWELL
 J. R. SPENCER
 R. THOMPSON
 M. J. TILBY
 I. H. WHITE
 S. WITHINGTON
 C. WOODFORD

PLACET vote of No Confidence

We, the undersigned, call on members of the Regent House to vote Placet in this historic vote. We note that there is a national No Confidence campaign underway, and that our colleagues in Oxford have already passed a Resolution in Congregation expressing no confidence in the Minister for Universities and Science, thereby sending a clear and unambiguous message to the government and to the public that it is our view that the nation's Higher Education system is being endangered in untenable ways by a precipitate policy, whose fundamental principle was imposed without due consultation or democratic debate. It is our responsibility as one of the nation's flagship universities to express our disquiet as well.

There is no evidence that the imposed policy of radically withdrawing public funding from the nation's HE sector to promote a student choice market will either improve students' university education or enhance social mobility. Nor, given the huge costs of the loans and the fact that so much of the debt will never be repaid, can it seriously be expected to improve the nation's finances over the long term. It amounts to little more than a reckless experiment, which was forced through Parliament without prior consultation or debate on December 9th 2010. While its precise impact on this university and others is entirely uncertain, what is quite beyond doubt is that it will saddle a future generation of today's young people with long-lasting burdens of debt and will deter some able students from applying at all, while running the distinct risk that it will undermine our ability to maintain the international excellence of our universities and their capacity to attract the most talented individuals from UK or abroad.

TARAK K. BARKAWI
FELICITAS BECKER
M. BITHELL
ELIZABETH BOYLE
B. J. BURCHELL
S. T. CAIN
M. CALARESU
R. H. S. CARPENTER
J. CHAMARETTE
R. L. C. CHARLES
JEAN CHOTHIA
J. CRAIGWOOD
GEORGINA EVANS
ANNA GANNON
S. GARRIGAN-MATTAR
HEATHER GLEN
MIA GRAY
RONALD S. HAYNES

N. D. HOPWOOD
S. HOUGHTON-WALKER
E. HUNTER
H. JAHN
A. J. KABLA
GEOFFREY KANTARIS
LAUREN KASSELL
J. P. KING
LAWRENCE KING
MARIA LISBOA
PETER MANDLER
E. MAWDSLEY
IAN MCCAVE
L. MCMAHON
TORSTEN MEISSNER
A. C. METAXAS
IRIS MÖLLER
AMY M. E. MORRIS

KATE PETERS
C. E. PRESTON
GABRIELA RAMOS
K. S. RICHARDS
R. J. E. RILEY
M. S. RODRIGUES ALVES DE
MAGALHÃES
M. RUEHL
L. RUPRECHT
S. J. SCHAFFER
A. L. STRATHERN
S. R. S. SZRETER
D. THOM
F. UDREA
C. G. WARNES
RUTH WATSON
D. L. WILLIAMS

Grace of no confidence: why you should vote PLACET

The coalition government has withdrawn public funding for the teaching of humanities and social sciences, and has greatly reduced the funding for teaching in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) subjects. It has replaced that funding with student fees, creating a market in which the money given to particular universities and subjects follows the student. Many subjects, and particularly those that are not perceived as direct routes to a well-paid job, will become unviable under this new regime, and the relationship between student and teacher will be recast across the board as a relationship between consumer and provider. Far from helping the economy, the cuts will produce a £100M-per-year funding gap, which will be closed by cutting the number of places available at UK Universities. (The declared aim of the changes is to increase that number.)

The government has raised the ceiling for tuition fees from £3,290 to £9,000. These fees do not take into account maintenance costs, which are likely to begin at around £6,000 per year. Students on three-year degree courses will therefore graduate with a minimum debt of £45,000. Longer courses, and those which involve years abroad (during which students will be charged 50% of the annual tuition fee) will create much heavier debts, and may become unviable. These debts will be inflated over time by interest charged at commercial rates (RPI+3%). Funding for postgraduate study will continue to shrink, so that only students from wealthy backgrounds or those with external sponsorship will be able to contemplate it. This will have negative consequences both for universities as research institutions and for the future of the academic profession. With over two-thirds of universities ignoring the government's instructions and charging the top rate, the £9,000 cap is unlikely to hold for long. The foundation of the profit-making New College of the Humanities, charging £18,000 per year for its courses, shows what the future will hold if current policies are not reversed.

While the new fee structure is likely to deter less wealthy students from entering into higher education, the government has continued to berate Oxford and Cambridge for their 'elitist' admissions policies. It has refused to acknowledge that the roots of current social inequities lie in primary and secondary education and to address the problem at its source. The fees will create a sharply stratified student body, dividing those who pay up-front (note that this *will* be possible) from those accruing lifelong debts and those who are in receipt of charitable handouts. The very complexity of the new system, with patterns of bursaries and fee-waivers that will vary from institution to institution and from year to year, places yet another obstacle in the way of students from poorer families.

What's more, this radical restructuring has been rushed through, without due care and attention to much of the necessary fine detail. Even though a White Paper is now imminent (damagingly reversing the traditional order of consultation, *then* implementation), universities have already had to decide on the level of undergraduate fees and make corresponding medium-term financial decisions. At best the White Paper may mitigate some of the worst effects of already implemented policy; more likely it will introduce additional elements of uncertainty as the government fiercely try to appease public sympathies and reduce the extra financial burden the new funding system has placed on the public purse.

The current Minister of State for Universities is officially responsible for the ill-considered policies of his government, but this vote is about policies, not personalities. We are called upon to respond to a crisis which has been caused by the inability of the governing classes to conceive the purposes of education in anything other than commercial terms. We cannot wait until the government makes higher education even less accessible to future generations than it already has. We cannot wait for the White Paper; the government has acted and so must we. We stand at a turning-point, at which it is vital that we defend the values that lie at the core of our enterprise. This Grace offers an historic opportunity for members of the University of Cambridge to join with our colleagues across the country in defending higher education as a public good. We urge you to vote **Placet**.

M. B. BECKLES
ELIZABETH BOYLE
B. J. BURCHELL
R. H. S. CARPENTER
R. L. C. CHARLES
N. R. M. DE LANGE
I. N. DiVANNA
B. K. ETHERINGTON
S. GARRIGAN-MATTAR
HEATHER GLEN
M. S. GOLDING
PRIYAMVADA GOPAL
R. GORDON

M. GORJI
MIA GRAY
P. R. HARDIE
RONALD S. HAYNES
S. HOUGHTON-WALKER
M. HREBENIAK
GEOFFREY KANTARIS
L. P. KING
M. R. LAVEN
RAPHAEL LYNE
E. MAWDSLEY
IRIS MÖLLER
I. K. PATTERSON

C. E. PRESTON
K. S. RICHARDS
R. J. E. RILEY
M. S. RODRIGUES ALVES DE
MAGALHÃES
J. SCOTT-WARREN
D. THOM
F. UDREA
C. G. WARNES
E. WATSON
RUTH WATSON
S. WATTS
ANDREW ZURCHER

Vote Placet. Education is a public good.

A devastating assault is currently underway on universities in this country. This is much more than a matter of diminished resources. All public bodies are, in one way or another, facing such diminution. It is, instead, a matter of the very conception of what kind of institution universities are, and what the relation of government to them should be. The current administration understands universities, essentially, as auxiliaries to commerce. Its notion of higher education is that it is or should be a market; that students should be shoppers in this market; that scholars should be salesmen and saleswomen in it. Students have protested forcefully against this idea of what they are and should be. Yet from universities themselves, and from those who are presumed to represent them, there has been heard barely a peep of dissent. It is as though we were calmly to witness the simple removal of the teaching funding for certain subjects, the trebling of fees, and the corporatization of the entire sector, and, effectively, to say: 'Do what you like. We're too demoralized even to say that you shouldn't do this.'

There is, however, an alternative. Public respect for universities such as Cambridge is partly dependent on the public's perception that the scholars in those universities will say what they think, not what it is convenient or advantageous to them to say. Cambridge is in a position of particular responsibility in this regard because of its pre-eminence. By declaring, collectively, that education is a public good, not merely a financial asset, we can repay the public's trust in us and demonstrate that we continue to deserve it. For this reason we ask you to vote Placet to the current Grace.

M. ARNOT
K. BLACK-HAWKINS
ROWAN BOYSON
B. J. BURCHELL
PAMELA BURNARD
S. CAIN
R. H. S. CARPENTER
R. L. C. CHARLES
C. H. CHOTHIA
JEAN CHOTHIA
M. R. CLARK
G. CLIFF HODGES
H. CREMIN
N. R. M. DE LANGE
I. N. DiVANNA
C. D. M. DODDINGTON
MICHAEL EVANS
PAOLA FILIPPUCCI
L. FISHER
PHIL GARDNER
S. GARRIGAN-MATTAR
H. GLEN
M. S. GOLDING
MINA GORJI

FIONA GREEN
LINDA M. HARGREAVES
RONALD S. HAYNES
R. D. HICKMAN
DAVID HILLMAN
PAM HIRSCH
EDWARD W. HOLBERTON
JOHN HOPKINS
ALEX HOUEN
S. HOUGHTON-WALKER
M. HREBENIAK
CAROLINE HUMPHREY
MICHAEL D. HURLEY
MARY L. JACOBUS
S. P. JARVIS
A. J. KABLA
GEOFFREY KANTARIS
LAWRENCE KING
R. KIRKPATRICK
RAPHAEL LYNE
ROBERT MACFARLANE
C. McLAUGHLIN
TORSTEN MEISSNER
LEO MELLOR

R. MENGHAM
N. MCK. MERCER
AMY M. E. MORRIS
M. NÍ MHAONAIGH
I. K. PATTERSON
P. POINTON
DIANE REAY
MICHAEL RICE
R. J. E. RILEY
M. S. RODRIGUES ALVES DE
MAGALHÃES
M. A. RUEHL
L. RUPRECHT
KENNETH RUTHVEN
W. O. SAXTON
S. J. SCHAFFER
N. SINGAL
A. M. STILLMAN
MARILYN STRATHERN
E. STRIETMAN
MORAG STYLES
M. SWANN
D. THOM
DAVID TROTTER

F. UDREA
ISOBEL URQUHART
M. J. WAITHE
J. M. B. WALLACE

C. G. WARNES
RUTH WATSON
S. WATTS
DANIEL H. WEISS

DAVID WHITLEY
STUART WIMBUSH
C. J. YOUNG
ANDREW ZURCHER

Vote PLACET: Science is Vital

Although there has been considerable criticism of current government Higher Education policy, both within the University and nationally, much of this has focussed on the likely effect of this policy on the Arts and Humanities. Many of the voices raised in protest, especially within the University, have been from the Arts and Humanities. So an uninformed observer could be forgiven for thinking that the Sciences will be relatively unscathed by the sweeping changes now proposed. However, this is not so, as Professor Steve Young, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Resources and Professor of Information Engineering, pointed out in a Discussion on 18 January 2011: “in my view the real threat is more likely to be to the sciences, where the rapidly reducing government grant will make it harder to justify a uniform fee to all Home undergraduates whilst continuing to provide high quality but costly laboratory-based teaching to those in science and technology” (*Reporter*, 2010–11, p. 450).

In its 27 April 2011 submission to the House of Commons Science & Technology Select Committee, the Campaign for Science & Engineering (CaSE) points out that although the Comprehensive Spending Review froze the Science Budget (in cash terms), capital expenditure on research was cut by 46% (£1.9bn), the impact of which “will be to reduce the UK’s capacity to invest in cutting-edge science and engineering projects by more than 50% (as well as seriously affecting ongoing research)”. As well as this, CaSE report that spending on programmes to address the gender imbalance and the under-representation of various groups (e.g. the disabled, students from comprehensive schools, etc.) in the STEM sector has been severely cut (by 100% in some instances). Furthermore “golden hellos” for new science and maths teachers are to be abolished, despite the UK’s severe shortage of teachers with the relevant background in physics, chemistry and maths (an estimated shortfall of 4,000 physics teachers alone). This is likely to reduce the number of children being properly educated in these subjects, and consequently to reduce the number of young people choosing to take these subjects at University, depriving us of the next generation of scientists.

Taken as a whole, it is clear that current government policy is not only not in the best interests of UK science, but also that it has not been thought out properly, and as a result has fallen foul of the law of unintended consequences. Not only can we not have any confidence in current policy delivering what is *best* for UK science, we cannot even be confident it will deliver what is *necessary* for UK science to remain internationally competitive. In 2010, the Science is Vital campaign showed that national protest from the general public and a united science sector could make a difference to government policy. This Grace is part of a national campaign (<http://www.noconfidence.org.uk/>) to get the government to re-think its Higher Education policy. Only together can we do this: therefore we ask all Regents, but particularly our colleagues in the STEM subjects, to vote **Placet**.

METE ATATURE
R. H. S. CARPENTER
M. R. CLARK
R. DE MULDER
ANDREW FERGUSON
P. L. GIBBARD
MALTE GROSCHKE
JOCHEN GUCK

S. HOUGHTON-WALKER
HENRI JOHNSTON
A. J. KABLA
ULRICH KEYSER
M. KÖHL
E. MAWDSLEY
J. J. MEGGITT
IRIS MÖLLER

MICHAEL RICE
K. S. RICHARDS
R. J. E. RILEY
W. O. SAXTON
F. UDREA
STUART WIMBUSH

VOTE PLACET: THEY GOT IT WRONG

There are obviously a number of important issues around this Grace of no confidence in the government’s Higher Education policies. But however you weigh up the pros and cons of such an action, at its heart is a very simple question:

Do you think that, with its current HE policies, our government has gotten it wrong?

If your answer to this question is “yes” (or “on balance, yes”) then we urge you to **VOTE PLACET**.

RACHEL ALEXANDER
TARAK K. BARKAWI
M. B. BECKLES
S. T. CAIN
R. L. C. CHARLES
M. R. CLARK
R. DE MULDER
I. N. DIVANNA
PAOLA FILIPPUCCI
P. L. GIBBARD

M. S. GOLDING
D. J. GOODE
P. R. HARDIE
RONALD S. HAYNES
E. W. HOLBERTON
JOHN HOPKINS
S. HOUGHTON-WALKER
KATE M. JEARY
LAWRENCE KING
LEO MELLOR

AMY M. E. MORRIS
KAMAL MUNIR
S. PAGE
I. K. PATTERSON
C. E. PRESTON
R. J. E. RILEY
M. S. RODRIGUES ALVES DE
MAGALHÃES
L. RUPRECHT
M. G. SARGEANT

E. STRIETMAN
D. THOM

F. UDREA
ISOBEL URQUHART

C. G. WARNES
ANDREW ZURCHER

Why this Higher Education Policy Must be Resisted

In the wake of the recent financial crisis, which left millions unemployed, uninsured and homeless, and ended in a massive transfer of funds from taxpayers to the corporate elite, which direction should public policy be taking? Should the realization that much of this was caused by our unflinching faith in the ‘free market’ bring us closer to the economic orthodoxy that lies at the heart of the Universities Minister’s education policy or prompt us to challenge it? If we learn one lesson from this disaster it should be that the economy must remain subservient to society. Decisions that affect society must be based on values that we hold dear and not on ‘efficiency’ considerations alone.

That this government should appoint a self-professed ‘free marketeer’ as Higher Education Minister when British society is still reeling from the damage done by this philosophy beggars belief. Shouldn’t the universities be advising the government *against* a dogmatic adherence to the mythical powers of the free market? Instead, we have the Higher Education minister opening doors for market forces to take over education and subsequently, British society. A three-fold rise in tuition fees, plans to sell off university seats to the highest bidders, corporate sponsoring for universities – all this in the complete absence of any pre-announced electoral mandate of this kind! That all this is being carried out in the name of social mobility is a further affront to our intelligence. What is next? Building of multi million-pound homes to solve the problem of homelessness?

Educating young minds is a social mission. We seek to deal with each students’ needs individually, seeing in her or him a future citizen. Preparing students to have independent minds and a concern for society requires cultivating a particular ethos in them. The current education policy is undermining that mission.

We must reject the erroneous assumption that the country can no longer afford to fund education, even as the taxpayer is being made to fund expensive wars being fought to preserve the interests of a few. We must stand up and deal a resounding blow to the ideology that this Higher Education minister represents.

Vote ‘Placet’.

R. L. C. CHARLES
B. K. ETHERINGTON
S. GOLOMBOK
PRIYAMVADA GOPAL
M. HREBENIAK

KATE M. JEARY
M. R. LAVEN
A. D. LEHMANN
TORSTEN MEISSNER
KAMAL MUNIR

I. K. PATTERSON
J. SCOTT-WARREN
ISOBEL URQUHART
RUTH WATSON

Grace 3 of 15 June 2011: Fly-sheet

As the principal *placet* flysheet notes, the Grace boils down to: *Do you think that, with its current HE policies, our government has gotten it wrong?* It would be surprising if Regents disagreed. But the initiated Grace mechanism was not intended as a way of ascertaining the *vox pop*. on matters unconnected with University governance.

A second *placet* flysheet, by Professor Simon Jarvis, asks us collectively to say that we believe education to be a public good. Indeed, the University has done so, in the Council statement of 8th December, twice since reiterated. But nothing of this is implicit in the Grace either as worded or as summarised above.

There are many good points in the *placet* flysheets pointing out the consequences of the government’s actions. This is not the way to make them. A lazy and jejune vote of no confidence does nothing to get these arguments a wider hearing. The Grace’s promoters could have used the opportunity to affirm the University’s stated values. They have chosen instead to make an empty political gesture.

We urge you to vote *non placet*.

P. ALEXANDER
W. ALLISON
R. BOLTON
V. GIBSON

D. A. GREEN
M. P. HOBSON
P. B. LITTLEWOOD
R. PADMAN

GUY POOLEY
JULIA M. RILEY
D. TITTERINGTON

VOTE PLACET: THE GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO RECONSIDER ITS EDUCATION POLICY.

The University of Oxford’s *no confidence* motion has received widespread publicity, making it absolutely clear that Oxford academics are overwhelmingly against the government’s education policies. The press coverage has been so positive and so widespread that a national campaign is being coordinated to encourage as many other Higher

27 July 2011

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER 1135

Education institutions as possible to follow this lead. This is being supported by the University and College Union (UCU), both nationally and by the Cambridge Local Association.

In the past year the coalition government has shown a pattern of attempting to impose half-baked ideological ideas with minimal dialogue. We have also seen that, with coordinated campaigns, they can be forced to reconsider or back down, as with the proposed privatisation of woodlands and NHS market proposals. A clear statement that those people who are most knowledgeable about these issues, such as the doctors and nurses working in the NHS, consider that the government's proposals are misguided has been crucial in bringing about these rethinks. It is therefore vital that university employees also voice their disapproval of the government's HE policies.

For this reason we urge you to vote **Placet** to the current Grace.

H. AZERAD
M. B. BECKLES
B. J. BURCHELL
R. H. S. CARPENTER
R. L. C. CHARLES
M. R. CLARK
DEVON CURTIS
I. N. DIVANNA
ROBERT DOUBLEDAY

B. K. ETHERINGTON
P. L. GIBBARD
D. J. GOODE
P. R. HARDIE
RONALD S. HAYNES
M. HREBENIAK
A. J. KABLA
GEOFFREY KANTARIS
LAWRENCE KING

AMY M. E. MORRIS
S. PAGE
R. J. E. RILEY
M. G. SARGEANT
F. UDREA
ISOBEL URQUHART
RUTH WATSON