

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6445

WEDNESDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2016

VOL CXLVII No 11

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	123
Discussion on Tuesday, 6 December 2016	123
Election to the Council	123
Election to the Board of Scrutiny	124
Notice in response to the Twenty-first Report of the Board of Scrutiny, 2015–16	124
Equality and Diversity Strategy and Action Plan (2016–21)	127
Equal Pay Review 2016	128

Vacancies, appointments, etc.

Electors to the Sir David Williams Professorship of Public Law	128
Electors to the Professorship of Statistical Science	129
Vacancies in the University	129

Regulations for examinations

Natural Sciences Tripos, Part IB	129
----------------------------------	-----

Form and conduct of examinations

Engineering Tripos, 2017	130
Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery, Second Examination, 2017	131
Examination in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies for the M.Phil. Degree, 2017	131

Reports

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the consideration of student complaints of harassment and sexual misconduct	132
--	-----

Graces

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 26 November 2016	144
---	-----

Acta

Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 9 November 2016	144
---	-----

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

College Notices

Elections	145
Vacancies	145

Societies, etc.

Cambridge Society for the Application of Research	145
---	-----

External Notices

University of Oxford	145
----------------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

26 November, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 2 p.m. (see p. 144).
 2 December, *Friday*. Full Term ends.
 6 December, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House (see below).
 19 December, *Monday*. Michaelmas Term ends.

Discussions (at 2 p.m.)

6 December
 20 December

Congregations

26 November, *Saturday* at 2 p.m.

Discussion on Tuesday, 6 December 2016

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 103) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House on Tuesday, 6 December 2016, at 2 p.m. for the discussion of:

1. Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 21 November and 18 November 2016, on the consideration of student complaints of harassment and sexual misconduct (p. 132).

Election to the Council

18 November 2016

The Vice-Chancellor announces that the following candidates have been nominated in accordance with Statute A IV 2 for election to the Council, and it has been certified to him that the candidates have consented to be nominated:

Candidates:

Nominated by:

Class (a): two from among the Heads of Colleges

Professor MICHAEL RICHARD EDWARD PROCTOR, *K*
 Professor IAN HUGH WHITE, *JE*

Professor A. C. Davis, *K*, and Professor N. E. Berestycki, *K*
 Professor A. D. Yates, *R*, and Professor M. R. E. Proctor, *K*

Class (b): two from among the Professors and Readers

Professor NICHOLAS JOHN GAY, *CHR*
 Professor FIONA EVE KARET, *DAR*
 Professor ALISON GAIL SMITH, *CC*

Dr A. W. A. Peterson, *CHR*, and Professor C. W. J. Smith
 Professor P. H. Maxwell, *T*, and Professor A. L. Fowden, *G*
 Professor E. F. Wilson, *CC*, and Professor H. Griffiths, *CL*

Class (c): four from among the other members of the Regent House

Dr STEPHEN JOHN COWLEY, *EM*
 Dr MARGARET EVELYN GLENDENNING
 Dr JENNIFER HIRST, *JE*
 Dr RICHARD MICHAEL MORTIER, *CHR*
 Dr ANDRÉ TIAGO REBELO MARQUES DE
 ALBUQUERQUE NEVES, *HO*
 Dr PHILIPPA JANE ROGERSON, *CAI*
 Dr MARK RODERICK WORMALD, *PEM*
 Ms JOCELYN MARGARET WYBURD, *CL*

Professor R. E. Goldstein, *CHU*, and Professor N. Peake, *EM*
 Dr N. J. Holmes, *T*, and Mr J. S. Hulme
 Professor I. H. White, *JE*, and Professor P. H. Maxwell, *T*
 Dr S. R. Kell, *CHR*, and Professor J. A. Crowcroft, *W*
 Dr A. J. Hutchings and Dr A. J. Wright
 Professor P. Robinson, *CAI*, and Dr S. Palmer, *G*
 Dr D. M. Holburn, *CAI*, and Dr M. Frasca-Spada, *CC*
 Dr R. Padman, *N*, and Dr P. Fara, *CL*

No other persons having been nominated, the candidates named above in class (a) are duly elected. It is necessary to hold elections in class (b) to select two from among the three candidates and in class (c) to select four from among the eight candidates. Online voting will open at 10 a.m. on Monday, 28 November 2016 and hard-copy papers will be distributed by the same date to those who have opted to receive them. Those elected will serve for four years from 1 January 2017.

Election to the Board of Scrutiny

18 November 2016

The Vice-Chancellor announces that the following candidates have been nominated for election to the Board of Scrutiny in the classes shown below, in accordance with Statute A VII 3, and it has been certified to him that the candidates have consented to be nominated:

Candidate:

Nominated by:

Class (c)(i): one person who has been a member of the Regent House for not more than ten years on 1 October 2017

Ms SABA ALA'I

Professor M. A. Parker, *PET*, and Dr M. E. Glendenning

Class (c)(ii): two members of the Regent House

Mr DAVID JOHN GOODE, *W*

Sir Richard Evans, *W*, and Professor G. L. Fowden, *PET*

Dr SIMON DAVID WILLIAM FROST

Professor J. L. Heeney, *DAR*, and Professor J. L. N. Wood, *W*

No other persons having been nominated, the above candidates are duly elected; the candidate in class (c)(i) to serve with immediate effect until 30 September 2019 and the candidates in class (c)(ii) to serve with immediate effect until 30 September 2017.

Notice in response to the Twenty-first Report of the Board of Scrutiny, 2015–16

21 November 2016

This Notice is the Council's reply to the Board of Scrutiny's Twenty-first Report (*Reporter*, 6433, 2015–16, p. 776) and the Discussion of it held on 11 October 2016 (*Reporter*, 6440, 2016–17, p. 54).

The Council welcomes the Board of Scrutiny's constructive comments and wishes to respond as follows to the recommendations made in its Report.

1. The Board recommends that the University publish a comprehensive analysis of the University's research income in comparison with our major competitors

The Research Policy Committee, the Planning and Resources Committee, and the Finance Committee monitor and benchmark the position against the major competitors, for example through the University's Sustainability Metrics that are considered by the Council, the General Board, and the Planning and Resources Committee, and the Research Funding Trends data that is presented regularly to the Research Policy Committee. The research strategies of our peers in terms of growth ambitions, themes, mix and type of sponsors, and resources and facilities to deliver those strategies are likely to differ. The Council considers that publication of any further analysis or comparison of our performance with major competitors, however defined, on their research income would be of limited value in the absence of a full understanding of the research strategies of those competitors.

2. The Board recommends that the University review its practice of accounting for Chest and non-Chest income separately

The University's finances are structured around general, designated, and restricted funds. The general unrestricted funds (Chest funds) available for direct allocation by the Council (on the advice of the Planning and Resources Committee and Finance Committee) are of particular value since they can be applied as best suits the strategic and tactical imperatives of operational and capital needs of institutions and Schools. The Council wishes to keep Chest income and expenditure funded by the Chest in balance over a rolling period and considers it vital that all sources of funds are tightly budgeted, monitored, and controlled. Non-Chest income is a major part of the University's funding mix and requires a similarly detailed approach to its planning, budgeting, and expenditure. The RAM Review Working Group, set up by the Resource Management Committee, is considering the classification of non-Chest and Chest income. This work will provide an opportunity to review the distinction between non-Chest and Chest income and introduce a more consistent approach to the treatment of income.

3. The Board recommends that substantial new allocations only be made following the submission of a full business plan

The annual planning guidance issued by the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC) continues to reiterate the requirement for all bids for additional Chest allocation to be supported by a full business plan. The Board of Scrutiny has expressed concern, in paragraph 15 of its Report, that the allocation of £1.2m to the University Information Services was not supported by a business plan. The vast majority of this allocation was for the support of the High Performance Computing Facility and a provisional allocation of just under £0.9m was built into the University's consolidated financial forecasts, but retained centrally. The PRC, on the advice of its Resource Management Committee, has agreed that the confirmation and release of this recurrent allocation is dependent on the production, and approval, of a satisfactory business case. A comprehensive business plan for the High Performance Computing Facility is anticipated as part of the overall University Information Services planning submission on 1 December 2016.

4. The Board recommends that estate strategy focus on meeting the long-term academic needs of the University

A strategic framework for the development of the estate has been approved by the General Board and the Council.¹ The framework has a clear focus on meeting the long-term academic needs of the University. The development of the non-operational estate – whether at West Cambridge, where planning permission is being sought for 170,000m² of commercial research development, or on central sites which may no longer be suitable for operational use – is driven by the goal of enhancing the income streams available to support and improve the financial sustainability of the University's teaching and research activity.

5. The Board recommends that Council investigate the increasing geographical spread of the University on effective scholarship and access to centrally provided services such as the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs and the Careers Service

Current and planned developments on the Biomedical Campus and at West Cambridge seek to enable effective scholarship by providing fit-for-purpose accommodation in which to undertake teaching and research of the highest quality. The planned consolidation of the physical estate of the Schools of the Physical Sciences and Technology at West Cambridge, and the ongoing development and expansion of the Biomedical Campus, are expected to foster and stimulate interdisciplinary encounters and collaboration.

While some of this collaboration will be facilitated by new academic developments such as the recently completed Maxwell Centre, these must be supplemented by new amenities for staff and students. At West Cambridge, the Site Development Board is currently reviewing options for delivery of the first of the shared facilities 'hub' buildings anticipated by the master plan. On the Biomedical Campus, the Clinical School Building is currently being refurbished and reconfigured to prepare the building for increased student numbers commencing in 2017. The requirement for greater and higher quality amenities for University staff and students is likely to be addressed in due course by a master planning exercise for the Biomedical Campus.

As Dr Feldman noted in the recent Discussion, the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs Centre in the city centre has recently been supplemented by facilities on the Biomedical Campus, to be followed in 2017 by a third site at North West Cambridge. The Student Counselling Service is now open two evenings a week to cater for students who may be unable to access the service during regular office hours. The opening hours of other services are under review in the context of the move in 2018 to a Student Services Centre on the New Museums site. The feasibility of providing 'pop-up' services on other University sites will also be considered.

6. The Board recommends that Council review how Regents may be effectively engaged in the governance of the University (including Discussions and voting), particularly those working outside the city centre

A number of measures have been introduced with the aim of engaging members of the Regent House in the governance of the University. All members of the Regent House are subscribed to the email alert for the *Reporter* in order to promote the visibility and awareness of official matters of interest to the Regent House. New members are provided with a leaflet, which provides information on members' rights and links to further information and resources. The Governance website provides a central point of access for members of the collegiate University who wish to access the unreserved minutes and certain papers of a number of Committees.² One of the reasons for the introduction of online voting in ballots of the Regent House was to make it easier to vote and thus increase engagement from Regent House members. The forthcoming review of certain aspects of the governance of the University will look further at Regent House membership and engagement in Discussions. The Board's comments and the report of its Discussion will be provided to the group undertaking that review.

7. The Board recommends that the University review the support it offers to unestablished researchers seeking to bring in funding (not limited to Research Council Fellowships); and develop a consistent policy to support unestablished researchers at different grades seeking to become Principal and/or Co-investigators on grants

The University does have established processes and procedures that enable early career researchers to be given the opportunity to apply for research funding as Principal and Co-investigators at the discretion of the relevant Head of Department or Faculty and subject to the eligibility requirements of the funding agency concerned. The acceptance and management of research funding by the University will always have a cost implication for the Faculty or Department concerned and this can be very significant, particularly where funding agencies provide only a limited share of the full economic cost of the research. It is, therefore, difficult to establish a consistent policy in this area, recognizing that the capacity of Departments or Faculties to host projects will always be limited.

There are already opportunities for postdoctoral researchers to learn about the changing research environment and to develop research leadership capabilities through short courses and extended programmes, and the Researcher Development Programme team within Personal and Professional Development has started discussions about how these opportunities can be extended, in collaboration with the Careers Service, the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, the PdOC Society, and the Research Operations Office. This topic is also one that is to be raised by the OPdA at Researchers14, a group of other Russell Group universities who meet informally three times a year to discuss topics pertinent to early career researchers, to establish what is done in other universities.

¹ <http://www.em.admin.cam.ac.uk/strategic-framework>.

² See <http://www.governance.cam.ac.uk>. Users with a Raven account can access the unreserved minutes and select papers of the Council, General Board, Finance Committee, Audit Committee, Finance Committee's Business Sub-Committee, General Board's Education Committee, Planning and Resources Committee, and Resource Management Committee.

8. The Board recommends that the Council keep the new governance arrangements for North West Cambridge and similar large projects under active review, and also publish sufficient documentation for the Regent House to have confidence in this particular project

Following the second report of the Audit Group³ established by the Audit Committee to investigate the causes of the projected Phase 1 cost over-runs, the governance structure of the North West Cambridge development has been reconstituted. The West and North West Cambridge Estates Syndicate has been replaced by a Board which has a majority of external members with expertise of developments and boards of this nature. New Board members are currently being recruited. The recommendations from the two Audit Group reports⁴ have been transposed into an action log that the Board monitors regularly. The implementation of the recommendations is reported in a quarterly progress report to the Council and presented by the Chair of the Board. The current position is that 94% of the first Audit Group report recommendations have been fully implemented and 85% of the second report recommendations have either been completed or are in progress. The Chair's quarterly report informs the Council of the programme, management, quality, and financial performance on a regular basis and details how key risks are being mitigated. The Regent House can read the quarterly progress report and the Council's comments on it in the Council minutes published on the Governance website. The financial KPIs are reported to each meeting of the Finance Committee.

9. The Board recommends that the Council ensures that Regent House is kept fully informed of the progress of the North West Cambridge development and other large-scale projects in the future, including publishing sufficient document on progress and concerns

The Audit Group notes, in paragraph 39 of its second report, that it is essential that the Regent House is consulted on the question of policy as to whether the University should embark on a large capital project or similar major commercial undertaking and should approve the strategic case, which would include the principle elements of the business plan. However, once Regent House approval has been obtained in this way, the Council as the principal executive body of the University will assume overall responsibility for the future management and administration of the venture, including any more detailed business case that is required, advised in this matter by its Finance Committee. In the case of North West Cambridge, the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board provides the minutes of its regular Board meetings to the Council detailing the progress of the project against its strategic objectives.

In her Discussion remarks, Dr Feldman expressed her concern that the University's postdoctoral community would suffer fragmentation, isolation, and disengagement due to geographical spread and limited public transport options to and from North West Cambridge. In addition to the OPdA centre Dr Feldman mentions, the Community Centre will be operational from mid-2017 offering facilities for residents and the public. A range of social and leisure activities will also be offered, with OPdA working closely with the Community Centre to ensure postdoc resident engagement. In addition to the OPdA and Community centres, a food store and other retail outlets will be launched starting from late summer 2017. There is a commitment to improving public transport provision to this part of the City as the development's occupants take up residence. The first of these measures is the increase in frequency to the University's bus (the Universal, previously the Uni4) implemented in July 2016. This route will be extended into the North West Cambridge development when people move onto site. This will be coupled with extensive travel planning measures, including personalized travel planning, free car club membership for new residents, secure cycle provision, and cycle training.

10. The Board recommends that staff needs regarding housing and transport are integrated into the University's Estate Strategy and submissions to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Board and other local planning processes

The strategic framework for the development of the estate seeks to improve sustainable travel, both to and from work, and aims to increase the number and range of sustainable travel options available to University staff and students, and to visitors, working closely with the local planning authorities and partners on the Biomedical Campus. A transport strategy will be prepared, and will include detailed proposals for transport initiatives, including initiatives to connect key University sites. The University's responses to recent City Deal consultations on options for the A428 corridor and the proposed 'Western Orbital' bus route have sought to highlight the benefits to the University, the city, and the region of providing direct bus services to the University's operational sites at West Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus.

The framework provides the impetus to explore opportunities to develop affordable key worker housing within residential communities in addition to North West Cambridge, and alternative rental and ownership models that may give wider, more affordable access to housing than is currently the case.

11. The Board recommends that the University develop a strategy for supporting all staff seeking to purchase living accommodation in the precincts

The University provides a number of schemes to support employees in finding a home, including initiatives to assist new staff moving to the area with the high cost of housing. In addition, the University has approximately 385 properties available for staff and students to rent and a further 700 new homes on the University's North West Cambridge development, available to qualifying 'key workers' of the University at subsidised rents. A further 320 properties from private landlords are listed with the Accommodation Service.

A Remuneration Working Group has been formed in Michaelmas Term 2016 to develop a reward strategy for the University and to consider a number of new initiatives for all staff. The Group will consider schemes to ensure that the University continues to be able to attract staff of the highest calibre, building on the schemes currently offered.

³ *Reporter*, 6421, 2015–16, p. 442.

⁴ *Reporter*, 6400, 2015–16, p. 53; *Reporter*, 6421, 2015–16, p. 442.

12. The Board recommends a review of the optimum size and operational structure of University administration, in light of the UniForum benchmarking process

The University is pleased to be one of a number of Russell Group members participating annually in the UniForum programme under the aegis of the Resource Management Committee. The benchmarking process will provide evidence of how much Cambridge spends on administrative and support roles, by function and location, in comparison with other participating universities. A Service Effectiveness Survey has been launched which will enable the University to assess the effectiveness of the services provided. The results of both activities will help the University make sound strategic and operational decisions in relation to planning and resource allocation, and will be communicated in Lent Term 2017.

13. The Board recommends that new staff, as part of the induction process, are provided with an improved guide outlining the governance, planning, activity, and spending of the University, with links to appropriate sites, documents, and Statutes and Ordinances to help them understand how the University is governed, what resources they have to effect change where necessary, and what their responsibilities are

As part of the induction process, new staff are directed to the Induction: Online course and the Welcome to Cambridge event which provide an overview of the governance and structure of the University.⁵ The OPdA runs a mandatory induction event for post-doctoral researchers which explains how the University is run. The University's Governance website provides further information on the key governing bodies of the University, with links to Statutes and Ordinances and the *Reporter*. Staff can consult the 'how to' and 'FAQ' sections of the site for information on their responsibilities and participation in University decision-making. In response to this recommendation, the Governance website will be updated to include additional links and information, including a summary of key sites and documents relating to the budgeting and planning processes of the University as an introduction to new staff members.

14. The Board recommends that the University measure the use of its estate facilities to investigate whether they are being optimally utilized, develop appropriate mechanisms to allow its resources to be used by local communities and businesses, and make these mechanisms available for the Colleges to use

The University recognizes that a number of its built assets are not fully utilized; of acute concern is the infrequent and inefficient use of teaching and meeting rooms. Current and planned developments on the University estate present a significant opportunity for change, and will be informed by the work of the PRC's oversight group for teaching, learning, and examination space, which is chaired by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education). Options for sharing facilities between the University and Colleges are being given serious consideration. Departments and institutions with the capacity and infrastructure to do so, such as the Fitzwilliam Museum and the Institute of Continuing Education, make their facilities available for commercial hire. Any new, shared facilities at West Cambridge are planned to be accessible to a wider community in addition to University staff and students. Many of the University's historic buildings are unsuitable for this purpose, however.

15. The Board recommends that an early date be set for the delivery of a holistic review of HR policy and practice and that appropriate resources are made available to facilitate a thorough and effective process that addresses all current and future issues

In addition to the established cycle of HR policy reviews, the HR Committee has appointed a number of working groups with membership representative of the University community to review and take forward work in key areas of HR policy and practice, including but not limited to: recruitment; promotion; career development; reward; and wellbeing. The HR Division is also conducting an in-depth review of its core business processes to identify opportunities for greater efficiency and effectiveness, and will continue to update its website content to ensure it is accessible and relevant. The resourcing implications arising from this work will be carefully considered and activity prioritized accordingly. At the Discussion of the Board's Report, Professor Evans expressed concern about the publication of amendments to the University's Retirement Policy in the form of a Notice. The Council has stated its intention to consult the Regent House on questions of policy which in the Council's judgement are likely to prove controversial (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 110). They will do this by submitting a Grace to the Regent House for the approval of a provisional decision or statement of intention; where appropriate, such a Grace will allow for the expression of a preference between alternative options. In this case, the changes were not deemed to require a Grace and therefore a Notice was approved by the Council for publication.

⁵ <http://www.induction.admin.cam.ac.uk/induction>

Equality and Diversity Strategy and Action Plan (2016–21)

21 November 2016

The Council and the General Board have approved the adoption of the Equality and Diversity Strategy and Action Plan (2016–21), to guide and govern equality- and diversity-related activity for the period 2016–21. The Strategy and Action Plan is available at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2016-17/weekly/6445/EqualityandDiversitySAP.pdf>, and will be updated on the Equality and Diversity website as work progresses on individual workstreams to achieve the objectives set.

Equal Pay Review 2016

The University is committed to the principles of equal pay for work of equal value, freedom from discrimination, and recognition and reward of the University's staff as its greatest asset. As part of this commitment the University analyses equal pay data annually and publishes an Equal Pay Review biennially. This is the University's sixth Equal Pay Review.

The first Equal Pay Review was commissioned by the University to take place in 2008 as part of the proposals in the Second Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on new pay and grading arrangements for non-clinical staff (*Reporter*, 6002, 2004–05, p. 745).

The Review Group's first three reports were published on an annual cycle, on 18 February 2009 (*Reporter*, 6141, 2008–09, p. 510), 21 April 2010 (*Reporter*, 6185, 2009–10, p. 688), and 15 December 2010 (*Reporter*, 6208, 2010–11, p. 318). Subsequently, the University agreed to publish an Equal Pay Review on a biennial cycle, but continue to collect and analyse data annually. Biennial reviews were published on the 26 November 2012 (*Reporter*, 6287, 2012–13, p. 151) and 17 December 2014 (*Reporter*, 6370, 2014–15, p. 300). All Equal Pay Reviews and can be found on the HR Division website at: <http://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/pay-benefits/pay-and-reward/pay/equal-pay-reviews>; the 2016 Equal Pay Review is also available at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2016-17/weekly/6445/EqualPayReview2016.pdf>.

The Equal Pay Review 2016 brings together the following pay data as at 31 July 2016:

- gender representation and average salaries¹ (basic pay and total pay by grade, staff category, and working hours);
- salaries paid to new employees;
- additional pensionable and non-pensionable payments for the 12 months ending 31 July 2016.

The appendices include median² and inter-quartile ranges³ where appropriate, in order to provide further insight into potential gender pay issues and for benchmarking purposes. The commentary primarily refers to the mean pay gap, but additional median pay gap information is also provided.

This report examines the impact of the above by gender and highlights differences and pay gaps including market comparisons. It also comments on progress made on matters of concern raised in previous equal pay reviews including the equal pay Key Performance Indicators which highlight key themes in equal pay at the University of Cambridge.

¹ Average (mean) salary is the sum of each single salary spine point value (or total pay if appropriate) divided by the number of instances.

² The median salary is the middle value of all single salary spine point values (or total pay if appropriate) when placed in lowest to highest order.

³ The inter-quartile range is the difference between the upper quartile (i.e. the value of all payments three quarters of the way from lowest to highest) and the lower quartile (i.e. the value of all payments one quarter of the way from lowest to highest)

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Electors to the Sir David Williams Professorship of Public Law

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Sir David Williams Professorship of Public Law as follows:

Professor Eilís Ferran, *CTH*, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Philip Allmendinger, *CL*
Sir David Lloyd Jones, *Royal Courts of Justice*

(b) *on the nomination of the General Board*

Professor Paul Craig, *University of Oxford*
Professor David Feldman, *DOW*
Professor Christine Gray, *JN*

(c) *on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Law*

Professor Mark Elliott, *CTH*
Professor Richard Fentiman, *Q*
Professor Anne Davies, *University of Oxford*

Electors to the Professorship of Statistical Science

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

Professor Jeremy Sanders, *SE*, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Lindsay Greer, *SID*
Professor Dominique Picard, *Université Paris-Diderot*

(b) *on the nomination of the General Board*

Professor John Aston
Professor Robert Nowak, *University of Wisconsin-Madison*
Professor Gareth Roberts, *University of Warwick*

(c) *on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Mathematics*

Professor David Firth, *University of Warwick*
Professor James Norris, *CHU*
Professor Gabriel Paternain, *T*

Vacancies in the University

A full list of current vacancies can be found at <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/>.

Professor of Climate Change Policy in the Department of Land Economy; tenure: from 1 October 2017; informal enquiries: Professor Colin Lizieri, Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: cml49@cam.ac.uk or tel.: 01223 337114); closing date: 2 February 2017; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/12164>; quote reference: JP10773

Professor of Information and Communications in the Department of Engineering; tenure: from 1 October 2017; informal enquiries: Professor Simon Godsill, Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: sjg@eng.cam.ac.uk or tel.: 01223 332604); closing date: 10 January 2017; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/12166>; quote reference: NM10774

Professor of Statistical Science in the Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics; tenure: from 1 October 2017; informal enquiries: Professor Gabriel Paternain, Head of Department (email: G.P.Paternain@dpmms.cam.ac.uk or tel.: 01223 337995); closing date: 31 January 2017; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/12160>; quote reference: LF10770

Clinical Lecturer in Infectious Diseases in the Department of Medicine; tenure: four years; salary: £31,614–£54,741; closing date: 19 December 2016; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/12177>; quote reference: RC10780

The University values diversity and is committed to equality of opportunity.

The University has a responsibility to ensure that all employees are eligible to live and work in the UK.

REGULATIONS FOR EXAMINATIONS

Natural Sciences Tripos, Part IB

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 394)

With effect from 1 October 2017

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Management Committee for the Natural Sciences Tripos, has approved an amendment to the regulations for the Tripos to change the name of Part IB subject *Pathology* to *Biology of Disease*, as follows:

Regulations 9 (in the list of subjects for Part IB), 20, 21(b) (ii), and 23(a) (v).

By replacing 'Pathology' with 'Biology of Disease'.

FORM AND CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS

Notices by Faculty Boards, or other bodies concerned, of changes to the form and conduct of certain examinations to be held in 2017, by comparison with those examinations in 2016, are published below. Complete details of the form and conduct of all examinations are available from the Faculties or Departments concerned.

Engineering Tripos, 2017

The Faculty Board of Engineering gives notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2017, the form of the examinations for certain papers of the Engineering Tripos will be changed as follows:

PART IIA

4D16. Construction management

The examination will consist of a one-and-a-half-hour written examination. Candidates will be asked to answer not more than three questions from a choice of five.

3F1. Signals and systems

This year's examination paper will contain questions on the z-transform, stability of discrete-time systems, digital filtering, and stochastic processes. There will no longer be a question on information theory. All other details of the examination remain unchanged.

3F3. Statistical signal processing

This paper was previously known as Signal and pattern processing. This year's examination paper will contain questions on advanced probability theory, random process theory, optimal filtering, and estimation. All other details of the examination remain unchanged.

3F7. Information theory and coding

The examination will consist of a one-and-a-half-hour written examination. This year's examination paper will contain questions on information theory, data compression, and channel coding. A 3F7 data sheet will be provided. Candidates will be asked to answer not more than three questions from a choice of four.

3F8. Inference

The examination will consist of a one-and-a-half-hour written examination. This year's examination paper will contain questions on probabilistic models and inference algorithms. Candidates will be asked to answer not more than three questions from a choice of four.

PART IIB

4A9. Molecular thermodynamics

The examination will consist of a one-and-a-half-hour written examination. Candidates will be asked to answer not more than three questions from a choice of four.

4B22. Flexible electronics

The examination will consist of a one-and-a-half-hour written examination. Candidates will be asked to answer not more than three questions from a choice of four.

4C8. Vehicle dynamics

This paper was previously known as Applications of dynamics. This year's examination paper will contain questions on vehicle dynamics and vehicle vibration. All other details of the examination remain unchanged.

4C15. MEMS design

The examination will consist of a one-and-a-half-hour written examination. Candidates will be asked to answer not more than three questions from a choice of four.

4D16. Construction management

The examination will consist of a one-and-a-half-hour written examination. Candidates will be asked to answer not more than three questions from a choice of five.

4F12. Computer vision

This paper was previously known as Computer vision and robotics. All other details of the examination remain unchanged.

GENERAL NOTE FOR PARTS IIA AND IIB

All candidates for the papers detailed above will be given ten minutes' reading time before the examination begins. All other parts of the examination remain unchanged.

Full details of the examination requirements, including the project, coursework, and examination credit notices for each Part, can be found on the Department of Engineering's undergraduate teaching website: <http://teaching.eng.cam.ac.uk/>.

Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery, Second Examination, 2017

The Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine gives notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2017, the form of the examination for the following paper for the Second M.B. Examination will be changed as follows:

Preparing for patients

Candidates will complete coursework by submitting answers to three short exercises online, each exercise consisting of three or four compulsory short answer questions. One exercise will be submitted before the first GP visit, plus a further exercise after each of the first and second visits. Work will be assessed formatively online and written feedback provided.

All other papers remain unchanged.

Examination in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies for the M.Phil. Degree, 2017

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 495)

The Faculty Board of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies gives notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2017, the form of examination for the following papers for the examination in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies for the degree of Master of Philosophy will be as specified below:

EA.1 Asia in theory

This exercise will consist of an extended essay of no more than 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography, for submission to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

EA.5 Chinese literature and modernity

This exercise will consist of an extended essay of no more than 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography, for submission to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

C4 The anthropology of China

This exercise will consist of an extended essay of no more than 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography, for submission to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

C6 War and modern China

This exercise will consist of an extended essay of no more than 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography, for submission to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

J1 Researcher development seminar

This exercise will consist of three essays each of no more than 1,600 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography. Drafts of the essays will be submitted in the Michaelmas and Lent Terms, and the final versions will be submitted in Easter Term. Students will receive critical feedback on the draft essays and on oral presentations. This will be unmarked. Marks will be given on the final essays only, which will be submitted to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

J19 Contemporary Japanese society

This exercise will consist of an extended essay of no more than 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography, for submission to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

MJR1E Muslim–Jewish relations, foundations

This exercise will consist of an extended essay of no more than 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography, for submission to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

MJR2E Muslim–Jewish relations, special topics

This exercise will consist of an extended essay of no more than 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography, for submission to the Degree Committee Office no later than 12 noon on the fourth day of the Full Easter Term of the year of study.

MJR3 Cairo Genizah

The three-hour examination consists of four passages of translation (with commentary), with three texts treated in class and one text unseen, all of which should be attempted. In addition, there is an essay answering one question out of a choice of three set questions. The examination will take place in the Easter Term in the year of study.

REPORTS

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the consideration of student complaints of harassment and sexual misconduct

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

1. This Report sets out proposals for a University procedure for handling cases of harassment and sexual misconduct between students, following the approval, by Grace 6 of 15 July 2015, of harassment as a matter on which the University Advocate can bring a disciplinary charge. It also proposes certain amendments to the existing disciplinary procedure to enable more appropriate handling of cases concerning such allegations.

2. The proposals have been prompted by an increasing awareness of the incidence of harassment, rape, and other forms of sexual assault within the wider student community, the developments at US universities, and student and other initiatives that have identified the issues and pressed for greater engagement by the UK HE sector in tackling them. They have been developed in collaboration with the Colleges' Committee and following consultation with students and with officers of CUSU and the GU, the police and other local agencies, including Rape Crisis, and with the University Advocate. They have also been informed by changes in social attitudes and to the law (notably the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010), and the evolving relationship between students and HEIs, including the acknowledgement in March 2016 by the Universities UK taskforce on violence against women, harassment, and hate crime affecting university students that the Zellick guidelines should be reviewed and updated, and the revised guidance issued by the taskforce in October 2016.¹ The proposals make clear that the University will not tolerate student harassment or sexual misconduct, and form part of the collegiate University's wider response in support of that message, which includes raising awareness, measures to support cultural and behavioural change based on mutual respect, and the provision of support for students who have been affected.

3. These proposals have been endorsed by the Council and the General Board, on the recommendation of the General Board's Education Committee, and have the support of the Senior Tutors' Committee and the Committee on Student Health and Wellbeing.

4. The Council and the General Board agree with the General Board's Education Committee that it is important that the collegiate University has an agreed protocol for dealing with these complex cases. They are aware that there has been much debate over the detail of the proposed framework that was circulated for comment during 2015–16. The Council and the General Board are content that the draft procedure annexed to this Report will provide the collegiate University with a means for handling these cases appropriately.

5. The proposals have been developed in the context of a review of student discipline in the University, the first stage of which was completed in February 2016 (see *Reporter*, 6415, 2015–16, p. 365), and a separate review of student complaints procedures. The Head of the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals (OSCCA), within the Academic Division, will be the officer responsible for the operation of the procedure set out in

Annex I and will act as a source of advice on its application, guided by the explanatory notes set out in Annex II. It is anticipated that the Head of OSCCA will work closely with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), as the institutional lead officer for student matters, in the early stages of the implementation of the procedure. Many of the elements of the infrastructure required to support the procedure are already in place. The Counselling Service will be available to supplement the individual support already provided to students by their Colleges. A pilot for a mediation service for students, provided by the Mediation Service that offers this service to members of staff, has been initiated.

6. Experience here and at other universities has shown that a specialist procedure is necessary to handle these complex cases where allegations of harassment or sexual misconduct have been made. The code of conduct and the procedure for handling cases of student harassment and sexual misconduct that the Council would adopt and the explanatory notes that the General Board would approve, if the recommendations of this Report are approved, are set out in Annexes I and II. The development of the code and the procedure, which would replace the current *Dignity@Study* guidance, has been guided by the following principles:

- (a) the collegiate University should take reasonable steps to secure a safe learning environment for its students, whilst recognizing the responsibility of all students to regulate their own conduct;
- (b) the arrangements are designed to empower students to raise a complaint about harassment and sexual misconduct and to support them in choosing, as far as is appropriate, how to do so within University or College procedures, or with the police;
- (c) the procedure must ensure fairness to all parties and recognize the rights of both the complainant and the person about whom the complaint is made;
- (d) the collegiate University has a responsibility to support students in making an informed decision on whether or not to report a criminal offence to the police and, whilst encouraging reporting of the most serious sexual misconduct, cannot require this;
- (e) the University's internal procedure cannot and must not be used to replicate criminal procedures and punishments;
- (f) the emphasis is on fact-finding and resolution – the procedure itself is not intended to be disciplinary or to involve any formal finding of wrongdoing, although it may lead to a complaint being referred for consideration under the University's disciplinary procedures;
- (g) informal processes are suitable for dealing with many cases of harassment, and Colleges play a key role in operating such processes, but a procedure must be available to students in cases where informal resolution has not been possible, or is not appropriate because of the seriousness of the allegation;

¹ <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/news/Pages/zellick-guidelines.aspx>; <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/news/Pages/Taskforce-publishes-recommendations-to-universities-on-dealing-with-violence-against-women-and-hara.aspx>.

(h) under its procedure, the University reserves the right to determine what action to take in response to a complaint, including to decide to take no action, and may take legal advice in respect of particular cases at any point in the process.

7. Attention is drawn to the following key points about the procedure at Annex I:

- (a) The scope is limited to complaints between students; further work is underway to review existing procedures for handling other complaints of harassment or sexual misconduct involving students and members of University staff.
- (b) All students are subject to the University's policies and disciplinary procedures as well as to those of their Colleges. This procedure therefore recognizes that students have a choice about whether to raise a complaint with the University, with their own College or that of the student about whom they are making the complaint, or with the police. Complaints will be considered on a case-by-case basis, but the expectation of the University and the Colleges is that certain complaints will usually be directed to the University's procedure, including complaints alleging sexual misconduct, when, after being given appropriate advice, complainants will be encouraged to consider reporting the matter to the police.
- (c) The Council and the General Board recognize that the complainant in such cases is not simply a witness of events that might amount to misconduct which is against the discipline of the University but also has a legitimate personal interest in the outcome of the procedure for handling such cases and any possible disciplinary proceedings arising from it. The procedure and its accompanying explanatory notes therefore provide that a person making a complaint under its provisions has a right to be kept informed of progress and may seek a review of a decision by the University Advocate (or other relevant officer) not to bring a disciplinary charge in relation to that complaint.

(d) Bringing a complaint under this procedure would not prevent the complainant from reporting the matter to the police at any time.

8. This Report also puts forward recommendations to implement the following changes:

- (a) the enactment of a power to impose precautionary measures on any person pursuing a course of study leading to the award of a degree, diploma, or certificate of the University, in order to ensure that a full and proper investigation can be carried out in relation to any matter (either under a procedure in the University or by the police) and/or to protect any person while any matter is being dealt with under a procedure in the University or as part of a criminal process;
- (b) the removal of the bar on the University Advocate being able to bring a disciplinary charge against a student whilst there is a likelihood of proceedings in a court of law concerning the same conduct; instead, it is proposed that, in such a scenario, the Advocate should have discretion to consider whether and when to bring a charge under the University's disciplinary procedure. In accordance with the UUK guidance, the Advocate will not normally commence an internal investigation until it is clear that the complainant is not planning to make a complaint to the police or that the police have concluded their own investigation and no criminal charge has been made or criminal proceedings have concluded.

9. If the recommendations of this Report are approved, further detailed codes of practice on particular aspects of the procedure, including guidance for students using the procedure, will be formulated. The proposals for revised disciplinary procedures will also be shaped by the proposals in this Report and by the UUK taskforce's wider recommendations.

10. The Council and the General Board recommend:

I. That, *with effect from 1 January 2017*, a new regulation be established as follows:

CASES OF STUDENT HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

The Council shall publish and keep under review a procedure for handling cases of student harassment and sexual misconduct between persons pursuing a course of study leading to the award of a degree, diploma, or certificate of the University.

II. That, *with effect from 1 January 2017*, new Special Ordinance D (v) be established as follows:

SPECIAL ORDINANCE D (v):

Precautionary Action (Special Ordinance under Statute D I)

1. The Academic Secretary shall have power to impose any precautionary measures set out in Section 2 below on any person pursuing a course of study leading to the award of a degree, diploma, or certificate of the University if the Academic Secretary considers that any such measures are necessary:

- (a) to ensure that a full and proper investigation can be carried out in relation to any matter (either under a procedure in the University or by the police); and/or
- (b) to protect any person while any matter is being dealt with under a procedure in the University or as part of a criminal process.

Subject to Sections 5 and 6 below, the Academic Secretary may impose precautionary measures under this section in relation to any matter for an initial specified period up to 21 days and thereafter for successive specified periods of up to two months.

2. The precautionary measures which the Academic Secretary may impose under Section 1 above are any one or more of the following measures:

- (a) excluding the person from some or all of the University's facilities and/or premises;
- (b) imposing conditions on the person (i) in connection with that person's use of the University's facilities and/or premises or that person's contact with other persons or (ii) in such other ways as may be considered necessary; and
- (c) suspending the person in question either in full or in part from her or his studies.

3. The power under Section 1 may be exercised by a deputy appointed in writing by the Academic Secretary but shall be reported to the Academic Secretary within 24 hours of its exercise. Where the Academic Secretary has appointed a deputy under this Special Ordinance, any reference to the Academic Secretary in this Special Ordinance shall be construed as referring to that appointed deputy.

4. As soon as practicable after the Academic Secretary has decided to impose precautionary measures on any person, the Academic Secretary shall notify that person in writing as to the precautionary measures which have been imposed and the grounds for imposing them, making clear at the same time that such measures do not constitute any penalty or sanction or imply any finding of wrongdoing. Except where the Academic Secretary provides otherwise, precautionary measures shall take immediate effect as soon as they are communicated to the person on whom they are imposed.

5. Before deciding whether or not to impose (or re-impose) any precautionary measures on any person under this Special Ordinance, the Academic Secretary shall give that person a reasonable opportunity to submit written representations, except that the Academic Secretary shall not be obliged to provide such an opportunity where it is not possible or appropriate to do so due to the urgent or sensitive nature of the matter; where a person on whom precautionary measures are imposed has not been given an opportunity to submit representations before the decision to impose the precautionary measures was taken, that person shall be entitled to request the Academic Secretary to review her or his decision by submitting written representations to the Academic Secretary within three days of receiving the notification under Section 4. On receipt of any request for a review under this section, the Academic Secretary will review her or his decision to impose precautionary measures and will notify the person seeking the review as to the outcome of the review within three days.

6. On the expiry of an initial, or any subsequent, period for which precautionary measures have been imposed, or if the Academic Secretary receives evidence of failure to comply with the terms of the precautionary measures, the Academic Secretary will review the position to determine whether or not the precautionary measures should be re-imposed for a further period and/or whether their terms should be revised, and the person who has been subject to the precautionary measures in question will be entitled to submit written representations and to be duly notified in accordance with Sections 4 and 5. In addition, a person on whom precautionary measures are imposed under this Special Ordinance shall at any stage have the right to request a review of the decision to impose such measures if there is a material change in the circumstances of the case. Such a request should be made in writing to the Academic Secretary, who will notify the person seeking the review as to the outcome of the review within five days of receiving the request for review.

7. The Academic Secretary may, at the request of the student, allow a term of residence, put the student in standing for the purposes of examination, or agree such other academic arrangement as he or she may think fit.

8. Any person on whom precautionary measures are imposed under this Special Ordinance may appeal any decision of the Academic Secretary or her or his deputy under this Special Ordinance to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor with responsibility for student matters, providing that all rights under this Special Ordinance to request the Academic Secretary to review her or his decision have first been exhausted. An appeal under this section may be initiated by sending to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor written grounds of appeal within five days of the date when the decision which is the subject of the appeal was notified to the appellant. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall issue a decision within five days of receiving the written grounds of appeal. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall have power to confirm, quash, or amend the original decision of the Academic Secretary or to refer it back to the Academic Secretary for further consideration. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor with responsibility for student matters may appoint another Pro-Vice-Chancellor to conduct an appeal initiated under this section on her or his behalf.

9. Any precautionary measures imposed under this Special Ordinance shall be reported to the College of the person on whom they have been imposed, and to the Council and the General Board, at the earliest opportunity.

III. That, *with effect from 1 January 2017*, the final sentence of Special Ordinance D (iv) 7 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 98) be amended and new Schedule D (iv) 7 inserted as follows:

The Advocate shall have the power to refer any student about whom a complaint is made under this section to a body or officer under another University procedure, as set out in the Schedule, and may defer any determination under this section pending that body's consideration of the matter.

SCHEDULE D (IV) 7

Amendment of this schedule is made by Grace.

Procedure to determine fitness to study

Procedure for handling cases of student harassment and sexual misconduct

IV. That, *with effect from 1 January 2017*, Regulation 4 of the Ordinance on initiation of proceedings before the University Tribunal, the Discipline Committee, or the Discipline Board (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 196) be amended so as to read:

4. If a member of the University is alleged to have committed an act or to have engaged in conduct for which he or she is liable to be prosecuted in a court of law and which is also a breach of the general regulations for discipline or other offence against the discipline of the University, the Advocate may, at her or his discretion, determine whether or when to bring a charge under the University's regulations, after taking into account whether, in her or his opinion, any proceedings against the member in a court of law in respect of that act or conduct are likely to be brought, and any other factors which appear relevant to her or him.

<i>21 November 2016</i>	L. K. BORYSIEWICZ, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	MARGARET GLENDENNING	RACHAEL PADMAN
	CHAD ALLEN	DAVID GOOD	SHIRLEY PEARCE
	ROSS ANDERSON	NICHOLAS HOLMES	MICHAEL PROCTOR
	RICHARD ANTHONY	ALICE HUTCHINGS	JOHN SHAKESHAF
	JEREMY CADDICK	UMANG KHANDELWAL	SUSAN SMITH
	R. CHARLES	STUART LAING	SARA WELLER
	ANNE DAVIS	MARK LEWISOHN	I. H. WHITE
AMATEY DOKU	SUSAN OOSTHUIZEN		
<i>18 November 2016</i>	L. K. BORYSIEWICZ, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	DAVID GOOD	RACHAEL PADMAN
	CHAD ALLEN	A. L. GREER	RICHARD PRAGER
	PHILIP ALLMENDINGER	ROBERTA HULDISCH	HELEN THOMPSON
	ANNE DAVIS	PATRICK MAXWELL	GRAHAM VIRGO
	ABIGAIL FOWDEN	MARTIN MILLETT	CHRIS YOUNG

Annex I

PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING CASES OF
STUDENT HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

1. Glossary

1.1. In this procedure the following terms shall have the meanings set out below:

Code of Conduct	The Code of Conduct for Students in respect of Harassment and Sexual Misconduct, as set out in Appendix 1
Complainant	A Student who has made a complaint under this procedure
Working Day	Any day except weekends, public holidays, and any other day when the University Offices are closed
OSCCA	The Office of Student Conduct, Complaints, and Appeals
Panel	The Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Panel (see paragraph 6.3.1)
Respondent	A Student about whom a complaint has been made under this procedure
Student	A person pursuing a course of study leading to the award of a degree, diploma, or certificate of the University

2. Scope of procedure

- 2.1. This procedure applies where a Student wishes to complain that the behaviour of another Student contravenes the Code of Conduct and constitutes an offence against the discipline of the University.
- 2.2. A complaint under this procedure may be brought by or against two or more Students where the complaint is about harassment or sexual misconduct arising from the same event(s). In such cases references in this procedure to the 'Complainant' or the 'Respondent' shall be construed as appropriate as referring to more than one person.
- 2.3. A Complainant may choose whether to raise a complaint under this procedure or under an equivalent College procedure, if applicable. However, it is the expectation of the Colleges and the University that this procedure will normally be used where:
 - (a) the complaint relates to sexual misconduct; or
 - (b) the complaint relates to conduct occurring in the context of University societies or sports clubs; or
 - (c) the complaint is brought against Students at more than two Colleges.
- 2.4. A complaint of harassment or sexual misconduct may be brought under this procedure whether or not it has been reported to the police (but see paragraph 3.6).
- 2.5. A complaint cannot be brought under this procedure where the Complainant has previously made a complaint about the same event(s) which has been dealt with under the University's Student Complaints Procedure or a College complaints procedure.
- 2.6. The General Board shall approve and keep under review explanatory notes, to be read in conjunction with this procedure. Those notes shall include a policy on the use of personal information under this procedure.

3. General principles

- 3.1. Any reference in this procedure to a University officer or other named role includes a deputy appointed by that officer or role-holder to exercise the functions assigned to that officer under this procedure.
- 3.2. The University will act reasonably in considering complaints under this procedure, having regard to the individual circumstances of the case. Every effort will be made to ensure that all parties are treated with fairness and dignity.
- 3.3. The time limits set out in this procedure may be varied by the Head of OSCCA for good reason, after consultation with the Complainant and the Respondent as appropriate.
- 3.4. A written decision issued in accordance with this procedure shall also include the reasons for that decision.
- 3.5. The Head of OSCCA may suspend the consideration of a complaint at any stage of this procedure and/or refer the matter for consideration under another procedure, after consultation with the Complainant and the Respondent as appropriate.
- 3.6. Where the events which are the subject of a complaint under this procedure have been reported to the police, the Head of OSCCA will normally suspend the procedure pending the outcome of any police investigation and/or criminal proceedings.
- 3.7. If the Head of OSCCA considers that precautionary action is necessary to protect any person or to enable a full and proper investigation of the complaint to be carried out, the Head of OSCCA may refer the matter to the Academic Secretary with a view to the Academic Secretary exercising the discretion under Special Ordinance D (v): Precautionary Action.

- 3.8. Where, at any point during this procedure, the Complainant and Respondent have agreed to seek alternative resolution of the complaint under paragraph 5 but have been unable to reach an agreed outcome, the Head of OSCCA will consider whether further action should be taken under this procedure and, if so, at what stage.
- 3.9. The Complainant may withdraw a complaint at any time during this procedure, by notifying the Head of OSCCA in writing. Where a complaint is withdrawn no further action will be taken under this procedure, but the Head of OSCCA may refer the matter for consideration under another University procedure.
- 3.10. None of the members of any body constituted under this procedure will have any previous knowledge of the case or any material connection with either the Complainant or the Respondent. The holders of the offices to which this procedure refers shall appoint standing deputies to act on their behalf in the event of any conflict of interest.

4. **Support and guidance**

- 4.1. The Head of OSCCA will provide advice at the outset to help both Complainants and Respondents to understand this procedure.
- 4.2. Complainants and Respondents are entitled to be accompanied by a supporter at any meeting held under this procedure. A supporter may be a tutor, student representative, or a friend. Complainants and Respondents are also entitled to be accompanied by a legal representative at such meetings.

5. **Alternative resolution**

- 5.1. Alternative resolution may be suitable for dealing with some cases that are brought under this procedure, and Colleges play a key role in supporting such processes. Wherever appropriate, Complainants are encouraged to seek alternative resolution to their concerns before bringing a formal complaint under this procedure.
- 5.2. Alternative resolution may not be appropriate for some complaints of harassment or sexual misconduct because of the seriousness of the allegations, or because the relationship between the parties has broken down. In such cases the complaint will be considered in accordance with the formal procedure (paragraph 6).

6. **Formal procedure**

6.1. *Raising a complaint with OSCCA*

- 6.1.1. A Student who wishes to make a complaint under this procedure must do so in writing. The Complainant should set out details of the complaint together with details of any attempts at alternative resolution, if appropriate.
- 6.1.2. The complaint should be addressed to the Head of OSCCA.
- 6.1.3. A complaint must be made within three months of the occurrence of the events which are the subject of the complaint (but see paragraph 3.3).
- 6.1.4. On receipt the complaint will be considered initially by a group comprising the Head of OSCCA, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), and the Secretary of the Senior Tutors' Committee. The convener of the group will be the Head of OSCCA. The group will determine (by a majority decision) whether to:
 - (a) refer the complaint for investigation under paragraph 6.2 of this procedure;
 - (b) dismiss the complaint because it is considered to be without merit, or vexatious, frivolous, or malicious;
 - (c) reject the complaint because it does not fall within the scope of this procedure;
 - (d) decline to refer the complaint for investigation under this procedure and recommend to the Complainant that the complaint is raised under a College procedure;
 - (e) decline to refer the complaint for investigation under this procedure for other reasons;
 - (f) recommend to the Complainant that alternative resolution of the complaint is sought.
- 6.1.5. The Head of OSCCA will notify the Complainant in writing of the decision of the group within ten Working Days of receipt of the written complaint.
- 6.1.6. In the event that a decision of the group falls within paragraph 6.1.4 (b)–(f) and the Complainant is unhappy with that decision, the Complainant shall have the right to request a review of that decision in accordance with paragraph 6.6. The review will be considered by a Panel appointed in accordance with paragraph 6.3.1.

6.2. *Investigation*

- 6.2.1. Where a complaint is referred for investigation, the Head of OSCCA will appoint an investigator to carry out an investigation of the case. The role of the investigator is to prepare a report, which sets out the undisputed facts of the case and any points of difference and makes recommendations based on the evidence and policies in place.
- 6.2.2. The investigator shall conduct the investigation as the investigator thinks fit, within the context of the general principles set out in paragraph 3 and the explanatory notes issued by the General Board under paragraph 2.6. The investigator may interview (with their consent) the Complainant and the Respondent and any other person involved in the events which are the subject of the complaint and consider or request any other evidence which appears to the investigator to be relevant. The investigator will aim to complete the investigation within twenty Working Days of the complaint being referred for investigation, but some cases may require longer, in which case the investigator will keep the Complainant and the Respondent informed about progress.

- 6.2.3. On receipt of the investigator's report, the Head of OSCCA may:
- (a) refer the complaint for consideration by a Harassment and Sexual Assault Panel under paragraph 6.3; or
 - (b) decide to deal with the complaint under paragraph 6.3 without reference to the Panel.
- 6.3. *Consideration of the case*
- 6.3.1. If the case is referred to a Panel, the Registry will appoint three members of the University, one of whom shall be a Student, to serve.
- 6.3.2. The Head of OSCCA or the Panel shall consider the complaint and the report prepared by the investigator. The Head of OSCCA or the Panel may meet (with their consent) the Complainant and/or the Respondent and any other person involved in the events which are the subject of the complaint.
- 6.3.3. Having considered the complaint and the report, and following any meeting(s) under paragraph 6.3.2, the Head of OSCCA or the Panel (by a majority decision) may:
- (a) refer the complaint for consideration under the University's disciplinary procedures (see paragraph 6.5);
 - (b) dismiss the complaint because it is considered to be without merit, or vexatious, frivolous, or malicious;
 - (c) decide that no further action should be taken under this procedure;
 - (d) recommend to the Complainant and the Respondent that they should seek alternative resolution of the complaint;
 - (e) propose one or more of the resolutions set out in paragraph 6.4.1.
- 6.3.4. The Complainant and the Respondent will be notified in writing of the decision of the Head of OSCCA or the Panel under paragraph 6.3.3 within twenty Working Days.
- 6.3.5. In the event that a decision of the Head of OSCCA or the Panel falls within paragraph 6.3.3 (b)–(e) and the Complainant is unhappy with that decision, the Complainant shall have the right to request a review of that decision in accordance with paragraph 6.6. The review will be considered by a committee of three persons appointed by the Registry, one as Chair of the committee.
- 6.4. *Resolutions*
- 6.4.1. The Head of OSCCA or the Panel may propose a resolution to the complaint, which may include (but are not limited to) the following:
- (a) that the Respondent will agree to abide by a conduct agreement issued by the Head of OSCCA, a record of which will be retained by the University and which may be taken into account if a further complaint is made against the Respondent under this procedure;
 - (b) with the prior approval of the relevant body, that the Respondent will take a period of intermission from study;
 - (c) that the Respondent will attend behaviour awareness training or workshops.
- 6.4.2. Both the Complainant and the Respondent must agree to the proposed resolution of the complaint. The Head of OSCCA will facilitate the process of reaching agreement between the Complainant and the Respondent and will issue written confirmation of any agreed resolution(s) to the Complainant and the Respondent.
- 6.4.3. If attempts at reaching an agreed resolution are unsuccessful the Head of OSCCA shall refer the complaint for consideration under the University's disciplinary procedures in accordance with paragraph 6.5.
- 6.4.4. If there are grounds to believe that the Respondent has failed to comply with the terms of an agreed resolution, the Head of OSCCA shall determine whether the complaint should be referred for consideration under the University's disciplinary procedures in accordance with paragraph 6.5.
- 6.5. *Disciplinary proceedings*
- 6.5.1. Where the Head of OSCCA or the Panel refers a complaint for consideration under the University's disciplinary procedures, it will be referred to the University Advocate in accordance with Special Ordinance D (iv) or to any other relevant officer. The University Advocate or other relevant officer will be provided with a copy of all relevant material, including the report of the investigator and a copy of the decision of the Head of OSCCA or the Panel.
- 6.5.2. The University Advocate or other relevant officer may decide to:
- (a) invoke disciplinary proceedings against the Respondent;
 - (b) refer the case back to the Head of OSCCA for further attempts at an agreed resolution;
 - (c) take no further action.
- 6.5.3. The Complainant and the Respondent will be notified in writing of the decision of the University Advocate or other relevant officer within twenty Working Days.
- 6.5.4. Where the University Advocate or other relevant officer decides to take no further action, the Complainant shall have the right to request a review of that decision in accordance with paragraph 6.6. The review will be considered by a committee of three persons appointed by the Registry, one as Chair of the committee.

- 6.5.5. Where disciplinary proceedings are brought against the Respondent, a copy of all relevant material, including the report of the investigator and a copy of the decision of the Head of OSCCA or the Panel will be made available to the relevant disciplinary body.
- 6.6. *Review*
- 6.6.1. In accordance with paragraphs 6.1.6, 6.3.5, or 6.5.4 of this procedure, the Complainant may seek the review of a decision made under this procedure. The review will be carried out by the body specified in the relevant paragraph.
- 6.6.2. A request for a review shall be made in writing and sent to the Registry within 15 Working Days of written notification of the decision (unless, for good reason, the Registry permits a longer period). The request for review shall specify the grounds for review which may be only one or more of the following:
- (a) that there was material procedural irregularity in the consideration of the Complainant's case;
 - (b) that there was bias or prejudice on the part of the decision-maker;
 - (c) that the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable decision-maker could have reached on the available evidence;
 - (d) that fresh material evidence is available, which was not available and/or not presented for good reason at the time of the original decision.
- 6.6.3. The request for a review should be accompanied by supporting documentation.
- 6.6.4. The reviewing body will consider the request for review and the documentation available to the original decision-maker. The reviewing body may, at its discretion, hold a hearing and regulate arrangements for the conduct of the hearing.
- 6.6.5. The reviewing body will issue an adjudication in writing as soon as possible, which shall normally be within twenty Working Days of the receipt of the request for a review or (if a hearing is held) within ten Working Days of the hearing. The reviewing body shall have power to confirm, quash, or amend the original decision or refer it back to the decision-maker for further consideration.
7. **Reporting**
- 7.1. An annual report of complaints considered under this procedure will be made to the Council, the General Board, and the Colleges, in which references to individual cases will be made anonymously.
- 7.2. The Head of OSCCA will be responsible for the regular review of this procedure.

Appendix 1

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR STUDENTS IN RESPECT OF HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

The University is committed to providing an environment that is free from discrimination and affirms the right of all members to be treated with dignity and respect. The University will not tolerate harassment of one member of its community by another nor sexual misconduct. The University takes allegations of harassment and sexual misconduct very seriously and may take action, including disciplinary action, in response to a complaint from a student.

The University defines harassment as single or repeated incidents involving unwanted or unwarranted conduct towards another person which it is reasonable to think would have the effect of (i) violating that other's dignity or (ii) creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating, or offensive environment for that other.¹

Harassment may be verbal, psychological, or physical, in person or via a virtual platform, or through other methods of contact. Harassment may occur in the course of an academic, sporting, social, cultural, or other activity either within the Precincts of the University² or elsewhere in the context of a person's membership of the University, or in circumstances where the victim of the harassment is a member, officer, or employee of the University or a College.

Under this Code of Conduct unacceptable behaviour, whether intentional or not, can take a variety of different forms. The following descriptions are not exhaustive, but give an indication of the types of behaviour which the University considers to be unacceptable:

- making sexually offensive comments about dress or appearance, the display or distribution of sexually explicit material, or demands for sexual favours;
- engaging in harassment on the grounds of a person's sexuality (or assumptions about a person's sexuality) including making derogatory homophobic, transphobic, or biphobic remarks or jokes aimed at a particular person, offensive comments relating to a person's sexuality, refusal to acknowledge a person's gender or identity, or threats to disclose a person's sexuality to others;
- making offensive references to a person's race, ethnicity, skin colour, religion or nationality, dress, culture, background or customs which have the effect of ridiculing or undermining an individual or fostering hatred and/or prejudice towards individuals or particular groups;

¹ See Regulation 6 of the General Regulations for Discipline.

² See Regulation 2 of the regulations for Residence and Precincts of the University.

- ignoring, disparaging, or ridiculing a person because of mistaken assumptions about their capabilities, or making offensive reference to an individual's appearance, in the context of their disability;
- controlling or coercive behaviour, such as pressure to subscribe to a particular political or religious belief.

Online harassment may take the form of intimidating, offensive, or graphic posts on social media sites or chat rooms, or communications by email, text, or instant messaging.

Sexual misconduct includes the following, whether or not within a sexual or romantic relationship, including where consent to some form of sexual activity has been given and then withdrawn, or if consent has been given on previous occasions:

- sexual intercourse or engaging in a sexual act without consent;
- attempting to engage in sexual intercourse or engaging in a sexual act without consent;
- sharing private sexual materials of another person without consent;
- kissing without consent;
- touching inappropriately through clothes without consent;
- inappropriately showing sexual organs to another person;
- repeatedly following another person without good reason;
- making unwanted remarks of a sexual nature.

Annex II

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON HANDLING CASES OF STUDENT HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

These notes should be read in conjunction with the Procedure for Handling Cases of Student Harassment and Sexual Misconduct and the Code of Conduct on Harassment and Sexual Misconduct. If there is any conflict between these notes and the procedure, the procedure takes precedence.

The numbers below refer to the numbers of the paragraphs in the version of the procedure approved on [date].

Any questions about the procedure and these notes should be directed to the Head of the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals (OSCCA) in the first instance, at:

Address: Head of OSCCA
Student Registry
4 Mill Lane
Cambridge
CB2 1RZ

Tel: +44 (0)1223 (7)61816

Email: oscca@admin.cam.ac.uk

2. Scope of procedure

- 2.1. This procedure applies only to complaints by students about the conduct of other students. The Head of OSCCA will be able to advise on the correct procedure for other types of complaint made by or about students.

Because this procedure places an emphasis on reaching consensual resolution, complaints made by a third party and anonymous complaints will not normally be accepted (see paragraph 2 of the Policy in the Appendix). College Tutors and others may wish to discuss alternatives to the use of this procedure with the Head of OSCCA.

In cases where a complaint is referred for consideration under the University's disciplinary procedures, there are different disciplinary procedures applicable depending on whether the Respondent is a matriculated student or not.

Matriculated students, i.e. all those pursuing a degree course, will be subject to the University's General Regulations for Discipline and the disciplinary procedure set out in the University's Statutes and Ordinances.

Non-matriculated students studying for a diploma or certificate will be subject to the disciplinary procedures of the University institution responsible for their course of study.¹

For the purposes of the University's General Regulations for Discipline, a definition of harassment is set out in Regulation 6 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 191). This definition covers acts of sexual misconduct. Under Regulation 6, a member of the University or person *in statu pupillari* commits a breach of the General Regulations for Discipline if that person engages in an act of harassment against another member, officer, or employee of the University or a College in any circumstances.

Complaints about the behaviour of officers of the Cambridge University Students' Union or the Graduate Union in the course of their duties should be referred to the relevant Union.

¹ See the Administering Bodies under the regulations for Diplomas and Certificates open to Non-members of the University (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 574).

- 2.3. Sub-paragraph (c) anticipates a complaint in which there is more than one Complainant and/or Respondent, in accordance with paragraph 2.2.
- 2.4. Bringing a complaint under this procedure does not prevent the Complainant from reporting the matter to the police at any time. See also paragraph 3.6 concerning suspension of this procedure pending the outcome of any police investigation and/or criminal proceedings. The University will support the Complainant in reaching a decision on whether to make a complaint to the police.

See the Appendix regarding the exceptional circumstances in which the Head of OSCAA may report the matter to the police.

- 2.5. A complaint that has been dismissed by a College will be treated as one which has been dealt with by the College for the purpose of this procedure.

3. General principles

- 3.2. A Complainant who believes that he or she has suffered any reprisal, or has received a threat of reprisal, as a result of making a complaint in good faith should raise the matter with the Head of OSCCA.

The Head of OSCCA will keep the Complainant and the Respondent informed of the general progress of the complaint. Where a complaint under this procedure leads to disciplinary proceedings, the Complainant will be kept informed of the progress in the proceedings and will be formally notified of the outcome of any disciplinary hearing and any sanctions applied.

- 3.5. The Head of OSCCA may suspend the consideration of a complaint and recommend to the Complainant that he or she should raise it under an external complaints procedure (see also paragraph 6.1.4 concerning College complaints procedures).

The Head of OSCCA may refer a case for consideration under one or more of the following internal procedures:

- the University's Fitness to Study procedure (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 225) or an equivalent College procedure
- the University's Fitness to Practise procedures (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 207 and p. 215)

- 3.6. *Guidance for Higher Education Institutions*² recommends that, if a matter is being dealt with under the criminal process, then, save for taking any necessary precautionary action (see paragraph 3.7), any internal disciplinary process should be suspended until the criminal process is at an end.

- 3.7. Under Special Ordinance D (v), the Academic Secretary has authority to take precautionary action where any matter is being dealt with under a University procedure or as part of a criminal process.

Where the risk is not considered high enough to require the suspension of a student in full from the student's studies, it may still be necessary to exclude the student from certain University facilities or premises, or impose conditions on the student's access to such facilities and premises. If appropriate, a College or Colleges may be consulted and agree to exclude the student from certain College facilities or accommodation. Precautionary action may include a requirement that the student should have no contact of any kind with named individuals, for example, the complainant or potential witnesses.

This action is not intended to be a punishment and it does not make any presumption of wrongdoing. It is to protect both parties whilst the allegation is being dealt with under a University procedure or as part of a criminal process, and/or to ensure that a full and proper investigation (whether by the police or the University) can be carried out.

If a student breaches any restrictions that have been imposed, this may be a breach of the General Regulations for Discipline. A breach can be considered as part of any subsequent University investigation of the original complaint or as a separate matter. A breach of the restrictions may be considered to increase the level of risk to the University community and therefore may increase the level of restriction subsequently imposed upon a student.

- 3.9. A Complainant who is considering whether to withdraw a complaint may wish to discuss the matter with those able to offer support as listed in the note to paragraph 4.2.

- 3.10. No person serving under this procedure as a member of a decision-making body or as an investigator will have any previous knowledge of the case or any material connection to the Complainant or the Respondent. Normally no person who is a member of the Department/Faculty or College of the Complainant or the Respondent will be involved in consideration of the case. The Complainant or the Respondent (or their representatives) will be entitled to object to the involvement of an individual for good cause. Standing deputies are appointed on a rolling basis, without reference to a specific complaint.

² *Guidance for Higher Education Institutions on How to Handle Alleged Student Misconduct which may also Constitute a Criminal Offence* prepared and written by Pinsent Masons and published by Universities UK in October 2016.

4. **Support and guidance**

- 4.2. The Head of OSCCA will be able to direct both Complainants and Respondents to the following sources of advice and support:

personal support available within the collegiate University and in the local community

guidance and support for seeking alternative resolution of the complaint, including mediation

legal advice and representation available free of charge from a panel of volunteers in the Faculty of Law; a list is available from the Secretary to the Faculty Board of Law.

The Appendix sets out the University's policy on the use of personal information under this procedure. A copy of the Appendix should normally be provided to Complainants, Respondents, and witnesses to events relating to the complaint so that they understand how their personal information will be used and the limits on confidentiality. The policy explains how information may be shared with certain University and College officers.

The Complainant and the Respondent can be accompanied to any meeting under the procedure by a College tutor, a student representative, or a friend. 'Student representative' in this context means a CUSU or GU officer or an advisor with the Student Union Advice Service. In addition, each is entitled, if they wish, to be accompanied by a legal representative; the officer convening a first meeting under the procedure will normally remind the Complainant/Respondent of this in writing.

5. **Alternative resolution**

See the note on paragraph 4.2 above.

6. **Formal procedure**

- 6.1.1. A formal written complaint should be addressed to the Head of OSCCA and sent to the postal or email address above, using the form available online at [URL]. Anonymous complaints will not normally be accepted; see the Appendix.

- 6.1.4. If a complaint does not fall within the scope of this procedure, it may nevertheless be referred for consideration under another procedure; see the note on paragraph 3.5 above.

See paragraph 2.3 concerning the complaints which would ordinarily be considered under this University procedure; the group may agree to consult with the Complainant and/or the College before deciding whether to decline a complaint and recommend its referral for consideration under that College's equivalent procedure.

The University reserves the right, after due consideration, to take no further action and may decline to refer the matter for investigation under this procedure for any reason, for example, because it lacks the necessary investigatory powers or forensic capability.

- 6.2.1. The Head of OSCCA will appoint an investigator from a pool of investigators (which may include external investigators) who have undergone training in investigating complaints under this procedure.

- 6.2.2. The following sets out the normal format of the investigation. The investigator will offer to have individual meetings with the Complainant and with the Respondent, and may also seek to have a meeting with any witnesses. Witnesses may be accompanied at a meeting by a supporter and/or legal representative in the same way as the Complainant and the Respondent are entitled to be accompanied. Each meeting will be minuted and the minutes agreed with those present as a correct record (or any disagreement noted), at which point any other record of the meeting will be destroyed.

- 6.2.3. The Head of OSCCA will normally refer a complaint alleging sexual misconduct to the Panel.

- 6.3.2. Both the Head of OSCCA and the Panel have discretion as to whom they meet.

- 6.3.5. The Registry shall normally appoint members from among those appointed to serve on the panels of the Discipline Committee and University Tribunal and as reviewers under the Student Complaints Procedure.

- 6.4.1. See the Appendix. A conduct agreement may include an undertaking by the Respondent to refrain from contact with the Complainant for a specified period of time.

The relevant body for the purpose of the consideration of a request for intermission will be the Board of Graduate Studies³ for applications concerning graduate students⁴ and the Council's Applications Committee for applications concerning other students.⁵ Approval may be granted by Chair's action on behalf of the relevant body.

- 6.4.4. Where there is evidence of conduct constituting a failure to comply with an agreed resolution, the Head of OSCCA may decide that the original complaint should be referred for consideration under disciplinary procedures under paragraph 6.4.4. The Head of OSCCA may also consider whether a referral under the University's disciplinary procedures should be made in respect of the conduct which is alleged to constitute a breach of the terms of the agreed resolution.

³ See the regulations for the Board of Graduate Studies, *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 120.

⁴ See the General Regulations for Admission as a Graduate Student, *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 421.

⁵ See the regulations for Allowances to Candidates for Examinations, *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 229.

- 6.5.1. See the Appendix.
- 6.5.4. See the note on paragraph 6.3.5 above.
- 6.5.5. See the Appendix.
- 6.6.5. Save where the reviewing body refers the original decision back to the decision-maker for further consideration, the adjudication in writing that is issued by the reviewing body will complete the University's internal procedures in relation to the complaint and, when the adjudication is sent to the Complainant, it should be accompanied by a Completion of Procedures letter in a form which accords with guidance published by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator from time to time.

Appendix: Policy on the use of personal information under the Procedure for Handling Cases of Student Harassment and Sexual Misconduct

A copy is to be provided to the Complainant, the Respondent, and any witnesses at the earliest contact.

1. The overall purpose of processing personal data in the context of the investigation and resolution of complaints of harassment and sexual misconduct is to decide what steps can appropriately be taken in response to such complaints. Personal data will be disclosed only to those persons who need to see such data for the purposes of conducting an investigation, determining or recommending a resolution, or deciding what other steps can appropriately be taken. Such persons may include the Head of OSCCA, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), the Secretary of the Senior Tutors' Committee, the Academic Secretary, members of the Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Panel, the investigator assigned to the case, solicitors in the University's Legal Services Office, the University Advocate (or other relevant officer), and members of any committee constituted under the procedure for the purposes of considering a review. An investigation under the procedure is not intended to arrive at a conclusion as to whether a breach of disciplinary regulations has been committed. In the circumstances, documentation generated in the course of an investigation under the procedure may not be disclosed in full to the Complainant and the Respondent except in so far as is reasonably necessary to conduct and to progress a fair investigation or a person has explicitly consented to the disclosure of personal data to the extent that the data relate to her or him.

2. In the interest of fairness to all parties, the University will not normally accept an anonymous complaint under this procedure. Where a complaint is brought under the procedure, the identity of the Complainant may be provided to the Respondent (and the Respondent's supporter and legal representative, if applicable), together with sufficient information to enable the Respondent to understand the gist or substance of the complaint. If you have concerns about the sharing of information between the Complainant and Respondent you should seek advice from the Head of OSCCA.

3. For both the student making the complaint and the student against whom the complaint has been made, the University will seek your written consent before providing the following people with a summary of the complaint, including your name, so that they are aware of the complaint and able to assist in providing you with support:

Your College Senior Tutor
Your Personal Tutor or Graduate Tutor

In some cases, your written consent may also be sought to disclose information to the following:

Your Head of Department or Faculty
Your Supervisor (if you are a research student)

4. The investigator's report will normally be released to the Complainant and the Respondent, but the minutes of any individual meetings will not usually be disclosed with the report. If the matter subsequently becomes the subject of disciplinary proceedings and the decision is taken to charge the Respondent, the Complainant's written complaint and the minutes of any individual meetings with the Complainant and the Respondent and/or with any witnesses will form part of the evidence in those proceedings and can therefore be expected to be disclosed to both sides in full at that point.

5. The University will normally respect the wishes of a person who is the victim of a crime and does not wish to report the matter to the police. However, in exceptional circumstances, where the facts as they emerge give rise to concerns that there is a significant risk to members of the community, the Head of OSCCA may decide to refer the matter to the police. Unless there are exceptional reasons related to the case, the Head of OSCCA will normally inform the Complainant of the intention to report the matter to the police and give reasons before doing so.

6. The University may be required to provide as evidence in any subsequent court proceedings information regarding the complaint, including any admission made in the course of this procedure (and/or any made during mediation or any subsequent disciplinary proceedings). Any admission made in the course of this procedure may also be used as evidence in University disciplinary proceedings, save that the University will abide by the confidentiality of any mediation and anything which is said in the course of mediation will not be used in evidence in any University disciplinary proceedings.

7. Following completion of the procedure, the investigator's report and a record of the outcome, including any conduct agreement entered into by the Respondent, will be retained securely by the Head of OSCCA usually for not more than one year beyond the Respondent's period of study at the University. This information will be used for the purposes of responding to any complaints regarding the application of this procedure as well as for compiling anonymous statistics regarding its use. Further, where any complaint is subsequently submitted under this procedure by the same Complainant, or by a different complainant, in respect of the same Respondent, giving the University reasonable cause for concern regarding an emerging pattern of potential harassment and/or sexual misconduct, this information may be taken into account by the Head of OSCCA or the Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Panel, as appropriate, in reaching a decision under paragraph 6.3.3 of the procedure, and may also be provided to the University Advocate or other relevant officer if relevant for the purposes of conducting disciplinary proceedings or referral for consideration under another procedure under paragraph 3.5 of this procedure.

8. Nothing in this policy is intended to prejudice any rights of access to personal data which any person may have under the Data Protection Act 1998 or otherwise.

9. If you have any questions or concerns about this policy, please contact the Head of OSCCA in the first instance.

GRACES

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 26 November 2016

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on 26 November 2016.

That the following persons be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts under the provisions of Statute B II 2:

1. ALEXANDRE SAMIR BOUAYAD, Fellow of St John's College.
2. MEREDITH ALLISON CROWLEY, Fellow of St John's College and University Lecturer in the Faculty of Economics.
3. MICHAEL FRANCISCUS LUCAS DE VOLDER, Fellow of St John's College and University Lecturer in the Department of Engineering.
4. HANNAH JANE JOYCE, Fellow of St John's College and University Lecturer in the Department of Engineering.
5. RICHARD JAMES GILBERTSON, Fellow of St John's College and Li Ka Shing Professor of Oncology in the Department of Oncology.

ACTA

Approval of Grace submitted to the Regent House on 9 November 2016

The Grace submitted to the Regent House on 9 November 2016 (*Reporter*, 6443, 2016–17, p. 101) was approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 18 November 2016.

J. W. NICHOLLS, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Corpus Christi College

Elected to a Category C Fellowship with immediate effect:

Professor I. David Abrahams, N. M. Rothschild & Sons
Professor of Mathematics, and Director of the Isaac
Newton Institute for the Mathematical Sciences

Vacancies

Girton College: Secretary to the Council (50% of full-time); salary: £49,230–£52,219 *pro-rata*; closing date: 5 December 2016 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.girton.cam.ac.uk/vacancies>

Pembroke College: Schools Liaison and Admissions Support Officer; tenure: fixed term for three years; salary: £19,486–£25,298; closing date: 6 January 2017 at 5 p.m.; further details: <http://www.pem.cam.ac.uk/the-college/job-vacancies/>

Peterhouse: Graduate Research Studentships, 2017; tenure: for the normal duration of the student's degree, up to a maximum of four years; funding: may cover University and College fees plus maintenance at the same level as the Arts and Humanities Research Council awards (currently £14,296 per year for doctoral students, and £10,722 per year for M.Phil. students) subject to circumstances; closing date: 4 January 2017 at 5 p.m.; further details: <https://www.research-studentship.pet.cam.ac.uk>

SOCIETIES, ETC.

Cambridge Society for the Application of Research

Professor Raymond Goldstein FRS FInstP, Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, will give a lecture entitled *Leonardo, Rapunzel, and the physics of hair*, at 7.30 p.m. on Monday, 28 November 2016, in the Wolfson Lecture Theatre, Churchill College, Storeys Way, CB3 0DS.

Further details are available at <http://www.csar.org.uk>.

EXTERNAL NOTICES

University of Oxford

Merton College: Academic Registrar; permanent post; salary: £40,000–£47,000 (discretionary range to £50,000); closing date: 8 December 2016 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.merton.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

St Anne's College: Database and Research Officer; salary: £32,245; closing date: 30 November 2016 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.st-annes.ox.ac.uk/about/job-opportunities>

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). Advice and information on content submission is available on the *Reporter* website at <http://www.reporter.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.