

**A REVIEW OF THE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS  
FOR SPORT WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY**

**November 2013**

**Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
Membership of the Review Committee.....	4
Terms of reference.....	4
A consultative report .....	4
The background and context to the review.....	4
A vision for sport in the University of Cambridge.....	5
GOVERNANCE AND OVERSIGHT ARRANGEMENTS FOR SPORT IN THE UNIVERSITY .....	6
The current role and membership of the Sports Syndicate.....	6
The proposed role and membership of the Sports Committee.....	7
Ordinances relating to sport .....	9
Senior Members of Sports Clubs.....	9
The relationship between the Sports Syndicate and the Societies Syndicate.....	10
The role of the Proctors .....	11
The delivery of sport in the University.....	11
Access of staff and the wider Cambridge community to University sports facilities .....	13
THE FUNDING OF SPORT IN THE UNIVERSITY .....	13
West Cambridge Sports Centre.....	14
Budgetary management by the Sports Syndicate .....	14
Stewardship and Philanthropic Funding.....	15
Sponsorship and Branding .....	15
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
LIST OF SUGGESTIONS.....	19
PRIORITY ISSUES TO BE ADDRESS BY THE NEW SPORTS SERVICE .....	19
APPENDICES .....	20

*Contents continue on following page*

Appendix A. The paper proposing a review that was approved by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2012. .... 20

Appendix B. Briefing documents considered by the review committee..... 23

Appendix C. List of interested parties who were approached to submit evidence to the review committee (in addition to the general invitation published in The Reporter). .... 24

Appendix D. List of those who provided written evidence to the review committee ..... 25

Appendix E. List of those who provided verbal evidence to the review committee ..... 26

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In November 2012 the Council established a committee to review and make recommendations in relation to the governance, management and funding of sport in the University. The committee now present a consultative report for consideration by the Council and the Regent House.

Responsibility for the governance of sport in the University, and for the provision of advice currently rests with the Sports Syndicate. However, there is neither a clearly articulated vision nor a strategy for sport nor evidence of forward planning, except for the construction of the West Cambridge Sports Centre. There is no significant institutional relationship between the Syndicate and the broader Collegiate University.

The Department of Physical Education is also structurally and administratively disconnected from the governance and decision-making structures of the University. The Syndicate does not oversee the budget of the Department, nor does it provide an effective bridge between the Department and the rest of the University. The apparent independence of the Syndicate and the Department from key decision-making bodies has had a negative impact on relationships between University and sport.

The review committee believes that the provision of high quality sporting facilities benefits students, staff and the Collegiate University as an institution as well as the local community. The Committee presents a draft vision for the role of sport which it recommends the University should adopt.

The review committee recommends that the Sports Syndicate should become a joint committee of the Council and General Board, and it should be called the University Sports Committee. It further recommends that the Department of Physical Education should be renamed the University of Cambridge Sports Service and become part of the Unified Administrative Service.

The principal terms of reference of the University Sports Committee should be to:

1. Set a strategy for sport
2. Secure and allocate resources to deliver that strategy
3. Oversee the delivery of that strategy by the Sports Service
4. Oversee the registration of sports clubs
5. Manage risks relating to sport in the University.

The Sports Committee should make the case to the University for sport, and be responsible for managing funding for sport in the University, including sponsorship and philanthropic giving.

The current management of sports facilities and services is fragmented. The Head of the Sports Service, the new post that is proposed to replace that of the current Director of Physical Education, should co-ordinate the use of those facilities and services throughout the University.

The provision of sports services should be primarily for students. However, such services should also be made available for the benefit of staff and the public, and to generate income, as far as it is possible to do so without compromising availability to students.

The report makes fifteen recommendations and two suggestions. These are a combination of structural recommendations for the University, and recommendations for action by the new bodies that will be created. If the recommendations of this review are approved, University Ordinances will need be revised accordingly. In addition, the report highlights a number of matters for priority attention by the proposed Sports Service and Sports Committee.

## INTRODUCTION

At its meeting on 26 November 2012, the Council accepted a recommendation from the Chair of the Sports Syndicate and the Registry that there was a need for an independent review of the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University. The paper which the Council received is attached at Appendix A.

### *Membership of the Review Committee*

The membership of the review committee was agreed as follows:

Professor Jeremy Sanders, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional Affairs (Chair)  
Dr Bill Nolan, Senior Tutor at Robinson College  
Professor Shirley Pearce, external member of the University Council and former Vice-Chancellor of Loughborough University  
Mr Christopher Pratt, Bursar of Jesus College and member of the Sports Syndicate  
Dr Christina Skott, the Junior Proctor (2012–13)  
Mr John Walker, Representative of the Graduate Union  
Mr Dom Weldon, Representative of Cambridge University Students' Union  
Mr Keith Zimmerman, Director of Student Administration and Services in the University of Oxford until September 2013 and then Director, Students at The Open University  
Mr Rob Needle, the Registry's Office (Secretary)

### *Terms of reference*

The Council approved the following terms of reference for the review:

1. To consider the current governance and oversight arrangements for sport in the University and to make recommendations to the Council.
2. To consider the current arrangements for the management and funding of sport in the University and to make recommendations to the Council.

### *A consultative report*

This report is intended to be a consultative report, for consideration by the Council, followed by a Discussion. The review committee will consider any suggested amendments and then submit a further Report to the Council for consideration and publication to the Regent House.

### *The background and context to the review*

The University of Cambridge lists as one of its core values the provision of 'opportunities for broadening the experience of students and staff through participation in sport, music, drama, the visual arts, and other cultural activities'. (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/mission.html>)

The value of sport to the University is endorsed by the Vice-Chancellor: 'Through its impact on the individual, sport helps the University achieve its mission of pursuing education, learning and research at the highest levels of international excellence'.

(<http://www.sport.cam.ac.uk/CambridgeSportsCentre/index.html>)

There has not been a significant review of sport in the University since the 1981 McCrum Report reported to the Athletics Syndicate, to the Council and to the University. The University reviewed the Athletics Syndicate in the Michaelmas Term 1992 replacing it with the Sports Syndicate.

The McCrum report focused on sites and buildings. It recognised that there was a range of different roles for sport in students' lives, and also incidentally mentioned the potential value of making facilities available to staff as a source of income for the University. However, there was no in-depth analysis of these matters nor any attempt to establish the most effective governance or management arrangements. There has also apparently been no revision of the relevant Ordinances for many years.

The Sports Syndicate is currently the body responsible for overseeing sport in the university. In April 2012, Dr Pat Marsh undertook a review of sport in the University on a voluntary basis. Dr Marsh presented a draft interim report on her findings to the Sports Syndicate in October 2012. That report highlighted the need for substantial changes in the governance and management of sport in the University.

As a result of that report, the Chair of the Sports Syndicate and the Registry presented a joint paper to the Council, asking for an independent review to be established by the University. Dr Marsh's draft interim report was made available to the review committee and provided valuable material that usefully informed its thinking.

In the course of the review, the committee considered eight documents (listed at Appendix B). Submissions of written evidence were invited by advertisement in the Reporter and by emails inviting evidence from key individuals and groups (listed at Appendix C). The committee received forty written submissions of evidence (listed at Appendix D) and heard verbal evidence from twenty witnesses (listed at Appendix E).

The organisation and financing of sport within colleges is a central feature of sport in Cambridge which is clearly outside the remit of the review committee. Nevertheless the relationships between University and College sport are important, and we refer to them where appropriate in this review.

### *A vision for sport in the University of Cambridge*

In accordance with the University's published core values, the committee believes that the provision of high quality sporting facilities benefits students, staff and the University as an institution. Students can benefit from engaging in physical activity. This complements the academic component of their time at Cambridge, whilst simultaneously providing motivation and developing transferable skills (such as teamwork, leadership, time-management), which will enhance their future employability and effectiveness. Staff also benefit from being healthier, happier and having fewer days sickness as a result of opportunities to keep fit, sport being a good means of relieving stress. Participation in sport also creates opportunities for students and staff of different backgrounds, ages, disciplines to come together, and it helps to create a sense of community. In addition, sport can also create opportunities for the University to engage with, and enhance the life of, the local community.

Sport can enhance the reputation of the University nationally and internationally. Major sporting occasions are opportunities for students of high academic achievement to display a correspondingly high level of sporting talent. The University's profile in the sports domain can be an effective means

of maintaining beneficial links with alumni who have positive memories of the time they spent playing sport at the University and in forging links with friends and supporters of the University. Also, what the University has to offer at the elite or recreational level of sport might attract potential applicants at both graduate and undergraduate level, including those whom the University is targeting in connection with its OFFA (Office for Fair Access) Agreement. It can help to attract those students who have the intellectual ability to apply but who might think it is too exclusively an academic environment for them to enjoy.

The University currently has no articulated vision or strategy for sport, and there is no evidence of forward planning or target setting, except for the construction of the West Cambridge Sports Centre. The review committee felt that there was need for a working definition of the University's ambition for sport and agreed the following working statement, which informed its enquiries and thinking:

*Through its wide-ranging benefits, sport will help the collegiate University to achieve and sustain excellence in teaching and research by:*

- *Providing for the health and wellbeing of the University community through encouraging widespread involvement in sport;*
- *Encouraging and enabling the success of College and University Sports Clubs in delivering competitive opportunities to their members;*
- *Supporting elite athletes to achieve their full potential.*

*This will be achieved by delivering outstanding facilities and services and managing them effectively and responsively for the benefit of students, staff and the wider community.*

## GOVERNANCE AND OVERSIGHT ARRANGEMENTS FOR SPORT IN THE UNIVERSITY

### *The current role and membership of the Sports Syndicate*

The University of Cambridge Ordinances relating to the Sports Syndicate state that its membership should be as follows;

- '(a) the Vice-Chancellor or a duly appointed deputy as Chairman;
- (b) five members of the Senate appointed by the Council;
- (c) one member of the Finance Committee of the Council, appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Committee;
- (d) the Chairman of the Committee of Senior Treasurers of College Amalgamated Clubs or a representative appointed by the Chairman;
- (e) the Director of Physical Education;
- (f) two Senior Treasurers of University sports clubs co-opted by the Syndicate;
- (g) not more than two other persons co-opted by the Syndicate;
- (h) one person *in statu pupillari* appointed by a special meeting of delegates of the Colleges, each College deciding for itself how its delegate shall be appointed;
- (i) six persons *in statu pupillari*, four appointed by the Blues Committee and two appointed by the Women's Blues Committee.' (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/2012/chapter01-section9.html#heading2-32>)

The Sports Syndicate met five times during the 2012–13 academic year.

It is the view of the review committee that it does not provide an effective bridge between the Department of Physical Education and the strategic decision-making structure of the University. Of the eleven senior members, six are current or retired Bursars. This is not necessarily unhelpful, since much of the current business of the Syndicate is about the management of resources, budgets and facilities. Whilst they bring a good understanding of the needs of Colleges with regard to sport, they do not link directly into the strategic committees of the University. The current membership of the Syndicate complies with the requirements of Ordinances but it includes no senior members who could ensure that the needs of sport are effectively brought to the attention of the University's strategic decision-making bodies. As a consequence of this distance from the strategic management of the University, senior figures in both the Department of Physical Education and the Sports Syndicate have come to believe that the University does not value sport.

The Ordinances state that the "Syndicate shall advise the Council and the University about the policy, facilities, and arrangements for sport in the University." (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/2012/chapter01-section9.html#heading2-32> ) However, the only vehicle for this advice appears to be the Annual Report which contains little more than a dry list of facts and the Minutes of the syndicate meetings, which are circulated to members of the Council. It is not clear if the Syndicate has offered advice, or — if it has — whether that advice has been accepted and acted on.

The review committee is strongly of the view that the apparent independence from the University's strategic decision-making structures of both the Sports Syndicate and the Department of Physical Education has had a negative impact on the University's capacity to deliver on its aspirations for sport. In order for the University to provide sporting facilities and support of the highest standard, the governance and management arrangements for its delivery need to be strongly tied into the committee and administrative structures of the University. In the modern University, where there is fierce competition for financial and human resources, including those that support philanthropic fundraising, sport has to be able to compete from within the structure, not from outside it.

Sporting activity represents a number of potential risks to the University: finance, health and safety, governance and management of the sports clubs all pose reputational and real risks. The current Sports Syndicate is not an effective mechanism for the management of these risks. The Sports Syndicate should become a committee, reporting jointly to the Council and the General Board and it should be called the University Sports Committee.

**Recommendation 1:** The Sports Syndicate should be reformed into a committee and renamed the University Sports Committee.

To complement reform of the Sports Syndicate into the Sports Committee, the existing Department of Physical Education should be replaced by the University Sports Service. The rationale for this change is set out in the section on 'The delivery of sport in the University', below (page 11).

### *The proposed role and membership of the Sports Committee*

The principal terms of reference for the Sports Committee should be to:

1. Set a strategy for sport
2. Secure and allocate resources to deliver that strategy
3. Oversee the delivery of that strategy by the Sports Service
4. Oversee the registration of sports clubs

5. Manage risks relating to sport in the University.

The Sports Committee should be a joint committee, reporting to both the Council and the General Board. It is anticipated that, once fully established, the committee will meet five times each year.

The Chair of the Sports Committee should be a senior academic figure who can act as an advocate for sport at the highest level of decision-making within the University. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (PVC) for Education would be appropriate, reflecting the fact that the sports service is run primarily for the benefit of students, whilst allowing staff to make use of the facilities as well. The committee should have broad representation including sports clubs but also University staff. It should provide the essential link between the Colleges and the University in relation to the provision of sporting facilities.

In addition to the PVC (Education) as Chair, the membership of the Sports Committee should include the following;

- Three members appointed by the Council at least one of whom will be a Council member and one of whom will be a member of staff nominated by the Human Resources Committee;
- Two members appointed by the General Board at least one of whom will be a member of the Board;
- One member appointed by the College Bursars' Committee;
- One members appointed by the College Senior Tutors' Committee;
- A student member nominated by the Education Committee and appointed by the General Board;
- A student representative appointed by the Clubs' sub-committee;
- A member with expertise in sports medicine and/or public health/wellbeing.

The Head of the Sports Service will be in attendance and will act as secretary to the Committee.

The student representative from the Clubs sub-committee should represent primarily the interests of sports clubs. The student member nominated by the Education Committee should represent the wider student body in relation to sport.

An early task for the new Sports Committee will be to articulate a vision and strategy for sport in the University and then hold the Sports Service to account for the progress it makes in delivering that strategy.

**Recommendation 2:** The University Sports Committee should devise a vision and strategy for sport in the University of Cambridge and then hold the University of Cambridge Sports Service to account for delivering it.

The importance of health and safety in relation to sport is such that it necessitates a designated body to oversee the activities of the University Sports Service and University Sports Clubs. The Sports Committee should provide the overarching governance for the University Sports Service and its facilities, and also oversee registration of clubs and the allocation of funds through a Clubs' sub-committee, a Health and Safety sub-committee and any other sub-committees it sees fit to create.

The Clubs' sub-committee would be responsible for overseeing the registration of all clubs, establishing and ensuring compliance with the conditions of registration, allocating available funds to clubs and overseeing the use of those funds.

The Health and Safety sub-committee would ensure that all sports clubs have up-to-date and published safety codes of conduct and risk assessments, and that these are in compliance with any guidance and codes of practice from the national governing body of any sport. The sub-committee would also oversee compliance with protocols governing issues such as travel by student athletes (including overseas travel), insurance and event management.

The current Sports Syndicate has sub-committees to oversee the operation of the various sports facilities run by the Department of Physical Education. It is likely that the new Sports Committee will have a similar set of sub-committees.

**Recommendation 3:** The Sports Committee should establish sub-committees responsible for overseeing the registration and management of clubs and health and safety issues relating to sport, plus any other sub-committees it sees fit to create.

**Recommendation 4:** The Director of Health and Safety should work with the Sports Service to establish a regime of audits to ensure that sports clubs comply with health and safety requirements and codes of practice from the national governing body of any sport. These audits should start with those clubs whose members engage in activities that pose the highest risk to themselves or to the reputation of the University in terms of compliance with regulatory requirements. This work is to be overseen by the Health and Safety sub-committee of the Sports Committee.

Some of the larger sports clubs directly employ their own staff but it is not clear if all staff employed in such a way enjoy the same standard of terms and conditions as those employed by the University directly. At least some staff employed in this manner have a line management structure leading to an undergraduate member of the sports club concerned, raising concerns about the level of knowledge and experience that a student has on employment law and good practice. Although these are not University staff, their association with University sports clubs represents a clear reputational risk.

**Recommendation 5:** The Sports Service should conduct an urgent review of the terms, conditions, line management and health and safety arrangements for all staff employed by University sports clubs.

### *Ordinances relating to sport*

The existing Ordinances relating to sport in the University contain references to long-defunct bodies and are in urgent need of revision. The Ordinances further state that the "Syndicate shall seek to ensure that the University's needs in the field of sport are properly provided for by the University sports clubs..." (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/2012/chapter01-section9.html#heading2-32>). Since many clubs do not allow staff to become members, this might appear to restrict the Syndicate's ability to provide for or oversee sports facilities for staff.

**Recommendation 6:** The Ordinances relevant to the management and governance of sport, the Department of Physical Education and the Sports Syndicate should be revised to remove references to defunct bodies and to incorporate those recommendations from this report that are approved by the Council.

### *Senior Members of Sports Clubs*

The role of the Senior Member (usually the Treasurer) is crucial in ensuring that the activities of registered sports clubs are compliant with the standards and principles of the University. Some clubs have reported difficulties in recruiting a senior member of the University willing to take on this role. This situation could be improved by reducing the bureaucratic burden of the role through the provision of more easily-accessible advice and support from the Sports Service, for example on issues relating to budgets, registration and regulatory compliance.

**Recommendation 7:** The Sports Service should proactively offer specialist advice and support to Senior Members of sports clubs.

### *The relationship between the Sports Syndicate and the Societies Syndicate*

There is currently some lack of clarity over which clubs should be registered with the Sports Syndicate and which with the Societies Syndicate. Several student clubs, such as those involved in competitive dance, mountaineering and caving could legitimately be described as sports but are not allowed to be registered with the Sports Syndicate. This is because the Sports Syndicate considers that its annual budget is already fully committed to giving grants to those clubs currently registered with it. Hence it does not allow any more clubs to be registered as sports clubs, whatever the merits of their claim to be classified as a sport. As a further example, members of Cambridge University Ultimate [Frisbee] Club compete against clubs which are recognised at other universities, but the fact they are not registered with the Sports Syndicate means that they are not able to advertise their club on the University Sport website or be invited to talks or briefings run by the Department of Physical Education.

This distinction between those clubs which are registered with the Sports Syndicate and those registered with the Societies Syndicate is illogical and unhelpful. This is an anomaly that needs addressing urgently, but the Sports Committee will not be able to resolve it without involving the Societies Syndicate.

The need to ensure proper financial governance, legislative and regulatory compliance and insurance is common to all student clubs whether supervised by the Sports or Societies Syndicates. A combined syndicate or committee could provide appropriate oversight and registration of all student clubs and societies engaged in extra-curricular activities. Moving to such a single body would require the agreement of the Societies Syndicate and the Regent House. If the broad recommendations of this review are accepted, the review committee suggests that further work should be undertaken to examine the possibility of merging the Sports Committee with the Societies Syndicate to create a single body to oversee all student clubs and societies.

**Suggestion 1:** The review committee suggests that further work should be undertaken to examine the possibility of merging the Sports Committee with the Societies Syndicate to create a single body to oversee all student clubs and societies.

Irrespective of whether or not the Sports Committee and Societies Syndicate are eventually merged, there is a need for a more rational means of establishing whether or not the activities of any particular club should be recognised as a sports club. Becoming registered as a sports club will bring with it requirements relating to risk assessments, insurance requirements and Codes of Conduct that would not apply to societies not engaged in sporting activity. The presumption should be that any club wishing to become registered as a University sports club is that the sport in question is recognised by, or very closely associated with, the list of registered Sport England clubs. In exceptional cases,, where this is not possible there should be a right of appeal to the Sports Committee.

**Recommendation 8:** Any club wishing to become registered as a University sports club should be recognised by, or very closely associated with, the list of registered Sport England clubs. In exceptional cases, where this is not possible, there should be a right of appeal to the Sports Committee.

### *The role of the Proctors*

The Junior Proctor has historically had a role in registering student clubs and societies. This can cause problems for the holders of that post, who hold office for one year only, and usually take on this role in addition to a full time position elsewhere in the University. The establishment of a new sports committee, with the Clubs' sub-committee having specific responsibility for the registration of clubs and ensuring compliance with the conditions of that registration, presents an opportunity to relieve the Proctors of that burden in relation to sports clubs.

**Recommendation 9:** The Junior Proctor no longer needs to be involved in the registration of sports clubs and therefore they will not be required to be a member of the Sports Committee. Ordinances should be updated to reflect these changes.

### *The delivery of sport in the University*

Given the degree of relative disconnection from the mainstream business of the University, it is a tribute to the staff of the Department of Physical Education that they have managed over a period to provide a series of significant new facilities: the athletics track, the indoor cricket school and most recently, the first phase of the new West Cambridge Sports Centre.

Like the Sports Syndicate, the Department of Physical Education is structurally and administratively disconnected from the governance and decision-making structures of the University. There is no prescribed line management route for the Director of Physical Education, other than through the Sports Syndicate, and hence there is no effective process for staff review and development of the holder of that post.

The professional sports staff provide a service to students and others that is conceptually similar to those provided by the Health Service (e.g. access to specialist advice and facilities). We therefore propose that the title "Department of Physical Education", which might imply an academic function, be changed to the "University of Cambridge Sports Service".

In the same way that the Sports Committee needs to be keyed more closely into the strategic decision-making bodies, the Sports Service should be more closely integrated into the core structures for delivering services to students and staff across the University. The current degree of isolation from the central administrative services has resulted in the Department of Physical Education missing out on opportunities to develop its services in tandem with other departments (e.g. Occupational Health and Welfare services) or in line with the general strategic direction of the University. This could be achieved more easily if the Department of Physical Education were to become part of the Unified Administrative Service (UAS). This would also be in line with the general trend of coordinating the work and focus of support services through the UAS.

We propose that, for the first two years or so, the Head of the Sports Service should report directly to the Registry. This will give time to decide the appropriate location for the Sports Service within the UAS structure, and also allow a detailed assessment of the resource and structure implications of that decision.

**Recommendation 10:** The Sports Service should become part of the UAS and the Head of the Sports Service should report to a senior officer within the UAS, the Registry in the first instance. This will give time for a proper assessment of where within the UAS the Sports Service would sit most appropriately and by whom the Head of the Sports Service should be managed in the long term.

The provision and management of sport facilities and services across the University are currently fragmented. 'Blue Fitness' at the University Centre is a fitness suite run by Estate Management, in effect in competition with the Department of Physical Education's facility and with no common membership. It has over 350 members, including students, current staff and retired staff. Its location on Mill Lane makes it a useful part of the provision of fitness facilities across the City Centre and this has become more significant now that the Department of Physical Education's fitness centre has moved from Fenners to the West Cambridge Sports Centre. It is, however, not financially and structurally appropriate to have different departments of the University running competing fitness facilities when there is surely much to be gained from coherent complementary offerings under a single management. The review committee is of the view that significant benefits (financial, administrative and in terms of sharing best practice) would be derived from bringing all of the University's sports facilities, including those being created at North West Cambridge, under the auspices of the Sports Service.

Cambridge University Press (CUP) also provides good sports facilities. CUP, as a wholly owned subsidiary, is part of the wider University and it is clearly desirable that the best possible use is made of the facilities available across the whole University Estate, to the benefit of students, staff and the wider community. Staff working at Cambridge Assessment, by contrast, have no access to dedicated sports facilities. University staff and students based at the Addenbrookes site can join the Frank Lee Leisure and Fitness Centre. This centre is self-funding and runs on a 'not for profit' basis. Membership is open to anyone who works on the Addenbrookes campus

There are many examples of sport being organised informally e.g. the Inter-Departmental cricket league. These tend to be self-funding, occasionally with additional support from their department but could potentially benefit from expert advice from the staff of the Sports Service or assistance in finding venues for their events to take place.

Sports facilities run by Colleges are clearly outside the control of the Department of Physical Education or the University. In addition, some of the larger and more historic sports clubs have been operating with a large degree of autonomy, without effective oversight by the Sports Syndicate or the Department of Physical Education. This could represent a considerable reputational and financial risk to the University.

The guiding principle for sport provision in future should be to offer services and facilities to students and staff at locations close, where possible, to where they work or study. A key role of the Head of the Sports Service should be to coordinate the optimal use of sports facilities and services across the whole University estate, whether they are run directly by the University or by Colleges, other University institutions or even by partner organisations.

**Recommendation 11:** The Head of the Sports Service should liaise with Colleges, managers of other University-related facilities and partner organisations, to identify and facilitate a mutually beneficial use of all sports facilities and services for all students and staff of the Collegiate University and the wider community.

The committee believes that the Sports Service should provide services that provide value for money to students and staff participating in sport whilst simultaneously ensuring that appropriate levels of

health, safety and regulatory compliance are met. An example of this is the transport service run by Oxford University Sports Department. The Department runs an online booking scheme for sports clubs, offering cheaper hire rates, avoiding duplication of booking of transport to the same venue, whilst also ensuring the vehicles are insured and the drivers are appropriately qualified.

**Recommendation 12:** The Sports Service should consider developing a transport service similar to that run by Oxford University Sports Department, thereby delivering good value for those wishing to take part in sport, avoiding duplication of costs and protecting the University by ensuring transport is only hired from reputable sources and driven by approved and registered drivers.

### *Access of staff and the wider Cambridge community to University sports facilities*

The committee believes that sport services should be primarily student-centred. It is not obvious that the University, in aspiring to be a good employer for its staff, should place a higher priority on capital investment in sports facilities than, for example, nurseries. However, the financial return on sports investment, and potential wellbeing benefits should be optimised. Therefore the sports facilities that are provided to students should be made available for the benefit of staff and the public, as far as it is possible to do so without compromising the availability of those facilities and services to students. Public access to the new Sports Centre is a commitment in the University's planning agreement for the North West Cambridge Development. Providing access to staff and the public has the additional benefit of generating a vital income stream.

Furthermore, making facilities available to staff and the local community helps to make some of the less popular sports viable, generating income and improving positive relationships with members of the local community. Within certain sports and in respect to some facilities this is happening already but it appears to be on a piecemeal basis and should be adopted as a working principle.

**Suggestion 2:** The review committee suggests that the Sports Service adopts the below statement of prioritisation in the management and promotion of its facilities and services:

Prioritisation of access to University Sporting facilities and services;

1. Students
2. Staff (if not compromising access for students)
3. Members of the wider community (as a means of income generation and to make some less popular sports viable, as long as they do not compromise accessibility of facilities to students or staff).

## THE FUNDING OF SPORT IN THE UNIVERSITY

It has not been possible to identify a precise figure for the total amount that the Collegiate University spends on sport because of the complexity of the landscape. In addition to those facilities provided by the Department of Physical Education or the Sports Syndicate there are those provided by Colleges or by other departments (e.g. Blue Fitness). The level of income generation achieved by these facilities is an additional complicating factor.

The combined annual expenditure of the four highest spending sports clubs equals that of the Department of Physical Education and the Sports Syndicate combined. We note also that the Sports Syndicate has not had any involvement in the decision to build a new University boathouse at Ely.

The combined expenditure of the thirty one Cambridge Colleges on sport is estimated to be far greater than the sum spent by the University. Some Colleges cooperate in sharing facilities such as sports grounds and boathouses but more could be done to achieve the most cost-effective use of sports facilities across the whole University estate. The committee believes that the Head of the Sports Service should have a responsibility, in liaison with College Bursars, to identify and facilitate a mutually beneficial use of all facilities for all students and staff of the Collegiate University (see Recommendation 11).

The diverse provision of sporting facilities across the University is also apparent in that several of the major sports fields used by the University are owned by trusts or limited companies which are independent of the University. The freehold of the Grange Road Rugby Union ground is owned by the Cambridge University Rugby Union and Association Football Trust Ltd. The freehold of Fenners Tennis Club is owned by Cambridge University Lawn Tennis Club. The freehold of Fenners Cricket Ground is owned by Cambridge University Cricket and Athletic Club Ltd. The Freehold of the Ely Boat House will be owned by a newly-formed company made up of Cambridge University Boat Club and Cambridge University Women's Boat Club. The freehold for the Wilberforce Road Athletics ground and hockey pitches is owned by St John's College.

### *West Cambridge Sports Centre*

The original business case for the West Cambridge Sports Centre has been subject to a separate review which reported to the Planning and Resources Committee in March 2013 and it continues to be monitored by a sub-committee of the Sports Syndicate.

### *Budgetary management by the Sports Syndicate*

The Sports Syndicate reviews and reports only on its own budget: it has had no oversight of the budget for the Department of Physical Education, which is submitted directly into the University planning round. The Sports Syndicate budget represents only a little over 13% of the total overall revenue spending on sport by the central University. Sports Syndicate expenditure for 2011/12 was £124,918, of which £73,164 was paid by Colleges via a capitation fee ([http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6296/SportsSyndicate2011\\_12.pdf](http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6296/SportsSyndicate2011_12.pdf)), whereas the total expenditure on Sports Syndicate and Physical Education for the same period was £958,000 (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/special/06/06-FMI-2012-SectionC.pdf>). The review committee does not see how the financial separation between the Syndicate and Department of Physical Education can be justified.

There is an immediate shortfall of funding for sports clubs that has been historically allocated through the Sports Syndicate. In recent years the Sports Syndicate income has been a little over £120,000. It has used this funding to cover the University's membership of British Universities and Colleges Sport (BUCS) the national governing body for Higher Education sport in the UK, and for grants to University sports clubs. Historically, this income had been provided by Colleges paying a levy for each of their students. This aggregated amount from all the Colleges was originally intended to be matched by an equal amount from the University. With the growth in student numbers in recent years, however, the proportion paid by the University has reduced. In recent years the income of the Sports Syndicate has been made up as follows;

2010/11: £128,160 (University £55,460, Colleges £72,700)

2011/12: £127,516 (University £54,352, Colleges £73,164)

2012/13: £135,269 (University £54,896, Colleges £80,373)

[Source: Planning and Resources Committee]

The capitation fee contribution to the Sports Syndicate income was levied at a rate of £4.40 per student for 2012/13. From 2013/14 onwards the Colleges had agreed to raise the capitation fee to £10.00 per students but that this would cover student membership of the West Cambridge Sports Centre. This capitation fee is now an essential component of the business case for the West Cambridge Sports Centre. However, it creates an annual shortfall in the funds for the Sports Syndicate of over £80,000, which will exhaust the Syndicate's reserves very soon. This system of funding for the Sports Syndicate is unsustainable.

In the longer-term, the Sports Committee should make a planning round submission for the totality of University funding for sport. In the interim, the University and the Sport Syndicate need to identify a short-term solution to the current situation.

**Recommendation 13:** The Sports Committee should determine what funding is needed to deliver its strategy for sport across the whole of the University and should bid to the University through the planning round, and to Colleges, to raise those funds.

### *Stewardship and Philanthropic Funding*

It should be the responsibility of the Sports Committee to publish an annual report, to include records of those who have competed for the University and in what role, and to make those records available to the Cambridge University Development Office (CUDO).

Currently the Department of Physical Education, Colleges and individual sports clubs all aspire to raise funds through philanthropy. To date this has been done in competition with each other, with limited success and on the basis of inadequate data records. Up to now, there has been no constructive relationship with CUDO in relation to raising funds for sport. One of the roles of the Sports Committee should be to explore how such appeals for philanthropic funding can be better managed. A coordinated approach, preferably involving the Colleges, has the potential to be more successful than the current model. It will be the role of the Sports Committee to make the case for philanthropic fundraising for sport to the University and to CUDO but it is of course for others to decide CUDO's priorities for fundraising.

**Recommendation 14:** The Sports Committee should take overall responsibility for making the case for funding for sport and for the appropriate prioritisation of fundraising for sport by Cambridge University Development Office.

### *Sponsorship and Branding*

Sponsorship is potentially a lucrative source of funding for University sport. Closely related to this is the University's trademark and licensing programme. The main licensing programme generates around £100k per year. The University Licensing Office plans to increase that. There are in place some loose arrangements (set up in 1993) covering the use of the trademark and funding; these favour some sports clubs over others.

Only a few clubs have the commercial viability to run a licensing programme in their own right, e.g. polo, rugby, and rowing. Currently, only polo and rugby are running their own programmes, each having registered their own trademarks in a number of countries. If all the clubs operated through the main licensing programme it would be possible to minimise the risk to the University from misuse of the trademarks and potentially to maximise revenue. The Licensing Office is working with the Legal Services Office to draw up a revised licensing agreement to achieve this.

**Recommendation 15:** The Sports Committee should review the revised licensing agreement covering the use of the University's brand, once completed, to ensure it complements and contributes to the strategy for sport.

## LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation 1:** The Sports Syndicate should be reformed into a committee and renamed the University Sports Committee.

**Recommendation 2:** The University Sports Committee should devise a vision and strategy for sport in the University of Cambridge and then hold the University of Cambridge Sports Service to account for delivering it.

**Recommendation 3:** The Sports Committee should establish sub-committees responsible for overseeing and the registration and management of clubs and health and safety issues relating to sport, plus any other sub-committees it sees fit to create.

**Recommendation 4:** The Director of Health and Safety should work with the Sports Service to establish a regime of audits to ensure that sports clubs comply with health and safety requirements and codes of practice from the national governing body of any sport. These audits should start with those clubs whose members engage in activities that pose the highest risk to themselves or to the reputation of the University in terms of compliance with regulatory requirements. This work is to be overseen by the Health and Safety sub-committee of the Sports Committee.

**Recommendation 5:** The Ordinances relevant to the management and governance of sport, the Department of Physical Education and the Sports Syndicate should be revised to remove references to defunct bodies and to incorporate those recommendations from this report that are approved by the Council.

**Recommendation 6:** The Sports Service should conduct an urgent review of the terms, conditions, line management and health and safety arrangements for all staff employed by University sports clubs.

**Recommendation 7:** The Sports Service should proactively offer specialist advice and support to Senior Members of sports clubs.

**Recommendation 8:** Any club wishing to become registered as a University sports club should be recognised by, or very closely associated with, the list of registered Sport England Clubs. In exceptional cases where this is not possible there should be a right of appeal to the Sports Committee.

**Recommendation 9:** The Junior Proctor no longer needs to be involved in the registration of sports clubs and therefore they will not be required to be a member of the Sports Committee. Ordinances should be updated to reflect these changes.

**Recommendation 10:** The Sports Service should become part of the Unified Administrative Service (UAS) and the Head of the Sports Service should report to a senior officer within the UAS. In the first instance, the Head of the Sports Service should report directly to the Registry. This will give time for a proper assessment of where within the UAS the Sports Service would sit most appropriately and by whom the Head of the Sports Service should be managed in the long term.

**Recommendation 11:** The Head of the Sports Service should liaise with College Bursars, managers of other University-related facilities and partner organisations, to identify and facilitate a mutually beneficial use of all sports facilities and services for all students and staff of the Collegiate University and the wider community.

**Recommendation 12:** The Sports Service should develop a transport service similar to that run by Oxford University Sports Department, thereby delivering good value for those wishing to take part in sport, avoiding duplication of costs and protecting the University by ensuring transport is only hired from reputable sources and driven by approved and registered drivers.

**Recommendation 13:** The Sports Committee should determine what funding is needed to deliver its strategy for sport across the whole of the University and should bid to the University through the planning round, and to Colleges, to raise those funds.

**Recommendation 14:** The Sports Committee should take overall responsibility for making the case for funding for sport and for the appropriate prioritisation of fundraising for sport by Cambridge University Development Office.

**Recommendation 15:** The Sports Committee should review the revised licensing agreement covering the use of the University's brand, once completed, to ensure it complements and contributes to the strategy for sport.

## LIST OF SUGGESTIONS

**Suggestion 1:** The review committee suggests that further work should be undertaken to examine the possibility of merging the Sports Committee with the Societies Syndicate to create a single body to oversee all extra-curricular activities engaged in through student clubs and societies.

**Suggestion 2:** The review committee suggests that the Sports Service adopts the below statement of prioritisation in the management and promotion of its facilities and services:

Prioritisation of access to University Sporting facilities and services;

1. Students
2. Staff (if not compromising access for students)
3. Members of the wider community (as a means of income generation and to make some less popular sports viable, as long as they do not compromise accessibility of facilities to students or staff).

## PRIORITY ISSUES TO BE ADDRESS BY THE NEW SPORTS SERVICE

**The review committee believes that there are a number of the Recommendations that should be prioritised for action by the new Sports Committee and Sports Service. These are listed below.**

**Recommendation 3:** The Director of Health and Safety should work with the Sports Service to establish a regime of audits to ensure that sports clubs comply with health and safety requirements and codes of practice from the national governing body of any sport. These audits should start with those clubs whose members engage in activities that pose the highest risk to themselves or to the reputation of the University in terms of compliance with regulatory requirements. This work is to be overseen by the Health and Safety sub-committee of the Sports Committee.

**Recommendation 5:** The Sports Service should conduct an urgent review of the terms, conditions, line management and health and safety arrangements for all staff employed by University sports clubs.

**Recommendation 13:** The Sports Committee should determine what funding is needed to deliver its strategy for sport across the whole of the University and should bid to the University through the planning round, and to Colleges, to raise those funds.

## APPENDICES

*Appendix A. The paper proposing a review that was approved by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2012.*

### **Sports Syndicate and Department of Physical Education: Proposed Review**

1. In July 2009, following a letter to the Registry by member of the Syndicate, Mr Christopher Pratt, the Chairman of the Sports Syndicate wrote to the Registry supporting Mr Pratt's request for a Review of Sport, to cover:
  - Actual and potential sources of funding
  - Governance arrangements, especially the role of the Syndicate
  - Accountability for access, health and safety, etc.
  - The role of the Colleges
  - The distribution of physical and financial resources
  - The long term needs of the main sports
  - The future of the sports centre project

At its meeting on 13 October 2009, the Syndicate was informed that the Registry had agreed to a Review, and that terms of reference would be proposed to the Council on 6 December 2009 with a view to completion of the review by Easter 2010. Consultation had suggested that the Review might be chaired by a Head of House. However, it proved impossible at that time to find a Head of House willing to chair such a Review.

2. At its meeting on 2 February 2010, the Sports Syndicate approved the establishment of a working party to review its own governance arrangements, to be undertaken with the support of Dr Kirsty Allen.
3. The terms of reference of the review were as follows:

To consider and bring forward proposals for the reform of the governance arrangements for the supervision and organisation of sport and associated University facilities, including the future of both the Sports and Societies Syndicates and the relationship between them or any successor body and the major sports clubs. Any proposals brought forward for improving the current governance arrangements are to include strengthening the current accountability for health and safety and the University's duty with regard to access and diversity.

At its meeting on 12 October 2010, the Syndicate noted that the review had been postponed pending a decision by the University on the future of the West Cambridge Sports Centre project.

In June 2011, the Chairman wrote to Dr Allen asking for the review to re-commence in view of the impending completion of the first phase of the new Sports Centre at West Cambridge and the need to ensure that its business plan (as approved by Planning and Resources Committee) was still sound and capable of delivery, and that the Syndicate itself was

properly constituted to have proper oversight of the implementation of the plan. Following discussion with the Registry, the Chairman and the Director of Physical Education agreed that the next step was for the Director to review the strategy for sport and produce a paper which would inform the review of governance. This has not so far been achieved.

4. In April 2012, the Director recruited, on a voluntary basis, Dr Pat Marsh to assist him. Dr Marsh was Chair of the University's Women's Boat Club from 2003 to 2010 and a founding senior committee member of The Ospreys. Her business background has included a mix of executive and non-executive experience including co-ownership of Ace Coin Equipment Ltd., a non-executive directorship of Yorkshire Water, the Chairmanship of Birmingham Children's Hospital, and co-owner of Philip Treacy Ltd. At its meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2012, the Syndicate approved the following terms of reference for a review assisted by Dr Marsh:
  1. To consider and bring forward proposals for the reform of the governance arrangements for the supervision and organisation of sport and associated University facilities, including the future of the Sports Syndicate, or any successor body, and its relationship with the major sports clubs and the Societies Syndicate. Any proposals brought forward for improving the current governance arrangements are to include strengthening the current accountability for health and safety and the University's duties with regard to access and diversity.
  2. To consider the future financial arrangements for sport in the University, including the annual budgets for the Sports Syndicate and the Department of Physical Education, and capital funding of sites and buildings, and the accountability arrangements for these.
  3. To propose how a strategy for sport for the collegiate University might be developed and implemented through the proposed reformed governance arrangements.
  4. To consider how improvements may be made in the short-term to the more effective use of existing sporting facilities across the collegiate University by improving co-operation and co-ordination for their use as a longer-term strategy for sport is developed.
  5. To consider the current arrangements for the funding of sport where done jointly by the University and the colleges and the consequent distribution of resources for particular sports and whether improvements might be made.
  6. To consider what arrangements need to be made for the management of the West Cambridge Sports Centre.
  7. To consider the future phases of the West Cambridge Sports Centre project, and how these might be funded and delivered as part of a longer-term consideration of the need for sports facilities and the access to them across the collegiate University.
  8. To consider the relationships between the Sports Syndicate, the Department of Physical Education, the Cambridge University Development Office and the Alumni Relations Office, and how these can be optimised for the benefit of fundraising for the West Cambridge Sports Centre and the Annual Fund which has been proposed to support the Syndicate's grant-making activity.
5. Dr Marsh interviewed a wide range of interested parties in the University, reviewed previous reports on the arrangements for sport in the University, and submitted an independent interim report to the Syndicate at its meeting on 9th October 2012.

6. In view of the findings made by Dr Marsh and the concerns expressed in her report, a majority of the Syndics came to a view that a wider review was required and one which was independently established by the University. Following the meeting of the Syndicate referred to above, its Chair, Ms Debbie Lowther, wrote to the Vice-Chancellor to inform him of its conclusions about the need for an independent review, having consulted the Registry on the most appropriate way forward.
7. The Council is requested to consider if it is willing to undertake a review as requested by the Syndicate. The Vice-Chancellor has approached Professor Sanders who has indicated that he would be willing to chair a review group if the Council wishes to proceed. It is Professor Sanders' view that the group needs to be inclusive of College interests and include an external member to advise the University on the issues that need addressing. Working from those premises, the Council is requested to consider the composition of the proposed group. Suggested members are:

Professor Jeremy Sanders (chair)  
Mr Christopher Pratt (Acting Bursar of Jesus College)  
Mr Keith Zimmerman (Director of Student Administration and Services in the University of Oxford – this post has management responsibility for University sport)  
The Junior Proctor  
A member of the Council  
A student member (on the understanding that the group may have reserved business from time to time)

The group should wish to consult Dr Marsh, receive her report to the Sports Syndicate and draw upon her experience and findings in coming to its conclusions. The group will be supported through the Registry's office.

8. The terms of reference for the group would be as follows:

To consider the current governance and oversight arrangements for sport in the University and to make recommendations to the Council

To consider the current arrangements for the management and funding of sport in the University and to make recommendations to the Council

The group will elicit views from the wider University and College and Sports Clubs' communities. The Regent House will be informed of the review and be invited to contribute.

The Chair of the Sports Syndicate has been consulted about the arrangements for the review, the proposed structure of membership and the terms of reference and is content it should proceed on this basis.

9. In order to address the question of the soundness of the business plan for the Sports Centre and to monitor its implementation, a separate group has been established to report back to the Planning and Resources Committee and to provide assurance as part of the annual planning procedures for Physical Education

*Ms Debbie Lowther, Chair of the Sports Syndicate*  
*Dr J W Nicholls, Registry*

*Appendix B. Briefing documents considered by the review committee.*

Statutes and Ordinances (pp136/7)

Yale Report (1973)

McCrum Report (1982)

Marsh Draft Report (2012)

Briefing report from Deborah Lowther, Chair of the Sports Syndicate

Briefing report from Tony Lemons, Director of Physical Education

Southern Universities Management Service Report into Sport at Oxford University (2012)

University of Cambridge Sports Yearbook 2013

*Appendix C. List of interested parties who were approached to submit evidence to the review committee (in addition to the general invitation published in The Reporter).*

Cambridge University Students' Union  
Graduate Union  
College Bursars  
College Heads of House  
College Senior Tutors  
Sports Clubs  
Blues Committee  
Women's Blues Committee  
Hawks  
Ospreys  
Societies Syndicate  
Careers Syndicate  
University Library Syndicate  
Fitzwilliam Museum Syndicate  
Gillian Luff, Licensing Office  
Pat Marsh  
Secretaries of Schools, to cascade to Departments and Faculties  
'Central Administrators'  
Non School Institutions  
Deborah Lowther  
Tony Lemons  
Wilberforce Road committee  
Fenners committee  
Joanna Cheffins, Legal Services Office  
Antoinette Jackson (Chief Executive, Cambridge City Council)  
PdOC  
UNISON  
Unite  
UCU  
The University Social Club

*Appendix D. List of those who provided written evidence to the review committee*

Robert Asher  
Jim Bellingham  
Sarah Botcherby, Human Resources Division  
Judith Bunbury  
Geoffrey Cass  
Gordon Chesterman, Careers Service  
Simon Cornish, Department of Physical Education  
Cambridge University Students' Union (CUSU)  
Jeremy Fairbrother, Real Tennis Club and Sports Syndicate  
Maya Ghossaini, PdOC Society  
Tejas Guruswami, Ultimate Club  
Bill Harris, Ice Hockey  
Holly Hedgeland, Cambridge University Combined Boat Clubs  
Will Hudson  
Julian Hunt  
Austin Jessop (and Mark Bailey), Cambridge University Rugby Football Club  
Mark Johnston, Cambridge University Polo Club  
Chris Kerr  
Joan Lasenby  
Tony Lemons, Director of Physical Education  
LGBT+ (CUSU)  
John Little (and Simon Summers), Football Club and Sports Syndicate  
Gillian Luff, Licensing Office  
Pat Marsh  
Duncan McCallum, Academic Division  
Dick McConnel  
Karen Pearce, Assistant Director of Physical Education  
Tom Ridgman, Cruising Club  
Mike Rose  
Tom Scrase  
Kenneth Siddle, Cricket Club  
Susan Smith, Mistress, Girton College  
Mathias Sorieul  
'The Tab' (Chris McKeon)  
Liisa Van Vliedt  
Tom Walston, Estate Management  
Michael Waring  
Richard Wheeler  
Ian Wilson, Hockey Club  
David Yates, Chair of the Careers Syndicate

*Appendix E. List of those who provided verbal evidence to the review committee*

Kirsty Allen/Ceri Benton – Registry's office

Joanna Cheffins – Legal Services Office

Holly Hedgeland - Cambridge University Combined Boat Clubs

Robert Hunt – Societies Syndicate

Austin Jessop/Ian Peck – Cambridge University Rugby Football Club

Mark Johnston/George Ullmann – Cambridge University Polo Club

Tony Lemons – Director of Physical Education, Cambridge University

Deborah Lowther – Chair of the Sports Syndicate

Gillian Luff - Communications Officer for Brand

Pat Marsh – Author of 2012 draft report to the Sports Syndicate

Duncan McCallum/Alice Benton – Academic Division

Jonathan Nicholls – The Registry

John Rallison – Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education

Jon Roycroft - Director of Physical Education, University of Oxford

Indi Seehra – Director of Human Resources

Alison Traub/Kate Wilson – Cambridge University Development Office

Keith Zimmerman - Director of Student Administration and Services in the University of Oxford