

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6367

WEDNESDAY 3 DECEMBER 2014

VOL CXLV No 11

## CONTENTS

### Notices

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Calendar  | 187 |
| Notice of a Discussion on Tuesday,<br>9 December 2014 | 187 |
| Dates of Discussions for 2015–16                      | 187 |
| Election to the Council in class (b): Vote result     | 187 |
| EU Public Procurement Regulations                     | 188 |
| Court of Discipline                                   | 188 |

### Vacancies, appointments, etc.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Electors to the Professorship of Nuclear Medicine | 188 |
|---|-----|

### Events, courses, etc.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc. | 189 |
|--|-----|

### Notices by the General Board

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Senior Academic Promotions Committees:<br>1 October 2015 exercise | 189 |
|---|-----|

### Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| LL.M., 2014–15: Notice of designated<br>papers, prescribed subjects, and forms of<br>examination: Amendment | 193 |
|---|-----|

### Form and conduct of examinations, 2015

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| English Tripos, Part I, 2015: Correction                          | 193 |
| Historical Tripos, 2015   | 194 |
| Law Tripos, 2014–15   | 194 |
| Natural Sciences Tripos, 2015                                     | 195 |
| Examination for the degree of Master of Law,<br>2014–15           | 196 |
| Examination for the degree of Master of<br>Corporate Law, 2014–15 | 196 |

### Class-lists, etc.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Master of Business Administration, 2014  | 197 |
| Master of Finance, 2014  | 198 |
| Second Examination for the degrees of<br>Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of<br>Surgery, Michaelmas Term 2014 | 198 |
| Final M.B. Examination, Part I, Pathology, 2014  | 200 |
| Final M.B. Examination, Part II, Clinical<br>Paediatrics, Obstetrics, and Gynaecology,<br>Michaelmas Term 2014 | 201 |
| Second Examination for the degree of Bachelor<br>of Veterinary Medicine, Michaelmas Term 2014                  | 201 |
| Final Veterinary Examination, Part II, 2014  | 203 |
| Final Veterinary Examination, Part III, 2014   | 203 |
| Approved for degrees   | 203 |
| Act for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine   | 206 |

### Graces

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Grace submitted to the Regent House on<br>3 December 2014 | 206 |
|---|-----|

### Acta

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Result of ballot on Grace 1 of 25 June 2014                            | 207 |
| Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent<br>House on 19 November 2014 | 207 |
| Congregation of the Regent House on<br>29 November 2014                | 207 |

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

### Fly-sheets reprinted

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of<br>25 June 2014 (Report of the Council, dated<br>17 March 2014, on the governance and<br>management arrangements for sport within<br>the University)   | 213 |
| Fly-sheet relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of<br>28 November 2012 (Report of the Council,<br>dated 22 October 2012, seeking authority to<br>commence development of University land<br>at North West Cambridge)                             | 217 |
| Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of<br>22 May 2013 (Joint Report of the Council<br>and the General Board, dated 18 March<br>2013, on IT infrastructure and support, as<br>amended by the Council's Notice, dated<br>20 May 2013) | 218 |

### Report of Discussion

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Tuesday, 25 November 2014 | 222 |
|---------------------------|-----|

### College Notices

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Elections | 223 |
| Vacancies | 223 |

### External Notices

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| University of Oxford | 223 |
|----------------------|-----|



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

## NOTICES

## Calendar

- 5 December, *Friday*. Full Term ends.  
 9 December, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House (see below).  
 17 December, *Wednesday*. Last ordinary number of the *Reporter* in the Michaelmas Term.  
 19 December, *Friday*. Michaelmas Term ends.  
 5 January, *Monday*. Lent Term begins.  
 13 January, *Tuesday*. Full Term begins.

## Notice of a Discussion on Tuesday, 9 December 2014

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 111) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House, on Tuesday, 9 December 2014, at 2 p.m. for the discussion of:

1. Report of the Council, dated 18 November 2014, on a Garden Room for the Botanic Garden (*Reporter*, 6365, 2014–15, p. 148).
2. Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 24 November 2014 and 5 November 2014, on revisions to the arrangements for the contribution-based review of Professorial pay (*Reporter*, 6366, 2014–15, p. 182).

## Dates of Discussions for 2015–16

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that Discussions will be held on the following days in the academical year 2015–16:

## Discussions (on Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

| MICHAELMAS TERM 2015 | LENT TERM 2016 | EASTER TERM 2016 | LONG VACATION 2016 |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 13 October           | 19 January     | 26 April         | 5 July             |
| 27 October           | 2 February     | 10 May           |                    |
| 10 November          | 16 February    | 24 May           |                    |
| 24 November          | 1 March        | 7 June           |                    |
| 8 December           | 15 March       |                  |                    |

## Election to the Council in class (b): Vote result

28 November 2014

The Vice-Chancellor announces that the following persons have been elected to serve as members of the Council from 1 January 2015 for four years in class (b) (Professors and Readers):

- Professor R. J. Anderson, *CHU* (first elected)  
 Dr S. M. Oosthuizen, *W* (second elected)

Details of the poll and of the transfer of votes under the Single Transferable Vote Regulations are as follows:

Number of valid votes cast: 817 (13 spoilt papers not counted) (Quota: 273)

|                                  | <i>First count</i> | <i>Transfer of Dr Rowe's votes</i> | <i>Second count</i> | <i>Transfer of Prof. Anderson's surplus</i> | <i>Third count</i> | <i>Transfer of Prof. Gay's votes</i> | <i>Fourth count</i> | RESULT         |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Prof. R. J. Anderson, <i>CHU</i> | 290                |                                    | 290                 | –17   | 273                |                                      | 273                 | FIRST ELECTED  |
| Prof. N. J. Gay, <i>CHR</i>      | 111                | +11                                | 122                 | +6.86                                       | 128.86             | –128.86                              |                     |                |
| Dr S. M. Oosthuizen, <i>W</i>    | 166                | +20                                | 186                 | +5.95                                       | 191.95             | +51.59                               | 243.54              | SECOND ELECTED |
| Prof. R. W. Prager, <i>Q</i>     | 190                | +19                                | 209                 | +3.99                                       | 212.99             | +28.96                               | 241.95              |                |
| Dr J. B. Rowe, <i>CL</i>         | 60                 | –60                                |                     |   |                    |                                      |                     |                |
| Non-transferable                 |                    | +10                                | 10                  |   | 10                 | +48.31                               | 58.31               |                |
| TOTAL                            | 817                |                                    | 817                 |   | 816.8              |                                      | 816.8               |                |

## EU Public Procurement Regulations

1 December 2014

The Council, on the advice of the Finance Committee, has declared that the University continues to remain outside the scope of the EU Public Procurement Regulations as it is less than 50% publicly funded. The calculation is carried out annually to ensure that it remains possible to make the declaration. It is the Council's intention that the University's procurement procedures should continue to follow the good practice set out in the regulations and in the University's Financial Regulations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 1016; see also <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/finance/regulations/finregs/purchasing.html>).

## Court of Discipline

3 December 2014

The Court of Discipline met on 29 September 2014 to consider a charge brought by the University Advocate on a complaint by the Chair of Examiners for a Tripos examination against an undergraduate member of the University. The Court consisted of: Dr D. M. Fox, *JN* (Chair), Professor C. S. Barnard, *T*, Dr J. M. Evans, *CAI*, Mr A. D. Lemons, *HH*, and Dr P. J. Watson, *EM*. Dr J. A. Knapton acted as Clerk to the Court. On the application of the Defendant, the Court consisted of senior members only and sat *in camera*.

The Defendant was charged with an offence contrary to Regulation 6 of the General Regulations for Discipline, namely that they had used unfair means in three Tripos examinations in 2014, specifically that they had in their possession without authorization material relevant to each of the examinations. The Defendant pleaded not guilty. The University Advocate presented her case and the Defendant's representative presented the Defendant's case. Witnesses were called and cross-examined. The Court considered with care all of the evidence and submissions placed before it and took note of the burden and standard of proof required and, after extensive deliberation, returned verdicts of not guilty on the first two charges and guilty on the third charge. The Court was adjourned following the announcement of the verdicts.

The Court met again on 20 October 2014 to consider the sentence; its membership and the basis upon which it convened were unchanged. The University Advocate highlighted the premeditated nature of the offence. The Defendant's representative presented various factors and evidence in mitigation. In determining its sentence, the Court considered both the extraordinarily acute evidence presented in mitigation and the serious nature of the offence. It ordered that the Defendant's mark in the relevant paper be reduced to zero and that, in consequence, their name be removed from the relevant class-list; that their membership of the University be suspended for the duration of the 2014–15 academic year; that their readmission to proceed to the remaining examinations of their degree be conditional on being granted allowances by the Applications Committee (*a*) after proof satisfactory to the Committee that they are fit to return to continue their studies in the 2015–16 academic year, and (*b*) to be put in standing to proceed to their next examination; and that they be barred from seeking any other allowance arising out of the relevant examination.

## VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

### Electors to the Professorship of Nuclear Medicine

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Professorship of Nuclear Medicine as follows:

Dr Jennifer Barnes, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy

(a) on the nomination of the Council

Professor Kevin Brindle, *F*  
Professor Lisolette Højgaard, *Copenhagen University*

(b) on the nomination of the General Board

Professor David Lomas, *EM*  
Professor Wim Oyen, *Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands*  
Professor Patrick Maxwell, *T*

(c) on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine

Professor Fiona Gilbert  
Professor Otto Hoekstra, *Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*  
Professor Franklin Aigbirhio

**EVENTS, COURSES, ETC.****Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.**

The University offers a large number of lectures, seminars, and other events, many of which are free of charge, to members of the University and others who are interested. Details can be found on Faculty and Departmental websites, and in the following resources.

The What's On website (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/whatson/>) carries details of exhibitions, music, theatre and film, courses, and workshops, and is searchable by category and date. Both an RSS feed and a subscription email service are available.

Talks.cam (<http://www.talks.cam.ac.uk/>) is a fully searchable talks listing service, and talks can be subscribed to and details downloaded.

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <i>Careers Service</i>  | <i>'Our students' and researchers' futures'. An overview of their choices, ambitions, successes, and failures in securing their chosen career – a talk and discussion by Gordon Chesterman, Director of the Careers Service, on 18 December 2014 in Mill Lane Lecture Room 1, at 2.15 p.m.</i> | <a href="http://www.careers.cam.ac.uk/">http://www.careers.cam.ac.uk/</a><br>Those wishing to attend should email Maggie Hart: <a href="mailto:mh292@cam.ac.uk">mh292@cam.ac.uk</a>   |
| <i>Institute for Manufacturing and SOAS, University of London</i> | The 14th Babbage Lecture: <i>Bringing production back into development</i> , by Ha-Joon Chang, Reader in the Political Economy of Development, on 11 December 2014 in the Khalili Lecture Theatre, SOAS, University of London, at 6 p.m.   | <a href="https://www.soas.ac.uk/economics/events/babbage-lecture-series-at-soas/11dec2014-14th-babbage-lecture.html">https://www.soas.ac.uk/economics/events/babbage-lecture-series-at-soas/11dec2014-14th-babbage-lecture.html</a> |
| <i>Kettle's Yard</i>  | <i>Beauty and revolution: the poetry and art of Ian Hamilton Finlay</i> , from 6 December 2014 to 1 March 2015   | <a href="http://www.kettlesyard.co.uk/exhibitions/2014/ihf/index.php">http://www.kettlesyard.co.uk/exhibitions/2014/ihf/index.php</a>   |

**NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD****Senior Academic Promotions Committees: 1 October 2015 exercise**

The General Board have appointed the following as members of their Senior Academic Promotions Committee and Sub-Committees for the 1 October 2015 Senior Academic Promotions exercise.

**General Board's Senior Academic Promotions Committee**

The Vice-Chancellor Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz (Chair)  
 Professor Liba Chaia Taub (Arts and Humanities)  
 Professor Jane Clarke (Biological and Medical Sciences)  
 Professor Ash Hariprasad Amin (Humanities and Social Sciences)  
 Professor Ian Hugh White (Physical Sciences)  
 Professor Anthony Kevin Cheetham (Technology)

*Externals:*

Professor Christopher Carey (University College London) (Arts and Humanities)  
 Professor Margaret Jane Dallman (Imperial College London) (Biological and Medical Sciences)  
 Professor Davina Cooper (University of Kent) (Humanities and Social Sciences)  
 Professor Alison Etheridge (University of Oxford) (Physical Sciences)  
 Professor James Andrew McLaughlin (University of Ulster) (Technology)

**General Board's Sub-Committees***Arts and Humanities*

Professor Liba Chaia Taub (Chair)  
 Professor Winifred Mary Beard  
 Professor Christopher Howard Page  
 Professor Koen Alexander Steemers  
 Professor Roel Sterckx  
 Professor Emma Fiona Wilson  
 Professor Christopher Carey (External)

*Biological and Medical Sciences*

Professor Jane Clarke (Chair)  
 Professor Fiona Jane Gilbert  
 Professor Beverley Jane Glover  
 Professor Peter Brian Jones  
 Professor Duncan John Maskell  
 Professor Angela Charlotte Roberts  
 Professor Margaret Jane Dallman (External)

*Humanities and Social Sciences*

Professor Ash Hariprasad Amin (Chair)  
 Professor Madeleine Mary Arnot  
 Professor Martin James Daunton  
 Professor Sarah Brooks Franklin  
 Professor Martin Kenneth Jones  
 Professor Kaivan Dara Munshi  
 Professor Davina Cooper (External)

*Physical Sciences*

Professor Ian Hugh White (Chair)  
 Professor Anne Christine Davis  
 Professor Judith Louise Driscoll  
 Professor Robert Charles Kennicutt  
 Professor Michael Christopher Payne  
 TBC  
 Professor Alison Etheridge (External)

*Technology*

Professor Anthony Kevin Cheetham (Chair)  
 Professor Vikram Sudhir Deshpande  
 Professor Elizabeth Ann Howlett Hall  
 Professor Andrew Mawdesley Pitts  
 Professor Richard William Prager  
 Professor Stefan Scholtes  
 Professor James Andrew McLaughlin (External)

**Faculty Promotion Committees**

## 1. SCHOOL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

*Faculty or other institution*

**Combined Faculty Promotions Committee One:  
 Architecture and History of Art, English, Music,  
 Philosophy, and Divinity**

*Members appointed*

Professor Susan Kathleen Rankin (Chair)  
 Professor Rae Helen Langton (GB Member)  
 Professor Paul Binski  
 Professor Hilton Richard Leslie Beadle  
 Professor Garth Lowther Fowden  
 Professor Simon Peter Jarvis  
 Professor Michael David Potter  
 Professor Barry Alexander Windeatt  
 Dr Wendy Ann Pullan (Readerships and USLs)  
 Ms Susan Caroline Round (Secretary)

**Combined Faculty Promotions Committee Two:  
 Classics, Modern and Medieval Languages, and  
 Asian and Middle Eastern Studies**

Professor Michael Moriarty (Chair)  
 Professor Marina Frolova-Walker (GB Member)  
 Professor Geoffrey Charles Horrocks  
 Professor Sylvia Huot  
 Professor Katarzyna Malgorzata Jaszczolt  
 Professor Adam Noel Ledgeway  
 Professor Stephen Phelps Oakley  
 Professor Yasir Suleiman  
 Professor Johan Jacob van de Ven  
 Ms Victoria Louise Aldred (Secretary)

## 2. SCHOOL OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

*Faculty or other institution***Biology and Veterinary Medicine***Members appointed*

Professor Lorraine Komisarjevsky Tyler (Chair)  
 Professor Fiona Eve Karet (GB Member)  
 Professor Michael Edwin Akam  
 Professor John Michael Edwardson  
 Professor Gerard Ian Evan  
 Professor Anne Carla Ferguson-Smith  
 Professor William Anthony Harris  
 Professor Trevor William Robbins  
 Professor Alison Gail Smith  
 Professor Geoffrey Lilley Smith  
 Professor James Lionel Norman Wood  
 Ms Margaret Alison Staff (Secretary)

## 3. SCHOOL OF CLINICAL MEDICINE

*Faculty or other institution***Clinical Medicine***Members appointed*

Professor Patrick Henry Maxwell (Chair)  
 Professor Anne Carla Ferguson-Smith (GB Member)  
 Professor John Andrew Bradley  
 Professor David Alastair Standish Compston  
 Professor John Danesh  
 Professor Gillian Griffiths  
 Professor Kay-Tee Khaw  
 Professor Eamonn Richard Maher  
 Professor Sir Stephen O'Rahilly  
 Professor Gordon Campbell Sinclair Smith  
 Professor Kenneth George Campbell Smith  
 Professor Simon Tavaré  
 Dr Litsa Maria Biggs (Secretary)

## 4. SCHOOL OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

*Faculty or other institution***Economics***Members appointed*

Professor Sanjeev Goyal (Chair)  
 Professor Sarah Elizabeth Worthington (GB member)  
 Professor Giancarlo Corsetti  
 Professor Eilis Veronica Ferran  
 Professor Christopher John Harris  
 Professor Oliver Bruce Linton  
 Professor Coenraad Nicolaas Teulings  
 Ms Marie Ann Butcher (Secretary)

**Education**

Professor John Michael Gray (Chair)  
 Professor Loraine Ruth Renata Gelsthorpe (GB member)  
 Professor Geoffrey Francis Hayward  
 Professor Maria Nikolajeva  
 Professor Pauline Margaret Rose  
 Professor Anna Frances Vignoles  
 Ms Kate Marie-Josephine Allen (Secretary)

**History**

Professor John Charles Robertson (Chair)  
 Professor Catherine Sarah Barnard (GB Member)  
 Professor David Samuel Harvard Abulafia  
 Professor Alison Caroline Bashford  
 Professor Eugenio Federico Biagini  
 Professor Christopher Munro Clark  
 Professor David James Reynolds  
 Professor Ulinka Rublack  
 Professor Simon Richard Stanislaw Szreter  
 Dr Elizabeth Haresnape (Secretary)

**Human, Social, and Political Sciences and the  
Department of History and Philosophy of Science**

Professor James Andrew Secord (Chair)  
Professor Loraine Ruth Renata Gelsthorpe (GB Member)  
Professor Patrick Jacques Nicole Baert  
Professor Cyprian Broodbank  
Professor Christopher Guy Nicholas Mascie-Taylor  
Professor Joel Lee Robbins  
Professor David Walter Runciman  
Professor Brendan Peter Simms  
Dr Gerald McLaren (Secretary)

**Land Economy and Law**

Professor Ronald Leonard Martin (Chair and GB Member)  
Professor Trevor Robert Seaward Allan  
Professor Richard Griffith Fentiman  
Professor Eilis Veronica Ferran  
Professor Christine Diana Gray  
Professor Colin Martyn Lizieri  
Professor John Stuart Landreth McCombie  
Professor Lawrence William Sherman  
Professor Jorge Enrique Viñuales  
Ms Laura Clare Smethurst (Secretary)

5. SCHOOL OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES

*Faculty or other institution*

**Earth Sciences and Geography**

*Members appointed*

Professor William Mark Adams (Chair)  
Professor Henrietta Miriam Ottoline Leyser (GB Member)  
Professor Michael James Bickle  
Professor Philip Leonard Gibbard  
Professor David Arnold Hodell  
Professor James Anthony Jackson  
Professor Sarah Anne Radcliffe  
Professor Simon Anthony Turner Redfern  
Professor Susan Smith  
Ms Andrea Turrell (Secretary)

**Mathematics**

Professor Pelham Mark Hedley Wilson (Chair)  
Professor Serena Michelle Best (GB Member)  
Professor Sheila MacDonald Bird  
Professor Nicholas Dorey  
Professor Raymond Ethan Goldstein  
Professor Mark William Gross  
Professor Peter Howard Haynes  
Professor Gabriel Pedro Paternain  
Professor Malcolm John Perry  
Professor Leonard Christopher Gordon Rogers  
Professor David John Spiegelhalter  
Ms Ann Mobbs (Secretary)

**Physics and Chemistry**

Professor Gerard Francis Gilmore (Chair)  
Professor Howard Allaker Chase (GB member)  
Professor Shankar Balasubramanian  
Professor Serena Michelle Best  
Professor Mark Giffard Blamire  
Professor Catherine Jane Clarke  
Professor Andrew Christopher Fabian  
Professor Daniel Frenkel  
Professor Christopher Allim Haniff  
Professor Michael Andrew Parker  
Professor Henning Sirringhaus  
Professor Dominic Simon Wright  
Ms Mary Howe (Secretary)



## 6. SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY

*Faculty or other institution***Business and Management***Members appointed*

Professor Daniel Ralph (Chair)  
 Professor Eilis Veronica Ferran (GB Member)  
 Professor Michael Ian Barrett  
 Professor Christoph Hubert Loch  
 Professor Jaideep Charles Prabhu  
 Professor Raghavendra Rau  
 Ms Julie Brown (Secretary)

**Computer Science and Technology**

Professor Ross John Anderson (Chair)  
 Professor Ruth Elizabeth Cameron (GB Member)  
 Professor Ann Alicia Copestake  
 Professor John Gustav Daugman  
 Professor Andrew Hopper  
 Professor Lawrence Charles Paulson  
 Ms Caroline Anne Stewart (Secretary)

**Engineering and Chemical Engineering, and Biotechnology**

Professor David Anthony Cardwell (Chair)  
 Professor Clare Philomena Grey (GB Member)  
 Professor William Joseph Byrne  
 Professor Nicholas Collings  
 Professor John Stephen Dennis  
 Professor Lynn Faith Gladden  
 Professor Sir Michael John Gregory  
 Professor Robin Stewart Langley  
 Professor Robert James Mair  
 Professor John Robertson  
 Ms Sally Dorothy Winton Collins-Taylor (Secretary)

**NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.****LL.M., 2014–15: Notice of designated papers, prescribed subjects, and forms of examination: Amendment**

The Notice of designated papers, prescribed subjects, and forms of examination for the LL.M. which was published on 30 July 2014 (*Reporter*, 6356, 2014–15, p. 785) should be amended as follows:

*Explanation of forms of examination*

7. There will be ten minutes of reading time before the start of every written paper of either two or three hours' duration unless otherwise announced.

**FORM AND CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS, 2015**

Notices by Faculty Boards, or other bodies concerned, of changes to the form and conduct of certain examinations to be held in 2015, by comparison with those examinations in 2014, are published below. Complete details of the form and conduct of all examinations are available from the Faculties or Departments concerned.

**English Tripos, Part I, 2015: Correction**

A correction has been made to the titles of papers appearing in the Notice published on 26 November 2014 (*Reporter*, 6366, 2014–15, p. 168).

**Part I**

The title of Paper 1 has been corrected to read as follows:

*Paper 1. Practical criticism and critical practice*

The title of Paper 2 has been corrected to read as follows:

*Paper 2. Early medieval literature and its contexts, 1066–1350 (also serves as Paper 20 of Part II of the English Tripos, as Paper 09 of Part II of the Classical Tripos, and as Paper 11 of Part I of the Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic Tripos)*



## Historical Tripos, 2015

The Faculty Board of History give notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2015, the form of the examinations for certain papers of the Historical Tripos will be as follows:

### Part I

*Section B, British political history*

*Paper 4. British political history, 1485–1714*

The paper will now be divided into two sections: Section A: Chronological, and Section B: Early Modern Monarchies/ Early Modern Themes, instead of only one section. Candidates will still be required to answer three questions, but at least one must be taken from each section.

### Preliminary Examination for Part II, and Part II

*Section C, Political thought*

*Paper 6. States between states: the history of international political thought from the Roman empire to the early nineteenth century*

This paper is being examined for the first time. There will be one three-hour examination paper consisting of twenty essay questions. Candidates will be required to answer three questions.

*Section D, Specified subjects*

*Paper 25. Middle Eastern modernities from c. 1700 to the present day*

This paper is being examined for the first time. There will be one three-hour examination paper, consisting of a maximum of eighteen essay questions. Candidates will be required to answer three questions.

*Paper 26. The American experience in Vietnam, 1941–1975*

This paper is being examined for the first time. There will be one three-hour examination paper, consisting of a maximum of eighteen essay questions. Candidates will be required to answer three questions.

All other papers remain unchanged. Full details of the examination can be found at <https://www.hist.cam.ac.uk/undergraduate/examinations>.

## Law Tripos, 2014–15

The Faculty Board of Law give notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2014–15, the form and/or conduct of the examination for the following papers for the Law Tripos will be changed as follows:

*Paper 5. Legal skills and methodology*

This paper will be evaluated by way of extended essay assigned at least two weeks before the last day of Full Lent Term. Candidates will have a choice of one of three titles. The word limit for the extended essay will be 3,000 words.

*Paper 23. Criminology, sentencing, and the penal system*

Candidates will be allowed to take Blackstone's *Statutes on Criminal Justice and Sentencing* (5th edition, 2014) into the examination.

*Paper 27. Competition law*

The paper will contain no fewer than eight questions of which candidates will be required to attempt any four.

Candidates will be allowed to take Blackstone's *EU Treaties & Legislation 2014–2015* (25th edition) and the Faculty's *Statutes on Competition Law* (2014–15) into the examination.

*Paper 48P. Later history of the civil law*

The paper will contain no fewer than six questions of which candidates will be required to attempt any three.

Candidates will not be provided with materials nor will they be allowed to use materials of their own.

*Paper 48Q. Personal information law*

This paper will contain no fewer than six questions of which candidates will be required to attempt any three.

Candidates will be allowed to take the Faculty's *Personal Information Law Materials* (2014–15) into the examination.

*Paper 48R. Legitimacy of judicial review*

This paper will contain three essay questions. There will be a choice of topics within each question.

Candidates will not be provided with materials nor will they be allowed to use materials of their own.

All other parts of the examination remain unchanged.

## Natural Sciences Tripos, 2015

The Committee of Management for the Natural Sciences Tripos give notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2015, the form and conduct of certain of the examinations for the Natural Sciences Tripos will be changed as follows:

### Part IA

#### *Biology of Cells – Practical*

The written practical examination will consist of a three-hour written paper containing nine questions (instead of ten questions). Candidates shall answer all nine questions.

All other papers remain unchanged. Full details of the examination can be found by following the appropriate links from: <http://www.bio.cam.ac.uk/undergraduate/courses/cells/assessment>.

#### *Physiology of Organisms*

There will be two written papers (instead of one): A three-hour theory paper and a ninety-minute practical paper. The theory paper will consist of two sections: A and B. Section A will consist of compulsory multiple choice questions and/or short answer questions and will carry 25% of the total marks, and Section B will carry 50% of the total marks and will consist of a number of essay questions of which candidates should answer two. The practical paper will consist of compulsory questions and will carry 25% of the total marks.

### Part IB

#### *Experimental Psychology*

In paper 1, the questions in Section A will be drawn from topics in Cognitive Psychology (e.g., how we remember, learn, think, speak, and understand); Section B topics in Biological Psychology (e.g., how the brain works, how it can be affected by drugs, the effects of hormones, and how we treat mental disorders); and Section C topics in Individual Differences (e.g., why people have different personalities and ability levels, the effects of atypical brain mechanisms on behaviour and reasoning).

In paper 2, questions in Section A will be drawn from topics in visual and auditory perception; Section B topics in Developmental Psychology (e.g., how humans develop physically, mentally, and socially during childhood and adolescence); and Section C topics in Social Psychology (e.g., how human behaviour, experience, and ability are affected by social context). Each written paper will carry the same mark.

No other aspects of the examination have changed.

### Part II

#### *Astrophysics*

The title of the course previously known as ‘Topics in Astrophysics’ is changed to ‘Physics of Astrophysics’.

#### *Physics and Physical Sciences half subject Physics*

Paper 6 (Particle and Nuclear Physics) of the examination in Natural Sciences Tripos, Part II, Physics, and Natural Sciences Tripos, Part II, Physical Sciences Half-Subject Physics in 2015 will revert to the form it had in 2013.

Specifically, Paper 6 is of two hours duration and shall contain four questions. Question 1 shall consist of three short parts. Question 2 shall be of the brief notes style and will contain three short parts. Candidates must attempt all parts of question 1, two parts of question 2, and one other question. Each of questions 1 and 2 has approximately one quarter of the total weight of the paper.

With this change, all written papers within Part II Physics will again have the same form.

#### *Zoology*

Section G on papers 3 and 4 will now examine the module ‘Cell Cycle, Signalling, and Cancer’ instead of the previous module ‘Control of Cell Division and Genome Stability’.

All other papers remain unchanged.

### Part III / Master of Advanced Study

#### *Materials Science*

The short courses formerly examined in section A of paper 1 are discontinued.

Section A of paper 1 will now contain a single question based on the long (12-lecture) modules. This will be divided into parts, there being one part from each such module. The rubric will read ‘Section A: Answer any nine parts of question 1’.

All other parts of the examination remain unchanged.

Full details are available at <http://www.msm.cam.ac.uk/teaching/>.

## Examination for the degree of Master of Law, 2014–15

The Faculty Board of Law give notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2014–15, that there will be ten minutes' reading time before the start of every examination unless otherwise announced.

Students should present themselves at the exam room at least 15 minutes before the advertised start time of each paper.

The Faculty Board of Law give notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2015, the form and/or conduct of the examination for the following papers for the LL.M. (Master of Law) will be changed as follows:

### *Paper 5. Economics of law and regulation*

The paper will contain no fewer than six questions of which candidates will be required to attempt any three.

Candidates will not be allowed to take any materials into the examination other than any monolingual or bilingual dictionary (except electronic dictionaries and specialized legal dictionaries).

### *Paper 6. Law and information*

The paper will contain no fewer than six questions, of which candidates will be required to attempt any three.

Candidates will be allowed to take the Faculty's *Materials on law and information* (2014–15) into the examination.

### *Paper 14. Competition law*

Candidates will be allowed to take Blackstone's *EU Treaties & Legislation 2014–15* (25th edition) and the Faculty's *Materials on Competition Law* (2014–15) into the examination.

### *Paper 15. International environmental law*

The paper will contain no fewer than six questions of which candidates will be required to attempt any three.

*International Environmental Law and Policy Treaty Supplement* (Foundation Press; 2011; D. Hunter, J. Salzmann, D. Zaelke) and the Faculty's *Materials on International Environmental Law* (2014–15).

### *Paper 32. Commercial equity*

The paper will contain no fewer than six questions of which candidates will be required to attempt any three.

All other parts of the examination remain unchanged.

## Examination for the degree of Master of Corporate Law, 2014–15

The Faculty Board of Law give notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2014–15, the form and/or conduct of the examination for the following papers for the degree of Master of Corporate Law (MCL) will be changed as follows:

### *Paper M1. The legal and economic structure of corporate transactions (deals)*

This paper will be evaluated by way of course-work assigned throughout the academical year and on the basis of class participation. There will be no written examination. For 2014–15 the maximum word limit on Deals Reports is 4,000 (not 5,000) words.

### *Paper M2a. Financial management*

The paper will contain four questions. Candidates will be required to answer ALL four of them. One question will comprise a series of multiple choice questions.

Candidates for this paper will not be allowed to take any materials into the examination other than any monolingual or bilingual dictionary (except electronic dictionaries and specialized legal dictionaries) and one of the following approved calculators: CASIO fx115 (any version); CASIO fx 570 (any version); CASIO fx 991 (any version); Texas Instruments BA II Plus; or the Texas Instruments BA II Plus Professional. Calculators will not be permitted in any other examinations.

### *Paper M2e. International merger control*

The paper will contain no fewer than five questions of which candidates will be required to attempt any three.

This will become an open book examination and no further materials will be prescribed.

All other parts of the examination remain unchanged.

**CLASS-LISTS, ETC.**

**Master of Business Administration, 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

## **Master of Finance, 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

## **Second Examination for the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery, Michaelmas Term 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

**Final M.B. Examination, Part I, Pathology, 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

**Final M.B. Examination, Part II, Clinical Paediatrics, Obstetrics, and Gynaecology,  
Michaelmas Term 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

**Second Examination for the degree of Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine, Michaelmas  
Term 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.



This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

### **Final Veterinary Examination, Part II, 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

### **Final Veterinary Examination, Part III, 2014**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

### **Approved for degrees**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

### **Act for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine**

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

## **GRACES**

### **Grace submitted to the Regent House on 3 December 2014**

The Council submits the following Grace to the Regent House. This Grace, unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 111), will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 12 December 2014.

- 1.** That the recommendations in paragraph 4 of the Report of the General Board, dated 5 November 2014, on the establishment or re-establishment of certain Professorships (*Reporter*, 6364, 2014–15, p. 140) be approved.

**ACTA****Result of ballot on Grace 1 of 25 June 2014**

*28 November 2014*

The Registry gives notice that as a result of the postal ballot held between 17 and 27 November 2014 the following Grace of the Regent House was **approved**:

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Report of the Council, dated 17 March 2014, on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University (*Reporter*, 6343, 2013–14, p. 452), as amended by the Council's Notice dated 16 June 2014, be approved.

The results of the voting on this Grace are as follows:

Number of valid votes: 805 (3 spoilt papers)

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| In favour of the Grace ( <i>placet</i> ) | 480 |
| Against the Grace ( <i>non placet</i> )  | 325 |

**Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 19 November 2014**

The Grace submitted to the Regent House on 19 November 2014 (*Reporter*, 6365, 2014–15, p. 149) was approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 28 November 2014.

**Congregation of the Regent House on 29 November 2014**

A Congregation of the Regent House was held at 2 p.m. All the Graces that were submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6366, 2014–15, p. 183) were approved.

The following degrees were conferred:

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

This content has been removed as it contains personal information protected under the Data Protection Act.

J. W. NICHOLLS, *Registrar*

**END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'**

**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. 116).

**Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of 25 June 2014 (Report of the Council, dated 17 March 2014, on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University)**

The Report of the Council, dated 17 March 2014, on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University, was published in the *Reporter* on 19 March 2014 (see *Reporter*, 6343, 2013–14, p. 452). For the result of the ballot, see p. 207.

**Report of the Council on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University**

***Placet* Flysheet**

The Sports Syndicate, and its precursor the Athletics Syndicate, have been established for over 50 years. The role of the Syndicate, as laid down in Ordinances, is to advise the Council and the University about the policy, facilities, and arrangements for sport in the University. However, there is little evidence that the Syndicate has offered or has been asked for, advice, and its terms of reference are extremely limited; it apparently has no role in thinking about sports facilities for staff or for the local community, and it has limited control over the University's physical facilities which are largely independent administratively. It has mainly restricted its activities to the small-scale distribution of funds to traditional sports. There is no effective over-arching supervision of sport in the Collegiate University, nor is there apparently a strategic vision. Furthermore, the Syndicate is not well placed to represent a coherent picture of Cambridge sport to alumni or other interested parties, or to coordinate philanthropic fund raising. The contrast in sports fund-raising success from alumni and foundations between Cambridge and Oxford is stark. The central position of sport in students' lives, and its funding, may have been taken for granted 50 years ago, but now the case needs to be argued in competition with other demands for resources. The Syndicate has become isolated in reporting terms and membership from the University's strategic and decision-making bodies, and that has limited its ability to make the case for sport, so it is unclear even where its limited current funding will come from in future.

The Council has therefore recommended that a University Sports Committee should be established as a joint committee of the Council and the General Board. It should be given overall responsibility for all aspects of University sport, including funding and organisation, and health and safety and reputational risks; the Committee should also take over some responsibilities from the Proctors. Council believes that students should be the primary focus for our sports investment, but that the maximum benefit will be only realised from that investment if more serious consideration is given to the needs and participation of staff and the wider community.

In common with other important committees, the Sports Committee should be chaired *ex officio* by a senior University figure — given the student focus, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education is proposed — with a broadly representative membership. Much of the current sub-committee structure is likely to be carried over unchanged, but it will need to be augmented to reflect increased responsibility.

The current Department of Physical Education should be renamed the Sports Service. It should provide more comprehensive administrative and infrastructure support to sports activities at every level, and it could do so more effectively as part of the UAS, in common with other student and staff services.

In short, we believe that this reform will lead to broader participation in sport by students and staff, better integration with other student and staff services, more effective fund-raising, and a more modern and coherent strategy and presence for Cambridge sport. We therefore urge you to vote *Placet* to this proposal.

M. P. BULLOCK  
J. L. CADDICK  
M. J. DAUNTON  
A. C. DAVIS  
A. K. DIXON  
C. M. DOBSON  
E. A. DRAYSON  
R. J. EVANS  
P. FARA  
L. F. GLADDEN  
A. S. GRABINER

W. A. HARRIS  
D. P. HEARN  
J. M. HOLMES  
D. J. IBBETSON  
F. E. KARET  
S. LAING  
R. J. LINGWOOD  
D. LOWTHER  
M. McDONALD  
I. J. MADDISON  
D. J. MASKELL

P. MAXWELL  
M. J. MILLETT  
J. N. MORRIS  
R. PADMAN  
S. A. PEARCE  
R. W. PRAGER  
J. M. RALLISON  
J. H. RUNDE  
J. K. M. SANDERS  
J. C. SHAKESHAFT  
M. C. SKOTT

B. M. STOCKING  
R. K. TAPLIN  
G. J. VIRGO  
G. C. WARD  
I. H. WHITE  
R. D. WILLIAMS  
A. D. YATES  
C. J. YOUNG  
S. J. YOUNG

## Report of the Council on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University

### *Placet* Flysheet

The Sports Syndicate has become isolated from University process, is in danger of becoming moribund and has thus contributed to, instead of preventing, the marginalization of sport in Cambridge over recent years. Currently, there is neither line management nor clear and defined strategy for sport in the Collegiate University. The current separation between the Department of Physical Education and the Sports Syndicate has been counter-productive. The latter has mainly restricted its activities to the small scale distribution of funds to traditional sports and has even become detached from both major sports and from College sport. Health and safety and reputational risks are inadequately managed. Integration with other student and staff services has been lacking.

We therefore welcome the Report of the Council, and we believe that the reforms proposed to the governance and management of sport will be an important first step in addressing the issues above. Integrating sport into the University's considerations, under a Pro-Vice-Chancellor as chair and with access to the funding round is vital and the Report proposes that. Likewise, integration with fundraising and the total student experience, as well as offering more to staff and alumni, as the Report seeks to ensure, have our full support. Cambridge has woefully lagged Oxford in these respects. Making the new Sports Committee, rather than the Proctors, responsible for the registration and monitoring of sports clubs is plainly right and the proposal that it should itself determine and put in place the optimum operational arrangements, while maintaining much of the present sub-committee structure, is well-judged. The lack of a clear reporting line for the Director has been evident for some time and this is at last provided.

The consequences of this Report not being approved would be dire. Inevitably, marginalization of sport would become still greater and the appetite of the University for reform and even to consider the case of sport would be lost, not to mention the financial and fundraising penalties.

In short, we believe that this reform is hugely to be welcomed by students and staff, that it will lead to better funding, more effective fundraising, and the creation of a vision and strategy. It is overdue and in the interest of Cambridge sport. We therefore urge you to vote *Placet* to this proposal.

P. ABRAHAMS  
S. AINGER-BROWN  
N. J. A. DOWNER  
A. ENTICKNAP  
P. FARA  
P. FFOLKES DAVIS  
D. GRIFFIN  
M. J. HACKETT

W. A. HARRIS  
T. HARVEY-SAMUEL  
D. P. HEARN  
M. C. HOUGHTON  
A. R. JEFFERIES  
M. K. JONES  
C. S. M. LAWRENCE  
J. P. LOUGHLIN

D. LOWTHER  
S. J. MORRIS  
G. T. PARKS  
B. S. PILGRIM  
J. H. RUNDE  
D. S. SECHER  
J. M. SOSKICE  
S. K. F. STODDART

S. SUMMERS  
L. M. THOMPSON  
P. WARREN  
I. H. WHITE  
K. WILLOX

## Report of the Council on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University

### *Non Placet* Flysheet

This report is about the suppression of the Department of Physical Education and the Sports Syndicate, and the creation of a so-called 'Sports Service' under the centralised control of the Unified Administrative Service (UAS) and the Registry. The proposal is in keeping with a long-term strategy of placing all but purely academic activities under the control of the UAS as foreshadowed in a Review of the UAS in 2010. We hope you will share our concern about this increasing centralisation of control in our federal and collegiate University and vote **non placet**.

The ostensible reasons for the proposed changes include the suggestion of better representation of sport at a senior level, the hint of more money (better bidding opportunities, allegedly) and transfer of registration and regulation of the semi-autonomous University sports clubs away from the overloaded Proctors, with the supposed result that health and safety procedures will be more streamlined. There is no evidence of non-compliance by clubs with health and safety requirements, but even if there were perceived to be a problem, this could easily be solved by making registration of a club dependent on compliance with national health and safety requirements for the relevant sport. Indeed, health and safety audits are already compulsory for clubs seeking grants from the Sports Syndicate and are carried out by people with a specialist knowledge of sport. All these potential changes could in fact perfectly well be implemented within the existing structure, with the advantage that those with enthusiasm for, and knowledge of, University sport would retain much greater influence than appears likely under the proposed major reorganisation. As it stands, the proposal thus risks alienating those senior members who voluntarily devote much of their time to University sport and may very well fail to have any genuinely beneficial impact on the success and diversity of Cambridge's sporting endeavour.

The Physical Education Department, like the Careers Service, the University Library and University Information Services (UIS), is not suited to centralisation under the UAS. The Physical Education Department provides sporting facilities,

advice and instruction to students, staff and the wider community. Its strength lies in its ability to respond rapidly to funding opportunities and changes in sporting safety requirements and codes of practice. In contrast, a central bureaucracy would most likely be run by managers without qualifications, training, interest or understanding of sport. The decision-making process would also be slower and the ‘Sports Service’ would have to compete for funds directly with other UAS services, which are already squeezed financially. Another important consideration is that the PE Department is increasingly contributing to research within the University, a role that has the potential to grow. Placing sport under the auspices of the UAS would prevent further exploitation of the burgeoning field of sports science.

A better proposal would be for the Vice Chancellor, who is the nominal Chair of the Sports Syndicate, to appoint a Pro-Vice Chancellor, or other suitable senior member of the University, as Chair of the existing Sports Syndicate. We believe there is no alternative but to ask the Council to think again. Indeed, even within the Council, there are misgivings about this proposal, as evidenced by the Note of Dissent by two members of Council, which is reproduced below in italics. Please vote **non placet**.

**Extract from the Note of Dissent (Reporter, 25th June 2014)**

*All agree that change is needed, and all agree with the need for high-quality sporting facilities benefiting all members of the Collegiate University, as well as the local community. Members of the Regent House with commitment to, and knowledge of, all levels of sport, from elite to community, raised cogent objections to the proposals in the Discussion. A number of relatively minor, though useful, changes have been made in response to their concerns, but the central thrust of the Report, i.e. the replacement of the Sports Syndicate by a Sports Committee, and the absorption of the Department of Physical Education in to the Unified Administrative Service (UAS) as the Sports Service, is unmodified. We are not convinced that the interests of sport in the University are best served by centralization.*

*The Report on Sport argues that the Sports Committee should devise a vision and strategy for sport in the University, and then hold the Sports Service to account for delivering it. However, the Syndicate could equally well, or better, devise a vision and strategy, and the Syndicate might have a chance of delivery (given that the Director of Physical Education is under the general control of the Syndicate). The Sports Committee would have little hope of ensuring delivery, since the Director of Sport would have no responsibility to the Sports Committee and instead would report to the Registrary (who is not even listed as in attendance at the Sports Committee). At least when Sir Geoffrey Howe was sent to the crease he had a broken bat; the Sports Committee looks like having none. There is a disconnect between the aims, aspirations, and principal terms of reference of the Sports Committee, and the implements it would be provided with to fulfil those objectives.*

*If better financial, legal, or HR support for the Syndicate is needed, it can surely be provided by the UAS without alienating those who understand the diverse nature of sport in the University and the needs of its participants, which must be the prime requisite for a body charged with devising a vision and strategy for sport.*

*On a wider note, we believe that the systematic concentration of power in a single point of failure is unwise. Syndicates have an important role within the University, and the apparent programme for their demise is to be regretted.*

|                      |                 |                  |                       |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| A. C. AITCHISON      | P. G. HARDING   | N. D. MATHUR     | M. A. RUEHL           |
| M. V. S. M. BLACKMAN | P. H. HAYNES    | M. R. MORRIS     | P. A. SARRIS          |
| A. R. BOTTOMLEY      | S. B. HOLDEN    | R. NICKL         | A. SHADRIN            |
| S. J. COWLEY         | N. J. HOLMES    | N. PEAKE         | R. W. SERJEANTSON     |
| S. B. DALZIEL        | M. B. HOLNESS   | M. J. PERRY      | N. I. SHEPHERD-BARRON |
| M. J. DIXON          | D. P. KENNEDY   | A. I. PESCI      | R. J. SPARKES         |
| S. J. EGLEN          | J. KHALFA       | S. PITTS         | D. R. SPRING          |
| S. R. ELLIOTT        | N. G. KINGSBURY | H. PRICE         | A. A. VINNICOMBE      |
| F. A. FISCHER        | T. W. KÖRNER    | N. RADIC         | Y. WAN                |
| R. E. GOLDSTEIN      | A. N. LASENBY   | O. RATH SPIVACK  | P. WINGFIELD          |
| B. B. GROISMAN       | J. LASENBY      | R. A. W. REX     |                       |
| F. M. GROSCHE        | A. D. LEMONS    | P. G. RICHARDSON |                       |
| S. K. HAIGH          | J. R. LISTER    | T. W. RIDGMAN    |                       |

## Report of the Council on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University

### *Non Placet* Flysheet

The report on the governance for sport within the University was compiled by a review committee comprising nine individuals, very few of whom are involved in student sport on a day-to-day basis. Appendix C lists “interested parties who were approached to submit evidence to the review committee”, however it is known that some of these parties were not approached, at least not in a way that made it clear what was required and what would come of their “evidence”. As a result, only a small subset of those approached actually provided evidence to the review, meaning that it is not necessarily representative of the views of all University sportspeople. We hope you share our concern regarding this lack of meaningful consultation of students and, perhaps more importantly, those participating in sport at the University, and vote **non placet**.



The membership of the current Sports Syndicate includes seven junior members, six of whom are sportspeople appointed by the Blues Committees. In contrast, the proposed Sports Committee will only include two people *in statu pupillari* in its membership, one of whom will likely be a CUSU representative. The other junior member will be “*a student representative appointed by the clubs’ sub-committee*” and thus it is likely, though not guaranteed, that this will be a sportsperson. Not only are we concerned about the reduction from seven to two junior members, but we also think it is unlikely that a single person can usefully represent the views of both male and female athletes from the whole range of University sports clubs; from the large, well-funded clubs such as CUBC, to the smaller, less-well-funded clubs such as Judo.

Funding itself is something that is touched upon by the review but which is not fully addressed. There is a suggestion that the incorporation of the Sports Service into the UAS will help improve funding for sport. Recommendation 13 is that “*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*”. However, the Department of Physical Education is already included in the planning round and thus there is absolutely no evidence of increased funding for sport as a result of the proposed structure.

At the time of writing, a petition in support of the review has 722 signatures. This petition is being undertaken by Cam Gill and Beck, “*on behalf of Dr Pat Marsh who was the author of the initial report to the Sports Syndicate 2012*”, a report that has not been made available to students. Although this suggests that there is some student support for the review, this number actually equates to a very small percentage of students participating in sport within the University. There are 52 University sports clubs registered with the Sports Syndicate. If those falling outside of the Syndicate are also counted, the total number exceeds 70 (depending slightly on the categorisation of sport). It is telling that only ten parties submitted evidence to the review on behalf of University Sports clubs. In addition, numbers from 2012–2013 suggest that there are 2365 students involved in 48 out of the 52 clubs that are registered with the Syndicate. This is just an indication of how many people are involved in sport at a University level – if college level sport is also taken into account the number of students with a vested interest in the governance of sport will be much greater.

The petition itself is actually intrinsically flawed; there is no way of verifying whether those who have signed were actually responsible for doing so themselves. In addition, it is not limited such that only current students can sign and it has not been set up to automatically remove duplicate entries. In fact, it has already been confirmed by those administering the petition that no fields on the petition are compulsory, duplicate entries have been received and that some signatures are linked to people without Cambridge University email addresses. Even if each signature was unique, 722 equates to 30% of the students involved in 48 University clubs, meaning that at least 70% of Cambridge sportspeople have not signed (and this is discounting college sportspeople and those not in the 48 University clubs for which we have data). If the flaws of the petition are taken into consideration then the number of Cambridge athletes showing their support by signing drops to a far smaller percentage.

Finally, the petition has been circulated to sportspeople by interested parties, with no encouragement to read the review itself, asking students to sign while failing to present them with all relevant information; we are concerned that students are being led to believe that if the review is not passed, the University will not look at the issue again for many years. We are fully supportive of a change to the way in which sport is governed at the University but are concerned about the lack of student consultation and representation and what the result might be for student sport. Please vote **non placet**.

|                |                 |                    |                |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| C. H. G. ALLEN | A. FRYXELL      | K. T. A. MAHBUBANI | H. R. SIMMONDS |
| L. ALLEN       | R. GARDNER      | J. MARTIN          | N. SMITH       |
| C. ATTWOOD     | S. GERRARD      | P. MATTHEWS        | K. STRUTHERS   |
| B. BÓRC SÖK    | C. GODDARD      | S. MERCADO         | A. STUBBS      |
| J. CHALMERS    | R. GOUGH        | M. MOLL            | Z. SZENCZI     |
| AMANDA CHEN    | T. GOUVEIA      | R. MULLER          | M. TEPLENSKY   |
| ALEXANDER CHEN | L. GRAHAM       | K. NECHAYEVA       | K. TRINH       |
| S. DANE        | M. GRIFFITHS    | T. NELSON          | E. TUNNEY      |
| T.-F. DAUCK    | C. P. GUYADER   | N. NOVČIĆ          | H. VOOLMA      |
| K. DAVIES      | R. HEYWORTH     | J. OCAMPOS-COLINA  | K. WAGENAAR    |
| D. DICU        | C. HO           | C. ORELLANA        | B. WALKER      |
| B. DOSEN       | L. IMPERATORI   | R. E. OSTFELD      | A. WATSON      |
| A. DREW        | E. JOHNSON      | K. PAVLYUK         | S. I. WILLIS   |
| C.-H. ELDER    | R. KERSHAW      | A. J. PEEL         | K. WOLF        |
| G. EMERSON     | E. KEYZER       | T.-L. PRECHT       | N. XIAO        |
| M. FALA        | A. KOUYOUMDJIAN | H. RESEMANN        | L. YOUNG       |
| R. A. FORSTER  | R. LAZAR        | A. RICHARDSON      | A. L. ZHU      |
| S. FRENCH      | R. LESS         | R. SCHEUERLE       | A. ZIELINSKA   |
| C. FULLER      | S. B. LIM       | R. SEVILLA MARTIN  |                |
| L. FUNCKE      | C. LOH          | J. SHILTON         |                |

## Report of the Council on the governance and management arrangements for sport within the University

### *Placet Flysheet*

We are aware of the petition <http://cgandb.co.uk/cu-sports-petition/> signed so far by 867<sup>1</sup> members of the University, young and older who are not members of the Regent House and therefore unable to vote, but strongly in favour of the Report as the way forward for sport in Cambridge and note that 71 of these are student officers who have signed on behalf of their sports clubs. We also note <http://www.bluebirdnews.co.uk/we-are-cambridge-sportsmen-and-women-and-we-support-the-cambridge-sport-review/> where prominent individual sportsmen and sportswomen indicate their support for the Report and urge those able to vote to take these views seriously.

We take the view that the Report's authors were both representative and consulted widely and wish to see the Report implemented as soon as possible. We deplore the antagonism to the UAS manifested in opposition.

We therefore urge you to vote *Placet* to this proposal.

A. M. FULTON  
M. J. HACKETT  
C. S. M. LAWRENCE

K. L. LEE  
D. LOWTHER  
S. SMITH

E. WADE  
P. WARREN

I. H. WHITE  
A. D. YATES

<sup>1</sup> At the time of going to press, there were 902 returns, of which 648 were from students, 28 from staff, and 249 from alumni.

*The following fly-sheets were not printed in the Reporter at the time the results of the relevant ballot were published; they are included now in maintenance of the University's historical record.*

### **Fly-sheet relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of 28 November 2012 (Report of the Council, dated 22 October 2012, seeking authority to commence development of University land at North West Cambridge)**

The Report of the Council, dated 22 October 2014, seeking authority to commence development of University land at North West Cambridge, was published in the *Reporter* on 24 October 2012 (see *Reporter*, 6282, 2012–13, p. 59). For the result of the ballot, see *Reporter*, 6295, 2012–13, p. 342.

### **Report of the Council seeking authority to commence development of University land at North West Cambridge**

#### *Placet Flysheet*

The case for developing the first phase of North West Cambridge is simply stated. A shortage of all types of appropriate affordable housing is a major constraint on our academic development, limiting our ability to recruit the best in the world-wide competition for talent. We therefore need to build now many of the homes that the University is likely to need in the foreseeable future. Phase 1 is sufficiently large and diverse to be economically and socially viable in its own right. There will be around 300 graduate student rooms; over 500 postdoctoral homes, mostly 1 and 2 bed flats; around 50 homes for University staff for rental at market rates; and 700 homes to be developed privately and sold freehold.

Postdoctoral researchers and graduate students are the creative and intellectual driving force behind much of the daily research success of Cambridge, and there is intense international competition to attract the best. For several years, all the Schools have been pressing to expand their graduate student numbers, but a lack of suitable accommodation has inhibited that expansion, so we are falling behind our competitors in responding to the inevitable change in student demographics. Several colleges are involved in the planning of the graduate housing; initially they will lease space for rental to graduate students. The architecture allows for the possibility that future development, probably funded by philanthropic donation, will allow evolution of this space into an independent college.

Postdoctoral workers are the largest staff group in the University, yet most have little college-type support or lifestyle, and many are shocked by the high rents they have to pay for low quality housing. By providing affordable accommodation for our own staff we expect to reduce the pressure on rented housing elsewhere in the City region. The availability and price of homes to buy is also an increasing problem in recruiting permanent staff at all levels, placing upward pressure on salaries, and forcing new colleagues to commute many miles.

North West Cambridge presents a unique opportunity to enhance the life of both the University and the City region. High-quality architecture and public spaces will create a sustainable community in a new local centre and in residential neighbourhoods that will complement the historic City Centre. The early development of the local centre, including primary school, nursery, shops, a community hall centre, health centre and police office will create a community focus from the very beginning and provide additional facilities for local residents.

The budget for this project matches its scale. The estimated cost of Phase 1 over the next 40 years will be £281m at today's prices, most of which is incurred in the early stages for constructing buildings and infrastructure. The project will be funded by a loan from the University, and we expect that it will repay the loan and interest in less than 40 years.

The development of North West Cambridge will demonstrate the confidence that the University has in its own future and in its local community. It will allow us to grow in a way that is coherent, sustainable, exemplary and exciting. Above all, it will help us to continue contributing at the highest level, but in a deeply practical way, to society and the economy locally, nationally and internationally.

We therefore urge you to vote *Placet* to this proposal.

|                    |                        |                     |                  |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| DAVID ABULAFIA     | A. K. DIXON            | D. A. GOOD          | K. B. PRETTY     |
| P. M. ALLMENDINGER | CHRISTOPHER M. DOBSON  | A. HOPPER           | J. RALLISON      |
| A. J. BADGER       | A. M. DONALD           | F. P. KELLY         | DUNCAN ROBINSON  |
| N. BAMPOS          | R. J. DOWLING          | ROBERT C. KENNICUTT | J. K. M. SANDERS |
| J. C. BARNES       | I. M. LE M. DU QUESNAY | S. LAING            | J. M. TODD       |
| RICHARD BOWRING    | B. J. EVERITT          | ROBERT LETHBRIDGE   | D. J. WALLACE    |
| H. A. CHASE        | RICHARD JOHN EVANS     | J. P. LUZIO         | I. H. WHITE      |
| SARAH COAKLEY      | SIMON FRANKLIN         | PATRICK H. MAXWELL  | S. J. YOUNG      |
| STEPHEN J. COWLEY  | C. A. GILLIGAN         | M. MCDONALD         |                  |
| M. J. DAUNTON      | L. F. GLADDEN          | RACHAEL PADMAN      |                  |

### **Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 1 of 22 May 2013 (Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 18 March 2013, on IT infrastructure and support, as amended by the Council's Notice, dated 20 May 2013)**

The Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 18 March 2013, on IT infrastructure and support, was published in the *Reporter* on 20 March 2013 (see *Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 418) and amended by the Council's Notice, dated 20 May 2013 (see *Reporter*, 6308, 2012–13, p. 547). For the result of the ballot, see *Reporter*, 6315, 2012–13, p. 678.

### **Flysheet for clarifying details of implementation group**

We, the undersigned, commend the IT Review Committee, the Council and the General Board on the excellent work that has gone into the most recent IT Review. The consultative processes and responsiveness to feedback in arriving at the final recommendations of the IT Review have been exemplary and we look forward to future reviews following similar paths. Much of what is proposed in the revised IT Review report (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2012-13/weekly/6302/Revised-IT-Review-Report.pdf>), properly implemented, will be of immense and lasting benefit to the University.

However, we feel that there is a small but significant oversight with regard to the proposed implementation group, probably as a result of the time pressures of meeting the relevant legislative deadlines. We feel that the details of the implementation group are too important not to be spelt out. Neither the Joint Report on IT infrastructure and support nor the subsequent Notice of 20 May 2013 are sufficiently clear about these details. We believe that it is vital, not only that there should be an implementation group, created in a timely fashion, but that it should be the *right* implementation group, with a clear, agreed membership, remit and *modus operandi*.

Under the current proposals, the implementation group will be operating for a significant period of time without the benefit of the proposed new governance structure for central IT. Further, nothing in the Joint Report or the subsequent Notice suggests that the implementation group would report to, or even work with, the body responsible for strategic IT (either the current body, ISSS, or the new body, the ISC). In addition, implementation of many of the recommendations of the revised IT Review should be left until the new Director of Information Services is in post. We believe that, under these circumstances, the lack of clarity around the implementation group is an oversight that could have potentially damaging consequences for the University's IT arrangements.

We observe that the University's IT arrangements are clearly a complex matter about which it is easy to make sub-optimal proposals, as is amply demonstrated by the significant changes between the IT Review Committee's initial and revised reports, and between the Joint Report and the subsequent Notice. We note that these changes were made in response to feedback from the wider University community, a community which has not had a chance to have any meaningful input in the matter of the composition, remit and operating procedure of the implementation group, since no detailed proposals have yet been made in this regard. We therefore feel that this specific point should be clarified by detailed proposals in a further Report to the Regent House.

We agree that commencing a search for a Director of Information Services is urgent, and this is adequately addressed by the current Grace. We do not seek to change these arrangements. However, the matter of the implementation group, whilst clearly very important, is not as urgent. We observe that no one has put forward any arguments in favour of implementing the other recommendations of the revised IT Review prior to the creation of the new University Information Services (UIS).

We realise that there are some who may fear that a further Report would only serve to delay the implementation of the recommendations of the revised IT Review. However, we feel that the proposed recommendations are so important, and their effects likely to be so wide-ranging, that it is more important to get the details of their implementation correct than it is to attempt to implement them quickly without a clear implementation plan.

Under the original proposals of the Joint Report, the implementation group would have had 3 months during the Long Vacation to do whatever was necessary as advance preparation for the creation of the UIS. If a further Report was placed before the Regent House, this would still give the implementation group 6 months, during University Term, prior to the creation of the UIS.

Clearly the implementation group should largely be carrying out preparatory work until the Director of Information Services is in post, which will be no earlier than 31 March 2014. There is therefore adequate time for a subsequent Grace detailing the membership, remit and operating procedures of the implementation group.

WE THEREFORE URGE THE REGENT HOUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY AMENDMENT WHICH WOULD RESULT IN SUCH MATTERS BEING DETERMINED BY GRACE [option (b) on the voting paper]. We believe that not only will it be to the University's advantage to further consider the matter of the implementation group but that it will be to its detriment to proceed without clarity around who will be responsible for implementing the IT Review's recommendations and how they will go about it.

|                    |                    |                  |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| A. I. ALTAPARMAKOV | N. J. HARWOOD      | J. P. KING       | S. PAGE            |
| M. B. BECKLES      | R. HAYNES          | F. E. R. LAHR    | C. QUY             |
| K. J. BODDY        | S. HOUGHTON-WALKER | M. R. LAVEN      | J. E. SCOTT-WARREN |
| S. M. FLOOD        | S. J. ISON         | J. M. LINE       | A. D. STONE        |
| R. C. FRANKLIN     | C. J. JARDINE      | I. W. MACKAY     | W. D. TROTTER      |
| J. L. GLUZA        | K. M. JEARY        | D. W. MCBRIDE    | J. WARBRICK        |
| P. GOPAL           | M. A. JOHNSON      | A. E. R. MOSELEY |                    |

## Flysheet supporting the Joint Report on IT infrastructure and support

Grace 1 of 22 May 2013 reads:

“That the recommendations in paragraph 8 of the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 6 and 18 March 2013, on IT infrastructure and support (*Reporter*, 6302, 2012–13, p. 418), as amended by the Council's Notice, dated 20 May 2013, be approved.”

After an extensive period of inquiry and consultation, the IT Review Committee has made a number of very sensible and wide-ranging recommendations for improving our IT provision. These include a new committee to oversee IT reporting directly to Council and General Board, the merger of the University Computing Service (UCS) and Management Information Systems Division (MISD), the appointment of a new Director to oversee the merged organization reporting directly to the Vice-Chancellor, minimum standards of provision for all staff and students and enhanced central provision to support these standards, greater user involvement in the design and delivery of IT services and improved career structures for all computing support staff.

The purpose of this Grace, which we fully support, is to give formal approval of these recommendations and enable the structural changes needed to implement them.

The proposed date for the merger of the UCS and MISD is 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014. In order to help prepare for this event, Council has proposed that an implementation group be formed as soon as possible. An amendment has been proposed that seeks to delay the formation of this group pending a further Report and Grace. Council has stated that the implementation group will be concerned only with the preparation of draft plans and it will consult fully with all involved including the Information Strategy and Services Syndicate. Given this reassurance, we believe that a further Report will introduce unnecessary delay and reduce the ability of the Group to consult as widely as possible with all stakeholders. We therefore strongly support the Council's Grace as it stands and reject the amendment.

We therefore urge members of the Regent House to indicate their approval of the Grace in its original form, incorporating amendments made by the Council's Notice of 20 May, by placing a 1 on the voting paper next to option (a).

|                    |                |                  |                  |
|--------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| P. M. ALLMENDINGER | A. P. DOWLING  | F. P. KELLY      | J. M. RALLISON   |
| N. BAMPOS          | A. C. FERRARI  | R. C. KENNICUTT  | D. A. RITCHIE    |
| J. C. BARNES       | N. A. FLECK    | R. D. LETHBRIDGE | I. G. ROBERTS    |
| J. R. BELLINGHAM   | S. C. FRANKLIN | R. J. LINGWOOD   | J. K. M. SANDERS |
| J. F. BLOOMFIELD   | R. H. FRIEND   | J. P. LUZIO      | J. SHAKESHAFT    |
| J. L. CADDICK      | Z. GHAHRAMANI  | P. H. MAXWELL    | H. SIRRINGHAUS   |
| D. J. CARTER       | C. A. GILLIGAN | M. MCDONALD      | M. A. THOMSON    |
| H. A. CHASE        | L. F. GLADDEN  | W. I. MILNE      | J. A. TODD       |
| S. A. COAKLEY      | K. GLOVER      | F. J. D. NOLAN   | I. H. WHITE      |
| A. A. COPESTAKE    | D. A. GOOD     | J. R. NORMAN     | D. M. WOLPERT    |
| M. J. DAUNTON      | M. J. GREGORY  | R. PADMAN        | A. D. YATES      |
| A. M. DONALD       | A. JARVIS      | M. A. PARKER     | S. J. YOUNG      |

## Flysheet for a properly constituted implementation group

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, URGE THE REGENT HOUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY AMENDMENT WHICH RESULTS IN THE DETAILS (MEMBERSHIP, REMIT, ETC) OF THE IMPLEMENTATION GROUP FOR THE IT REVIEW'S RECOMMENDATIONS BEING DETERMINED BY GRACE.

As explained in another flysheet, neither the merger of the UCS and MISD nor the appointment of a Director of Information Services would be delayed by such an amendment. Instead, it would guarantee that the implementation group – who will initially be given a budget of **£2 million** and charged with **completely re-organising the University's IT arrangements** – will be properly constituted, with a well-defined membership, remit and *modus operandi*.

The most likely 'detrimental' effect of such an amendment is that the implementation group would not be formally created until after the end of the Long Vacation 2013. Thus any suggestion that this might have a noticeable detrimental effect on the implementation group, and any consultation it might undertake, ignores the reality that the University all but closes down over the Long Vacation.

Further, during the Long Vacation IT staff are either away or taking advantage of everyone else's absence to maintain, develop and upgrade the IT systems they support. In particular, over the Long Vacation 2013, UCS and MISD staff will also be busy preparing to co-locate in the Roger Needham Building in West Cambridge. Thus, over this period most IT staff won't have the time to give the considered response that the implementation group should require.

We therefore believe that an amendment requiring a further Grace to establish the implementation group will not have any significant detrimental effect on this group. Consequently, WE URGE THE REGENT HOUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY AMENDMENT WHICH RESULTS IN THE DETAILS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION GROUP BEING DETERMINED BY GRACE [option (b) on the voting paper].

M. B. BECKLES  
J. L. GLUZA  
R. HAYNES  
C. J. JARDINE

K. M. JEARY  
J. P. KING  
M. R. LAVEN  
M. LEGGATT

J. M. LINE  
I. W. MACKEY  
D. W. MCBRIDE  
A. E. R. MOSELEY

J. E. SCOTT-WARREN  
A. D. STONE  
J. WARBRICK

## Statement on behalf of the Council

The Review Committee tasked with undertaking a review of the University's IT infrastructure and support has been commended for its consultative approach and has gathered broad support for its conclusions. The Committee examined four main areas: governance, delivery, staffing, and systems. Underlying many of the issues raised, it identified structural deficiencies that are limiting our ability to provide IT services and systems at a level commensurate with our standing as a leading university. The recommendations that would be carried with the approval of the Grace under either option (a) or (b) will provide a governance structure for IT provision in the University in line with the Committee's recommendations, which will enable the implementation of the remaining proposals made in the final report of the Review Committee. The main structural changes proposed are:

- The formation of the University Information Services (UIS), under the supervision of the Council, from the merger of the University Computing Service and the Management Information Services Division;
- The establishment of a new University office of Director of Information Services, reporting to the Vice-Chancellor, as head of the UIS;
- The replacement of the current Information Strategy and Services Syndicate by an Information Services Committee, reporting jointly to the Council and the General Board.

In its reply to the remarks made at the Discussion on 23 April, the Council noted the support expressed for these proposed changes and responded to the comments on the timetable for effecting the merger and the process for appointing the new Director. The Council's amendments to the original Grace, as published in the Council's Notice of 20 May, revise the timetable for implementation so that, if the Grace is approved, the merger and related structural changes will now take place from 31 March 2014 or on appointment of the new Director, whichever is the later. These amendments also propose that an *ad hoc* appointment committee will be established to recruit a new Director, in an exercise open to both internal and external candidates.

The Council has also recommended the establishment of an implementation group. The group will work closely with both the two current Directors and with the new Director once appointed. It will be led by a senior professor with both relevant experience and knowledge of academic computing and provision of IT services. The suggested principal activities of this group, as noted in the Joint Report and modified consequent to the Council's Notice, are as follows:

- (a) to prepare a draft implementation plan for the full set of review recommendations in consultation with the staff involved, relevant committees including the ISSS and in due course the new Director;
- (b) to prepare a submission to the 2013–14 planning round to provide an implementation budget;
- (c) to ensure good communication both within the institutions directly affected by the changes and across the Collegiate University.

It is expected that the draft implementation plan would be brought to the new Information Services Committee at its first meeting or soon thereafter for discussion and agreement.

A proposal for an amendment to the Grace has been received from members of the Regent House putting forward a change to this last recommendation. The amendment would make the remit and membership of the implementation group the subject of a separate Report and Grace.

If the amendment to the Grace is approved, it will not be possible to put the resulting Report on the agenda for a Discussion until the Michaelmas Term and therefore establishment of the implementation group will be delayed by at least five months and possibly longer if there are differing opinions on the role and membership of the group. Given that the remit of the proposed implementation group is intended to focus on advance planning and it will not have decision-making powers, the Council believes that this delay is neither necessary nor helpful.

The Council therefore invites members of the Regent House to indicate their approval of the Grace in its original form, incorporating amendments made by the Council's Notice of 20 May, by placing a 1 on the voting paper next to option (a) and not giving a preference for the alternative options.

F. P. KELLY

*On behalf of the Council*



## REPORT OF DISCUSSION

**Tuesday, 25 November 2014**

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Graham Virgo was presiding, with the Registrary's Deputy, the Senior Pro-Proctor, the Deputy Senior Proctor, and four other persons present.

The following Reports were discussed:

***First-stage Report of the Council, dated 31 October 2014, on the North Range of buildings on the New Museums site (Reporter, 6363, 2014–15, p. 119).***

Dr S. J. COWLEY (Chair of the Faculty of Mathematics, and University Council):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of both the University Council and the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC). I did not sign this Report.

Over the past few years the University, under the leadership of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Resources, has developed a Capital Plan. The University has, of course, always had capital projects, but a more coherent long-term plan was urged on us by, *inter alios*, one of our first external members of Council, Lord Simon. The current Capital Plan has at least £750m in the green zone, with more to come as plans for the move of Engineering to West Cambridge develop. There are ambitious plans for the redevelopment of the Cavendish Laboratories, a possible move of the Chemistry Laboratories to West Cambridge, and re-development of both the Old Press/Mill Lane and New Museums sites. All of this is desirable, indeed highly desirable. However, funds are limited, and we cannot always do everything we want; we have to be willing to identify priorities. Indeed, as well as building priorities, like the £150m for Biofacilities requiring Home Office licences, there are non-building priorities, e.g. equipment and other facilities, and might I suggest staff wages and pensions (and not just the wages and pensions of the 250 or so earning more than £100k per annum).

This Report concerns the North Range of buildings on the New Museums site (NMS). As someone who regularly lectures on the New Museums site, there is no question that the site needs redevelopment. Indeed, I have offered to swing the demolition ball at the Cockcroft lecture theatre (which is far from the ideal place to lecture first-year mathematicians). The question is whether the time is ripe to proceed with the North Range development; I am not convinced.

This redevelopment is related to Phase 2 of the UAS Strategic Estate Plan. This, as Paper 1537, was due to be considered at the meeting of the PRC on 26 March 2014. There was an outline paper and four Annexes. In particular, a total cash-flow projection was included as Annex C with a somewhat more detailed breakdown as Annex D. I was looking forward to discussing these Annexes because I had had difficulty making sense of some of the sums and assumptions. The headline was good:

‘this analysis shows that in broad terms the series of moves will generate sufficient cost savings over 20 years to produce a net cash inflow of £6.6m’,

although the qualification less so:

‘the key assumption made in the cash-flow projection is that the Student Services Centre is a University strategic project in the green zone of the Capital Plan and is to be funded by the Capital Fund’.

The cost of the Student Services Centre as given in the current Report is £32.7m (i.e. £39.2m minus £6.5m for demolition, public realm, and infrastructure works that are necessary for the redevelopment of the NMS).

However, returning to my main point, Paper 1537 was not discussed because of the amount of business at the meeting on 26 March. Neither was it considered, as promised, at the meeting of 23 April, while the PRC meeting of 21 May was cancelled. The UAS Strategic Estate Plan was discussed at the meeting of 25 June, but the Annexes were not re-circulated (and I unfortunately failed to ask them to be so). However, my reading of the Annexes is that, even if you accept the calculations included there (and I am not convinced), the cost recovery from the rationalization of the buildings used by the UAS will make only a small dent in the required Capital Expenditure. Further, when the Student Services Centre was discussed at the PRC on 15 October, the Minutes record that:

‘A detailed cost/benefit analysis for the Student Services Centre was not possible due to commercially-sensitive information in relation to the Old Press/Mill Lane site. The Committee were reminded that the redevelopment of the Old Press/Mill Lane site was not the only driver for developing the New Museums site. Raising the quality of the University's estate was essential if the University was to maintain its status as a leading provider of higher education.’

I can understand the commercially-sensitive information not being released to the Regent House, but the Regent House also need to understand that the information is not being released to the elected members of the Council on the relevant committee. As such, in my judgement this project looks like a call on the University's funds that is one step too far at the moment. I do not believe that the Student Services Centre is a sufficient priority, when compared to the other calls on the University funds I have outlined above. As to the argument regarding raising the quality of the University's estate if the University is to maintain its status as a leading provider of higher education, that could be applied to many other projects, e.g. Biofacilities, Land Economy, Physics, Geography, Medicine, as well as Student Services. All have legitimate claims on the Capital Fund.

Yes, there is a need to vacate the Old Press/Mill Lane site at some point, but for a comprehensive redevelopment of that site it needs to be emptied. At the meeting of the PRC on 15 October, I asked whether the construction of the Student Services Centre would achieve this. As far as I can recall the answer was no (but the reply was not minuted). It may be that the proceeds from the Old Press/Mill Lane site will pay for the Student Services Centre, and that there may even be additional funds to spare for other priorities; but at the moment I, and other members of the Council, do not know. Further, suppose that the proceeds will not pay for the Student Services Centre, then is the University convinced that the priority for £30m or so, is a centrally located Student Services building, in an age when more and more administration is being done electronically and remotely, and when the building does not include



accommodation for CUSU and the GU (and there is a proposal, the last I heard, that CUSU moves, at least temporarily, to the Old Press/Mill Lane site)?

Yes, there has been much work on the Student Services Centre and the redevelopment of the NMS, yes, in a perfect world with unlimited resources it makes sense, but in the real world of austerity and make do, I think that this Report should be put on hold until there are, at least, firm plans for the full release of the Old Press/Mill Lane site, and the funding in place to make that possible. To me insufficient ducks are lined up, and surely one of the motivations for the Capital Plan was to ensure that they were. We should ensure that we have the correctly prioritized funds before embarking on the journey.

**Report of the General Board, dated 5 November 2014, on the establishment or re-establishment of certain Professorships** (*Reporter*, 6364, 2014–15, p. 140).

No remarks were made on this Report.

## COLLEGE NOTICES

### Elections

*Fitzwilliam College*

The following election has been made:

Elected into a Fellowship in Class A, with effect from 26 November 2014:

Hero Amaryllis Chalmers, B.A., D.Phil., *Oxford*

### Vacancies

*Christ's College*: W. H. D. Rouse Junior Research Fellowship for work in Classics, Indian Languages, or Indo-European Philology; tenure: four years, from not later than 1 October 2015; closing date: 26 January 2015 at 12 noon; further particulars: <http://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/jobs>

Charles Darwin and Galapagos Islands Fund Non-Stipendiary Research Fellowship in any area relevant to present-day aspects of the work originally undertaken by Charles Darwin and which will help to promote the scientific understanding, conservation, and long-term sustainability of the Galapagos Islands; tenure: for not more than four years from not later than 1 October 2015; closing date: 2 January 2015 at 12 noon; further particulars: <http://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/jobs>

*Trinity Hall*: Research Fellowship in Medical Law and Ethics; tenure: three years from 1 October 2015; stipend: up to £21,470 plus benefits; closing date: 20 December 2014 at 5 p.m.; further particulars: <http://www.trinhall.cam.ac.uk/about/vacancies/detail.asp?ItemID=2465>

## EXTERNAL NOTICES

### University of Oxford

*Pitt Rivers Museum*: Director; closing date: 26 January 2015; further particulars: [http://www.ox.ac.uk/about\\_the\\_university/jobs/fp/](http://www.ox.ac.uk/about_the_university/jobs/fp/)

*Corpus Christi College*: President; closing date: 16 January 2015; further particulars: <http://www.russellreynolds.com/executive-opportunities/search> or [Responses@RussellReynolds.com](mailto:Responses@RussellReynolds.com)

*New College*: Warden (from 1 October 2016); salary: £98,900 plus allowances; closing date: 16 January 2014; further particulars: <http://www.new.ox.ac.uk/wardenship>

Notices for publication in the *Reporter*, or queries concerning content, should be sent to the Editor, Cambridge University Reporter, Registry's Office, The Old Schools, Cambridge, CB2 1TN (tel. 01223 332305, email [reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk)). Copy should be sent as early as possible in the week before publication; short notices will be accepted up to **4 p.m. on Friday** for publication the following Wednesday. Inclusion of notices is at the discretion of the Editor.