

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6449

WEDNESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2016

VOL CXLVII No 15

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	267	Second Vet. M.B. Examination, Michaelmas Term 2016	277
Discussion on Tuesday, 20 December 2016	267	Final Vet. M.B. Examination, Part II, 2016	279
Amending Statutes for Clare College	267	Final Vet. M.B. Examination, Part III, 2016	279
Elections to the Council in classes (b) and (c)	267	Postgraduate Certificate in Education, 2016	279
Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the consideration of student complaints of harassment and sexual misconduct: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	269	Approved for degrees	280
Teaching Excellence Framework – Year 2	270	Obituaries	
Research Excellence Framework: consultation	270	Obituary Notices	283
Annual Reports	270	Graces	
Vacancies, appointments, etc.		Grace submitted to the Regent House on 14 December 2016	283
Electors to the Janeway Professorship of Economics	270	Acta	
Electors to the Herchel Smith Professorship of Biochemistry: Amendment	271	Result of ballot on Grace 3 of 13 July 2016	283
Election	271	Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 30 November 2016	283
Vacancies in the University	271	<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Regulations for examinations		Fly-sheets reprinted	
Classical Tripos, Part II	271	Ballot on Grace 3 of 13 July 2016: Fly-sheets	284
Economics Tripos	272	Report of Discussion	
Engineering Tripos, Part IIb: Correction	272	Tuesday, 6 December 2016	284
Form and conduct of examinations		College Notices	
Historical Tripos, 2017	272	Vacancies	287
Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (New Curriculum Regulations)	273	Elections	287
Class-lists, etc.		External Notices	
Master of Finance, 2016	274	University of Oxford	287
Second M.B. Examination, Michaelmas Term 2016	275		
Final M.B. Examination, Part I, Pathology, Michaelmas Term 2016	277		
Final M.B. Examination, Part II, Clinical Paediatrics, Obstetrics, and Gynaecology, Michaelmas Term 2016	277		
Final M.B. Examination, Part I (New Regulations), Michaelmas Term 2016	277		



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

- 14 December, *Wednesday*. Last ordinary number of the *Reporter* in the Michaelmas Term.
 19 December, *Monday*. Michaelmas Term ends.
 20 December, *Tuesday*. Discussion at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House (see below).
 25 December, *Sunday*. Christmas Day. Scarlet Day.
 5 January, *Thursday*. Lent Term begins.
 11 January, *Wednesday*. First ordinary number of the *Reporter* in the Lent Term.
 17 January, *Tuesday*. Full Term begins.

Discussion on Tuesday, 20 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, 20 December 2016, at 2 p.m. for the discussion of:

1. Report of the General Board, dated 30 November 2016, on the rescinding of the Medical and Veterinary Sciences Tripos and the introduction of two new Triposes, the Medical Sciences Tripos and the Veterinary Sciences Tripos (*Reporter*, 6447, 2016–17, p. 189).

Amending Statutes for Clare College

12 December 2016

The Vice-Chancellor begs leave to refer to his Notice of 10 November 2016 (*Reporter*, 6444, 2016–17, p. 104), concerning proposed amending Statutes for Clare College. He hereby gives notice that in the opinion of the Council the proposed Statutes make no alteration of any Statute which affects the University, and do not require the consent of the University; that the interests of the University are not prejudiced by them, and that the Council has resolved to take no action upon them, provided that the Council will wish to reconsider the proposed Statutes if they have not been submitted to the Privy Council by 12 December 2017.

Elections to the Council in classes (b) and (c)

9 December 2016

The Vice-Chancellor announces that the following persons have been elected to serve as members of the Council in classes (b) and (c) from 1 January 2017 for four years:

Class (b) (Professors and Readers): Professor NICHOLAS JOHN GAY, *CHR*, and Professor FIONA EVE KARET, *DAR*.

Class (c) (members of the Regent House other than Heads of Colleges, Professors, and Readers): Dr STEPHEN JOHN COWLEY, *EM*, Dr PHILIPPA JANE ROGERSON, *CAI*, Dr MARK RODERICK WORMALD, *PEM*, and Ms JOCELYN MARGARET WYBURD, *CL*.

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

Election in class (b)

Number of valid votes cast: 939 (no invalid votes) (Quota: 313)

	First count	Transfer of Professor Gay's surplus	Second count	RESULT
Professor NICHOLAS JOHN GAY, <i>CHR</i>	366	−53	313	FIRST ELECTED
Professor FIONA EVE KARET, <i>DAR</i>	302	+15.48	317.48	SECOND ELECTED
Professor ALISON GAIL SMITH, <i>CC</i>	271	+35.82	306.82	
Non-transferable		+1.7	1.7	
TOTAL	939		939	

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the consideration of student complaints of harassment and sexual misconduct: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

12 December 2016

The Council has considered the remarks made at the Discussion on 6 December 2016 (p. 284) concerning the above Report (*Reporter*, 6445, 2016–17, p. 132).

The Council notes the remarks made by Dame Barbara Stocking, Ms Sebatindira, Dr Wormald, and Professor Dame Athene Donald in support of the Report's proposals as part of the collegiate University's response to cases of harassment and sexual misconduct.

The Council agrees with Dr Freer that, in dealing with a complaint concerning such alleged misconduct, the rights of both the student making a complaint and the student about whom the complaint is made should be recognized and that both students should be treated fairly. Currently there is only one formal response to such a complaint by the University, namely referral for consideration as to whether to bring a charge under the University's disciplinary procedures. If the procedure for handling complaints by one student about the conduct of another student that has been proposed in this Report is approved, there will be an alternative to the disciplinary route; as it is not a disciplinary procedure, the possible outcomes of this procedure are a number of resolutions agreed with the parties, not penalties. The procedure put forward in this Report builds on models of similar procedures operated in universities in the USA that have successfully offered a means of resolving such complaints.

The Report proposes, in recommendation IV, an amendment to ensure that when a complaint is also the subject of a police investigation or a criminal prosecution, the University Advocate has discretion on whether and when to bring a charge. As the Report notes in paragraph 8(b), in line with UUK guidance, the University 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. The procedure for handling cases of harassment and sexual misconduct between students also applies these principles.¹

The proposed procedure thus provides a way of addressing a complaint by one student about another that, for whatever reason, does not become a matter before the criminal court. The focus is on consensus; both parties must be willing to participate in order for the procedure to work as intended.² The University Advocate has no role in the operation of the procedure; the University Advocate will become involved only where a complaint is referred on to the Advocate for consideration on whether to bring a disciplinary charge.

Although no penalties can be imposed under the proposed procedure, the potential risk of self-incrimination through admissions made during investigation of the complaint is acknowledged. The procedure therefore confirms that students have a right to legal representation and to seek advice and support,³ and that they must be made aware of the ways in which their personal information could be used as a result of participating in the investigation of the complaint under the procedure (including the risk of an admission being used in a later police investigation or criminal court case, or in an internal disciplinary case).⁴

Where a complaint is brought under the procedure, the identity of the complainant may be provided to the person about whom the complaint is made, together with sufficient information to enable that person to understand the gist or substance of the complaint,⁵ but a respondent will be free to choose not to co-operate with the handling of the complaint going forward. The General Board is under a duty to keep under review the explanatory notes accompanying the procedure and the question of the extent to which any adverse inference may be drawn from a respondent's silence will be specifically addressed in short order in the next iteration.

The Council notes the relevance of much of Dr Freer's remarks to the work of the review committee tasked with revising the University's student disciplinary procedures; these comments will be referred to the review committee for consideration in its ongoing work.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 283) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report.

¹ Paragraph 3.6 of the procedure and the corresponding paragraph of the explanatory notes. Whilst those operating the procedure will endeavour to establish at the outset whether or not a complaint is going to be submitted to the police, it is recognized that a complainant might take the matter to the police halfway through an internal investigation by the University, resulting in the suspension of the University procedure.

² Paragraph 6.4.2 of the procedure and the corresponding paragraph of the explanatory notes.

³ Paragraph 4.2 of the procedure and the corresponding paragraph of the explanatory notes.

⁴ See the policy on the use of personal information, appended to the explanatory notes, which explains the way in which information will be shared, particularly paragraph 6 in connection with police investigations and criminal prosecutions.

⁵ See paragraph 4 of the policy on the use of personal information, appended to the explanatory notes.

Teaching Excellence Framework – Year 2

12 December 2016

Further to the Council's Notice dated 11 July 2016 (*Reporter*, 6433, 2015–16, p. 749), the Council and the General Board, on the recommendation of the Planning and Resources Committee and the General Board's Education Committee, and with the support of the Colleges' Committee, have agreed that the University will participate in Year Two of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF).

In Year One of the TEF, providers who successfully completed a quality assessment review were awarded the first level of TEF and will be able to raise their fees in line with inflation from the 2017–18 academic year. The University agreed to take part in Year One and anticipates that the tuition fee will be raised to £9,250 for those students starting their undergraduate studies in October 2017.

For Year Two, institutions which apply will be rated Gold, Silver, or Bronze¹ based on metrics of graduate employment, student retention, and student satisfaction as determined by aspects of the National Student Survey, as well as on a narrative. The award of a rating will be announced in Spring 2017 and will last for three years. For the first year, the ratings will not carry any differentiation in fees. All institutions participating in TEF2 which meet basic standards will therefore be allowed to raise fees in line with inflation for 2018–19. Institutions which do not participate in TEF2 but have an access agreement approved by the Office for Fair Access will be permitted to charge a maximum annual fee of £9,000 from October 2018.

¹ These ratings replace the originally proposed ratings which included *Meets Expectations*.

Research Excellence Framework: consultation

Deadline: 30 January 2017 at 5 p.m.

The UK higher education funding bodies are consulting on detailed arrangements for research assessment in a second Research Excellence Framework (REF). Further information is available on the HEFCE website: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/refconsultation/>.

The General Board would welcome comments by 5 p.m. on Monday, 30 January 2017 so that these can be taken into account in drafting a response on behalf of the University. Responses can be provided by email to consultationresponses@admin.cam.ac.uk. Input to the consultation is also being sought from the Colleges, the Research Policy Committee, the Heads of the Schools, and from Chairs of Faculty Boards and Heads of Department.

Annual Reports

The following Annual Reports have been received by the Council and the General Board and are available on the websites indicated.

Cambridge Assessment Annual Report and Accounts, 2015–16	http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/346655-annual-report-15-16.pdf
Language Centre Annual Report 2015–16	http://www.langcen.cam.ac.uk/lc/about/about.html [embedded link to issue in right-hand menu]

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Electors to the Janeway Professorship of Economics

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

The Vice-Chancellor, in the Chair

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Dimitri Vayanos, *London School of Economics*
Professor Anna Vignoles, *JE*

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

Professor Philip Allmendinger, *CL*
Professor Sanjeev Goyal, *CHR*
Professor David Myatt, *London Business School*

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

Professor Giancarlo Corsetti, *CL*
Professor Christopher Harris, *K*
Professor Jackie Scott, *Q*

Electors to the Herchel Smith Professorship of Biochemistry: Amendment

The Council has made an amendment to the members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Herchel Smith Professorship of Biochemistry, as previously published (see *Reporter*, 6440, 2016–17, p. 46):

In class (a) (on the nomination of the Council), Professor Geoffrey Smith, *EM*, has replaced Professor Michael Yaffe.

Election

Dr Jessica Gardner, B.A., M.A., Ph.D., *Leeds*, Director of Library Services and the University Librarian at the University of Bristol, elected University Librarian with effect from 18 April 2017 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of nine months.

Vacancies in the University

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

LEGO Professorship of Play in Education, Development, and Learning in the Faculty of Education; closing date: 20 January 2017; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/12374/> or contact Perrett Laver (email LEGO@perrettlaver.com)

Faculty Manager assigned to the Faculty of Music in the School of Arts and Humanities, in the Academic Division; salary: £39,324–£49,772; closing date: 9 January 2017; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/11114/>; quote reference: AK09819

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

Classical Tripos, Part II

(Statutes and Ordinances, p. 284)

With effect from 1 October 2017

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Classics, has approved amendments to the regulations for the Tripos have been amended so as to abolish the requirement for candidates to take at least two papers from a group. This will allow candidates to have a greater choice of papers.

Regulation 23.

By removing the current regulation and replacing it with a regulation so as to read:

23. A student who is a candidate for Part II in the year next after obtaining honours in Part IB or in another Honours Examination shall offer

- either* (a) four papers chosen from Groups A, B, C, D, E, X, and from the Schedule of Optional Papers;
or (b) three papers chosen from Groups A, B, C, D, E, X, and from the Schedule of Optional Papers, together with a thesis, as prescribed in Regulation 26 on a topic (proposed by the candidate and approved by the Faculty Board) which falls within the field of Classics;

provided that

- (1) no candidate shall offer a thesis on a topic that coincides substantially with the subject of any of the papers that he or she is offering in the examination;
- (2) no candidate shall offer more than one thesis, or more than one paper from the Schedule of Optional Papers.

Regulation 24.

By removing the current regulation and replacing it with a regulation so as to read:

24. A student who is a candidate for Part II in the year next but one after obtaining honours in Part IB or in another Honours Examination shall offer

- either* (a) five papers chosen from Groups A, B, C, D, E, X, and from the Schedule of Optional Papers;
- or* (b) four papers chosen from Groups A, B, C, D, E, X, and from the Schedule of Optional Papers, together with a thesis, as prescribed in Regulation 26, on a topic (proposed by the candidate and approved by the Faculty Board) which falls within the field of Classics;

provided that

- (1) no candidate shall offer a thesis on a topic that coincides substantially with the subject of any of the papers that he or she is offering in the examination;
- (2) no candidate shall offer more than one thesis, or more than one paper from the Schedule of Optional Papers.

The Faculty Board of Classics has confirmed that no candidate's preparation will be affected.

Economics Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 294)

With immediate effect

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Economics, has approved an amendment to Regulation 16, so as to reduce the duration of the examination for Paper 3, 'Theory and practice of econometrics I', from three hours to two hours. This change will result in Paper 3 becoming an unsectioned paper with empirical questions, which better reflects the nature of current econometric practice and teaching.

By replacing 'The examination for Paper 3 shall consist of a written paper of three hours' duration and the submission of project work undertaken by the candidate;' in Regulation 16 with 'The examination for Paper 3 shall consist of a written paper of two hours' duration and the submission of project work undertaken by the candidate;'

The Faculty Board of Economics has confirmed that no candidate's preparation for the examination will be affected.

Engineering Tripos, Part IIb: Correction

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 311)

With effect from 1 October 2017

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Engineering, gives notice of a correction to the previous amendment of the regulations for this degree (*Reporter*, 6444, 2016–17, p. 105) as follows:

In Regulation 28, amending the date of submission for the statement of modules to be not later than the **second** Wednesday of Full Michaelmas Term in the year of candidature.

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.

Historical Tripos, 2017

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

Preliminary Examination for Part I

Section E, World history

Paper 19. World history, from 1400

The maximum number of questions on this paper has been reduced from forty to thirty.

Part I

Section B, British political history

Paper 3. British political history, 1050–1509

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

Preliminary Examination for Part II**Part II***Paper 16. Overseas expansion and British identities, 1585–1714*

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

Paper 21. Borderlands: life on the Habsburg-Ottoman frontier, 1521–1881

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

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

Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (New Curriculum Regulations)

The Final M.B. B.Chir. examinations are concerned with the principles and practice of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense, commensurate with the stage of student progression through the course. The Part I examination may include material relating to General Medicine, General Surgery, Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, General Practice, Pathology, Public Health Medicine, Paediatrics, Psychiatry, and other medical and surgical specialities as appropriate.

The Part I examination is designed to assess the candidate's

- knowledge and experience of Medicine and Surgery in their broadest sense (as defined above);
- understanding of the pathological basis of disease;
- ability to apply that knowledge and experience to the management of patients;
- ability to communicate effectively with patients and to respect their autonomy;
- experience of ethical problems in clinical medicine.

Candidates may be asked to interpret radiographs and scans, electrocardiograms, clinical photographs, and other data. Knowledge, skills, and behaviour will be assessed.

Written papers are assessed without knowledge of the candidate's name.

PART I

The examination comprises two components:

Written examination:

Single best answer examination paper	Marks:	50% of Part I total
	Length:	3 hours
	Structure:	Up to 150 five-option, single response, computer-marked questions
		<i>To pass:</i> candidates must achieve the pass mark as set by the examiners, or higher

Clinical examination:

	Marks:	50% of Part I total
	Length:	Up to 2.5 hours
	Structure:	10 stations of up to 12 minutes' duration, testing history-taking, clinical reasoning and other interpersonal communication skills, and core clinical/physical examination skills, using real and simulated patients
		<i>To pass:</i> candidates must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher. In addition, candidates must achieve a pass in at least three of the communication skills stations and in at least three of the clinical/physical examination skills stations. Where a station is made up of two parts, a pass in both parts is required to achieve an overall pass on that station

Note: to achieve an overall pass in the Final M.B. Part I examination, candidates must pass both the written and clinical examinations at the same sitting.

PART II

The examination comprises both written and clinical elements, with the written assessment made up of two components:

Written examination:

Single best answer examination paper	Marks:	25% of Part II total
	Length:	3 hours
	Structure:	Up to 150 five-option, single response, computer-marked questions <i>To pass:</i> candidates must achieve the pass mark as set by the examiners, or higher
Extended clinical cases examination paper	Marks:	25% of Part II total
	Length:	3 hours
	Structure:	Up to 10 questions of short answer format <i>To pass:</i> candidates must achieve the pass mark as set by the examiners, or higher <i>Note:</i> To achieve a pass in the written examination, students must pass both components at the same sitting

Clinical examination:

Marks:	50% of Part II total
Length:	Two circuits, each lasting up to 1.25 hours (total exam time up to 2.5 hours)
Structure:	Two circuits, each comprising six stations of up to 12 minutes' duration, testing history-taking, clinical reasoning and other interpersonal communication skills and core clinical/physical examination skills, using real and simulated patients. One circuit will focus on Paediatrics, and the other on Women's health (the latter may require the assessment of major adult systems, e.g. cardiovascular, respiratory, abdominal, neurological) <i>To pass:</i> candidates must achieve the pass mark, as set by the examiners, or higher. In addition, candidates must achieve a pass in at least three of the Paediatric examination stations and in at least three of the Women's health examination stations

Note: to achieve an overall pass in the Final M.B. Part II examination, candidates must pass both the written and clinical examinations; candidates who are unsuccessful in one element (i.e. the written or the clinical examination) may, at the discretion of the Exam Board, be asked to re-sit that element alone.

CLASS-LISTS, ETC.

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

OBITUARIES**Obituary Notices**

JOHN MALCOLM STEWART, Ph.D., Life Fellow of King's College, Emeritus Reader in Gravitational Physics, died on 14 November 2016, aged 73 years.

FELICITY JANE COOK WEBSTER, SE, B.A., M.Eng., Senior Assistant Treasurer in the School of the Biological Sciences, formerly Administrative Officer in the Estate Management Division of the University Offices, died on 5 December 2016, aged 43 years.

GRACES**Grace submitted to the Regent House on 14 December 2016**

The Council submits the following Grace to the Regent House. This Grace, unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 103), will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 23 December 2016.

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 10 of the 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 (*Reporter*, 6445, 2016–17, p. 132) be approved.¹

¹ See the Council's Notice on p. 269.

ACTA**Result of ballot on Grace 3 of 13 July 2016**

9 December 2016

The Registry gives notice that as a result of the ballot held between 28 November and 8 December 2016 the following Grace of the Regent House was **not approved**:

3. That the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 16 May 2016 and 27 April 2016, on the public display of class-lists and related matters (*Reporter*, 6426, 2015–16, p. 547), as revised by the Council's Notice dated 11 July 2016 (*Reporter*, 6433, 2016–17, p. 752), be approved.

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

Number of valid votes: 1,241 (no invalid votes)

In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	514
Against the Grace (<i>non placet</i>)	727

Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 30 November 2016

The Graces submitted to the Regent House on 30 November 2016 (*Reporter*, 6446, 2016–17, p. 158) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 9 December 2016.

J. W. NICHOLLS, *Registry*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

FLY-SHEETS REPRINTED

Ballot on Grace 3 of 13 July 2016: Fly-sheets

In accordance with the Council's Notice on Discussions and Fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 108), the fly-sheets from the ballot on Grace 3 of 13 July 2016 (regarding the public display of class-lists and related matters) are published at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2016-17/weekly/6449/fly-sheets.pdf>.

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 6 December 2016

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

The following Report was discussed:

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 (Reporter, 6445, 2016-17, p. 132).

Dame B. M. STOCKING (President of Murray Edwards College), read by Dr W. O. Saxton:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I would like to speak on behalf of Murray Edwards College in support of the proposals by the Council and General Board on student complaints of harassment and sexual misconduct.

In the three and a half years I have been in office as Head of House, I have been shocked at the level of harassment, student to student, taking place in Cambridge; mainly, though not exclusively, against women. I do recognize that this is similar to other universities in the UK. However, I believe it is vital for the students themselves and for the reputation of the University that proper procedures are in place in Cambridge.

There has been much discussion about where our responsibility lies, and whether the only route for a complaint should be to the police. Of course, extreme care should be taken so as not to jeopardize any investigations being undertaken by the police. However, in many cases, the complainant is unlikely to want to go to the police. In the UK, it is estimated that 90% of women saying they have been raped do not wish to have their case investigated by the police. There is every reason to believe that this would be similar for university students and in fact matches my own experience of students in my College and beyond. It would be entirely wrong to leave young women without internal University procedures for complaint in these circumstances and I believe the procedures have been thought through very carefully.

In Murray Edwards we strongly support the need for a central University resource for investigation, as proposed here. These complaints require to be investigated by those who have the proper training and expertise. Except for very minor concerns, we believe they are best handled at this level rather than within the Colleges. We have experience of a great variety of opinions about the seriousness of particular cases amongst Colleges. We accept that each College will take its own view of whether

to use the central resource, but we would encourage our students in Murray Edwards to use the central University resources and procedures, except in the most minor cases.

Even when the procedures are in place, there is much work to be done to change the underlying culture which makes the behaviours seem normal. There is no doubt that there needs to be strong leadership in the University and Colleges. Where we as leaders see unacceptable behaviour we should challenge it and support others who do so. I know that work is going on through other Committees to look at levels of alcohol consumption, which is a key underlying factor. I would also encourage the University to work with nightclubs in Cambridge and with restaurants where 'Swaps' take place. I know too that efforts are being made in the University sports clubs. Culture change will not happen quickly but if we work across all these areas we will signal that harassment and sexual misconduct are simply unacceptable and not what we expect of our students in Cambridge.

These draft proposals have our full support.

Ms A. J. W. SEBATINDIRA (CUSU Women's Officer, and Trinity Hall):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, sexual harassment and assault are serious and endemic problems in university campuses across the UK. This is not a controversial statement. Much has been said and written about this issue, and Cambridge University is not exempt from it.

The 2014 *Cambridge Speaks Out* report on sexual harassment on our campus provides a number of worrying statistics. 77% of respondents had experienced sexual harassment, while 28.5% had experienced sexual assault. Over 80% of students across all types of incidences of sexual misconduct did not report the incident. 85% experienced a negative impact on their mental health as a result of these incidents.

The [Cambridge University Students Union] Women's Campaign has tried to tackle this issue by campaigning, introducing consent workshops across all undergraduate Colleges, and is planning to provide safe spaces for survivors. But the University has a duty to tackle this issue too. Even despite the out-dated and roundly criticized *Zellick Report*, which suggested otherwise.

So it is really great to see that the University has stepped up to protect its students, and it is vital that this policy goes through.

Students at Cambridge have been campaigning for sexual harassment policies for a number of years now. Mostly their efforts have been directed at individual Colleges. While every College has some sort of policy on bullying or harassment, there is an obvious need for an independent sexual harassment policy which explicitly details what behaviour is unwelcome in our communities and to whom students can turn when things go wrong.

Despite this obvious need, the success of students in calling for such policies has been inconsistent across the Colleges for a variety of reasons. Thus the importance of having a University policy becomes apparent. A broader policy allows for students to be prevented from slipping through the cracks. Moreover, the involvement of trained specialists such as the newly introduced Sexual Harassment and Assault Advisor will ensure that students receive the best possible advice and support as they seek redress through the University system.

The role of an independent Investigator is also welcomed. While the close-knit community that Colleges provide is great in many respects, anecdotal evidence from

many students suggests that an investigation carried out by someone wholly removed from the parties of the complaint would be a necessary addition to the current system. In addition to this, the ability of students to report incidents of sexual harassment and assault without necessarily having to go through the complaints procedure will allow the University to collect important data on the true scope of the problem. This will be essential in its continued fight against sexual harassment on campus.

Finally the existence of this policy sends a clear message to all members of the University and those outside of it: that we take the welfare of our students seriously. These guidelines are not an end in themselves, and far more needs to be done to engender a culture here where sexual harassment is not such a plague on our community. But they are a very good place to start.

Dr E. A. O. FREER (Robinson College), read by the Deputy Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the panel that provides advice to student members of the University charged with disciplinary offences. This contribution to the discussion has been seen by all the members of that panel. There is general support for the spirit of the points raised. For that reason, it is couched in collective terms. We agree that the fundamental rights of students not to suffer harassment or degradation whilst at university must be protected. However, we are deeply concerned that the mechanism that is being proposed does not offer appropriate protection of the rights of accused students. It must be remembered that such students are innocent until their guilt is proven. We are concerned that the University has lost sight of this fundamental precept of English law.

Cases under Regulation 6 have already been investigated by the Advocate, though no charges have yet been brought. This experience has highlighted the absolute importance of having a procedure that is open and transparent, ensures fairness to all parties, and recognizes the rights of both parties.

There are three particular concerns:

- (1) The absence of procedural protection under the University process, in particular, no consideration of the 'right to silence';
- (2) The absence of qualified criminal lawyers to defend;
- (3) The potential for police investigation, and criminal prosecution, to follow *after* the University process, which only magnifies the above problems.

The key concern we have is the apparent lack of thought that has been given to how the disciplinary process interacts with any police proceedings – para. 3.6 provides that the Head of the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints, and Appeals (OSCCA) will 'normally' suspend the internal procedure pending the outcome of criminal proceedings.

When an incident of harassment occurs, it might also amount to a criminal offence. We use the word 'might' because Regulation 6 is drawn more widely than the criminal law. As many incidents of harassment could amount to a criminal offence, however, it is important to consider how the University and police routes interact.

It is at this point that there is potential for significant conflict between the two systems.

When a complaint is made about the conduct of a student to the University Advocate ('UA'), s/he has a statutory duty to investigate it unless there are specific reasons (set out in the Statute) for rejecting it. The first stage of such an

investigation is usually an 'investigative meeting'. This is held with the intention that on hearing the accused's account in it, the UA can decide whether it is appropriate to bring charges against the accused student.

There is no mention of how matters shall proceed if the accused student refuses to attend such a meeting. At no point is it communicated to the student that they have a choice whether to attend or not, and thus it seems that it is assumed that accused students will be willing to attend such a meeting to assist the UA in deciding whether they should be charged. There are no formal sanctions or adverse inferences detailed for a failure or refusal to engage in this part of the process, although it seems that common sense would require that the entire procedure could not be brought to an effective end by the accused student refusing to attend. Therefore, it seems in this situation the UA would have to simply decide from the account given by the complainant whether there was a sufficiency of evidence to proceed. Likewise if the student does attend, but refuses to give an account (akin to a 'no comment' interview in criminal law). Under the criminal law, an accused person has a right of silence. There is no such right recognized by the University, meaning it is unclear whether a student can choose to stay silent (which in itself would subvert the process), and if they do, what the repercussions of this are (in criminal proceedings there would be an adverse inference, for example).

Investigatory meetings are described to accused students as an opportunity for them to give their side of events. They are warned that the Minutes taken at the meeting may be presented as evidence before the Discipline Committee if the matter proceeds. The student is entitled to have someone accompany them to this meeting, and they are advised that the University maintains a panel of people who will accompany the student free-of-charge should they wish (of that panel, two have experience in Regulation 6 cases already). This list is comprised of willing volunteers who are Lecturers and Fellows in Law both in the Faculty and at College level. They receive no payment for acting in this capacity. They are not all criminal law specialists, have received no training to be on the panel, and none (save for one) have any experience of criminal law as practitioners.

What is notable about this meeting is that there is no requirement that it take place with the student having been cautioned – thus the student is not told whether they can stay silent, nor the potential repercussions should they choose to do so. As the meeting Minutes can be used as evidence before the Discipline Committee (who are the tribunal which decides guilt on the charge) it seems fundamentally unsatisfactory that the accused student is not subject to any protections akin to those to which the police must adhere in interview or risk the interview being ruled inadmissible in any subsequent criminal proceedings. There is no entitlement to advance disclosure prior to the meeting, meaning that the accused student is required to give an account 'blind'. Even the UA might not know the full extent of the allegations as they may not – and certainly are not required to – have taken a full written statement before they commence the investigatory meeting. Thus all the accused student will know will be the date and time of the alleged incident, and the identity of the complainant. They may pick up some notion of the complaint on the basis of the questions asked by the UA, but are not entitled to any disclosure.

Furthermore, if para. 3.6 is not invoked (as it is clear it is at the discretion of the Head of OSCCA) and this meeting takes place at a time when police proceedings are still on-

going, it is unclear what possible crossover could occur. Due to the greater time pressure on the police, it may well be that when a complainant reports a matter to both the police and the UA on the same day, the UA is likely to act faster. This means that the investigatory meeting is likely to be held before the accused student has been contacted by the police (indeed, possibly before the accused student even knows that the police had been contacted about the matter).

As someone advising a student in this position, the terrain is decidedly rocky. If they give a full account in the investigatory meeting, that account will be fully minuted, and the accused student allowed to check and sign those minutes, but it will not be subject to audio recording (as required in police interviews) which can be obtained in case of disagreement about what was said. Furthermore, that account is likely to be disclosed to the Crime Prosecution Service (CPS) if police proceedings progress to charge and the student indicates an intention to plead not guilty. It seems likely to us that the Minutes of the investigatory meeting would be sought by the police or the CPS to obtain the accused student's first account of events. Given that statute allows disclosure of personal information for the purposes of the detection of crime and the prosecution of offenders, it is arguable that the University could lawfully disclose this information to the police or CPS without any court order. If the University were to decline to do so voluntarily, we consider it highly likely that a court would grant an application for an order to produce it.¹

Where this account has been given without audio-recording; without any clarity about a right to remain silent (or lack thereof); without any sort of warning such as that required by PACE Code C² regarding failure to mention relevant facts later relied upon in court, and without the presence of a person who understands criminal procedure and evidence, prejudice is highly likely to occur. The only possible way to maintain fairness in both sets of proceedings is for the UA to stay proceedings pending the outcome of the police proceedings. At such a point as the police decide to take no further action, or there is a conviction (through plea or trial) or an acquittal, then the University proceedings can properly be reinstated and proceed to their conclusion.

Obviously where the complainant is pursuing the disciplinary route instead of making a report to the police there can be no complaint about the UA proceeding straight away. However, thought must be given to two possible scenarios. Firstly, that the matter may be reported to police by others who hear about it, or witnessed it, and secondly what would happen if the complainant felt aggrieved by the outcome of the University process and decided to make a complaint to the police at that stage – or similarly if the police were alerted to the matter by others. Once again, issues of third party disclosure orders loom large. At the very least, we would consider fairness to require any interviewee to be expressly warned before the commencement of an investigative meeting that the confidentiality of what was said within the meeting could not be guaranteed.

In general, however, our concern is that, for now, these newly-introduced disciplinary matters have been contorted and shoe-horned into procedures designed only for academic misconduct. The process is consequently desperately ill-equipped to deal with the needs of complainants, and also the needs of the respondents. As is returned to below, it cannot be assumed that accused students will not suffer as a result of such proceedings, even if they are not subsequently charged or found guilty. The regulations give no guidance at all to the UA on the

procedure to follow, or how the disciplinary matters may interact with police matters.

Most young people facing charges in an internal disciplinary procedure will have no experience of being subjected to either criminal or disciplinary systems. The punishments available at Cambridge include the ending of their membership of the University, and consequently their right to study here. Being accused of harassment or sexual misconduct carries huge stress and stigma regardless of the outcome.

It is crucial that students who have been subjected to sexual misconduct or harassment are fully supported and have access to a formalized system for reporting the matter if they wish to do so. We owe a responsibility to those students to investigate their complaints properly. However, we are concerned that the specific ways in which the University has decided to do this risk demonizing the accused students, subjecting them to a potentially unfair, 'hit and miss' process without knowledgeable representation and potential clashes with police matters when the disciplinary outcome can still be very serious. We also owe a duty to them to deal with them fairly, and on the basis that they are innocent until proven otherwise. We must not lose sight of the fact that all of these processes usually involve young people who are in times of great transition and need to be dealt with sensitively and fairly, whether they are the complainant or the respondent. Whatever pitfalls might be perceived in the criminal justice process (and we do not seek to suggest that there are not many) there are some matters that internal processes simply are not appropriate to resolve, and we cannot expect them to fill gaps perceived in the criminal justice system.

¹ Under either section 97 of the Magistrates' Courts Act 1980 or section 2 of the Criminal Procedure (Attendance of Witnesses) Act 1965.

² Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, Code C, Code of practice for the detention, treatment, and questioning of persons by police officers (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pace-code-c-2014>).

Dr M. R. WORMALD (Pembroke College), read by the Senior Pro-Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I welcome this new Procedure for handling student complaints of student harassment and sexual misconduct. As a Senior Tutor I am well aware that this type of behaviour is happening, both from what I have heard from colleagues and from my own experiences of students disclosing their experiences directly to me. We have a responsibility to make it clear to our students that harassment and sexual misconduct are not acceptable and a duty to respond to issues as they arise to provide students with a safe environment within which to study.

This Procedure is one part of the journey; it allows students to be confident that we will consider complaints of this nature seriously, fairly, and transparently. However, the critical change that needs to come about is to the wider culture across the University and Colleges. Junior and Middle Common Rooms, welfare representatives, sports clubs, and other societies all have their part to play, in conjunction with College authorities, in raising awareness of the seriousness of the consequences of sexual harassment and sexual misconduct for both victim and perpetrator; our aim has to be that as a result of bystander training and other initiatives the incidence of such behaviour is reduced. But we also need to respond appropriately when harassment and sexual misconduct occurs. Barriers to reporting must be removed and our students need to understand that any

behaviour of this nature will not be tolerated in the collegiate University. We still have some way to travel before our University community is a place where all can learn in a safe environment; this Procedure is a critical step forward and I am pleased to support it.

Professor Dame A. M. DONALD (Master of Churchill College, and Department of Physics), read by the Senior Pro-Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I would like to express my support for the University as it begins, through this Report, to tackle issues in our culture that lead to a less than healthy environment for many people studying and working here. It deals solely with harassment and sexual misconduct between students, via a sensible and practical, non-disciplinary procedure. The issues are clearly much wider and will need continued focus and consideration. Nevertheless, this is an important step forward. Churchill College, through its Council, has already begun discussions about how our own internal procedures can be made more robust and to mesh smoothly with the University recommendations. We believe that any less than a zero-tolerance approach towards sexual harassment, including between students, is unacceptable. Nor do we think we can or should leave tackling such matters solely to the courts. Our students, like our employees, should adhere to acceptable norms of behaviour in respect of harassment and sexual misconduct. If they choose not to, other students who suffer in consequence should have access to means of support and redress.

As the University's former Gender Equality Champion as well as current Master of Churchill College, I am aware that too often there are examples of the sorts of issues the Report deals with that cause stress, distress, and lasting damage to members of the University. The recent Universities UK report has highlighted that this is a national phenomenon. It is important that we are not complacent about the issues locally but collectively face up to our responsibilities and set in train a re-evaluation of our values and our culture. Future and current generations of students need to have confidence that our processes are fair and transparent.

COLLEGE NOTICES

Vacancies

Corpus Christi College: The College is seeking to elect a new Master to succeed Mr Stuart Laing; stipend: negotiable; tenure: one fixed, non-renewable term of office for a period set by the College on appointment (with a maximum of ten years); opening date for applications: 23 January 2017; closing date for applications: 8 February 2017; further details: <http://www.corpus.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/academic-vacancies/>

Lucy Cavendish College: Henslow Research Fellowship 2017, for women only (in any science subject); tenure: three years from 1 October 2017; stipend: £20,800; closing date: 20 January 2017 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.lucy-cav.cam.ac.uk>

Elections

Newnham College

The following elections have been made:

Elected a Fellow in Category A from 2 December 2016:

Dr Chana Morgenstern, B.A., *New College of California, M.A., Bard College, New York, Ph.D., Brown Rhode Island*

Elected a Visiting Bye-Fellow for one year from 1 March 2017:

Professor Pamela Cowin (Professor, Departments of Cell Biology and Dermatology, New York University School of Medicine), B.Sc., Ph.D., *Southampton*

St John's College

Elected to a Fellowship under Title B from 5 January 2017:

Laura Torrente Murciano, M.A., *Rey Juan Carlos, Ph.D., Bath*

Trinity Hall

The Governing Body has elected the following into a Fellowship with effect from 1 January 2017:

Elected into a Research Fellowship (Class A):

Dr Eugenio Giannelli, B.A., M.A., *Florence, Ph.D., Royal Holloway, University of London*

EXTERNAL NOTICES

University of Oxford

Merton College: Leventis Research Fellowship in Ancient Greek; salary: £29,819, plus £10,000 housing allowance or free accommodation; tenure: as from 1 October 2017 for four years; closing date: 3 February 2017 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.merton.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

St Hilda's College: Junior Research Fellowships in the Sciences; tenure: three years from 1 October 2017; salary: £21,000 plus housing allowance; closing date: 12 January 2017 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.st-hildas.ox.ac.uk/content/two-stipendiary-junior-research-fellowships-sciences>

Trinity College: Domestic Bursar; salary: £80,000; closing date: 13 January 2017; further details: <https://www.trinity.ox.ac.uk/vacancies/>