

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6426

WEDNESDAY 18 MAY 2016

VOL CXLVI No 31

CONTENTS

Notices		Obituaries	
Calendar	518	Obituary Notice	549
Notice of a Discussion on 24 May 2016	518	Graces	
University Combination Room: Closure on Wednesday, 1 June 2016	518	Graces submitted to the Regent House on 18 May 2016	549
Events, courses, etc.		Acta	
Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.	518	Congregation of the Regent House on 14 May 2016	550
Notices by the General Board		<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Senior Academic Promotions Committee: Appeals 2016	518	Report of Discussion	
Regulations for examinations		Tuesday, 10 May 2016	560
Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos, Part II	519	College Notices	
Linguistics Tripos	519	Vacancies	569
Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos	520	External Notices	
Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos, Part II	523	University of Oxford	569
Theological and Religious Studies Tripos, Part IIA: Amendment	524		
Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University	524		
Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.			
Master of Music, 2016–17	525		
Reports			
Report of the Council on the financial position and budget of the University, recommending allocations from the Chest for 2016–17	525		
Report of the Council on revised governance arrangements for the development of the West and North West Cambridge sites	545		
Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the public display of Class-lists and related matters	547		



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES**Calendar**

22 May, *Sunday*. Trinity Sunday. Scarlet Day. Preacher before the University at 11.15 a.m., The Rt Revd Dr Bill Musk, formerly Area Bishop for North Africa and Rector of St George's, Tunis (*Ramsden Preacher*).

24 May, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House (see below).

1 June, *Wednesday*. End of third quarter of Easter Term.

Discussions at 2 p.m.

24 May

7 June

15 July

Congregations

15 June, *Wednesday at 2.45 p.m.* (Honorary Degrees)

22 June, *Wednesday at 10 a.m.* (General Admission)

23 June, *Thursday at 10 a.m.* (General Admission)

24 June, *Friday at 10 a.m.* (General Admission)

25 June, *Saturday at 10 a.m.* (General Admission)

15 July, *Friday at 10 a.m.*

16 July, *Saturday at 10 a.m.*

Notice of a Discussion on Tuesday, 24 May 2016

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 107) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House, on Tuesday, 24 May 2016, at 2 p.m. for the discussion of:

1. Report of the General Board, dated 27 April 2016, on the establishment of certain Professorships (*Reporter*, 6424, 2015–16, p. 504).

2. Report of the General Board, dated 27 April 2016, on the introduction of a Doctor of Business Degree in the Judge Business School (*Reporter*, 6424, 2015–16, p. 505).

The Reports in this issue (p. 525, p. 545, and p. 547) will be discussed on 7 June 2016.

University Combination Room: Notice of closure on Wednesday, 1 June 2016

The University Combination Room will be closed on Wednesday, 1 June 2016 for a private event.

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 individual Faculty, Department, and institution websites, on the What's On website (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/whatson/>), and on Talks.cam (<http://www.talks.cam.ac.uk/>).

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

*MRC Laboratory of
Molecular Biology*

John Kendrew Lecture: *Post-translational regulation of cell signalling*, by Tony Hunter, at 3 p.m. on 25 May 2016, in the Max Perutz Lecture Theatre, LMB

<http://www2.mrc-lmb.cam.ac.uk/news-and-events/scientific-seminars/>

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD**Senior Academic Promotions Committee: Appeals 2016**

The procedure for senior academic promotions (paragraph 11.1) provides that applicants have the right to lodge an appeal against the decision of the General Board's Academic Promotions Committee not to promote.

In accordance with the policy that Committee membership for the senior academic promotions exercise be published, the members of the Appeals Committee for the 1 October 2016 exercise agreed by the General Board are as follows:

Professor Richard Hunter (Chair)

Professor Jon Crowcroft

Professor Susan Golomboks

Professor Fiona Karet

Professor Sarah Worthington

Secretary: Ms Stephanie Lott

REGULATIONS FOR EXAMINATIONS

Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos, Part II

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 273)

With effect from 1 October 2016

The General Board has, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, approved amendments to the regulations governing Part II of the Tripos, so as to allow candidates wishing to offer Chinese with Japanese in Part II to offer Paper J7, Literary Japanese; and so as to revise the notice period for which candidates need to apply for permission from the Faculty Board to offer this subject from one year to two years in advance of the examination; that is by the division of the Lent Term next but one preceding the examination.

The same requirement (when there was previously none) has been introduced for candidates wishing to offer Japanese with Chinese. Henceforth candidates wishing to offer this subject must apply for permission from the Faculty Board to offer this subject by the division of the Lent Term next but one preceding the examination.

PART II

Regulation 22.

By amending Regulation 22(b) so as to read:

(b) *Chinese with Japanese*

Candidates shall offer:

- (i) Papers J.4–5 from Part IB of the Tripos;
- (ii) Paper C.12;
- (iii) either Paper C.11, or Paper C.13, when it has been announced by the Faculty Board under the provisions of Regulation 8;
- (iv) either two further papers chosen from the papers announced by the Faculty Board under Regulation 8, provided that only papers prefixed with C may be chosen; or Paper J7 and one further paper chosen from the papers announced by the Faculty Board under Regulation 8, provided that only papers prefixed with C may be chosen.

Candidates shall also offer a Japanese oral examination, under conditions set out by the Faculty Board from time to time. This option may only be taken with the permission of the Faculty Board, such permission to be granted no later than the division of the Lent Term of the year next but one preceding the examination.

And by the addition of a final sentence to Regulation 22(d) so as to read:

(d) *Japanese with Chinese*

This option may only be taken with the permission of the Faculty Board, such permission to be granted no later than the division of the Lent Term of the year next but one preceding the examination.

The Faculty Board of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies is satisfied that no candidate's preparation for the examination in 2017 will be affected.

Linguistics Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 350)

With effect from 1 October 2016

Amendments have been made to the list of papers set for the Linguistics Tripos. Papers 11 and 14 have been suspended in 2017–18 and in each alternate year thereafter. Papers 17 and 19 have been suspended in 2016–17.

Regulation 12.

SECTION C

Paper 11. Historical linguistics (also serves as Paper 15(a) of Part II of the Anglo Saxon, Norse, and Celtic Tripos, as Paper 43A of Part II of the English Tripos, and as Paper Li. 11 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

By suspending the paper in 2017–18 and in each alternate year thereafter.

Paper 14. History of the French language (also serves as Paper Li. 14 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

By suspending the paper in 2017–18 and in each alternate year thereafter.

Paper 17. A subject in linguistics to be specified by the Faculty Board from time to time (also serves as Paper Li. 17 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

By suspending the paper in 2016–17.

Paper 19. A subject in linguistics to be specified by the Faculty Board from time to time

By suspending the paper in 2016–17.

SECTION D

Paper 22. Aspects of the history of the German language (Paper Ge. 11 of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos)

The paper is no longer suspended.

The Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages has confirmed that no candidate's preparation for the examination in 2017 will be affected.

Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 363)

With effect from 1 October 2016

The list of papers available in Parts Ib and II has been amended so as to amend the titles of certain papers; suspend certain papers; introduce new papers and reintroduce certain papers; and so as to debar certain papers from being replaced by optional dissertation. In addition Paper Sp. 1, 'Introduction to the language, literatures, and culture of the Spanish speaking world', may no longer be offered in Part Ib. Paper Sl. 2, 'The history and culture of Early Rus', may be replaced in Part Ib by two long essays under the provisions of Regulation 23. A new form of examination has been introduced for Paper Pg. 3, 'Introduction to the language, literatures, and cultures of the Portuguese-speaking world'. Papers MES. 37, 'History of the pre-modern Middle East', and MES. 41, 'Comparative Semitic linguistics' may no longer be offered in Part II.

The Supplementary Regulations for Part II have been amended so as to clarify that the maximum mark allocated to Paper C2, 'Foreign language: text and culture' will be 70% of the maximum mark allocated to a three-hour written paper.

SCHEDULE B

French

Fr. 8. Living, loving, and dying in Renaissance France (also serves as Paper 35 of Part II of the English Tripos).

By removing the current title of the paper and replacing it with a paper entitled:

Fr. 8. Wondrous forms in the age of Montaigne (also serves as Paper 35 of Part II of the English Tripos).

German

Ge. 11. Aspects of the history of the German language (also serves as Paper 22 of the Linguistics Tripos).

The paper is no longer suspended.

Modern Greek

Gr. 3. Introduction to modern Greek language and culture (also serves as Paper O2 of Part II of the Classical Tripos).

By inserting a footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be replaced by an optional dissertation; and by inserting a footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be taken in the same year as Gr. 6A or Gr. 6I

Gr. 6. Greek literature, thought, and history since 1900.

The paper is no longer suspended.

By removing the current title of the paper and replacing it with two new papers entitled:

Gr. 6A. Myth matters: receptions of mythology in Modern Greek literature and culture (*ab initio*).

By inserting a footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be offered in the same year as Gr. 3 or if the paper has been offered in a previous year; and by inserting a separate footnote to state that the paper will not be available by optional dissertation.

Gr. 6I. Myth matters: receptions of mythology in Modern Greek literature and culture (intermediate).

By inserting a footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be offered in the same year as either Gr. 3 or Gr. 6A, or if Paper Gr. 6A has been offered in a previous year; and by inserting a separate footnote to state that the paper will not be available by optional dissertation.

Italian

It. 3. Italian modernism.

The paper is no longer suspended.

By removing the current title of the paper and replacing it with a paper entitled:

It. 3. Italian cinema.

Neo-Latin

NL. 1. Introduction to Neo-Latin literature, from 1350 to 1700 (also serves as Paper 41A of Part II of the English Tripos).

The paper is suspended until further notice.

NL. 2. A special subject in Neo-Latin literature: selected authors (also serves as Paper O7 of Part II of the Classical Tripos and Paper 41B of Part II of the English Tripos).

The paper is suspended until further notice.

Portuguese

Pg. 3. Introduction to the language and literature of Portugal, Brazil, and Portuguese-speaking Africa.

By removing the current title of the paper and replacing it with a paper entitled:

Pg. 3. Introduction to the language, literatures, and cultures of the Portuguese-speaking world.

By inserting a footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be replaced by an optional dissertation; and by inserting a further footnote so as to read:

The examination for this paper will consist of: a written examination of two hours on cultural topics, *and* a written language examination of one and a half hours.

Slavonic Studies

Sl. 6. Russian culture after 1953.

The paper is no longer suspended.

Sl. 7. Soviet and Russian cinema.

The paper is no longer suspended.

Sl. 9. Introduction to the language, literature, and culture of Ukraine (also serves as Paper 10P of Part I of the English Tripos).

By inserting a footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be replaced by an optional dissertation.

Sl. 11. Russia in revolution, from 1861 to 1917.

By inserting a footnote so as to suspend the paper until further notice.

Sl. 12. Socialist Russia, 1917–91.

By inserting a footnote so as to suspend the paper until further notice.

Sl. 13. Introduction to the language, literature, and culture of Poland.

By inserting a footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be replaced by an optional dissertation.

Spanish

Sp. 5. Spanish-American culture and history.

By removing the current title of the paper and replacing it with a paper entitled:

Sp. 5. Latin American culture and history.

Sp. 7. Spanish literature, thought, and history, from 1492 to 1700.

By removing the current title of the paper and replacing it with a paper entitled:

Sp. 7. Spanish and Latin American Early Modern literature and culture.

Sp. 10. Introduction to Catalan literature and culture .

By inserting an additional footnote so as to indicate that the paper may not be replaced by an optional dissertation.

Linguistics

Li. 11. Historical linguistics (Paper 11 of the Linguistics Tripos).

By amending the current footnote so as to suspend this paper in 2017–18 and each alternate year thereafter.

Li. 14. History of the French language (Paper 14 of the Linguistics Tripos).

By amending the current footnote so as to suspend this paper in 2017–18 and each alternate year thereafter.

Li. 17. A subject in Linguistics to be specified by the Faculty Board from time to time (Paper 17 of the Linguistics Tripos).

By amending the current footnote so as to suspend this paper in 2016–17.

SCHEDULE I_B

Papers available in Part I_B

By amending the Schedule so as to:

- i. replace Paper Gr. 6 with paper Gr. 6A, together with a footnote so as to indicate that Paper Gr. 6A may not be offered in the same year as Gr. 3;
- ii. reintroduce Paper It. 3;
- iii. remove Paper Sp. 1;
- iv. suspend papers NL. 1, Sl. 11, and Sl. 12 until further notice;
- v. make provision for Paper Sl. 2 to be replaced by two long essays under Regulation 23.

SCHEDULE II

Papers available in Part II

By amending the Schedule so as to:

- i. replace Paper Gr. 6 with papers Gr. 6A, and Gr. 6I, together with footnotes so as to indicate that Paper Gr. 6A may not be offered in the same year as Gr. 3, or if it has been offered in a previous year; and that Paper Gr. 6I may not be offered in the same year as either Gr. 3 or Gr. 6A, or if Paper Gr. 3 or Gr. 6A has been offered in a previous year; and by inserting separate footnotes so as to indicate that neither Gr. 6A, nor Gr. 6I will be available by optional dissertation;
- ii. reintroduce papers SL. 6 and SL. 7;
- iii. suspend papers NL. 1, NL. 2, SL. 11, and SL. 12 until further notice;
- iv. suspend paper Li. 17 in 2016–17;
- v. suspend papers Li. 11 and Li. 14 for the academical years 2017–18 and each alternate year thereafter.

SCHEDULE D

PAPERS FROM OTHER TRIPOSES THAT MAY BE TAKEN IN PART II

Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos, Part II

Paper MES. 37 History of the pre-modern Middle East

By removing the paper from the list of papers that may be offered.

Paper MES. 41 Comparative Semitic linguistics

By removing the paper from the list of papers that may be offered.

The Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages has confirmed that no candidate's preparation for the examination in 2017 will be affected.

SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

Part II

Papers C1 and C2, and Oral Examination C

Paper C2. Foreign language: text and culture

By adding a final sentence to the Supplementary Regulation so as to read:

The maximum mark allocated to this paper will be 70% of the maximum mark allocated to a three-hour written paper.

Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos, Part II

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 363)

With effect from 1 October 2016

The regulations governing the submission of the year abroad project or dissertation offered under Regulation 24, and their word limits, have been amended.

Candidates for the year abroad project will, henceforth, no longer be required to submit titles by the third Friday of Full Easter Term next preceding the examination, but will instead be required to submit a clearly defined subject area within which the project will fall by the seventh Friday of the Full Easter Term next preceding the examination. If a candidate subsequently wishes to revise his or her choice of subject, he or she must seek the permission of the Faculty Board, in accordance with any instructions issued by the Board and according to the timetable set out in Schedule E. Submission dates for the title of the optional dissertation remain unchanged.

Word limits specified in sub-paragraph (e) for the year abroad project and optional dissertation shall henceforth exclude appendices; and candidates will be required to submit an electronic copy and two paper copies of the year abroad project or optional dissertation, in accordance with detailed arrangements approved by the Faculty Board, so as to reach the Faculty Board by the dates specified in Schedule E.

Regulation 27(i).

(b) *Year abroad project*

By removing the second and third sentences of the sub-paragraph of the Regulation and replacing them with text so as to read:

After giving notice as required above, a candidate shall submit a clearly defined subject area within which the project will fall by a date announced by the Faculty Board, which shall be not later than the Division of Lent Term in the year next preceding the examination.

If, after submitting such a subject area, a candidate subsequently wishes to revise his or her choice of subject and to offer a project on a subject that falls within an area different from that notified, he or she must seek the permission of the Faculty Board, in accordance with any instructions issued by the Board and according to the timetable set out in Schedule E.

(f)

By removing the first sentence of the sub-paragraph of the Regulation and replacing it with a sentence so as to read:

(f) The word limits specified in sub-paragraph (e) above include notes but exclude appendices and bibliography.

(g)

By replacing the sub-paragraph of the Regulation and replacing it with a sentence so as to read:

A candidate shall submit an electronic copy and two hard (paper) copies of the year abroad project or optional dissertation, in accordance with detailed arrangements approved by the Faculty Board, so as to reach the Faculty Board by the date specified in Schedule E.

SCHEDULE E

REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECTS AND OPTIONAL DISSERTATIONS IN PART II

By amending the first header in the table from 'Date by which titles are to be submitted' to 'Date by which subject area revisions or titles are to be submitted'.

By inserting the word 'Subject area' against 'Projects' under the first header in the table, and amending the submission date from the third Friday of the Full Easter Term next preceding the examination to the seventh Friday of the Full Easter Term next preceding the examination.

By inserting the word 'Title' against 'Optional dissertations' under the first header in the table.

The Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages has confirmed that no candidate's preparation for the examination in 2017 will be affected.

Theological and Religious Studies Tripos, Part IIa: Amendment

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 399)

With effect from 1 October 2016

Further to the Notice published on 13 April 2016 (*Reporter*, 6421, 2015–16, p. 448) the list of papers available in Part IIa has been amended so as to introduce a revised title for Paper B8.

Regulation 18.

Paper B8. Great theologians

By removing the title of the paper and replacing it with a revised title so as to read:

Paper B8. Great Christian theologians

SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

With effect from the same date the Supplementary Regulations for the Tripos have been amended so as to introduce a revised description for Paper B1.B.

Paper B1. Intermediate language and texts

B. New Testament Greek

By removing the current description for the paper and replacing it with revised text so as to read:

This paper will contain (i) passages for translation, textual, exegetical, and theological comment from such portions of text as the Faculty Board will from time to time prescribe, and (ii) passages for unseen translation from texts of similar provenance from the New Testament as prescribed by the Faculty Board.

Paper B8. Great theologians

By removing the title of the paper and replacing it with a revised title so as to read:

Paper B8. Great Christian theologians

The description for the paper remains unchanged.

The Faculty Board of Divinity is satisfied that no candidate's preparation for the examination in 2017 will be affected.

Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 557)

With effect from 1 October 2016

Diplomas

Institute of Continuing Education

The General Board has approved the following additions to the Schedule:

Diploma in International Development: Environment, Sustainability, and Globalization

Diploma in International Development: Economy, Society, and Welfare

Diploma of Higher Education in International Development

With effect from 1 October 2017

Certificates

Institute of Continuing Education

The General Board has approved the following addition to the Schedule:

Certificate in International Development

The Certificates in International Development I and International Development II will be closed to new applicants from 1 October 2017 and will be removed from the Schedule once all current students have completed the course. The Certificate of Higher Education in International Development will be removed from the Schedule when all eligible candidates have received the award.

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.**Master of Music, 2016–17**

The Faculty Board of Music gives notice that it has prescribed the following set works and topics for the M.Mus. in 2016–17 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 466):

Section 1: Choral conducting:

Tomás L. de Victoria, *Ave Maria*
Luca Marenzio, *Zefiro torna*
arr. Edward Bairstow, *The Oak and the Ash*
Felix Mendelssohn, *Jaglied*, Op. 59/6
James MacMillan, *The Canticle of Zachariah*

Section 2: Seminar course:

Strand one:

Theological and liturgical contexts (six seminars)

Strand two:

The English choral tradition – cultural and historical contexts (six seminars)

REPORTS**Report of the Council on the financial position and budget of the University, recommending allocations from the Chest for 2016–17**

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Budget Report reviews the financial position of the University and recommends allocations from the Chest for the financial year 2016–17.

2. Information on trends in staff and student numbers, research, and expenditure patterns is provided in the usual way in Appendices 1–4.

Overview

3. The 2015 Budget Report drew attention to the significant level of uncertainty in the political and economic landscape, and observed the potential for considerable change in higher education policy and funding in the future with the potential to have an impact on the University's financial position.

4. This year's Budget Report follows the Chancellor's Autumn Statement¹, and the publication, in November 2015, of the Higher Education Green Paper *Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice*² and Sir Paul Nurse's Review of the Research Councils.³

5. The Green Paper and the Nurse Review have provided greater clarity on the scope of the changes planned for the governance of and funding arrangements for the higher education sector, although the precise details will not emerge until later this year. Further, this year's Budget Report will be published shortly before the referendum, on 23 June 2016, on the United Kingdom's membership of the European Union. There is, therefore, the potential for a major upheaval in the external environment which may have wide-ranging ramifications for the economy, and, ultimately, the higher education sector.

6. This year's Budget Report shows a deterioration in the financial forecasts compared to the 2015 Budget Report, which anticipated that the Chest would remain in balance for most of the planning period. The Chest is now expected to remain in deficit for the planning period. This is predominantly a result of a reduction in forecast income, as described later in this Report. While the University is in a strong position to manage short-term, temporary deficits on the Chest, the Council observes that this position is unsustainable for the medium- to long-term, and supports the principles outlined later in this Report to raise income and to use non-Chest income, as well as Chest income, to support academic strategies.

7. The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) funding for 2016–17 is broadly in line with expectations. HEFCE teaching funding includes the removal of £2.7m of institution-specific, high-cost provision from 2016–17; this assumption was already built into forecasts in the previous planning round. HEFCE research funding is slightly higher than forecast following an increase in overall mainstream Quality-Related (QR) research funding.

8. The Chest forecasts for the planning period continue to assume a modest 1% per annum increase in allocations to School and non-School institution (NSI) budgets. Schools and Departments are continuing to draw on their accumulated Chest-derived reserves to mitigate the constraint exercised on allocations since 2011–12.

9. Overall, the budget for 2016–17 forecasts a deficit on Chest income and allocation of just over £3m. The Chest is expected to remain in deficit for the remainder of the planning period.

¹ The Autumn Statement highlights the government's intention to protect, in real terms, the £4.7 billion resource budget for science for the rest of the Parliamentary term, and to maintain funding in real terms for high cost subjects. Full documents are available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spending-review-and-autumn-statement-2015-documents>. See also the HEFCE grant letter from BIS at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/news/newsarchive/2016/Name,107598,en.html>.

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/higher-education-teaching-excellence-social-mobility-and-student-choice>.

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nurse-review-of-research-councils-recommendations>.

External and internal environment

Referendum

10. On 23 June 2016, there will be a referendum to determine whether or not the United Kingdom remains a member of the European Union.⁴ It is not possible, at this point, to do more than speculate about what an exit from the European Union might mean for the economy in general, and for the higher education sector in particular. A subgroup of the Risk Steering Committee is discussing options, gathering information and considering how far-reaching the implications of an exit from the EU might be, but preparation of a full risk assessment and contingency plan is premature.

Higher Education Green Paper

11. The Higher Education Green Paper, *Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice*, has set out proposals to reform the Higher Education system, including plans for a Teaching Excellence Framework and the creation of a new Office for Students to replace HEFCE.⁵ A technical consultation to consider how the proposals for a Teaching Excellence Framework might be implemented is expected in early summer.

Sir Paul Nurse Review

12. The government has committed to taking forward the recommendations in the Nurse Review of the Research Councils. These include a recommendation for greater co-ordination and collaboration between policy-makers and the research community. One proposed approach is the formation of a Ministerial Committee that will help ministers to engage with science, although other options may emerge.⁶ A new oversight body, Research UK, is anticipated, although there is considerable uncertainty about how it might operate and the effect it might have on the funding landscape. The review envisages Research UK will discharge five primary roles, including the management of funds to support cross-cutting activity across the Research Councils.⁷ The government has described its role as ‘shaping and driving a strategic approach to science funding, ensuring a focus on the big challenges and opportunities for UK research’.⁸ The extent to which this new body will take on the research functions that currently sit with HEFCE is unclear, as is the future arrangement for determining distributions of QR research funding. This

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/eu-referendum>.

⁵ As HEFCE was established by the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, legislation would be required if it were to be unwound.

⁶ <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/science-technology/Correspondence/160107-BIS-TSB-SR.pdf>.

⁷ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478125/BIS-15-625-ensuring-a-successful-UK-research-endeavour.pdf, pp. 27–28, 33. The review also observes a role of Research UK should be to promote interactions with Innovate UK, p. 31.

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spending-review-and-autumn-statement-2015-documents/spending-review-and-autumn-statement-2015#investing-in-britains-future-1>. The government is also considering the possible integration of Innovate UK into Research UK in order to strengthen collaboration between the research base and business; see <https://bis.gov.uk.citizenspace.com/innovation/innovate-uk-and-research-uk>.

will be informed by the outcome of the Stern review of the Research Excellence Framework, which will be reported to the government later in 2016. It is expected that it will include consideration of simpler, light-touch methods for assessing research performance in which data and metrics are used in addition to peer review.⁹

Strategic research reviews

13. As part of a strategy to maintain the quality and volume of its research activity and to respond to potential changes in the external environment, the University has initiated a programme of strategic research reviews. The purpose of the reviews, which will include expert external advice, is to ensure that the University is best placed to exploit new and emerging research opportunities, maximize impact, and enhance its international research profile. Each of these factors is critical if the University is to maintain or increase its share of mainstream QR funding, which currently makes up 16.5% of the University’s central funding.

14. Schools and Departments are also encouraged to maximize engagement with the commercial sector and will be supported in this by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Enterprise and Regional Affairs. For instance, the relocation of AstraZeneca to the Biomedical Campus, and increasing collaborations with a range of others, including GlaxoSmithKline, present a particular opportunity to maximize research and development activity in pharmaceutical research. This is strengthened by the development of the Cambridge Academy of Pharmaceutical Sciences.¹⁰ Similar strategic developments are on-going in many other areas of the University’s activity, and these must be built on. Current examples include the transfer of more MRC units into the University,¹¹ the Maxwell Centre, which opened in April 2016,¹² and the National Research Facility for Infrastructure Sensing.¹³

⁹ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/487362/bis-15-705-ref-review-terms-of-reference.pdf, p. 2.

¹⁰ The Cambridge Academy of Pharmaceutical Sciences will bring together University departments in the physical and biological sciences, and in the Clinical School, with external stakeholders to provide an environment in which teaching and research pertinent to drug discovery can flourish and be translated with maximum efficiency.

¹¹ The University is in negotiations to transfer a further four units into the University; the Biostatistics Unit, the Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, the Mitochondrial Biology Unit, and the Toxicology Unit.

¹² The Maxwell Centre, located on the West Cambridge site, is enabling a new approach to engagement with industry in order to promote knowledge exchange and innovation. The building hosts the SKF University Technology Centre and is due to become the Cambridge site of the Sir Henry Royce Institute for Advanced Materials Research. More details are available at <http://www.maxwell.cam.ac.uk/>.

¹³ The National Research Facility for Infrastructure Sensing is in development. It is part of a UK-wide collaboration for research in infrastructure & cities (UKCRIC), into which the Government is investing £138m. Cambridge is one of thirteen partner universities and will receive £18m in funding towards the National Research Facility, which will be based at West Cambridge. The project will also include the first phase of the relocation of the Department of Engineering to the West Cambridge site and is expected to come into use during 2019. For more details see <http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/cambridge-awarded-ps18-million-in-funding-to-support-uk-infrastructure-research>.

Financial sustainability

15. In order to improve the financial sustainability of its teaching and research activities, the University must find ways of enhancing its income streams in addition to maintaining its focus on financial restraint in spending and achieving value for money. The tight fiscal regime introduced since 2010 has been crucial in attaining greater financial sustainability. However, this must not constrain prudent investment in order to deliver longer term growth in strategically important areas of academic activity. The University must become better placed to secure and increase future revenue streams for reinvestment in teaching and research, and its academic and financial planning processes must be informed by this objective. The Planning and Resources Committee (PRC) will take this into account when it sets the strategic and financial assumptions for the next planning round. Upholding the University's reputation for excellence will be paramount.

16. Philanthropy will continue to be a crucial part of the strategy to raise income, and significant Chest funds have been committed to support Development and Alumni Relations in order to maximize the output of the current Campaign. However this is not a panacea and cannot be the only solution. Measures will need to be taken by the academic community, hand-in-hand with strategies led by the central bodies. There must, therefore, be appropriate mechanisms and incentives in place to ensure that the academic community can benefit directly when its strategies also help to raise income, thus contributing to an improved overall financial position. In recognition of this, the Resource Management Committee has approved the formation of a subgroup, which will carry out a thorough review of the Resource Allocation Model (RAM). The review will include consideration of the purpose of the RAM in the allocations process, its structure and application, the level of ease with which it can be used and understood, and how its coverage might be expanded beyond informing Chest allocations.

17. The University may wish to explore whether the distinction between Chest and non-Chest income is helpful. The merits of differentiating these two core income streams must come under scrutiny when the Chest is forecasting a deficit over the planning period while Schools – through their Departments – report unrestricted reserves¹⁴ totalling £193m at the 2014–15 year end. The PRC, in its annual planning guidance, has emphasized the importance of using *all* sources of funding in support of Schools' strategic priorities for teaching and research, and has continued to call for greater transparency on non-Chest activity, particularly trading activity.

18. The University will continue to focus on restraining expenditure and increasing efficiency where there is scope to do so without putting core services at risk. The University's participation in a detailed benchmarking exercise will give a clearer indication of the level of resourcing needed to support the University's administrative infrastructure. At the same time, the Schools are reviewing their governance structures and examining relationships between their Departments and Faculties with the aim of identifying and removing layers of duplication and any inefficiency. Notwithstanding the continuing drive for efficiencies in administrative functions, there are some areas where investment in core functions may pay substantial dividends in terms of disproportionately increased income. A clear case in point may be the administrative support for Research Grants and Contracts and it may be that the on-going review of the Research Office will determine that further investment is necessary.

¹⁴ Chest and non-Chest.

Capital

19. The Estates Strategy Committee is overseeing the preparation of the University's estate strategy, which will be published in Michaelmas Term 2016. A priority will be to ensure that the University's buildings and facilities are fit for purpose and can support an evolving, world-leading University. The strategy will also include consideration of the principles for the effective management of the University's estate and it will explore the potential for generating long-term revenue from the non-operational estate as a way of enhancing the University's income streams.

20. The University continues to invest in physical infrastructure. This year sees the opening of the Dyson Centre for Engineering Design, the David Attenborough building, and the Maxwell Centre on the West Cambridge site. Work continues on the second phase of the development of the New Museums site, and planning for phase 3 is in progress. A review of the Sidgwick site masterplan is nearing completion and the conclusions are expected in summer 2016. Construction has commenced on the Chemistry of Health Building on Union Road, and on Capella, a new building on the Biomedical Campus that will bring together researchers from the Schools of the Biological Sciences and Clinical Medicine. Plans for a new Cavendish Laboratory are also well underway and the University has submitted a Full Business Case to the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills to secure the £75m investment that was announced by the Chancellor in the Autumn Statement.¹⁵

21. The scale of the University's plans to invest in the estate is ambitious. Average expenditure over the next ten years is anticipated to be in the region of at least £100m per annum. In addition to this, the Capital Plan forecasts expenditure of well over £2bn in the medium- to long-term, including projects to redevelop the Biocentrum and to relocate the Departments of Engineering and Chemistry to West Cambridge.

22. The ongoing development and modernization of the ageing estate is essential if the University is to continue to recruit and retain the best staff, and to protect and maintain its leading global position in teaching and research. The substantial sums required present challenging goals for fundraising; the PRC will keep the attainability of these goals under review as part of the strategy for funding the University's Capital Plan alongside other funding schemes such as UKRPIF and resourcing from the University's Capital Fund. Given the scale of the Capital Plan, however, the Council considers that the University may need to review its ability – and willingness – to commit central funds over and above current levels if the strategic priorities as articulated by Schools and NSIs are to be delivered.

PLANNING ROUND 2015

Guidance and assumptions

23. In June 2015, the PRC agreed again to continue the Planning Guidance issued in previous years. Schools and NSIs have, therefore, prepared forecasts of income and expenditure assuming a 1% increase in Chest allocation for 2016–17 over 2015–16 and for each year thereafter. Schools and NSIs also have the opportunity to bid for additional allocation in support of investment in strategic priorities. The outcome of this exercise is outlined in paragraph 36.

¹⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spending-review-and-autumn-statement-2015-documents/spending-review-and-autumn-statement-2015>; see section 8.

24. Assumptions about future pay awards are a key area of sensitivity in the financial projections of this Budget Report and increases in pay inevitably lead to significant, additional recurrent costs. A central contingency is set aside to mitigate this risk for Chest-funded posts, but the risk of extra costs remains. For modelling purposes, the pay award assumed in the planning guidance was 1% per year during the planning period. Apart from National pay awards, all additional pay costs arising from promotions, increments, and regrading are met from within allocations to the Schools and other NSIs except where separate provision is made. The Finance Division's pay model is used to identify how University-level forecasts would change for different pay assumptions.

25. A default inflation assumption of 2% has been used for non-pay inflation in all years unless there have been compelling reasons to adopt an alternative assumption for specific classes of non-pay expenditure.

26. The RMC continues to use the current RAM and RAM Distribution Model to ensure that incentives are in place to maximize Chest income and minimize Chest costs. The RAM Distribution Model is based on end-of-year RAM calculations, whereby, if a School's RAM surplus exceeds 5% of its out-turn, then 10% of the surplus above the tolerance band is added to the School's allocation in the next round. Similarly, if a School's RAM deficit exceeds 5% of actual out-turn, then 10% of the deficit below the tolerance band is subtracted from the allocation. The operation of this mechanism based on the accounts for 2014–15 has resulted in an increase in core allocation in 2016–17 for one School and a reduction for another (see the summary of additions to allocations in the table below, p. 529). The effectiveness of this mechanism will be examined as part of the review of the RAM mentioned in paragraph 16.

27. For the purposes of this Report, allocations to Schools and NSIs are assumed to be fully spent even if a balance is carried forward to the next year. This is the mechanism by which Chest-derived reserves accumulate.

Financial forecasts

Fees and HEFCE funding

28. The Secretary of State sets out the annual funding for higher education in a letter to HEFCE that is typically sent in the winter. This year's Funding Letter from HEFCE was delayed to 4 March 2016,¹⁶ and, as a result, the announcement of grants for each institution funded by HEFCE has also been later than expected.

29. Appendix 5 describes HEFCE funding in 2016–17. The University's allocation of HEFCE funding for teaching continues to decrease with a reduction of £3.5m compared to 2015–16. This is driven in the main by the withdrawal, as anticipated, of institution-specific, high cost distinctive provision and the winding down of the supplement for Old Regime students admitted before 2012 and paying the lower fee.¹⁷

30. The University's allocation of HEFCE funding for research has increased by £1.9m due substantially to increases in mainstream QR funding and Charity Support funding.¹⁸

¹⁶ See footnote 1.

¹⁷ HEFCE funding for teaching has progressively reduced as the numbers of New Regime students paying the higher £9,000 fee has increased. A supplement has been received for Old Regime students on longer courses admitted before 2012 who were paying the lower fee. The final tranche of this supplement is due to be received in 2017–18.

¹⁸ The uplift in mainstream QR income is due to an increase of £20m in the total funding for distribution by HEFCE.

31. As always, the allocations outlined in the HEFCE grant letter are provisional since the academic and government financial years differ. A government budget cut in 2017–18 may therefore result in a 'claw-back' from the 2016–17 HEFCE allocations.

Actual 2014–15 and forecast 2015–16

32. The actual Chest out-turn for 2014–15 is provided in Table 1 of this Report (p. 531). The overall position on the Chest was a surplus of £16.1m compared to a £6.7m surplus anticipated in the 2015 Budget Report (*Reporter*, 6387, 2014–15, p. 550). The improvement is due to lower than forecast expenditure on certain administered funds.¹⁹

33. Table 2 (p. 531) summarizes the forecast out-turn for the Chest in 2015–16. In the 2015 Budget Report the overall position on the Chest was forecast to be a small surplus of £2.7m. The forecast is now for a deficit of £3.8m driven by the withdrawal of HEFCE non-consolidated, transitional research income, lower academic fee income, and a fall in overhead income to the Chest. The impact of the withdrawal in HEFCE funding was minimized by a £2.5m provision already included in Chest forecasts to mitigate the risk of a 'claw-back' in HEFCE funding as described in paragraph 31.

34. Activities funded outside the Chest (and excluding Cambridge University Press, Cambridge Assessment, and the Cambridge Trusts) were previously forecast to result in a deficit of £8.4m in 2015–16 after making a contribution to the Chest for central costs. This component of the budget is difficult to predict with precision but there is currently no reason to expect a significantly different out-turn by the end of the year.

Forecasts for 2016–17

35. Forecast Chest income for 2016–17 is £442.3m compared to £446.3m assumed in the 2015 Budget Report. The reduction of £4m is driven in the main by a reduced estimate of tuition fee income, which has been revised downwards to take into account lower than projected student numbers in 2015–16, and a change in the forecast proportions of Overseas students and Home/EU students.²⁰ Research grant overhead income to the Chest is also forecast to fall as a result of reduced rates of growth in the Schools of Clinical Medicine, Technology, and the Physical Sciences, as well as a shift in research income mix from Research Councils to the European Commission and Charities.²¹

¹⁹ It is the case that, for certain administered funds, any balance remaining at the year-end will roll back to the Chest.

²⁰ Fee income forecasts are based on forecast entrant numbers submitted by Schools in their respective Planning Round submissions. The relationship between forecast entrants and total student numbers is being addressed by Schools, the Planning and Resource Allocation Office, and the Admissions Office.

²¹ The rate of indirect cost recovery in general continues to follow a downwards trend as a consequence of a decrease in funding from Research Councils and an increase in EC and Charity funding (which pay lower or no overheads respectively), and by the reductions in indirect costs following the Wakeham review.

36. A breakdown of the forecasts for 2016–17 is shown in Table 4 (p. 533). Forecast expenditure includes a number of bids for additional Chest allocation beyond the core 1% increase built into the planning guidance. Bids were scrutinized at an annual planning meeting with each School and NSI, and reviewed again by the RMC. In the current planning round, the RMC has agreed to recommend increases to allocations in 2016–17 totalling £5.6m as detailed in the summary below. Approximately £0.8m of the increase to Schools is cost-neutral, representing their share of premium M.Phil. Degree fee income and RAM Distribution Model adjustments. The additional allocation for the NSIs is £4.2m, over half of which is to support the work of Development and Alumni Relations for the current Campaign.

Table notes:

- * A separate, non-recurrent grant of £125k was approved by RMC for the benefit of the School of Arts and Humanities in 2016–17.
- † This represents a supplementary allocation for two years only.
- ‡ The allocation to the High Performance Computing Service is subject to provision, and approval by RMC, of a full business plan.
- § In addition to the recurrent allocation, a non-recurrent grant of £126k in total will be available to support the Sports Service over the next three years.
- # A supplementary allocation of £115k was agreed for 2016–17 pending the development of a business plan for a Postdoctoral Foundation.

Summary of new additions to allocations in 2016–17, (£000)

2016–17	Additions to allocation	RAM Distribution Model	Total addition to allocation
School of Arts and Humanities		(12)	(12)*
School of the Humanities and Social Sciences	265		265
School of the Physical Sciences	300		300
School of Technology		532	532
School of the Biological Sciences	117		117
School of Clinical Medicine	152		152
Schools total	834	520	1,354
CUDAR (including CAm)	2,541		2,541
Fitzwilliam Museum	28		28
Kettle's Yard	125 [†]		125
University Information Services [‡]	1,187		1,187
UAS (incl. DRC)	229 [§]		229
Office for Postdoctoral Affairs	115 [#]		115
Total non-School institutions	4,225		4,225
GRAND TOTAL	5,059		5,579

37. At the same time as approving a number of increases in allocation, the RMC has also approved a series of measures to realize non-recurrent Chest savings totalling £19m over the planning period. The application of these savings, which includes the claw-back of certain unspent reserves, has been phased to smooth the effect on the bottom line of the Chest forecast.

38. The RMC has also considered the forecasts for the Administered Funds. These centrally-held funds (of which a substantial portion is for direct allocation to Schools or represents the Colleges' share of fees to be offset against gross fee income) meet University-wide costs or provide specific streams of funding against which Schools and NSIs may bid. The forecasts for 2016–17 are broadly in line with the forecast in the previous Budget Report.²²

²² Over time the number of administered funds has grown and the RMC has approved a review of the rationale for and activity supported by each centrally-held fund. The criteria for new administered funds will be more clearly determined and the principles applied to existing funds. Where RMC agrees that expenditure would be more appropriately funded through institutional baselines, there will be a corresponding cost-neutral transfer in time for the next planning round.

39. The Administered Funds include the estate maintenance budget, for which the allocation is £18.3m in 2016–17. Estate Management's forecasts are informed by an asset prioritization model, which has enabled the production of more sophisticated data to support maintenance planning and the identification of higher and medium priorities for maintenance works over the planning period.

40. The Operating Budget described in this Report is developed and managed on a fund accounting basis. The University's annual Financial Statements are prepared on a financial accounting basis consistent with generally accepted accounting principles. A number of adjustments are needed to convert the Operating Budget to a format comparable to the Income and Expenditure account seen in the University's Financial Statements. The main adjustments are to remove capital expenditure from the Operating Budget and bring in a depreciation charge, to estimate the amount of spend against reserves and build-up of reserves, and, with a change to new accounting standards, inclusion of certain donations received. To aid comparison with the Financial Statements, such a conversion of the Operating Budget for 2016–17 is shown in Table 5 (p. 534). The Council considers, however, that the format used in Table 3 is the appropriate one for planning.

Forecasts for 2017–18 to 2019–20

41. The forecasts for the Chest show a deficit across the planning period, which, over the three years from 2017–18 to 2019–20, is forecast to total just under £23m.

42. Tuition fee income beyond 2016–17 is based on expected changes to the composition of the student population and the changing fee structures. A significant increase in tuition fee income is forecast from 2017–18, at which point the number of undergraduate clinical students is expected to increase from 160fte per annum to a maximum 273fte per annum as a result of the full cohort of students remaining in the University for their clinical training. The forecast additional income to the University is £1.5m although there will be significant increases in accompanying costs.

43. Projections of expenditure beyond 2016–17 have been built up from the detailed plans at School and NSI level submitted in December 2015.

44. Pay awards have been assumed to be 1% per annum across the planning period with a contingency set aside to allow for any variation in actual pay awards.

CONCLUSIONS

45. The University is in a strong position to manage short-term, temporary deficits on the Chest as forecast in this year's Budget Report. However, improving the financial sustainability of a growing volume of teaching and research activities over the longer-term will necessitate an increase in income. This may require some initial investment in strategically important academic areas in order to deliver growth, and enhance and sustain future revenue.

46. To this end the University will develop its strategic planning and resource management policies in order to ensure there are appropriate mechanisms and incentives to allocate resources where needed and drive change. Above all, upholding the University's reputation for excellence will be critical, and will ensure the University is well-placed to manage risk and respond, as necessary, to ongoing uncertainty in the external environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

47. The Council recommends:

I. That allocations from the Chest for the year 2016–17 be as follows:

- (a) to the Council for all purposes other than the University Education Fund: £183.3m
- (b) to the General Board for the University Education Fund: £262.2m

II. That any supplementary HEFCE grants which may be received for special purposes during 2016–17 be allocated by the Council, wholly or in part, either to the General Board for the University Education Fund or to any other purpose consistent with any specification made by HEFCE, and that the amounts contained in Recommendation I above be adjusted accordingly.

16 May 2016

L. K. BORYSIEWICZ, *Vice-Chancellor*
 CHAD ALLEN
 RICHARD ANTHONY
 JEREMY CADDICK
 R. CHARLES
 ANNE DAVIS
 MARGARET GLENDENNING

DAVID GOOD
 NICHOLAS HOLMES
 FIONA KARET
 STUART LAING
 MARK LEWISOHN
 PRISCILLA MENSAH
 RACHAEL PADMAN

SHIRLEY PEARCE
 MICHAEL PROCTOR
 CORNELIUS ROEMER
 JOHN SHAKESHAFT
 SUSAN SMITH
 SARA WELLER
 I. H. WHITE

TABLES AND APPENDICES

TABLE 1: CHEST 2014–15 ACTUAL OUT-TURN VERSUS BUDGET

	Budget 2014–15	Actual 2014–15	Variance 2014–15
Income	£m	£m	£m
Grants from the Funding Council	152.1	154.2	2.1
Teacher Development Agency	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic fees	176.7	171.6	(5.1)
Research grants and contracts	40.5	38.9	(1.6)
Endowment income and interest receivable	22.4	23.6	1.2
Other operating income	9.5	12.4	2.9
Other services rendered	1.8	2.1	0.3
TOTAL INCOME	403.0	402.8	(0.2)
Allocation / Expenditure			
Academic Departments	175.1	175.1	0.0
Academic institutions and services	35.3	35.3	0.0
Staff and student services	1.7	1.7	0.0
Unified Administrative Service (UAS)	33.5	33.5	0.0
College fee	45.3	45.8	(0.5)
Estates related expenditure	43.7	43.9	(0.2)
Other administered funds	61.7	51.4	10.3
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	396.3	386.7	9.6
Surplus / (deficit)	6.7	16.1	9.4

TABLE 2: CHEST 2015–16 LATEST FORECAST

	Original Budget	Latest Forecast	Changes to Chest
	2015–16	2015–16	2015–16
Income	£m	£m	£m
Grants from the Funding Council	148.2	146.7	(1.5)
Academic fees	207.4	203.6	(3.8)
Research grants and contracts	41.8	40.1	(1.7)
Endowment income and interest receivable	22.4	23.8	1.4
Other operating income	16.4	15.3	(1.1)
Other services rendered	1.8	2.0	0.2
TOTAL INCOME	438.0	431.5	(6.5)
Allocation / Expenditure			
Academic Departments	180.2	180.2	0.0
Academic institutions and services	42.1	42.1	0.0
Staff and student services	1.3	1.3	0.0
Unified Administrative Service (UAS)	30.0	30.0	0.0
College fee	47.1	47.1	0.0
Estates related expenditure	45.0	45.0	0.0
Other administered funds	89.6	89.6	0.0
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	435.3	435.3	0.0
Surplus / (deficit)	2.7	(3.8)	(6.5)

TABLE 3: CONSOLIDATED OPERATING BUDGET FOR 2016–17

	Chest	Research grants and contracts*	Trust funds	Other non-Chest	Total budget
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Income					
Grants from the Funding Council	145.1			4.3	149.4
Academic fees	213.6			23.1	236.7
Research grants and contracts	40.2	405.1		0.0	445.3
Endowment income and interest receivable	24.7		36.5	3.0	64.2
Other operating income	16.7	1.4		73.7	91.8
Other services rendered	2.0			52.6	54.6
TOTAL INCOME	442.3	406.5	36.5	156.7	1,042.0
Allocation / Expenditure					
School of Arts and Humanities	21.7	7.7	5.3	4.6	39.3
School of the Humanities and Social Sciences	36.1	17.9	5.5	11.5	71.0
School of the Physical Sciences	40.7	74.6	9.9	10.5	135.7
School of Technology	31.2	54.5	5.1	63.6	154.4
School of the Biological Sciences	34.5	87.8	4.4	9.8	136.5
School of Clinical Medicine	18.4	162.7	3.6	34.3	219.0
Total Schools	182.5	405.2	33.8	134.3	755.8
Academic institutions and services	46.0	1.1	3.2	24.5	74.8
Staff and student services	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.7
Unified Administrative Service	31.2	0.0	0.6	11.9	43.7
Strategic provisions	0.5				0.5
College fee	46.6				46.6
Estates related expenditure	45.2				45.2
Other administered funds	92.3				92.3
TOTAL ALLOCATION / EXPENDITURE	445.6	406.3	37.6	172.1	1,061.5
Surplus / (deficit)	(3.3)	0.3	(1.1)	(15.4)	(19.5)

* Research grants and contracts income in this non-Chest column represents *direct* costs and the portion of *indirect* costs recovered which accrue to Departments.

The portion of *indirect* costs recovered which accrues to the Chest is shown in the Chest column (£40.2m).

Research grants and contracts expenditure in this non-Chest column represents *direct* costs and expenditure funded by the Departments' *indirect* costs income.

TABLE 4: OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY

Income	BUDGET 2016-17			PROJECTION 2017-18			PROJECTION 2018-19			PROJECTION 2019-20		
	Chest £m	Non- Chest £m	Total £m	Chest £m	Non- Chest £m	Total £m	Chest £m	Non- Chest £m	Total £m	Chest £m	Non- Chest £m	Total £m
Grants from the Funding Council	145.1	4.3	149.4	142.3	4.2	146.5	143.7	4.4	148.1	144.5	4.4	148.9
Academic fees	213.6	23.1	236.7	224.4	25.3	249.7	234.0	27.1	261.1	244.4	29.0	273.4
Research grants and contracts	40.2	405.1	445.3	40.7	418.3	459.0	41.8	426.1	467.9	42.5	432.0	474.5
Endowment income and interest receivable	24.7	39.5	64.2	24.6	43.0	67.6	25.1	46.0	71.1	25.5	49.3	74.8
Other operating income	16.7	75.1	91.8	17.9	77.9	95.8	18.1	77.7	95.8	18.4	80.5	98.9
Other services rendered	2.0	52.6	54.6	2.1	54.3	56.4	2.1	55.4	57.5	2.2	56.2	58.4
TOTAL INCOME	442.3	599.7	1,042.0	452.0	623.0	1,075.0	464.8	636.7	1,101.5	477.5	651.4	1,128.9
Allocation / Expenditure												
Schools	182.5	573.3	755.8	185.7	591.5	777.2	189.0	602.0	791.0	192.4	609.0	801.4
Academic institutions and services	46.0	28.8	74.8	47.7	28.3	76.0	49.5	28.0	77.5	50.0	30.7	80.7
Staff and student services	1.3	1.4	2.7	1.3	1.4	2.7	1.3	1.3	2.6	1.3	1.5	2.8
Unified Administrative Service	31.2	12.5	43.7	31.6	13.6	45.2	31.9	13.7	45.6	32.2	13.6	45.8
Strategic provisions	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5
Other administered funds	184.1	0.0	184.1	195.4	0.0	195.4	199.5	0.0	199.5	206.5	0.0	206.5
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	445.6	616.0	1,061.5	462.2	634.8	1,097.0	471.7	645.0	1,116.7	482.9	654.8	1,137.7
Surplus / (deficit)	(3.3)	(16.2)	(19.5)	(10.2)	(11.8)	(22.0)	(6.9)	(8.3)	(15.2)	(5.4)	(3.4)	(8.8)

TABLE 5: PROJECTED STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME 2016-17

£m	Operating			RDEC, capital grants, new endowments			Total		
	Projected 2016-17	Budget 2015-16	Actual 2014-15 <i>restated</i>	Projected 2016-17	Budget 2015-16	Actual 2014-15 <i>restated</i>	Projected 2016-17	Budget 2015-16	Actual 2014-15 <i>restated</i>
Income									
Tuition fees and education contracts	265.7	252.6	214.4				265.7	252.6	214.4
Funding body grants	149.4	148.7	154.9	16.0	24.1	48.9	165.4	172.8	203.8
Research grants and contracts	402.0	397.4	384.1	14.9	37.4	78.0	416.9	434.8	462.1
Donations and endowments	23.5	20.1	22.5	45.2	64.9	30.7	68.7	85.0	53.2
Other income	96.0	93.6	101.9	13.2	14.8	16.8	109.2	108.4	118.7
Investment income	74.1	71.9	71.4				74.1	71.9	71.4
Total income	1,010.7	984.3	949.2	89.3	141.2	174.4	1,100.0	1,125.5	1,123.6
Expenditure									
Staff costs	189.2	179.3	180.9				189.2	179.3	180.9
Research	346.4	340.2	365.0				346.4	340.2	365.0
Other	160.5	162.7	142.5				160.5	162.7	142.5
Other operating expenditure	300.1	273.6	248.6				300.1	273.6	248.6
Other	78.3	67.2	60.1				78.3	67.2	60.1
Depreciation	28.8	28.3	28.8				28.8	28.3	28.8
Interest and other finance costs									
Total expenditure	1,103.3	1,051.3	1,025.9				1,103.3	1,051.3	1,025.9
(Deficit) / surplus before tax	(92.6)	(67.0)	(76.7)	89.3	141.2	174.4	(3.3)	74.2	97.7
Taxation	-	-	-	-	-	(11.7)	-	-	(11.7)
(Deficit) / surplus before other gains and losses	(92.6)	(67.0)	(76.7)	89.3	141.2	162.7	(3.3)	74.2	86.0
Gain / (loss) on investments				63.8	46.2	195.8	63.8	46.2	195.8
Actuarial loss				-	-	(4.5)	-	-	(4.5)
Total comprehensive income	(92.6)	(67.0)	(76.7)	153.1	187.4	354.0	60.5	120.4	277.3

Table 5: Basis of preparation

Table 5 above presents a forecast income and expenditure account for the academic University based on accounting policies and practices in force for 2015–16, equivalent to the University management accounts ('Red Book'). This reflects the implementation of FRS 102 and the new Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) for Higher Education which has fundamentally changed the recognition of income with effect from 2015–16.

North West Cambridge capital receipts are not included in the above Table, nor are the activities of subsidiary companies except to the extent that surpluses are transferred to the University.

RECONCILIATION

The projection in Table 5 above for 2016–17 is based on Table 3 adjusted as follows:

	Per Table 3	Total income £m	Surplus / (deficit) £m
Capital fund	Capital Fund receipts from Cambridge Assessment and Cambridge University Press.	1,042.0	(19.5)
Capital adjustments	Exclude from expenditure equipment and other items which will be capitalized as fixed assets in the financial statements. Include estimates of depreciation on such items. Include the external funding for these items in income (following FRS 102)	35.0	(16.7)
New endowments	The anticipated level of donations establishing new trust funds and other endowments. Under FRS 102 these are included in total income.	26.2	26.2
Subsidiary companies	Remove subsidiary company activity included in the plans for certain University institutions.	(16.2)	–
Donations for research	The estimated impact of a small number of research grants for which income is recognized in advance of costs being incurred.	(1.2)	(1.2)
Eliminations	Eliminate certain income items against related expenditure.	(12.2)	–
Bond investment	Include bond interest charges and the investment income arising on bond issue proceeds.	13.2	–
Defined benefit pension schemes	Deficit recovery payments on USS and the deficit on CPS. Interest charges and other movements on these liabilities are reflected in the income statement.	–	(5.3)
	Table 5 projection	1,100.0	(3.3)

APPENDIX 1: STAFF FTE BY ORGANIZATION AND STAFF GROUPING: 2006–2016

	Academic										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Schools & Academic institutions	1,484	1,553	1,594	1,557	1,533	1,520	1,536	1,530	1,581	1,608	1,615
UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office											
Academic Services	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	
Museums & Galleries		2	2							1	1
Staff & Student Services	1	1									
DAR & Investment Office											
Total	1,487	1,559	1,599	1,559	1,535	1,523	1,539	1,533	1,582	1,610	1,616

	Academic-related (administrative)										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Schools & Academic institutions	172	206	208	249	265	288	313	350	393	449	496
UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office	296	297	293	323	323	310	283	313	342	354	409
Academic Services	16	10	9	13	18	16	10	11	4	21	38
Museums & Galleries	13	17	17	20	20	20	22	22	21	20	23
Staff & Student Services	20	23	27	18	23	26	25	22	8	9	3
DAR & Investment Office	35	31	33	37	41	39	43	38	43	63	66
Total	553	584	587	660	690	700	696	756	812	915	1,036

	Academic-related (computing)										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Schools & Academic institutions	219	222	224	222	226	231	225	231	261	268	277
UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office	47	48	49	55	59	61	60	73	78	6	6
Academic Services	98	98	97	95	93	89	90	84	83	160	168
Museums & Galleries	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Staff & Student Services	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
DAR & Investment Office		2	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	7
Total	369	376	378	380	386	391	385	397	431	444	463

	Academic-related (other groups)										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Schools & Academic institutions	111	95	98	104	101	104	109	113	131	171	164
UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office	13	14	13	15	14	13	15	15	26	28	27
Academic Services	67	71	72	75	69	71	74	75	68	69	66
Museums & Galleries	18	19	19	18	16	16	17	13	21	23	23
Staff & Student Services	14	20	18	18	15	14	15	17	13	13	13
DAR & Investment Office											
Total	223	219	220	230	215	217	230	234	259	304	294

	Research										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Schools & Academic institutions	2,257	2,484	2,532	2,576	2,679	2,712	2,797	3,048	3,296	3,561	3,654
UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office	1	1	1	7	6	7	5	4	1	1	1
Academic Services	31	30	32	34	34	32	32	31	27	22	19
Museums & Galleries	14	16	9	13	13	12	11	14	14	17	13
Staff & Student Services											
DAR & Investment Office											
Total	2,302	2,531	2,574	2,630	2,733	2,763	2,845	3,097	3,337	3,600	3,687

	Assistant										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Schools & Academic institutions	1,773	1,806	1,832	1,875	1,908	1,920	1,902	2,007	2,068	2,131	2,031
UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office	398	430	445	554	526	494	405	417	443	430	627
Academic Services	271	262	263	272	268	251	242	245	242	279	269
Museums & Galleries	78	83	82	85	89	87	82	94	94	96	107
Staff & Student Services	51	125	121	37	48	51	43	45	45	47	20
DAR & Investment Office	15	18	19	20	31	34	32	31	40	49	46
Total	2,586	2,724	2,762	2,843	2,871	2,836	2,706	2,838	2,931	3,033	3,100

	All staff										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Schools & Academic institutions	6,016	6,366	6,488	6,583	6,713	6,775	6,882	7,279	7,732	8,127	8,237
UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office	755	789	801	954	928	885	769	822	888	879	1,071
Academic Services	485	474	476	491	484	462	451	448	424	552	560
Museums & Galleries	125	139	131	139	141	138	135	146	153	160	169
Staff & Student Services	89	173	170	76	91	95	87	88	70	73	40
DAR & Investment Office	50	50	54	59	74	76	78	71	86	115	118
Total	7,520	7,993	8,120	8,302	8,431	8,430	8,401	8,855	9,353	9,905	10,196

Notes:

All data as at 31 January. Because of rounding, totals may not always equal the sum of the parts.

Organization group*Schools & Academic institutions*

All Schools; ICE; CISL; UAS staff in Faculties, Departments, and School offices; biomedical services (until 2015, then in UAS).

UAS & Vice-Chancellor's Office

Excludes staff in Faculties, Departments, and School offices. Includes Vice-Chancellor's Office; MISD (until 2014).

Academic Services

Libraries; UCS (until 2014); UIS (from 2015); Language Centre (until 2013, then in Schools); Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (until 2007, then in Schools); Cambridge-MIT (until 2009).

Museums & Galleries

Fitzwilliam Museum; Kettle's Yard; Hamilton Kerr Institute.

Staff & Student Services

Careers; Accommodation Service (until 2013, then in UAS); Sports Service (until 2015, then in UAS); Telecommunications (until 2009, then in Academic Services); ADC; Graduate Union; Dental Service (until 2011); DRC (until 2007, then in UAS); University Centre (until 2009, then in UAS); Counselling Service (until 2013, then in UAS).

DAR & Investment Office

Development and Alumni Relations & Investment Office.

Academic-related (other groups) includes: Librarians; Keepers; Technical Officers; Ceremonial posts; Language Teaching Officers; Counsellors; Therapists.

APPENDIX 2: UNIVERSITY STUDENT STATISTICS (FULL-TIME FEE-PAYING STUDENTS ONLY)

UNDERGRADUATES	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16
Home and EU										
Full-fee	10,420	10,315	10,415	10,538	10,518	10,506	10,343	10,241	10,210	10,173
Compulsory year abroad	159	137	136	110	83	110	84	92	183	192
	10,579	10,452	10,551	10,648	10,601	10,616	10,427	10,333	10,393	10,365
Islands										
Full-fee	49	51	44	35	30	33	39	25	17	5
Compulsory year abroad	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
	49	51	45	35	31	33	39	25	17	5
Overseas										
Full-fee	1,112	1,179	1,258	1,247	1,214	1,199	1,248	1,306	1,392	1,479
Compulsory year abroad	2	1	1	8	3	–	1	–	8	1
	1,114	1,180	1,259	1,255	1,217	1,199	1,249	1,306	1,400	1,480
Total Undergraduates	11,742	11,683	11,855	11,938	11,849	11,848	11,715	11,664	11,810	11,850
FULL-TIME POSTGRADUATES										
Home and EU										
P.G.C.E.	503	477	438	431	429	412	406	407	364	308
M.B.A. / M.Fin.	26	42	54	47	48	45	42	41	36	38
Other Postgraduates	3,302	3,038	2,883	2,971	3,223	3,295	3,327	3,410	3,403	3,477
	3,831	3,557	3,375	3,449	3,700	3,752	3,775	3,858	3,803	3,823
Islands										
P.G.C.E.	4	3	2	1	4	3	5	1	–	–
M.B.A. / M.Fin.	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other Postgraduates	–	–	–	–	5	7	7	3	1	–
	4	3	2	1	9	10	12	4	1	–
Overseas										
P.G.C.E.	4	7	4	4	1	2	3	3	2	4
M.B.A. / M.Fin.	78	102	119	142	153	148	155	145	146	183
Other Postgraduates	2,292	2,166	2,042	2,204	2,335	2,313	2,488	2,542	2,477	2,471
	2,374	2,275	2,165	2,350	2,489	2,463	2,646	2,690	2,625	2,658
Total Postgraduates	6,209	5,835	5,542	5,800	6,198	6,225	6,433	6,552	6,429	6,481
Total Home/EU student numbers	14,410	14,009	13,926	14,097	14,301	14,368	14,202	14,191	14,196	14,188
Total Islands student numbers	53	54	47	36	40	43	51	29	18	5
Total Overseas student numbers	3,488	3,455	3,424	3,605	3,706	3,662	3,895	3,996	4,025	4,138
TOTAL STUDENT NUMBERS	17,951	17,518	17,397	17,738	18,047	18,073	18,148	18,216	18,239	18,331

Appendix 2: Notes**Data as at 1 December of each academical year**

1. This simple overview tabulation cannot be directly compared with any of the detailed tables in the annual Student Statistics publication as there are differences of treatment for certain categories of student, e.g. postgraduate students working away and paying no fees.

2. Students with a part-time mode of study are excluded from this appendix.

3. Postgraduate students who have completed the minimum requirements of their course, i.e. who are writing up or under examination, are also excluded from this appendix. In 2006–07 postgraduate students were recorded as full-time for the first ten terms and as writing up from the eleventh term onwards. From 2007–08 students are classified as full-time for nine terms and as writing up from the tenth term onwards. The effect of these changes in definitions is that the number of full-time postgraduate students is higher for 2006–07 in comparison with following years.

4. Prior to 2010–11 direct entrants to the Certificate in Advanced Study in Mathematics (C.A.S.M.), an undergraduate-level qualification, were included in the undergraduate numbers. In 2010–11 C.A.S.M. was replaced with two new qualifications: the M.Math. qualification for students continuing from the B.A. course on an integrated Master's programme and the Master in Advanced Study (M.A.St.) qualification for direct entrants. From 2010–11 students studying for the M.Math. are included in the undergraduate numbers, but students studying for the M.A.St. are included in the postgraduate numbers. The effect of these changes is a decrease in undergraduate numbers and an increase in postgraduate numbers in 2010–11.

5. In 2009–10 students reading the Diploma in Theology and Religious Studies (five students) were included in the undergraduate numbers, but in all other years the students on this course were included in the postgraduate numbers.

6. From 2004–05 and up to 2010–11 other postgraduate students with Islands residency were included in Home and EU other postgraduate numbers. From 2013–14, the Island fee eligibility category stopped being available for new entrants.

7. Incoming exchange students on Erasmus, MIT, and NUS programmes are excluded from this appendix for all years as they do not pay fees. Up to 2013–14, outgoing Erasmus Home/EU students were also excluded, but in 2014–15, they started to pay fees and thus are included in this table.

8. Since 2010–11 postgraduate students who are working away and not paying fees are excluded from this appendix. This includes students participating in the National Institute of Health (NIH) and Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) Ph.D. Programmes, in which students spend at least 50% of time in the USA and pay no fees during those periods of time.

9. The 'Compulsory year abroad' category for undergraduates includes students on a compulsory year abroad as part of their Modern and Medieval Languages, Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, or Education Tripos, who pay a reduced rate of fees. This category does not include Cambridge students participating in non-compulsory exchange programmes such as MIT or NUS, who are included in the 'Full-fee' category even though they also pay a reduced rate of fees.

APPENDIX 4: EXPENDITURE

In parallel with the new presentation of staff numbers, the Council agreed to show the changing patterns of total expenditure from both Chest and non-Chest sources in the form of the table below. This shows a fairly stable pattern of expenditure in academic institutions as a proportion of total expenditure.

Given the inclusion in the other institutions and activities line of *ad hoc* and project expenditure, a certain amount of variation from year to year would be expected. For that reason the breakdown between other institutions and other activities is given.

Expenditure (£000)	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15
Schools and other academic institutions	499,839	517,412	538,018	590,152	643,794	693,374
	68%	67%	67%	68%	68%	69%
Other institutions	179,604	187,255	191,550	200,902	213,308	225,245
	24%	24%	24%	23%	23%	22%
Other activities	56,876	70,869	75,853	83,001	87,704	89,841
	8%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
Total expenditure	736,319	775,536	805,421	874,055	944,806	1,008,460

Notes

Schools and other academic institutions' figures include the Centre for Islamic Studies, the Institute of Continuing Education, plus UAS staff in Schools.

'Other activities' represents College fees, subsidiary companies, bond interest, CPS deficit contributions not costed with pay, and balance sheet adjustments. In 2010–11 this category also includes total expenditure under the Voluntary Severance Scheme.

APPENDIX 5: HEFCE FUNDING FOR 2016–17

1. This paper is a review of the provisional HEFCE funding announced for 2016–17.

2. HEFCE publish considerable detail of its funding methods, the financial background to its decisions and the funding it provides to institutions. Reference should be made to the HEFCE website¹ for the further detail of 2016–17 grants – in particular the *Guide to Funding 2016–17: How HEFCE allocates its funds* (Circular 2016/7) and *Recurrent Grants for 2016–17*. These circulars are supported by individual letters to institutions and more detail on the web.²

3. Government funding and priorities for 2016–17 for HEFCE and for higher education were announced in the Secretary of State's letter of 4 March 2016.³

4. The main decisions of the HEFCE Board for 2016–17 were announced in Circular Letter 03/2016.⁴ Provisional funding for the University for 2016–17 was announced in a letter of 19 April 2016 to the Vice-Chancellor followed up by Circular 2016/09⁵ in which HEFCE announce an intention to consult institutions later this year on the development of their teaching and research funding methods from the 2017–18 academic year.

5. Funding has been finalized for 2014–15 with a further minor reduction in mainstream teaching funding. Funding for 2015–16 is unchanged from the October 2015 announcement.

6. Circular Letter 04/2016⁶ of 22 March 2016 contained the announcement of formula based capital allocations for teaching and research in 2016–17.

7. 2016–17 total funding for the University is reduced by 1.13% compared with the adjusted 2015–16 figures: including a reduction of 16.29% in funding for teaching and a 1.54% increase in funding for research.

8. Further comparisons are shown in the annex and, in the funding section of the HEFCE website.⁷

HEFCE's funding method for teaching

9. HEFCE's aim is to focus funding on areas where costs cannot be met by tuition fees, or where it is in the public interest that provision receives additional support, including high-cost and strategically important subjects.

10. HEFCE funding for teaching has progressively reduced as the numbers of New Regime students paying the higher £9,000 fee has increased. Funding is now received at standard rates for both old and New Regime students in the Price Groups which include the higher cost STEM subjects. A supplement is received for Old Regime students on longer courses admitted before 2012 paying the lower fee. One last tranche will be received in 2017–18 for the last Old Regime cohort.

11. Funding is also calculated for taught postgraduate STEM FTE. A further Targeted Allocation provides additional support for very high cost STEM subjects.

12. Details of funding methods are contained in technical guidance circulated with the grant announcement and the notes below are a brief summary highlighting any changes.

2014–15 grant

13. 2014–15 grant is now finalized on actual student FTE reported in HESA 2015. The reduction is £54,001 (all in teaching funding) compared with the revised adjusted grant announced in October 2015.

¹ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>

² <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/funding/annalocns/1617/>

³ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/news/newsarchive/2016/Name,107598,en.html>

⁴ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/CL,032016/>

⁵ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/201609/>

⁶ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/CL,042016/>

⁷ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/funding/annalocns/>

2015–16 grant

14. Funding for 2015–16 is unchanged from the October 2015 announcement. That announcement included the cancellation, announced in July 2015, of £3.98m supplementary funding originally announced in March 2015 to mitigate the effect of changes in funding after the REF.

2016–17 T grant

15. For the 2016–17 academic year teaching allocations are based on student numbers from 2015–16, and will not generally be recalculated after October 2016.

16. Provisional funding for 2016–17 is £17,863,081, a reduction of 16.29% over the 2015–16 adjusted funding at March 2015. The continued transition from old to New Regime accounts for part of the reduction but no funding is now received for ‘institution-specific high cost distinctive provision’ which in 2015–16 was £2,712,079.

17. The ‘high cost subject funding: supplement for postgraduate taught’ is not new but is a change in presentation. In 2015–16 funding for UG and PGT was shown as a single sum which rolled up funding for PGT at higher rates. In 2016–17 the main sum is for UG and PGT calculated at the same rates, with a supplement for PGT shown separately.

18. Student opportunity and other targeted allocations fluctuate according to the underlying data on which the allocations are calculated but there has been a substantial increase in the ‘widening access and improving provision for students with disabilities’. HEFCE have doubled total funding ‘to support institutions to meet the rapid rise in mental health issues and to transition towards an inclusive social model of support for disabled students’. The formula has also changed so that it better reflects the actual numbers of disabled students at each institution by no longer assigning institutions to quartile groups for weighting purposes.

19. The targeted allocations include funding for students on Erasmus and overseas study programmes who may only be charged reduced fees.

Student number controls

20. The University has remained within Student Number Controls which now apply only to medical [and dental] students. Remaining within the control is a condition of grant.

Funding for research

21. The formulae for calculating the different elements of Research Funding include the volume and quality ratings derived from the REF; the weightings 4* (4); 3*(1), zero the rest are unchanged from 2015–16 but the total funding for distribution has increased by £20m leading to an increase in mainstream QR for the University.

22. R Funding as provisionally announced is not generally changed in later grant announcements, but the research grant and contract income reported in the HESA finance return on which the allocations of Charity Support Funding and Business R are calculated is subject to audit; grant may be adjusted if individual grants are ruled ineligible.

2016–17

23. Mainstream QR is £73,012,852, an increase of £1,369,203 over 2015–16. The non-consolidated transitional funding ‘to mitigate removal of STEM protection’ and ‘for RDP supervision’ announced in March 2015 for 2015–16 were cancelled in July 2015 and there are no equivalents for 2016–17.

24. Charity Support and Business Research funding reflect changing volumes reported in the HESA return; Charity support funding has increased by £894,556 and Business R has reduced by £583,051. The multipliers tend to reduce annually and are 22% and 15% respectively, reduced from 23% and 16% in 2015–16 (and which stood at 24% and 17% in 2014–15).

25. Total Research Degree Programme Funding is about the same although the number of countable students in the formula has increased since 2015–16.

26. Total recurrent research funding is £121,947,263, an increase of 1.54% over £120,096,538 in 2015–16.

Other funding: 2016–17

27. Funding for research libraries, for museums and collections, and for Knowledge Exchange (formerly HEIF) – including the supplementary allocation are all unchanged but HEFCE is expected to announce shortly a review of the funding for museums and collections for 2017–18.

Future funding

28. There are no indications of funding in or after 2017–18 beyond the indicative allocations in the BIS grant letter but the case is being made to HEFCE for the funding in 2017–18 of the additional clinical intake in that year.

Conditions of grant

29. The grant letter from BIS and the financial memorandum between HEFCE and institutions sets out the terms and conditions for payment of HEFCE grants, including compliance with tuition fee regulations and the terms of the access agreement. The grant announcement has the usual reservations:

(1) Allocations are provisional. Grant is based on forecast student numbers and will be revised. Rates of funding may change. Funding is provisional until the grant settlement is final for the whole of the 2016–17 academic year (the last four months of which are in the 2017–18 financial year).

(2) There is a control over the entry to medicine.

HEFCE will continue to audit the data that informs the allocation of funds; they reserve the right to review funding allocations for the most recent seven year period.

APPENDIX 5 ANNEX: HEFCE FUNDING FOR 2016–17

HEFCE Recurrent Funding for Cambridge 2016–17 (initial April 2016) and previous two years compared

HEFCE T	2014–15 Adjusted grant as at April 2016 £	2015–16 Initial grant as at October 2015 £	2016–17 Initial grant as at April 2016 £	Note 1
TEACHING FUNDING				
Teaching funding – core funds				
Funding for Old Regime students	12,626,914			
High cost funding for New Regime students	6,688,610			
High cost subject funding		14,241,876	14,065,640	Note 2
High cost subject funding: supplement for postgraduate taught			266,355	
	19,315,524	14,241,876	14,331,995	
High cost subject funding	19,315,324	14,241,876	14,331,995	
Targeted allocations				
<i>Student opportunity allocation</i>				
Widening participation from disadvantaged backgrounds – full-time	185,248	180,589	140,436	
Widening participation from disadvantaged backgrounds – part-time	0	4,252	3,935	
Widening access and improving provision for students with disabilities	66,131	92,680	276,618	Note 3
Improving retention: full-time	59,109	46,012	28,446	
Improving retention: part-time	19,476	26,527	27,874	
Total student opportunity allocation	329,964	350,060	477,309	
<i>Other targeted allocations</i>				
Targeted allocation for part-time undergraduates	3,120	621	491	
Accelerated full-time undergraduate provision	29,485	27,333	34,526	Note 4
Intensive postgraduate provision	83,568	77,437	96,854	Note 5
Erasmus and overseas study programmes	455,597	434,250	474,750	
Very high cost STEM subjects	893,475	842,042	856,609	Note 6
Institution-specific high cost distinctive provision	2,610,443	2,712,079	0	Note 7
Clinical consultants' pay	513,315	525,938	525,938	
Senior academic GPs' pay	13,953	14,296	14,296	
NHS pension schemes compensation	69,117	70,817	70,817	
Supplement for Old Regime students		2,041,319	979,496	Note 8
Total other targeted allocations	4,786,961	6,746,132	3,053,777	
TOTAL TEACHING FUNDING	24,317,562	21,338,068	17,863,081	

HEFCE T: Notes to Table

- 1 Grants may be adjusted in later announcements.
- 2 In 2015–16 funding the single sum included a higher rate for PGT; that supplement is reported separately in 2016–17.
- 3 In 2016–17 HEFCE have increased the amount of funding and have changed the formula to better reflect the actual numbers of disabled students at each institution.
- 4 The funding is distributed ‘for FT UG students in price groups B, C, C1, C2, or D who are on long years of study’ (in this context, the first year of the Graduate Medical Course).
- 5 The funding is distributed for FT and PT PGT students in price groups B, C, C1, or C2 who are on long years of study.
- 6 Distributed on the basis of student FTEs in the academic cost centres physics, chemistry, chemical engineering, and mineral, metallurgy, and materials engineering. Subject to the conditions of grant set out in HEFCE Circular Letter 02/2013.
- 7 The former small and specialist institutions premium, now discontinued for Cambridge.
- 8 Provides funding to reflect, in broad terms, the difference in grant rates which institutions have been receiving for their Old- and New-Regime FTEs. The last tranche will be in 2017–18.

HEFCE R	2014–15 Adjusted grant as at April 2016 £	2015–16 Initial grant as at October 2015 £	2016–17 Initial grant as at April 2016 £
RESEARCH FUNDING			
Mainstream QR	77,512,644	71,643,649	73,012,852
Mainstream QR	77,512,644	71,643,649	73,012,852
Charity support funding	23,566,109	25,766,583	26,661,139
Business research funding	4,574,244	4,634,876	4,051,825
Sub-total	28,140,353	30,401,459	30,712,964
Research Degree Programme (RDP) supervision funds	16,536,049	15,891,697	16,061,714 <i>Note 1</i>
Mainstream funding	122,189,046	117,936,805	119,787,530
QR funding for National Research Libraries	2,129,914	2,159,733	2,159,733
TOTAL RESEARCH FUNDING	124,318,960	120,096,538	121,947,263
TOTAL			
	2014–15 Adjusted grant as at April 2016 £	2015–16 Initial grant as at October 2015 £	2016–17 Initial grant as at April 2016 £
Total funding for teaching and research	148,636,522	141,434,606	139,810,344
Knowledge Exchange (formerly HEIF)	2,850,000	2,850,000	2,850,000
Funding, excluding museums, galleries, and collections fund	151,486,522	144,284,606	142,660,344
ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS			
Knowledge Exchange supplement	500,000	500,000	500,000
Museums, galleries, and collections fund	1,956,000	1,983,384	1,983,384 <i>Note 2</i>
TOTAL ADDITIONAL	2,456,000	2,483,384	2,483,384
ALL FUNDING	153,942,522	146,767,990	145,143,728

HEFCE R and TOTAL: Notes to Tables

- 1 Subject to the condition of grant that the University complies with chapter B11 of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education on PGR programmes.
- 2 HEFCE are expected to announce a review of this line of funding.

Report of the Council on revised governance arrangements for the development of the West and North West Cambridge sites

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Report proposes certain amendments to the arrangements for the governance of the North West Cambridge development and the further development of the West Cambridge site, which have been prompted by a review of the governance and delivery arrangements for the North West Cambridge development undertaken by the North West Cambridge Audit Group.

2. The Council has considered the findings of the Audit Group, as set out in its two reports, and has approved the Group's recommendations (*Reporter*, 2015–16; 6400, p. 53; 6421, p. 442). The majority of the recommendations of the first report have already been acted upon; the remainder will now be implemented following approval of the recommendations of the second report. This Report puts forward amendments to implement a number of the recommendations in the second report, as noted below.

3. The Group's second report,¹ which focusses on the lessons to be learned in the management of large-scale commercial projects, makes several specific recommendations in relation to the terms of reference and membership of the body responsible for delivery of the North West Cambridge development, namely:

- (a) That the West and North West Cambridge Estates Syndicate should be reconstituted as a Board, as a title better reflecting its responsibilities (Recommendation 4);
- (b) That the membership of the Board should be revised to reduce the number of members who must also be members of the Regent House from five to two, to reduce the number of such members required to be present for a meeting to be quorate from two to one, and to introduce a requirement that the majority of the members should be external (Recommendation 11);
- (c) That, once the Regent House has approved a large capital project or similar major commercial undertaking, the Council should have overall responsibility for the management and administration of the venture, without being expected to seek further permissions from the Regent House, except where the University's Statutes and Ordinances expressly require it (Recommendation 14);
- (d) That consideration be given to the need for a Chief Financial Officer to take overarching responsibility for large commercial undertakings (Recommendation 15) and that the Chief Financial Officer attend meetings of the Board, replacing the University officer who is currently a member of the Syndicate (Recommendation 18). The Council has agreed that a Chief Financial Officer should be

8. The Council recommends:

- I. That the regulations for the West and North West Cambridge Estates Syndicate (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 134) be rescinded and replaced with the regulations for the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board as set out in Annex I.
- II. That a new Section 6 introducing a definition of 'external member' be inserted in Special Ordinance A (vii) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 71) so as to read:

6. In any Ordinance or Regulation the term 'external member' shall mean any person who at the time of appointment is not qualified to be a member of the Regent House except under Statute A III 10 (a)(ii) nor is an employee of the University or a College.

appointed.

4. The Council agrees with the view of the Audit Group that the Council is the body that should be expected to 'assume overarching executive decision-making responsibility in respect of large-scale commercial undertakings' (paragraph 39 of the Group's second report). In order for the Council to assume this role, it is necessary for the body advising the Council on the management of such a project to operate as if it were a board of directors and to be answerable to the Council. The Council is therefore proposing in Recommendation I of this Report that the West and North West Cambridge Estates Syndicate should be disbanded and replaced with a board that reports directly to the Council.

5. The Audit Group's second report, in paragraph 29, recommends that, of the two members of the Regent House on the Board, one should be the Pro-Vice-Chancellor whose responsibilities most closely align with the North West Cambridge development, and the other should not be otherwise connected with the management of that development. The Council believes that the latter position on the Board should be reserved for a member of the Regent House who is independent of those with senior management or leadership responsibilities in the University. In the proposed regulations for the Board the definition used in determining eligibility for the membership of the Board of Scrutiny has therefore been applied. The Council has also proposed that the number of members appointed by the Council should be up to nine and no less than five, of whom two will be members of the Regent House, and the quorum accordingly reduced from five to four, of whom one shall be a member of the Regent House.

6. In order to provide a smooth transition, it is proposed that, if this Report's recommendations are approved, the membership of the Syndicate would become the membership of the Board with immediate effect, vacancies would be filled in accordance with the new membership arrangements for the Board, and any remaining changes to the membership would take effect from the expiry of the periods of office of the existing members.

7. The opportunity is being taken to establish a definition of 'external member', which employs the wording used to describe the eligibility to serve as a member of the Council in class (e) under Statute A IV 2(e), as set out in Recommendation II.

¹ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2015-16/weekly/6421/NWCDAG-SecondReport-2016.pdf>.

16 May 2016	L. K. BORYSIEWICZ, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	DAVID GOOD	RACHAEL PADMAN
	CHAD ALLEN	NICHOLAS HOLMES	SHIRLEY PEARCE
	ROSS ANDERSON	ALICE HUTCHINGS	MICHAEL PROCTOR
	RICHARD ANTHONY	FIONA KARET	CORNELIUS ROEMER
	JEREMY CADDICK	STUART LAING	JOHN SHAKESHAF
	R. CHARLES	MARK LEWISOHN	SUSAN SMITH
	ANNE DAVIS	PRISCILLA MENSAH	SARA WELLER
	MARGARET GLENENNING		

ANNEX

WEST AND NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE ESTATES BOARD

1. The West and North West Cambridge Estates Board shall consist of the following, the majority of whom shall be external members:

- (a) a person appointed by the Council as Chair who shall be a person with experience and expertise in matters relevant to the affairs of the Board;
- (b) up to nine and no fewer than five members appointed by the Council who shall be persons with experience and expertise in matters relevant to the affairs of the Board (two of whom shall be members of the Regent House, one of whom shall not be a senior officer in the University¹ and shall have no previous association with the management of the West and North West Cambridge Estates and one of whom shall be a Pro-Vice-Chancellor).

Subject to Regulation 12 below and the General Regulations for Boards, Syndicates, etc., members shall be appointed for four years from 1 January following their appointment.

The Chief Financial Officer shall attend meetings of the Board.

2. The Registry shall appoint the Secretary of the Board.
3. No business shall be transacted at any meeting of the Board unless at least four members are present, of whom at least one is a member of the Regent House.
4. Within the strategic and financial framework and any other limitations set by the Council or the University, as amended from time to time, the Board shall be responsible for:
 - (i) the management, development, and stewardship of the North West Cambridge Estate (being the University's land and property holdings in the area between Madingley Road, Huntingdon Road, and the M11 motorway); and
 - (ii) the development and stewardship of the West Cambridge Estate (being the University's land and property holdings in the area bounded by Madingley Road, Clerk Maxwell Road, the Coton Footpath, and the M11).

The Board shall have authority to establish such sub-committees reporting to the Board as it sees fit.

5. Subject to the restrictions set out in Regulations 4, 6, and 7, the Board shall be authorized to exercise in the name of the University in relation to the affairs of the Board all the powers of the University, except in so far as the Statutes and Ordinances expressly or by necessary implication provide otherwise.

6. The approval of the Finance Committee shall be required for any proposal to borrow money or to establish or acquire an interest in any company registered under the Companies Acts or otherwise.

7. For the avoidance of doubt, no proposal relating to the erection, demolition, or substantial alteration of any building for academic or (non-commercial) research purposes shall be implemented unless it has been specifically approved by Grace of the Regent House.

8. The Board shall make an Annual Report to the Council, which shall include a budget and audited accounts and which shall be published to the University either as a whole or in summary. The Board shall make such other reports and take such other steps as the Council may require from time to time.

9. Members of the Board shall register and declare all personal and business interests which may, or may be perceived to, influence their judgement in connection with the affairs of the Board and, where appropriate, shall withdraw from related business and discussions. The Council may from time to time determine procedures for the financial regulation and conduct of the affairs of the Board after consultation with the Chair of the Board.

10. There shall be the post of a Project Director for the North West Cambridge project. The duties of the Project Director shall be determined jointly by the Chair of the Board and the Director of Estates Strategy. Appointments and reappointments to the post of Project Director shall be made by the Board.

11. The Council shall have the power in exceptional circumstances to discharge the Board and to assume full responsibility itself for the management, development, and stewardship of the West and North West Cambridge Estates for the time being.

12. The Council shall have the power at any time to revise the period of a person's appointment as a member of the Board.

¹ For the purpose of these terms of reference, the senior officers who shall not be eligible for appointment shall be the University officers listed in Statute A VII 4, and in the Ordinance made under it.

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the public display of Class-lists and related matters

The COUNCIL and the GENERAL BOARD beg leave to report to the University as follows:

1. In this Report the Council and the General Board seek approval for the discontinuation of the public display of class-lists outside the Senate-House and in Colleges and University institutions.

2. At the beginning of the 2015–16 academical year, the General Board received, through its Education Committee, a petition, signed by *c.* 1,200 current and former students on behalf of the ‘Our grade, our choice’ campaign, which asked the University to consider two options: (a) the discontinuation of publicly displayed class-lists or (b) a more flexible procedure for students to opt to have their names excluded from such lists. The Board noted that the University of Oxford had discontinued the public display of its class-lists in 2009. In order to determine how to proceed, the General Board consulted all Faculty Boards (and equivalent bodies), the Colleges, CUSU, and the Proctors. The Board’s consultation invited comments on four options: (a) maintenance of the status quo; (b) greater flexibility for individual students to opt out; (c) the discontinuation of lists being posted outside the Senate-House but continuing to be distributed to Faculties and Departments, with each College receiving the results of that College’s students only; and (d) the discontinuation of public displays of class-lists anywhere in the collegiate University. The Board also invited comments on the value of the ‘Baxter’ and ‘Tompkins’ tables, on the continuation of the Special Class-Lists Number of the *Reporter* and on the current arrangements for the publication in the *Reporter* of those candidates approved for Graduate Student qualifications awarded by Degree Committees and the Board of Graduate Studies (including the titles of theses to be deposited in the University Library).

3. Thirty-seven responses were received: seventeen from Colleges, fifteen from Faculty Boards and University institutions, and five other responses (including a response from CUSU). Only one Faculty Board and one College were in favour of option (a) above. No respondent supported option (b) above. No respondent supported the notion of publicly displayed but anonymized class-lists. The majority of Colleges supported the discontinuation of public displays of class-lists (in all fora) but distinguished between public display and the need to make class-lists available to Colleges for legitimate academic reasons. Colleges strongly supported full class-list data and mark books being made available to them for a variety of purposes including: the need to track their students’ performances within the larger cohort; to compare the College’s performance with that of other Colleges; to monitor their performance as academic providers (including the performance of Directors of Studies and Supervisors); as an essential tool in informing the College’s recruitment and admissions policies; as a set of information necessary in advising their students; and for the production of references and the award of prizes and studentships.

University institutions took a similar view, *i.e.* the discontinuation of public displays but the circulation of full class-list data to themselves. In addition to reasons comparable to those given by the Colleges, Faculties and Departments cited the value of such data in: rankings for postgraduate admissions decisions; the allocation of graduate studentships; admission to Parts of Triposes which do not admit students on matriculation; the comparison, in inter-departmental Triposes, of departmental performances; and the timely organization of the allocation of projects, of the following year’s laboratories and of departmentally organized supervisions.

CUSU supported the discontinuation of publicly available class-lists and the release to Colleges of data relating to that College’s students only. Following consultation with students, it is the opinion of CUSU that it should be for each student to determine with whom to share her or his result.

Other points made were whether the names of prize-winners should continue to be published and the need for certain external bodies to receive class-list data.

Only one College supported the retention of the ‘Baxter’ and ‘Tompkins’ tables. The significant majority would not be concerned were these tables no longer able to be produced, on the understanding that Colleges would receive the class-list data referred to above.

There was general support for the retention of the Special Number of the *Reporter*, as representing a definitive historical record and a means of discouraging students from misrepresenting their class.

The majority of respondents saw no need to alter current practice in relation to the publication, in the *Reporter*, of successful candidates for Graduate Student qualifications, noting that the names of those failing to achieve such qualifications were not published, that there was no public differentiation, so far as the M.Phil. Degree is concerned, between levels of pass, and that the publication of titles of dissertations to be deposited in the University Library remained of scholarly value.

4. After considering the responses received, the General Board’s Education Committee agreed to recommend to the Board that:

- (i) this current Report be drafted;
- (ii) procedures should remain to ensure that the signed class-lists produced by Boards of Examiners are retained centrally as an historical record;
- (iii) class-lists and mark books should be distributed to Colleges and University institutions but, so far as the Colleges were concerned, they should be anonymized save only for the names of the College’s own students; and that they should be distributed on condition that these data remained confidential and released to individuals within the College on a ‘need to know’ basis;
- (iv) publication of a Special Number of the *Reporter* should continue but that rather than indicate those achieving particular classes, it should list all students who had satisfied the requirements for the examination concerned;
- (v) the names of prize-winners should continue to be published in the *Reporter*;
- (vi) the information provided to students on the use of their personal information, in the context of the Data Protection Act 1998, be reviewed and where necessary amended in light of the proposals contained in this Report;
- (vii) further consideration should be given by the University to the analyses of classing data; and
- (viii) no changes should be proposed to the current arrangements for Graduate Students.

5. The General Board, in accepting the recommendations of its Education Committee, also agreed that any new arrangements should not place additional burdens on Boards of Examiners or University institutions. The Board has agreed that, if the proposals in this Report are approved, a pilot exercise, involving the Student Registry and a number of Colleges and University institutions, be conducted in the Long Vacation 2016. The Council has endorsed the General Board’s position in these matters.

6. The Council and the General Board accordingly recommend:

- I. That, with effect from 1 October 2016, the practice of publicly displaying class-lists in any forum in the collegiate University should be discontinued.
- II. That, with effect from the same date:

Regulation 6 of the regulations for Allowances to Candidates for Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 237) be amended so as to read:

6. The names of students to whom the Council make allowances under Regulation 3 (other than under sub-paragraph (b)(i)) shall not be appended to the lists of successful candidates for the examinations for which they were severally entered, but the Registry shall make arrangements for the students' records to be amended as necessary.

Regulation 4 of the regulations for the Publication of Lists of Successful Candidates in Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 244) be deleted and the remaining regulations re-numbered and amended so as to read:

4. The Registry shall arrange for copies of each complete list, anonymized save for the College's own students, to be sent to each College as soon as possible after receiving them.

5. The Chair of Examiners shall communicate to the Registry as soon as practicable a statement of the day on which the Registry may expect to receive the list.

6. In any case in which the Chair of Examiners satisfies the Vice-Chancellor that a list provided in accordance with the foregoing regulations needs amendment, the Vice-Chancellor may authorize an amended list.

III. That, with effect from the issue to be published in 2017, the title of the Special Number of the *Reporter* be amended from 'Class-Lists' to 'Examination Results and Prize-Winners'.

16 May 2016	L. K. BORYSIEWICZ, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	NICHOLAS HOLMES	SHIRLEY PEARCE
	CHAD ALLEN	FIONA KARET	MICHAEL PROCTOR
	RICHARD ANTHONY	STUART LAING	JOHN SHAKESHAFT
	JEREMY CADDICK	MARK LEWISOHN	SUSAN SMITH
	R. CHARLES	PRISCILLA MENSAH	SARA WELLER
	ANNE DAVIS	RACHAEL PADMAN	I. H. WHITE
	DAVID GOOD		

27 April 2016	L. K. BORYSIEWICZ, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	ABIGAIL FOWDEN	RACHAEL PADMAN
	CHAD ALLEN	DAVID GOOD	RICHARD PRAGER
	PHILIP ALLMENDINGER	A. L. GREER	HELEN THOMPSON
	ROBERT CASHMAN	PATRICK MAXWELL	GRAHAM VIRGO
	ANNE DAVIS	MARTIN MILLETT	CHRIS YOUNG

NOTE OF DISSENT

Cambridge's success has been due in part to competition between Colleges. Abolishing the Tompkins table will remove a key incentive for Colleges and leave us at a disadvantage to Oxford, which still publishes its Norrington table despite having discontinued the public display of class-lists. And just as Colleges need to know which of their Directors of Studies are effective, so also departments need to know which Colleges are teaching their subjects well. Both departments and Colleges said they needed class-lists in the consultation. Restricting class-lists to the central administration will make it less likely that failings will be fixed. Prospective students will also be less able to find out which Colleges teach their subject well, and the resulting information asymmetry will decrease the value of a place at Cambridge. It will also be socially regressive, as it will disadvantage people without existing Cambridge connections.

From the viewpoint of governance, Regents and members of Council will be less able to hold the senior management team to account if the administration can cherry-pick the statistics presented in reports.

Finally, making performance information less available goes against the grain of transparency and of modern data-driven approaches to management; these are needed in order to create better metrics of added value, so that less traditional Colleges can be assessed fairly.

For all these reasons we oppose this report as a poorly-conceived centralizing measure, likely to undermine the University's academic standards and performance, and to damage its system of governance.

16 May 2016	ROSS ANDERSON	ALICE HUTCHINGS
	MARGARET GLENDENNING	CORNELIUS ROEMER

OBITUARIES**Obituary Notice**

Dr JANET ELSPETH HARKER, M.A., Sc.D., Life Fellow of Girton College, Vice-Mistress 1969–78 and Acting Bursar 1967–69, Director of Studies in Biological Sciences 1954–92 and Veterinary Medicine until 1976, University Demonstrator in the Department of Zoology 1959–64, and University Lecturer 1964–92, died on 5 May 2016, aged 89 years.

GRACES**Graces submitted to the Regent House on 18 May 2016**

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, unless they are withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 107) will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 27 May 2016.

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 8 of the First-stage Report of the Council, dated 19 April 2016, on the construction of a new Heart and Lung Research Institute on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (*Reporter*, 6422, 2015–16, p. 474) be approved.
2. That on the nomination of Darwin College, Timothy Nicholas Milner, M.A., of that College, be appointed a Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2016–17.
3. That on the nomination of Newnham College, Gemma Lucy Burgess, M.A., Ph.D., of that College, be appointed a Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2016–17.
4. That on the nomination of the Vice-Chancellor and the Proctors Designate, David John Goode, M.A., of Wolfson College, be appointed an additional Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2016–17.¹
5. That on the nomination of the Vice-Chancellor and the Proctors Designate, David Anthony Woodman, M.A., Ph.D., of Robinson College, be appointed an additional Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2016–17.¹

¹ Also nominated under Special Ordinance C (iii) 3 for election as a Deputy Proctor, in addition to Richard Keith Taplin, M.A., of Downing College.

ACTA**Congregation of the Regent House on 14 May 2016**

A Congregation of the Regent House was held at 10 a.m. All the Graces that were submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6425, 2015–16, p. 515) were approved.

The Master of St Edmund's College and the Master of Trinity Hall presented to the Vice-Chancellor's Deputy, in the presence of the Registry's Deputy, Gordon Chesterman, M.A., of St Edmund's College, and Cristiano Andrea Ristuccia, of Trinity Hall, as the persons nominated by those Colleges for election to the office of Proctor for the academical year 2016–17.

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'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 10 May 2016

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Chris Abell was presiding, with the Registrar, the Junior Proctor, the Junior Pro-Proctor, and fifty-nine other persons present.

The following Reports were discussed:

First-stage Report of the Council, dated 19 April 2016, on the construction of a new Heart and Lung Research Institute on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Reporter, 6422, 2015–16, p. 474).

No remarks were made on this Report.

Topic of concern to the University: That the Regent House, as the governing body of the University, consider the impact of existing measures taken in view of the Prevent regulations, as well as anticipated and possible other measures; their likely effectiveness; their compatibility with academic freedom and human rights; and the appropriate governance of these measures (Reporter, 6423, 2015–16, p. 479).

Professor E. V. FERRAN (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional and International Relations), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional and International Relations. In this capacity I act as the University's Prevent Lead and I chair the newly-formed Prevent Committee, a joint committee of the Council and the General Board.

The Prevent duty became law in September of last year as part of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015. It places a duty on specified bodies, including universities, to have 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism'.

The Act also requires those authorities to have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State in meeting the Prevent duty. That guidance refers to a number of key areas that require properly thought-through and applied policies and procedures.

Importantly, the Act makes clear that universities must protect freedom of speech and academic freedom in meeting the requirements of the Prevent duty.

Those, in very brief outline, are the relevant legal requirements as they have been specified, although it is important to consider Prevent in the wider context of other relevant legislation, in particular the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Education Act 1986. The latter requires higher education institutions to secure freedom of speech within the law for staff, students, and visiting speakers.

The Prevent duty has triggered much criticism and debate, both before and after its enactment. Today's Discussion is testament to that, as well as the enduring vitality of our own democratic system of governance, and our core values of 'freedom of thought and expression' and 'freedom from discrimination'.

It is also worth noting that the University of Cambridge, along with the Russell Group and Universities UK, voiced strong concerns about the Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill at the consultation stage. Those representations were successful in achieving certain changes to the statutory guidance.

But Prevent is now law, and the University and Colleges (along with other higher education establishments and public authorities) must now comply.

So what impact will the Prevent duty have on the University, its operations, and its people?

The initial impact is mainly administrative. The University is required to submit an action plan to the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) by 1 August this year that shows how it intends to meet its duties under Prevent. It must also submit a risk assessment, and demonstrate how it will mitigate risks around external speakers and events. Thereafter, the University is only required to submit an annual report to HEFCE.

Members of the Regent House should be aware of the considerable freedoms that universities have in meeting their duties under Prevent. As HEFCE's own Monitoring framework for the higher education sector – makes clear:¹

The duty applies to a wide range of providers with very different institutional structures and cultures. Relevant higher education bodies are responsible for assessing Prevent-related risks in their own context and deciding on appropriate and proportionate actions in response to their assessment of those risks.

The measures taken by the University will therefore be proportionate and risk-based. They will draw heavily on existing policies that hitherto have been considered suitably well managed and governed. Where revision is required – for example, in issuing new guidance for booking meetings and events – it will be light touch, and will focus on helping individuals assess risks and seek further advice within the University if they have any concerns. The Prevent Committee will provide strategic oversight and advice, and ensure that measures taken are both effective and appropriate.

Much emphasis will be placed on upholding the excellent levels of pastoral care and welfare support that the collegiate University provides for its staff and students. We do not anticipate a need to change significantly the highly effective safeguarding mechanisms that the University and Colleges already have in place. The impact on the University community will therefore be negligible.

At the heart of the Prevent duty is a desire to mitigate the risks posed by dangerous criminal behaviour. We should view our responsibilities under the duty in the way that we view our responsibilities towards any criminal behaviour. In other words, we should be aware of the risks, be prepared to take appropriate and proportionate action, and to know when, and how, to seek the involvement of external partners in the very unlikely situation that they may be required.

¹ <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2015/201532/>

Dr A. J. HUTCHINGS (University Council and Computer Laboratory):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a Research Associate at the Computer Laboratory. I am a criminologist, specializing in understanding cybercrime offenders, and the prevention, intervention, and disruption of online crime. I am an elected member of the University Council; however, my remarks here today are made in a personal capacity.

Under the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015, the University is required to have 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism'. The University must have regard to the guidance issued by the Home Office when carrying out this duty.

A careful reading of the Prevent duty guidance reveals that it is quite broad, and there is an element of discretion and judgment that is required. For example, the University is required to 'assess risks' and 'consider' implementation. Hopefully, this broadness will enable the University to take a 'light touch' approach to the duty, and I will shortly discuss why I believe this is necessary. However, such discretion could also allow for heavy-handed approaches, for example, prohibiting students from booking rooms for social events, or monitoring their use of social media. Indeed, I understand that compliance with the Prevent duty has already been used to justify such actions in UK universities.

It is my belief that, when considering risk, the University should consider the risk of extremism and terrorism overall. As Steven Pinker makes quite clear in his book, *Better Angels of our Nature*, violence has declined significantly over time. Despite what the news headlines tell us about modern-day terrorism, this downward trend is continuing. We now live in some of the most peaceful times humans have ever known. This is not to downplay the effects that are felt by the victims of violence, and those that are displaced from their countries. Indeed, it is my belief that governments can and should do more to treat asylum seekers and refugees humanely, and with dignity and compassion.

Pinker analyses the historical trends that relate to this decline in violence, with the most recent trend being the rights revolution. Arising from the period after World War II and continuing to the present day, the rights revolution is associated with an awareness, and championing, of human rights. Therefore, I argue that any implementation of the Prevent duty that potentially degrades rights, including freedom of speech and freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, is potentially counterproductive. Universities should not just 'balance' the legal duties with freedom of speech and academic freedom, but these considerations should take priority.

In fact, I would argue that to respond to the risk of violence with policies that are disproportionate to the threat, are contrary to human rights, and that have negative consequences for the law-abiding majority, does little in terms of prevention. Instead, it breeds mistrust of authority, stigmatizes marginalized groups, and can have detrimental effects. A common theme in the literature on radicalization is a process of disenfranchisement and progressive isolation leading to identification with extremist ideologies. As there are little known risk factors for radicalization, the probability of stereotyping is likely to be high, including of the young, males, and Muslims.

As a criminologist, I am aware of a number of theories that would question the effectiveness of Prevent, and the associated Channel de-radicalization programme, in countering violent extremism. For instance, Diego Gambetta's signalling theory helps us understand the ways criminals identify themselves to each other and signal trustworthiness in an otherwise untrusted environment. Applying this theory to this context, then prohibiting somebody from speaking at the University, or referring a student to the Channel programme, could send the signal that they are legitimate recruiters or are susceptible to recruitment.

Another perspective comes from the symbolic interactionist elements of Howard Becker's labelling theory. Known as the 'looking glass effect', labelling people as criminals (or in this context, as extremists), may create a self-fulfilling prophecy, as they may adopt an identity congruent with that label, and act accordingly.

Therefore, when implementing the Prevent duty, I believe that the University should take these potentially negative and adverse effects into consideration. Feelings of alienation and being misunderstood do little to prevent antisocial behaviour, and could have a stigmatizing effect.

A negative impact on the perceived legitimacy of the UK government is another concern. Research has demonstrated that perceived legitimacy is as important as deterrence principles in influencing compliance with the law. Ensuring that crime prevention interventions are perceived as legitimate, in that they have public acceptance, is essential to their success. Laws, policies, and institutions that are seen as overstepping legitimacy can lessen overall authority in a state.

Surprisingly, I have been unable to find any published evaluation or cost benefit analysis of the Prevent duty, or the associated Channel programme, despite them having been in operation for over four years. I would expect that any requirements that bear such cost to the University, including social costs, to be based on best practice. Furthermore, I would expect that any evaluations should be independent, in that they should not be run by those that developed or deliver the programme, and subject to full and rigorous peer review.

I am concerned that such onerous, potentially harmful, and poorly defined requirements are being imposed without a clear justification and benefit. Beyond challenging the basis of the Prevent duty, the University and Colleges have little option but to comply. However, they should carefully consider all aspects when choosing how this is to be done, and it is my belief that they should not implement more than the bare minimum.

Professor R. J. ANDERSON (University Council and Computer Laboratory):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am Professor of Security Engineering and an elected member of the University Council, although I make these remarks in a personal capacity.

We are required to have 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism', to 'assess risks' and 'consider' implementation. My colleague Alice Hutchings has mentioned the enormous decline in violence that has followed the invention of the state, the arrival of the Enlightenment, and most recently the rights revolution. As one of the organizers of the annual Workshop on Security and Human Behaviour, which brings together security engineers with psychologists, anthropologists, and economists to study issues from cybercrime to terrorism, I can confirm that the views of Steven Pinker which she quoted reflect a broad consensus among people who study such matters.

Dr Hutchings argues that any implementation of the Prevent duty that potentially degrades rights, including freedom of speech, thought, conscience, and religion, is potentially counterproductive. I go further. The modern state is a machine that evolved, or in some cases was designed, with wheels that move at different speeds. Fundamental freedoms are rightly the hardest of all to change; to withdraw from the European Convention on Human Rights we would have to leave not just the European Union but also the Council of Europe. Unless and until that happens, the University is obliged to put rights first. And we should do so with enthusiasm rather than hand-wringing, since a rights-based policy is not only morally and legally the right one, but is also likely to give the best outcomes.

There has been much research on how young men are radicalized and drawn into violent extremism. Dr Paul Gill at UCL, for example, has investigated lone-wolf terrorists as well as mass killers – people who murder four or more victims. He finds no significant differences between them. In fact, people with a propensity for violence who come off the rails typically seek some moral justification. An abusive ex-husband, having brooded for months on his wife's leaving him, goes to her church and shoots her along with some other worshippers, blaming the church's liberal attitudes for America's decline. In just the same way, a young man with a propensity for violence may blame the world's woes on the wickedness of the west. More generally, the anthropologist Alan Fiske has documented how most human-on-human violence is 'virtuous', in the sense that the perpetrator needs to feel that the murder, or mutilation, or beating that they are about to commit defends some social norm. Heretics are killed to please God; female genital mutilation protects purity; and one thug knifes another for showing 'disrespect'.

Against this background, we can understand how an alienated youngster, finding himself one of thousands of freshers in a large metropolitan university, may gravitate to a group of religious or other enthusiasts who offer the thrill of helping to right the world's wrongs by direct action. The group can be more effective if it acts as an echo chamber and takes over its members' social lives. Sadly, the violent action that some young men seek can find validation there.

Cambridge has produced remarkably few violent extremists over the years, and we can now perhaps understand why. Students here are immersed in College life and forced to socialize with people not of their choosing – on their staircase, in their supervision groups, on tutorial sides, sports teams, and perhaps group project work. Interacting with people from different backgrounds and studying different subjects has long been a critical part of our magic formula. So has regular contact between students and senior members of the University, whether acting as tutors, directors of studies, mentors, or friends. An echo chamber is not the Cambridge way.

The guidance invites us to consider non-violent extremism. Cambridge has a long history of distinguished scholars who took extremist positions and thereby changed the world, from Erasmus and Newton to Darwin and Russell. I wrote about this in my *Unauthorised history of Cambridge University*¹ to celebrate our octocentenary seven years ago. In fact, the four violent extremists I've found among our alumni are the Pilgrim leaders Henry Barrowe, John Greenwood and Robert Browne, and of course Oliver Cromwell. I note in passing that while the government's Prevent training materials portray the Glasgow airport bomber Mohammad Asha as a 'Cambridge' plotter, this is somewhat of a slander. First, Mr Asha worked for Addenbrooke's, not for Cambridge University; and second, the jury acquitted him. I am not aware of any Cambridge alumnus in the last century who ended up a violent extremist; even during the turbulent 1970s, when I was an undergraduate, no-one ran off to join the IRA or the PLO.

So we have had due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism, and assessed the risk, which I assess as low. Now we have to consider implementation.

The guidance asks us to consider the use of filters for blocking access to jihadist websites. We do have some expertise here. Twenty years ago I proposed the Eternity Service, a pioneering censorship resistant system, that led to Freenet and the peer-to-peer movement; for some years one of my postdocs was a lead maintainer of Tor; and I

have a research student who studies online censorship in less developed countries. If we were to block Islamist websites, then interested students would simply use Tor or Virtual Private Networks to access them, as students do in Iran to access western websites. What's more, Tor would make it much harder for the security service to see who's watching what. It is perhaps unsurprising that GCHQ won't give Janet the list of naughty websites, so blocking isn't an option.

Might surveillance be an option? Here the answer is a clear no. The Prevent guidance forbids us from doing anything covert, as do the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, the European Convention on Human Rights, and the Treaty of Rome as explained by the European Court of Justice in the Digital Rights Ireland case which found against suspicionless bulk surveillance.

We are also asked to have policies for students and staff working on sensitive online materials. We already have people working with all sorts of hazardous and sensitive material from human pathogens through toxic chemicals and radionuclides to computer malware. The normal procedure is for the Principal Investigator to do a risk assessment and draw up handling rules. We can see no reason for doing something special for materials that are freely available online in any case.

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, both the science and our history teach us that we should value what we've got. We must understand why it works, and build on it. The Proctors must continue to supervise student societies, vet external speakers where there is some risk of disruption, and stand ready to act as arbiters whenever a student society suffers a failure of governance. We must set our face against any measures that might stigmatize some groups of students. Above all we must continue to provide an inclusive, supportive, and liberal environment that promotes and defends the values of the Enlightenment.

¹ <http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~rja14/unauthorised.html>

Dr S. RANGANATHAN (Faculty of Law and King's College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, thank you for the opportunity to speak. I want to make a few points about the legal scope of the Prevent duty, and its implications for us. I hope not to take up more than five minutes of your time. What I will say are of course my own views on the matter, but I represent here also the views of my colleague, Dr Eva Nanopoulos, who could not be present today.

First, it is crucial to keep in mind that virtually all institutions that supply social goods, and perform public functions, have been made the bearers of this duty. Schools, universities, hospitals, our GPs, county councils, and of course police and prisons, are all charged with the duty to Prevent. Thus, although we are here today to discuss the implementation of Prevent by universities, the duty itself applies to a wider range of institutions and hence will have implications way beyond the university sector.

But what is the duty to Prevent? And this is my second point. Prevent legislation, i.e., the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act of 2015 is an extraordinary piece of drafting. It is both extraordinarily intrusive and extraordinarily vague.

It is extraordinarily intrusive because it targets ideas, not just actions. 'Thoughtcrime' is not crime, but Prevent would seem to make it so. In doing so, it reduces the space for dissent.

And for what? It is not even clear what precisely is being targeted. The statutory guidance issued under the Counter-Terrorism Act directs us to all forms of 'extremism',

described as ‘vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.’ Fine values, all of them, but the mere opposition to them does not make one a terrorist. Not if it is not violent, or inciting of violence: I could understand if that was what the guidance focused upon, but its scope is broader.

In fact, how we can claim to respect these values on the one hand, and make the fact that someone else may not a reportable incident? Are we then respecting their liberty; or showing tolerance for their different belief? We fail by our own standards.

The legislation is also extraordinarily vague. Law – as this country’s great jurisprudential tradition teaches us – is supposed to be clear and specific. When it asks us to do something, it must clearly set out the aim to be achieved, the means to be used, and the standards by which we will be judged. The Counter Terrorism Act does none of this. It simply states the duty ‘to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism’. With respect, this is as anodyne as saying ‘a duty to have due regard to the need to avoid the apocalypse’.

The overall strategy is made more problematic, not less, by the anodyne quality of the Prevent legislation. For, implicit in the vague statement, is an exhortation. That it is up to us to define the contours of what we will do; and to take it upon ourselves to do the very maximum. Up to us to make the vague duty a rod for our backs.

We see this exhortation made plain in the statutory guidance, which seeks to co-opt our institutions into surveillance and reporting of students and colleagues. Co-opt us into reading into their radicalism – their environmentalism, their socialism, their cultural pride, their rage against the machine, their take-downs of neo-liberalism, their distaste for Trident or for the war in Syria, their dislike of cricket – disaffections that have become dangerous. Prevent seeks to privatize security, and make all of us its agents; collaborators on the slippery slope of suspicion.

Laws are reprehensible when they permit government to intrude upon our liberty, equality, and dignity. But they are much worse when they lead us to intrude upon each other.

And here is my third and final point: the implications for us. Now you may say that all the dangers I have described cannot possibly be true of Cambridge, and those who will administer Prevent here. And you would be right. I have enormous respect for the University administration, and admiration for some decisions it has taken in the past, that though not easy, were right. I am glad of the fact that even on the present issue, the University is making all effort to consult widely. So when you say that you will not read into the law any ridiculous meanings, I believe you.

But here is how law works. Law normalizes incrementally. It continuously evolves new equilibria in which what was once beyond the pale becomes quotidian. And we forget when it was not. Law also dispels our sense of responsibility, of having made a choice; we take the new normal as our new ‘given’. And when the legal rule is vague, and indeterminate, as this one is, it remains available for capture: for the grafting of ever-new more invasive normals. And we, in being just the conscientious followers of the law, become its objects.

We should, rather, engage with the law actively – not just to implement it, but to fix its meaning by our careful and explicitly-stated interpretation. And in this way, foreclose the opportunity for other readings that would lead us into intrusive and discriminatory new normals.

We must seize upon the vagueness of the Prevent duty, and the law’s own recognition of the importance of academic freedom and the freedom of speech. We must say that we cannot possibly see it as endorsing the policing of thought, or of non-violent action even if it confronts British values. We do not accept the conflation of extremism with terrorism; nor the covert conflations of dissent with extremism and terrorism with Islam. We do not accept also the nudge towards a bureaucracy of surveillance and suspicion. In short, we do not see this law as adding anything new to the responsibilities we already bear as citizens and members of the community.

So by all means let us follow the law, but also use well the opportunity we have to give it a meaning that we can live with.

Ms S. KUS (University Information Services):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a Computer Officer in the University Information Services, and from Wolfson College; I am also an ex-Special Constable.

Given my work at the University, I’d like to offer some thoughts on the consequences of the Prevent duty to the individual, particularly student, who may encounter it. I will do so as a set of questions that I hope can be considered as we think about what, in the long run, will be the toll of this duty on young people at this University.

1. There are already several law enforcement agencies tasked with monitoring young people. What will this duty do in particular? Why must it be made?

2. As part of our duties as tutors, investigators, administrators, we already identify vulnerable students and seek to support them; what is different now?

3. Two notes here: First, the duty forces citizens to take on the duties of monitoring an entire community – more or less. We are asked to watch, scrutinize Muslims, from the time they enter school until they end university. And then, police and intelligence services take over more directly as their communities and institutions are monitored more directly.

4. But let us look at Prevent at this University. A student is here for a limited time. We are asked to offer pastoral care for students already vulnerable to radicalization or ‘extremism’. What can this mean? What can it mean to look for extremism when looking at a student who, even before they have arrived at the University, has likely been subject to racism, sexism, and Islamophobia.

5. If we are to understand the research on radicalization, many of the young people who become part of violent extremist groups often do so as a result of incremental acts of violence (physical, emotional, or otherwise) towards them – or their communities. We say that Prevent will be able to streamline a process of deterring ‘radicalization’ before it happens, but what of that targeting itself? How do we guarantee that those trainings of implicit bias, or sensitivity, actually understand the individual alienations of students, whose experiences are as multiple and varied as any others? What does targeting in itself do? And it is targeting – because every indicator used has been drawn from an essentialized understanding of how ‘particular’ groups – here almost squarely Muslims – are assumed to do as a result of alienation (for whatever reason).

In other words, we already have a policing mechanism to stop and search based on preconceived ideas of who and what a person is or may be doing. It has largely failed, and instead has given cover to the overwhelming targeting of brown and black citizens. How is Prevent any different, and why should this University participate in such a failed exercise?

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History), read by the Junior Pro-
 Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor,

The statutory Prevent duty

The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015, s.31 has trouble with its definitions, especially the ones which matter most in this place, ‘academic freedom’ and ‘freedom of speech’ (or ‘expression’).

It chickens out, simply referring in s.31(5) to two existing pieces of legislation. The first is Education (No. 2) Act 1986, s.43. This was passed in a period when student organizations were banning speakers with whose views they did not agree, in a way not dissimilar to recent ‘safe space’ campaigning – as commentators have pointed out. ‘The duty on universities to ensure freedom of speech’ is defined in the Counter-Terrorism Act in terms of this limited provision, designed to ensure that invited speakers could not be prevented from speaking in a particular place, the ‘campus’. Cambridge is required to have a Code of Practice under this statute and to keep it up to date.¹ There have been one or two challenging episodes in Cambridge in recent years.

The second is the Education Reform Act 1988, c.202(2) (a) which protects academics, but only academics to whom it formally applies, from losing their jobs or ‘privileges’ for expressing lawful but ‘controversial or unpopular’ opinions. That wording entered the Cambridge Statutes, as was required at the time, and is still there, now at Statute C I 3(a). The legislation of 1988 was meant to protect academics who lost tenure under that Act. It is now applicable to all University Officers in Cambridge but not to unestablished academic and academic-related staff. Their freedom seems unprotected by it too, as does the academic freedom of all academics in post-1992 universities or the new ‘alternative providers’ with degree-awarding powers or university title, for this legislation does not apply to them. To the best of my knowledge only one litigant has sought to use this provision and then only tangentially, against University College London in the late 1990s.

The Act creating the Prevent duty says that ‘“academic freedom” means the freedom referred to’ in this section of the 1988 Act, although the phrase is not actually used in the 1988 legislation. ‘Academic freedom’ seems never to have been defined in English law except now in this unsatisfactory way in the Counter-Terrorism legislation, by reference to a clause in which the phrase does not even appear.

These definitions referred to in the new legislation may be statutory, but they have been taken far out of the context in which they originally became law. The legislation of 1986 was about not banning speakers intending to speak ‘lawfully’, whatever they wanted to say. However, it applies only on University property. The Counter-Terrorism legislation seeks to require such prospective speakers to demonstrate their intention in detail two weeks in advance.

But, as the government was warned in consultation, it is going to be difficult to require an invited speaker to provide his exact words fourteen days ahead of delivery. It was pointed out that ‘requiring any external academic or speaker to have a presentation ready within fourteen days of presenting would be impractical’.² Could you manage that every time you were going to lecture? Have you never spoken *extempore* or made changes when your audience looked bored with your script?

The definitions in the new Act bear the marks of the framing of legislation in a panic. They create for the academic world a Dangerous Dogs Act seeking to put new rules on academic freedom of speech, and going far beyond the limited concern of 1988, s.202 to prevent academics being dismissed for ‘question[ing] and test[ing] received wisdom’ or ‘put[ting] forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions’.

Have a look at the clauses of the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991. It begins by describing its purpose thus. It is:

An Act to prohibit persons from having in their possession or custody dogs belonging to types bred for fighting; to impose restrictions in respect of such dogs pending the coming into force of the prohibition; to enable restrictions to be imposed in relation to other types of dog which present a serious danger to the public; to make further provision for securing that dogs are kept under proper control; and for connected purposes.

Run an eye over some of the clauses. They cover ‘dogs bred for fighting; other specially dangerous dogs; keeping dogs under proper control; destruction and disqualification orders; seizure, entry of premises and evidence; dogs owned by young persons; muzzling and leads’. It soon became clear that some harmless mutts were being arrested for their resemblance to a ‘dangerous dog’ and there was a lot of ‘just in case’ muzzling. One would not need to stretch metaphor very far to map these loosely-defined doggy undesirables and their handlers onto the mindset of the Act which imposes the Prevent duty now. ‘One person’s non-violent extremist is another person’s wise voice’ notes the Master of Fitzwilliam in her blog.³ My characterful mongrel is your dangerous breed.

HEFCE’s requirements

In the case of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act s.31, there is the further concern that the Secretary of State gets to ‘specify authorities’ to whom universities are to report and in the case of Cambridge that is to be the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). But HEFCE is listed for abolition in favour of a new Office for Students in the Green Paper published in November 2015.⁴ We are promised a White Paper very soon and HEFCE may yet survive but the word on the street is that there has been a good deal of falling out between the Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills (BIS) and HEFCE recently.

As to the powers of Secretaries of State, the use of Statutory Instruments always needs watching closely and there is a long history of resistance (fairly successful so far but having to be fought with energy in both Houses of Parliament whenever new higher education legislation is in prospect) to attempts to allow the holders of that office for universities to gain direct control of academic matters in individual institutions.

HEFCE has meanwhile been entrusted with the task of being the ‘authority’ to which Cambridge like other universities must respond with their Prevent plans. Search the *Cambridge Reporter* and the *Oxford Gazette* for the *Lambert Review* and remind yourself of the concerns which were expressed last time Cambridge and then Oxford had a ‘governance-change’ debate. It was rumoured that HEFCE might withhold funding from Oxford and Cambridge if they did not comply with the Lambert requirement (Recommendation 7.6) to demonstrate within three years that they were going to ‘agree with the Government’ about ‘reform’, to make their governance look like that of other universities.⁵ Both the rumoured

threat and the requirement disappeared into oblivion before the three years were up. If HEFCE disappears what will the Secretary of State set over Cambridge as the new ‘authority’?

The final version of the HEFCE monitoring framework was published in November 2015. Section 10 notes that universities are:

responsible for assessing Prevent-related risks in their own context and deciding on appropriate and proportionate actions in response to their assessment of those risks.

HEFCE will then:

assess whether the action plans, policies and processes set out by each university take account of the topics covered in both sets of statutory guidance and are sufficient to respond to the issues identified in their own risk assessments.

Cambridge’s response so far ...

The Colleges all have to be monitored separately but for the University the Cambridge Council met on 18 January to discuss its required preliminary response.⁶ The Minutes are commendably full. Among the comments recorded are the important one that it is:

important that the University continued to act as a vocal champion of freedom of expression and academic freedom, *recognising that these were, in themselves, mechanisms by which to challenge and prevent people from being drawn into terrorism* [italics added].

There have apparently been ‘joint meetings with HEFCE Officers’ involving the Colleges and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education is ‘producing training materials’.⁷ Whatever Cambridge makes of these the Council minuted that it ‘would be important to be able to capture data about the uptake of this training for the purposes of reporting to the HEFCE’.

Oxford has quite an extensive open-access Prevent website already⁸ and has published its preliminary submission (though with the rest of the Oxford Prevent duty ‘documentation’ this is incomprehensibly accessible only with Oxford’s equivalent of Raven access).⁹ Given sight of it, it is interesting to read that Oxford’s preliminary submissions in January included the expression ‘as we deem necessary’ more than once. Cambridge has not made its preliminary submission available to members of the Regent House, nor, I understand has the Council seen it. Could Cambridge perhaps provide us with a comparable website, and preferably with all the documentation visible? I have not been able to find one yet.

The University is advertising for an Information and Legal Compliance Administrator (Fixed Term), closing date 19 May, to support ‘the Head of the Registry’s Office on the implementation of the University’s Prevent duty under the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015. In particular, the post-holder will assist in the development and maintenance of procedures in this area, including the servicing of the relevant committee’.¹⁰ Lucky him or her – for a University trying to comply with a law which cannot adequately define its terms and sees Hounds of the Baskervilles and Cerberus look-alikes everywhere – is rightly going, I hope, to insist on better clarification of what exactly ‘compliance’ will require.

‘Academic autonomy’ is now normally used with reference to institutions, not to speaking and writing persons. However, it is another phrase likely to cause problems in the implementation of s.31 and one would

have liked to see an attempt at definition in the Act we are discussing. The Counter-Terrorism legislation recognizes (Schedule 6) that the ‘specified authority’ for this University is its governing body, and its governing body under Statute A III 1 is the Regent House. The Regent House would have to make an act of delegation to hand over to the Council or any officer, however senior, the right to decide how Cambridge fulfils its statutory duties. One hopes it won’t Grace any such proposal. As things stand, it has a right to be in full control of whatever is to be done in fulfilment of this new statutory duty.

¹ <http://www.cambridgestudents.cam.ac.uk/new-students/rules-and-legal-compliance/freedom-speech>

² https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/409886/Prevent_Duty_Guidance_-_Summary_of_reponses.pdf

³ <https://blog.fitz.cam.ac.uk/2015/06/16/the-prevent-agenda/>

⁴ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/474227/BIS-15-623-fulfilling-our-potential-teaching-excellence-social-mobility-and-student-choice.pdf

⁵ http://www.vinnova.se/upload/dokument/Verksamhet/Kommersialisering/Nyckelaktorer/lambert_review_final_450.pdf

⁶ <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/meeting-20160118/MeetingDocuments/Council%20confirmed%20minutes%2018%20Jan%2016.pdf>

⁷ <https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/news/index.cfm/preventtraining>

⁸ http://www.ox.ac.uk/staff/working_at_oxford/policies_procedures/prevent-duty

⁹ http://www.ox.ac.uk/staff/working_at_oxford/policies_procedures/prevent-duty/prevent-duty-document

¹⁰ <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/10056/>

Mr A. Q. M. S. ZAMAN (King’s College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am an undergraduate Historian at King’s College, I am a member of the Islamic Society’s Activism subcommittee, and I also speak in my capacity as a Muslim student.

Prevent is the biggest concern Muslim students have about their time in universities. For us, it is a huge barrier for free speech, as anything we say can be seen through the prism of security. Students I’ve spoken to are afraid to speak truthfully about their views even in supervisions, due to the fear that they might be identified as an extremist. I myself am also very wary of speaking about American foreign policy, for example, with my supervisors. And to some extent this is for good reason too: a [Muslim] student studying a postgraduate degree on counterterrorism in the University of Salford was interrogated by the university authorities about why he was reading a book called *Terrorism studies*. There have, of course, been many more absurd examples, not all in a university setting, about Muslim students being questioned about what they say; for example, a student at school being questioned about why he used the phrase ‘ecoterrorism’.

Prevent also extends to denying platform speakers who could be defined extremists. I have had to cancel a discussion within my own College titled *Islam in Europe*, after a *Telegraph* article was written on one of the invited speakers, which labelled him as an extremist. The fact that the speaker wrote a response countering these allegations did little to change that. The political landscape is such that it is so easy for the press or for politicians to label Muslim speakers as extremists, that it’s hard to find speakers on Islam or Muslim speakers without any allegations as such. A recent example of this would be Suliaman Ghani who clearly had some unsavoury views but was quite vocal in condemning ISIS. Yet the Prime Minister himself called him an extremist. This form of censorship makes it very

difficult to organize debates on topical issues among Muslim students. However, it does not stop these conversations from occurring as they still occur underground in more dangerous environments. Muslims will still talk about Syria, about Wahabism, or about American foreign policy. But they are more likely to find their information from questionable sources on the internet rather than from intellectual discussions at university. Prevent is counterproductive as counterterrorism.

The Prevent programme affects almost exclusively Muslim students. It takes the patronizing view that Muslim students cannot think critically or that they are swayed so easily by speakers. I would urge the University to revoke its implementation of Prevent legislation: for us, it elicits anxiety, it amounts to controlling our language, and is against the principles of free speech.

Dr J. E. POWLES (Faculty of Law and Computer Laboratory):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I wish merely to add two points on this extremely troubling subject. I do so as a postdoctoral legal researcher in the Law Faculty and the Computer Laboratory, with some background in national security matters.

My first point is practical. We should accord the Prevent duty no more time than the government itself envisaged in its Impact Assessment on the proposed Bill. That is to say, £573 – or the allocation of one junior staff-member's time for one week per year – and a one-hour training session for seven to eight individuals per year. Training that we should subject to rigorous academic enquiry as to how it accords with the evidence base on counterterrorism and with principles of law and justice.

I do not say this disrespectfully. To the contrary, I say it out of the greatest respect for this institution, its enterprise, and the rule of law. I say it because there is no legal obligation imposed by this Act that this University, through its *Statutes and Ordinances*, does not already comply with, and which, as Professor Ross Anderson enunciated so clearly, is not aided by the 'magic formula' that is this institution and its Colleges.

The only operative parts of this legislation, in the primary part of the Act, are a general duty on the institution as a whole and an express recognition of the need to preserve academic freedom and freedom of expression.

Beyond this, there are – as colleagues have noted – impossibly diffuse, unclear aspirations with regard to 'extremist' and 'radical' thought. The guidance, which is under delegated legislation and is voluntary, is predicated on risk. Risk that we will in some unclear way be guided on, and which in the Impact Assessment, the government failed to address beyond saying that it is impossible to quantify the future possible benefit in reducing loss of life [from terrorism]. To this I would argue that there is a clear and immediate risk to our freedoms and rights by imposing this obligation.

My second point is one of principle. The clear intent of the Prevent duty is to shift responsibility for the impossible task of reducing incidents of terrorism [to citizens]. If there is extremism at the heart of the Prevent duty, it is in the notion that ordinary citizens should become conscripted as agents of the Security State.

Professor I. H. WHITE (University Council and Master of Jesus College), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am the Chair of the Colleges' Committee and wish to comment on some governance matters relating to the Topic of Concern.

Firstly, the requirement of the University to respond to the matters approved in the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 is enshrined in that legislation and in the subsequent statutory guidance published in September of last year. The legal requirements placed upon the University apply equally – and separately – to each of the Colleges as well.

Compliance with the law is being monitored by the appointed regulator for higher education, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), and representatives of the University and the Colleges have met with officers from HEFCE on a number of occasions to clarify their expectations and interpretation of the statutory guidance, particularly in the context of the collegiate University.

Each College has been separately reviewing its legal duties through their own governance structures. In addition, matters relating to Prevent have also been discussed on a number of occasions between Heads of House, and between Senior Tutors, leading to the development, by the Head of the Office of Intercollegiate Services, of guidance notes for Colleges to take forward their consideration of the prescribed duties, including among others the scope of any risk assessment, and an agreed position on the importance of academic freedom. These are available at: <https://www.ois.cam.ac.uk/resources-for-colleges/prevent-duty-guidance-1>.

In consultation with the University, HEFCE, and BIS advisers on Prevent, the intercollegiate guidance has suggested that the Colleges take a proportionate approach based on a review of the likelihood of risks indicated in the statutory guidance. In most cases, the legal requirements of Prevent have resulted in Colleges reviewing the transparency of their current arrangements. To date, no significant risks of non-compliance have been communicated to the Office of Intercollegiate Services. More importantly, the actions taken to date have not revealed any significant risks to the security and safety of Colleges and their members.

Dr P. GOPAL (Faculty of English and Churchill College), read by Dr Qato:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I wish to express my grave concern about the ethical and political implications of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 and the Prevent duties imposed upon universities. As has been noted by several commentators already, the implementation of the Act can be challenged under the Human Rights Act of 1998 that is already in force. Specific applications of the Prevent duty are in danger also of violating Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights. These relate to freedom of expression, and freedom of assembly which, in addition to academic freedom, it is the primary duty of any academic community to protect vigorously. Colleagues at Oxford have noted that the way in which the Act has been operationalized through their Colleges' submissions to HEFCE 'makes significant in-roads into these rights'.

Apart from noting, as many will, the manifold problems of implementing such heavy-handed legislation in any community that values equality, diversity, political debate, and academic freedom, let us also not skirt the most serious

issue at stake: the fact that this is legislation which in intent and spirit, if not openly to the letter, is in grave danger of making the University complicit in singling out one minority community and consolidating the unacceptable levels of racism and unexamined prejudices which are on the rise in society more broadly. I believe that it is not only the duty of a robust academic community to refute any such association but that we should be leading the charge against ending all such pernicious thinking and attitudes. As things stand, compliance with the Prevent duty put us on the reverse path: of sleepwalking into inequality and racial profiling. Oxford and Cambridge have already received a lot of criticism for their failures in relation to race and racial equality; we should do nothing which puts us in danger of exacerbating the ills of an already less than felicitous atmosphere for Black and Minority Ethnic students and staff.

Finally, let us remember that what is deemed ‘extremism’ today in relation to one community is a movable goalpost. Our every action must protect the freedom to question and test received ideas and put forward new ones, including the unpopular, without undue restrictions or danger of losing our jobs and privileges. To allow, endorse, and implement such sweeping legislation may be usefully irrelevant to our own interests, concerns, and affiliations today; tomorrow may be an entirely different story as such laws are turned against us. As an academic community that values the highest forms of equality, freedom of inquiry, and robust debate, let us not find ourselves complicit in programmes of action that are incommensurate with these values.

Dr W. YAQOOB (Faculty of History and Pembroke College): Deputy Vice-Chancellor, my name is Waseem Yaqoob. I am a Research Fellow in Politics and International Studies at Pembroke College, and Research Staff Representative of the Cambridge University branch of the University and Colleges Union (UCU), and though I speak in a personal capacity, these remarks broadly reflect the position of the Union as decided through the democratic deliberation of its over 100,000 members across the UK. They therefore apply both to the Higher Education and Further Education sector as a whole as well as to the implementation of the Prevent duty at this university.

UCU is of the view that the Prevent duty threatens academic freedom and freedom of speech at universities. It will stifle political and social activity on campuses, and perhaps most importantly, it forces academics to involve themselves in processes that will inevitably disproportionately target Muslim students and breed mistrust between educators and those students. I will focus on four broad areas of concern here.

The first area of concern relates to the issue of ‘British values’ as defined by the Prevent duty itself. Prevent centres on tackling what the government calls ‘non-violent extremism’ – in other words, no actual violent act may have been considered or admired for it to be activated. The government defines extremism as

vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.

[It also includes in its definition of extremism calls for the death of members of the armed forces.] This opens up a very ambiguous definition of extremism and includes expressions of political views that may not involve any invocation or support of violence. This definition opens the

Prevent powers to be used against political activities and social activities that may have nothing at all to do with terrorism.

The second area of concern relates to the model of radicalization that stands behind Prevent. It is based on a ‘conveyor belt’ model that involves vulnerable individuals being groomed by radical clerics, the internet, or other associates and in which non-violent extremism leads inexorably to violent extremism and therefore to acts of terrorism. This ignores the multifarious social and economic contexts in which extremism may develop, focusing instead on a narrow securitization of education and society, and placing the burden for that security agenda on public sector institutions.

Prevent also disproportionately targets Muslim students. Most of the training packages for Prevent stress that it is about targeting all forms of terrorism, not just ‘Muslim extremism’. The Home Office’s WRAP DVD¹ dwells at length, for example, on the case of a far-right activist. However in practice Prevent as it has been already implemented in other public sector institutions outside of Higher Education has overwhelmingly targeted Muslims. Muslim individuals, have made up 90 percent of those referred to Prevent’s anti-radicalization programme Channel between 2007 and 2010, despite being less than five percent of the population. Prevent definitely encourages racial profiling as Priyamvada Gopal has already suggested in her remarks. Three schools in Barnsley, an area with a high level of English Defence League activity, for example, published risk assessments early this year that stated that the schools were not prone to radicalization or extremism as the cohort were pupils of white British majority. The risk assessments were taken from a template approved by the Prevent team at South Yorkshire Police and led to a number of students being submitted to the authorities in cases in which there was no case to answer.

So to the fourth area of concern. Much of the Prevent duty is being dressed up as a form of safeguarding; helping people who may be vulnerable to radicalization. Many employers are incorporating the Prevent duty into existing safeguarding procedures. Much training asks public sector workers to look for signs of ‘vulnerability’ and ‘radicalization’ in colleagues as well as people under their care; in other words we are being asked to be suspicious of each other. Some of the risk factors specified include: substance and alcohol misuse; peer pressure; influence from older people or via the internet; bullying; crime and anti-social behaviour; domestic violence; family tensions; race or hate crime; lack of self-esteem or identity; grievances (personal or political); migration.

As you can see, this encompasses huge numbers of people who are not in any way connected to terrorism or extremism. The perceived risk of radicalization is highly subjective and open to abuse. UCU feels that this is likely to breed an atmosphere of suspicion, even at august institutions such as this one, providing an almost endless list of identifiers that can be used to label suspect individuals or groups. This approach also potentially deters children, vulnerable people, and students from seeking help, support, or medical advice for fear of being labelled as at risk of radicalization.

Many inappropriate referrals are already being made to Prevent’s anti-radicalization programme Channel; 80% of Channel referrals between 2006 and 2013 were eventually rejected by the Channel panel, showing that many referrers are finding threats where none exist.

Finally, I would like to note the likely chilling effect Prevent will have on legitimate forms of political activity. There are many recorded instances of how Prevent is being used to crack down on legitimate forms of political activity on campuses and elsewhere. Lancaster University's student union president was targeted by police for displaying pro-Palestinian posters in her office; Prevent officers were involved in shutting down a conference on Islamophobia at Birkbeck University in December 2014; Police in West Yorkshire told over 100 teachers attending Prevent training that they should consider environmental protesters, anti-fracking campaigners and anti-capitalists as potential extremists, citing Green MP Caroline Lucas as an example.

Some of these examples, stretching across schools, further education, and higher education may seem very distant from our situation here at Cambridge University. As Eva Nanopolous² and Surabhi Ranganathan have already emphasized today, we are justified in viewing our institutions as possessors of good faith and sound judgment. But we will not be immune to the ratchet effects that will and are already being produced by the vagueness of the Prevent duty as it is defined and its broader legal framework. As academics, we operate in the wider world of other HE institutions and public sector organisations and the public culture of this country. There is a strong case for Cambridge using its prestige to make stronger public criticisms of the Prevent duty, and vocally championing the principles of freedom of expression and academic freedom, while doing nothing more than the absolute minimum to comply with the letter of the law on Prevent.

¹ See <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/advice/training/workshop-to-raise-awareness-of-prevent-wrap>

² See Dr Ranganathan's remarks above

Mr C. H. G. ALLEN (University Council and King's College, and President of the Graduate Union):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I'm a Ph.D. student in Computational Toxicology, from King's College, and I am a member of the University Council and the President of the Graduate Union.

I will try to be brief, as my broader concerns about the insidious, counterproductive Prevent legislation have already been raised by those who have spoken before me.

I will begin by drawing the attention of the Regent House to the minutes of CUSU's first Prevent Taskforce meeting, held last Wednesday, and available now on the CUSU website (<http://www.cusu.co.uk/articles/prevent-taskforce-meeting-minutes>). In attendance were representatives of MCRs, JCRs and University societies, other interested students, as well as Dr Allen on behalf of the University, and Dr Russell on behalf of the Colleges.

The discussion was constructive, and the remarks from Dr Allen and Dr Russell were broadly reassuring – both with regard to the fact that the University takes the concerns of its members about the Prevent strategy very seriously, and has sought to implement its legal duties with as much restraint, sensitivity, and understanding as possible within the obvious limits of the fundamental problems with the legislation.

We cannot pretend that the University and Colleges may disregard their legal duties without consequences. In the case of the Prevent strategy, institutional non-compliance or resistance would most likely result in the pseudo light-touch enforcement being replaced by sterner external pressure and a worse outcome for the members of the University.

This University has stood for over 800 years. The Home Office has lasted for less than a third of that time, and Theresa May's reign of terror hasn't yet reached one percent. Governments and their hobby horse legislation come and go and, with luck, and with the continued public engagement of the experts within this University, the Prevent duty may not survive a general election or cabinet reshuffle.

What would be utterly disastrous would be if the University internalized the idea that it owes a duty to treat its students as suspects. The University's cultural and institutional norms can last for centuries, whether or not they still serve a useful purpose, as proceedings in this Senate-House often demonstrate. I am very concerned at the parasitic nature of the Prevent duty, embedding itself in its hosts via the medium of a specialist committee.

I therefore urge all members of the Regent House, and all College Fellows, to ensure, so far as is possible, that the Prevent duty at their institutions within this University be fulfilled through the various already-existent mechanisms that have worked well at preventing violent extremism at Cambridge.

Where this tactic is impossible, and there are situations where it is impossible, I urge you to channel your concerns into positive but critical engagement with the various Prevent Committees which will begin to spring up across the collegiate University. And don't forget, as the success of CUSU's Prevent meeting has demonstrated, some of the most engaged, informed, and critical voices are to be found amongst the student body. It is important that College Governing Bodies seek to include students in their Prevent apparatus beyond a tokenistic gesture fulfilling the minimum legal requirement. Not only will student engagement help to reassure the student body that the governors of the University share their concerns about the strategy, but it will ensure that the mechanisms of Prevent compliance are routinely challenged by outside voices and new perspectives – and are not over time absorbed as an ordinary, if regrettable, part of University business.

COLLEGE NOTICES**Vacancies**

Lucy Cavendish College: Sutasoma Research Fellowship in social sciences; stipend: £18,031 plus research fellowship privileges; closing date: 8 June 2016 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.lucy-cav.cam.ac.uk/about-us/vacancies/sutasoma-research-fellowship>

EXTERNAL NOTICES**University of Oxford**

Exeter College: Stipendiary Lecturer in Modern History (fixed-term); stipend: £4,295–£4,830; closing date: 9 June 2016 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.exeter.ox.ac.uk/stipendiary-lecturer-modern-history-fixed-term.html>

Lincoln College: Lavery-Shuffrey Early Career Fellowship in Roman Art and Archaeology; stipend: £28,143–£30,738 a year plus benefits; closing date: 14 June 2016; further details: <http://www.lincoln.ox.ac.uk/Lavery-Shuffrey-Early-Career-Fellowship->

St Hilda's College: Stipendiary Lecturer in English; tenure: one year from 1 October 2016; stipend: £17,179–£18,219; closing date: 9 June 2016 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.st-hildas.ox.ac.uk/news-item/english-stipendiary-lectureship>

Wadham College: Stipendiary Lecturer in Philosophy; stipend: £15,032; closing date: 13 June 2016; further details: <https://www.wadham.ox.ac.uk/about-wadham/jobs/academic/stipendiary-lecturer-in-philosophy>

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). 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.

© 2016 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the University of Cambridge, or as expressly permitted by law.

The University is the owner or the licensee of all intellectual property rights in the site and in the material published on it. Those works are protected by copyright laws and treaties around the world. All such rights are reserved.

Material prepared for the primary purpose of providing information about the University of Cambridge, its teaching and research activities, its subsidiary companies and organizations with which it is associated or affiliated has been placed on the site by the University ('University Material').

Subject to statutory allowances, extracts of University Material may be accessed, downloaded, and printed for your personal and non-commercial use and you may draw the attention of others within your organization to University Material posted on the site.