

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6505

THURSDAY 10 MAY 2018

VOL CXLVIII No 29

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	551
Discussion on Tuesday, 15 May 2018	551
Report of the Council on external finance for income-generating projects including housing solutions in the non-operational estate: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	551
Report of the Council on a new University nursery building: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	552
Publication of the results of graduate students	552
Vacancies, appointments, etc.	
Vacancies in the University	553
Appointments and grants of title	554
Awards, etc.	
Adams Prize, 2017–18	554
Events, courses, etc.	
Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.	555
Notices by the General Board	
Chairs and Senior Examiners, Easter Term 2018: Correction	555
Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.	
Natural Sciences Tripos, Part II (History and Philosophy of Science), 2019: Papers and Sources amendment	555
Form and conduct of examinations, 2018	
Examination in Computational Biology for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018	555

Reports

Report of the General Board on arrangements for senior academic promotions	556
--	-----

Graces

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 10 May 2018	562
---	-----

Acta

Result of ballot on Grace 2 of 17 January 2018	563
--	-----

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Fly-sheets reprinted

Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 2 of 17 January 2018 (class-lists)	564
---	-----

Report of Discussion

Tuesday, 1 May 2018	567
---------------------	-----

College Notices

Elections	569
Vacancies	569
Other Notices	569

Societies, etc.

Postdocs of Cambridge (PdOC) Society	569
--------------------------------------	-----

External Notices

Oxford Notices	569
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

10 May, *Thursday*. Ascension day. Scarlet day.

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

19 May, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.

20 May, *Sunday*. Whitsunday. Scarlet day. Preacher before the University at 11.15 a.m., Dr D. Mukarji OBE, formerly Director of Christian Aid and sometime Vice-President of the Methodist Conference.

21 May, *Monday*. Easter Term divides.

Discussions (at 2 p.m.)

15 May

29 May

12 June

26 June

10 July

Congregations

19 May, *Saturday at 10 a.m.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion on Tuesday, 15 May 2018

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) to attend a Discussion in the Senate-House on Tuesday, 15 May 2018 at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Report of the Council, dated 1 May 2018, pursuant to Special Ordinance A (i) 7 (b) concerning an initiated Grace relating to the University and the Universities Superannuation Scheme (*Reporter*, 6504, 2017–18, p. 539).

The Report published in this issue (p. 556) will be discussed on 29 May 2018.

Further information on Discussions, including details on format and attendance, is provided at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions/>.

Report of the Council on external finance for income-generating projects including housing solutions in the non-operational estate: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

8 May 2018

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 1 May 2018 (p. 567) concerning the above Report (*Reporter*, 6502, 2017–18, p. 514).

The Council acknowledges the note of dissent signed by two members of the Council concerning the above Report (*Reporter*, 6502, 2017–18, p. 515), and has received the remarks made by Professor Anderson, as supported by Professor Evans. The Council wishes to make the following points by way of clarification.

The Council makes the recommendations in the Report in order to capture a market opportunity of securing external finance at historically low interest rates, with the objective of providing the University with the option of developing its non-operational estate (defined as capital projects outside those directly enabling core academic teaching and research activities). Such projects are of strategic importance, bringing significant indirect benefits, and considered essential to the University's primary mission. Such income-generating projects will, *inter alia*, address the critically important housing challenge, provide alternative income streams at a time of significant financial volatility, and add significant long-term value in the service of the University's academic mission and student interest.

While specific business cases are indeed immature at this stage, the Council has a high degree of confidence in the collective potential of such projects. The Council is therefore seeking to secure the option for the University to progress such projects in the future, if the business cases for individual projects demonstrate it is appropriate to do so. This authority for advancing external borrowings would not have an impact on normal University governance processes for the sanction of individual development projects as their business cases are matured and were ready for formal approval.

While significant lessons have been, and must continue to be, learned from the North West Cambridge Phase 1 development, as identified through the post-implementation audits, it should be remembered in this context that Phase 1 was executed primarily as a strategic project for the provision of affordable key worker housing for postgraduates and staff. It was not wholly justified or optimized in design or execution on commercial grounds. That having been said, there was a clear expectation that the income from rental and capital receipts would enable both the principal and interest on the element of the loan relating to Phase 1 to be repaid on time. As set out below, every effort will be made to enhance the financial position of Phase 1 through optimizing the use of the site over time, in conjunction with North West Cambridge Phase 2, if approved, and with other potential housing developments. Eddington has significant future value as a vibrant, established mixed-usage central city quarter, and ultimately, the University will be in a position to realize value at the end of the original loan term through market disposals, or re-financing as appropriate, to repay the loan principal. There should be no resultant risk to the academic University's finances.

For future purposes, the Council will not recommend any new projects serviced by external borrowings unless they have robust, stress-tested, business cases with a high degree of confidence of commercial returns. Changes have been, and will continue to be, made in response to the lessons learned and there is no reason why the University's governance, decision-making, and management structures should not be capable of managing such opportunities successfully in the future.

The Council through its Finance Committee has considered both the 'cost of carry' of the additional borrowings pending project decisions, and a theoretical 'fall-back option' of long-term investment in the Cambridge University Endowment Fund should no projects meet these rigorous financial criteria. Under conservative assumptions, these indicate a high level of cover in meeting both interest over the loan life and principal repayment.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 2, p. 562) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report.

Report of the Council on a new University nursery building: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

8 May 2018

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 1 May 2018 (p. 568) concerning the above Report (*Reporter*, 6502, 2017–18, p. 516).

The Council notes, in relation to the points made by Dr Thomas, that the current plans for the Harrison Drive Nursery proposal will provide a total of 84 bicycle parking spaces (52 covered and 32 uncovered), available to staff and parents of the proposed nursery, and also to other University users including staff who work at the neighbouring Donald McIntyre Building. Sixty of the places will be situated adjacent to the main entrance of the nursery offering a safe route to the front door. An external buggy store will also be located immediately next to the main entrance. The ongoing development of the proposal will take into account the comments about the parking of cycle child trailers so that adequate provision can be made.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 3, p. 562) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report.

Publication of the results of graduate students

9 May 2018

The Council and the General Board have received recommendations from the General Board's Education Committee concerning the practice of publicly displaying class-lists outside the Senate-House and subsequently publishing them in the *Reporter*, and other matters concerning class-lists, for implementation by 25 May 2018 (the application date of the GDPR).

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 8, p. 562) for the approval of the changes to Ordinances to reflect the proposals in so far as they relate to Graduate Students and recipients of higher degrees, with effect from 25 May 2018, as set out in the Annex to this Notice.

ANNEX

1. By replacing the last two sentences of the Regulations listed below with the following wording:

Subject to the candidate's agreement being received by the Secretary not later than the last day of the term following the term or vacation in which the decision on her or his candidature was made or in exceptional circumstances, which it shall itself determine, accept a candidate's agreement at a later date, the Board shall approve the candidate for the award of that degree and the Secretary shall publish a notice of such approval unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

- (i) Doctor of Business (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 449): Regulation 14;
- (ii) Doctor of Education (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 463): Regulation 15;
- (iii) Doctor of Engineering (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 467): Regulation 15;
- (iv) Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Science, Master of Letters, and Master of Philosophy by Dissertation (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 499): Regulation 20.

2. By inserting the following at the end of the first sentence of Regulation 13 of the regulations for the Master of Studies (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 555):

unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board. Distinctive marks may be attached to the names of those candidates who in the opinion of the Examiners deserve special credit.

3. By inserting the following wording into the Regulations as specified in the sub-paragraphs below:
- unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board
- (a) Doctor of Business (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 449): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 12;
 - (b) Bachelor of Divinity (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 459): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 8;
 - (c) Doctor of Divinity (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 461): at the end of the penultimate sentence of Regulation 9;
 - (d) Doctor of Education (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 463): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 13;
 - (e) Doctor of Engineering (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 467): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 13;
 - (f) Doctor of Law (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 474): at the end of the penultimate sentence of Regulation 8;
 - (g) Doctor of Medicine (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 483): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 14;
 - (h) Doctor of Medicine, Special Regulations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 486) at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 15;
 - (i) Doctor of Medical Science (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 489): at the end of the penultimate sentence of Regulation 9;
 - (j) Master of Surgery (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 491): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 11;
 - (k) Doctor of Music (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 498): at the end of the penultimate sentence of Regulation 7;
 - (l) Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Science, Master of Letters, and Master of Philosophy by Dissertation (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 499): at the end of the final sentences of Regulation 17 and Regulation 18;
 - (m) Doctor of Philosophy, Special Regulations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 503): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 13;
 - (n) Master of Philosophy by Advanced Study (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 506): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 16;
 - (o) Master of Research (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 547): at the end of the penultimate sentence of Regulation 11;
 - (p) Doctor of Science and Doctor of Letters (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 554): at the end of the first sentence of Regulation 8;
 - (q) Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (Old Regulations) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 572): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 12;
 - (r) Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (Revised Regulations) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 575): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 11;
 - (s) Advanced Diploma in Economics (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 578): at the end of the final sentence of Regulation 9;
 - (t) Postgraduate Diploma in Legal Studies and Postgraduate Diploma in International Law (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 579): at the end of the second sentence of Regulation 9.

4. By amending the first sentence of Regulation 12 of the regulations for the Certificates of Postgraduate Study (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 581) to read as follows:

The awards of Certificates shall be published by the Board of Graduate Studies unless the candidate has requested the removal of her or his name from the published list in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board, but no publication shall be made of an award to a Graduate Student who has been given leave by the Board of Graduate Studies to count the period or any part of it during which he or she has been a candidate for the Certificate towards a course of research for the degree of Ph.D., Eng.D., M.Sc., or M.Litt.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Vacancies in the University

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

Clinical Lecturer in Respiratory Medicine in the Department of Medicine; fixed term: four years; salary: £32,478–£57,444; closing date: 4 June 2018; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/15217/>; quote reference: RC13526

Deputy Director (Education, Administration, and Student Services) in the University Information Services; salary: £86,060–£105,807; closing date: 31 May 2018; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/17248/>; quote reference: VC15331

Head of Academic Centre Administration (Professional Studies) in the Institute of Continuing Education; fixed term: two years in the first instance; salary: £35,550–£47,722; closing date: 1 June 2018; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/17370/>; quote reference: EA15443

Head of Academic Centre Administration (Arts and Sciences, part-time) in the Institute of Continuing Education; fixed term: part-time (0.5FTE) for two years in the first instance; salary: £35,550–£47,722 *pro rata*; closing date: 1 June 2018; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/17371/>; quote reference: EA15444

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.

Appointments and grants of title

The following appointments and grants of title have been made:

APPOINTMENTS

University Lecturers

Architecture. Dr Nicholas Luca Simcik Arese, B.A., *California, Berkeley*, M.Sc., *London*, D.Phil., *Oxford*, AADipl., M.Arch., *London*, appointed from 1 September 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology. Dr Bart Hallmark, M.Eng., M.A., Ph.D., *DOW*, CEng, CSci, MChemE, appointed from 1 September 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Engineering. Dr Sebastian William Pattinson, M.Phil., *DAR*, Ph.D., *CAI*, appointed from 1 September 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

History. Dr John Henry Ribant Gonzalez, B.A., *Harvard*, M.A., Ph.D., *Chicago*, appointed from 24 April 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Law. Dr Andrew Gareth Sanger, B.A., Ph.D., *SE*, LL.M., *London*, and Dr Jonathan William Rogers, LL.B., *Nottingham*, Ph.D., *London*, appointed from 1 October 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Sociology. Mr Ali Samoon Meghji, B.A., *M*, M.Phil., *HO*, appointed from 2 September 2019 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Principal Assistant Treasurer

University Offices (Finance Division). Mr Spencer John Moore, M.Phil., *PEM*, B.A., *Norwich*, ACA, ACT, appointed from 1 April 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of nine months.

Departmental Secretary (Chief Operating Officer)

University Library. Dr Kirsty-Anne Allen, M.A., M.Litt., Ph.D., *St Andrews*, M.A., *Cambridge*, AUA, appointed from 15 May 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of nine months.

GRANTS OF TITLE

Affiliated Lecturer

Clinical Medicine. Mr Martin Graves has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 June 2018 for a further two years.

CORRECTION

Certain of the details published in the Notice on 25 April 2018 (*Reporter*, 6503, 2017–18, p. 529) were incorrect and should have read as follows:

Senior Assistant Treasurer

University Offices (Finance Division). Ms Lucy Harney, **B.A., Keele, M.A., Cambridge, ACMA**, appointed from 18 June 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of nine months.

AWARDS, ETC.

Adams Prize, 2017–18

The Adams Prize is awarded jointly each year by the Faculty of Mathematics and St John's College to UK-based researchers, under the age of 40, doing first class international research in the Mathematical Sciences. The Prize was named after the mathematician John Couch Adams and commemorates Adams's role in the discovery of the planet Neptune, through calculation of the discrepancies in the orbit of Uranus.

This year's topic was *The mathematics of astronomy and cosmology*, and the prize was awarded jointly to:

Dr Claudia de Rham, *Imperial College London*, for her work on nonlinear, ghost-free, theories of massive gravity; and

Dr Gustav Holzegel, *Imperial College London*, for his work on the mathematical study of the stability problem for black holes.

For further information on the Adams Prize see <https://www.maths.cam.ac.uk/adams-prize-winners-2017-18-announced>

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

The University offers a large number of lectures, seminars, and other events, many of which are free of charge, to members of the University and others who are interested. Details can be found on individual Faculty, Department, and institution websites, on the What's On website (<http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/whatson/>), and on Talks.cam (<http://www.talks.cam.ac.uk/>).

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

<i>African Archaeology Group</i>	John Alexander Seminar Series: <i>The veins of the Horn: trade routes and merchants in Western Somalia (12th–16th centuries)</i> , by Dr Jorge de Torres, British Museum, at 4.30 p.m. on Monday, 14 May 2018, in the Seminar Room, McDonald Institute, Downing site	https://www.mcdonald.cam.ac.uk/events/aag18_6
----------------------------------	--	---

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD**Chairs and Senior Examiners, Easter Term 2018: Correction**

The General Board announces the following changes to the list of Chairs and Senior Examiners for the examinations in Easter Term 2018 published on 18 April 2018 (*Reporter*, 6502, 2017–18, p. 499):

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS AND TRIPOS EXAMINATIONS

Medical and Veterinary Sciences Tripos:

Part I: Dr M. Mason (Assistant Chair).

Natural Sciences Tripos:

Part II:

Biological and Biomedical Sciences: Dr C. Lindon (Senior).

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.**Natural Sciences Tripos, Part II (History and Philosophy of Science), 2019: Papers and Sources amendment**

Further to the notice published on 2 May 2018 (*Reporter*, 6504, 2017–18, p. 536), the title of Paper 6 has changed and will now be as follows:

Paper 6: Ethics and politics of science, technology, and medicine

FORM AND CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS, 2018

Notices by Faculty Boards, or other bodies concerned, of changes to the form and conduct of certain examinations to be held in the Easter Term 2018, approved exceptionally following recent industrial action, are published below. Complete details of the form and conduct of all examinations are available from the Faculties or Departments concerned.

Examination in Computational Biology for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018

The Degree Committee of Mathematics gives notice that, exceptionally, for the examinations to be held in 2018, the form and conduct of the examination in Computational Biology for the degree of Master of Philosophy will be changed as follows:

- (i) the module *Cancer evolution* will be examined by a single piece of coursework [instead of two] and will be weighted as a half-module [instead of a whole module]; and
- (ii) the weighting for the final examination will be calculated out of 11.5 [instead of 12].

REPORTS

Report of the General Board on arrangements for senior academic promotions

The GENERAL BOARD begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Report proposes the first steps to implement a new Academic Career Pathway model (ACP Scheme) aligned to academic titles. The ACP Scheme is intended to replace the Senior Academic Promotions (SAP) Scheme, which will run for the last time in 2019 (*Reporter*, 2002–03, 5899, p. 98 and 5919, p. 729; 2011–12, 6266, p. 606; 2012–13, 6302, p. 423; 2015–16, 6434, p. 802) and current probationary arrangements (*Reporter*, 6383, 2014–15, p. 493). The ACP Scheme responds to concerns that the current process is unduly complex and lengthy, the evaluative criteria are weighted too heavily towards research, and there is a lack of constructive feedback to candidates.

2. A central aspect of the proposed move to an ACP Scheme is that when it is fully implemented criteria for academic excellence will act as a ‘golden thread’ running through the academic probation and promotion processes. Other proposed changes in the first stage and subsequently are set out below.

3. This Report covers the first stage of implementing this academic pathway model, suggesting changes to be made to the 2019 SAP exercise to accommodate some of the proposals where there was broad agreement from the consultation to proceed. If this Report is approved, further proposals to implement the ACP Scheme more fully will be brought forward during 2019–20. Those later changes will be the subject of a subsequent Report.

4. The proposals for change have arisen from the discussions of a Working Group formed in 2016 under the Talent Management strand of the University’s People Strategy to review the University’s current arrangements for managing the probation and promotion of its academic staff and to develop recommendations on how the University could best manage academic career paths. The Working Group concluded that:

- (a) The current promotions guidance set out evidence to be provided but included only limited information on the assessment criteria. This meant that the SAP Scheme lacked transparency in that it was not clear how decisions were made. It would be helpful if evaluative criteria were developed to define academic excellence for each office which were applied consistently in probation and progression processes.
- (b) There was no consistency of approach in terms of local promotions management.
- (c) Eligible academics did not always seek appropriate advice before applying, as provided for in the SAP guidance.
- (d) Each annual SAP exercise took more than a year including the appeals process. This period should be shortened to reduce the time before candidates received an outcome.
- (e) The administrative load and timeframe would be reduced if there were two rather than three committee levels.
- (f) The exercise was a competition where only the strongest candidates were promoted but it was described as a threshold process where candidates were placed above or below a line by the senior promotions committees and this led to unsuccessful applicants feeling very dissatisfied.

(g) Female academics were not applying at the expected rate, despite initiatives such as a CV mentoring scheme and provision to declare additional circumstances, for example childcare responsibilities, which impacted on their contribution. The equality and diversity and inclusivity provisions needed to be updated in line with best practice.

(h) There was concern that individuals who were eligible and ready for promotion were not putting themselves forward.

(i) There was no common understanding of the role of University Senior Lecturer (USL) across the Schools, with distinct differences between those in the sciences and the arts. There was also a ‘dual track’ problem; a University Lecturer (UL) could apply for promotion to the office of USL or to a Readership, causing confusion about the nature of the USL role.

(j) With greater emphasis being placed on teaching excellence and the introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), more detail and weight needed to be given to teaching.

(k) There was no progression path for other academic roles such as teaching- and research-focused roles. A revised process could provide a career path for these roles, as provided by many Russell Group universities.

(l) Academic titles needed to be reviewed to ensure they described the broad range of the roles and took into account those used by peer institutions; it was noted that most Russell Group universities used the same titles as those in use at Cambridge and that a previous consultation at the University in Michaelmas Term 2014 on whether to change the academic titles had not found any significant appetite for change.

5. Heads of Schools and the Heads of academic institutions were provided with details of initial proposals made by the Working Group for consultation in Easter Term 2017. A second consultation was carried out during Michaelmas Term 2017, inviting comments from academic staff (*Reporter*, 6484, 2017–18, p. 108). A broad range of responses was received from both consultations. After each consultation further work was carried out to refine the ACP Scheme, taking into account the feedback received. A summary of each consultation and the resulting revised proposals were taken to the HR Committee for consideration. The proposals for initial steps set out in this Report were approved by the HR Committee at its meeting on 19 April 2018. Consultation responses are published on Moodle at <https://www.vle.cam.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=153181>.

6. The following is a summary of the key proposals for the initial steps towards the ACP Scheme where changes are made to the 2019 Senior Academic Promotions exercise to be launched in August 2018, as follows:

- (a) For applications for Professorships and Readerships, the standard model for scoring and weighting between the three evaluative criteria is to be adjusted as follows:
 - *research/scholarship*: up to a maximum of 50/100 (previously 30/50);
 - *teaching*: up to a maximum of 30/100 (previously 10/50);
 - *general contribution*: up to a maximum of 20 points (previously 10/50).

This change will represent a new beginning in how the University recognizes excellence in teaching. It will provide a foundation for other work on recognizing excellence in teaching, including the further evolution of the ACP Scheme and career progression for teaching-only staff (para. 12).

(b) Exceptional departures from the scoring and weightings in (a) will be permitted as follows:

Either

- *research/scholarship*: up to a maximum of 60/100 (previously 30/50);
- *teaching*: up to a maximum of 20/100 (previously 10/50);
- *general contribution*: up to a maximum of 20 points (previously 10/50).

Or

- *research/scholarship*: up to a maximum of 50/100 (previously 30/50);
- *teaching*: up to a maximum of 20/100 (previously 10/50);
- *general contribution*: up to a maximum of 30 points (previously 10/50).

These alternatives reflect the preference expressed by several Schools for some flexibility in adjusting the scores between the criteria. The level of flexibility is not as extensive as was recommended by the original Working Group proposal as that was not supported by consultation responses because it was felt that would be too complex to operate and concerns were expressed that it placed a heavy load on Heads of Institution. The level of flexibility will be made available on the basis that it is to be applied sparingly, proposed by the Head of Institution, and that the Faculty Committee (FC) formally records in the minutes in each case the reasons for departing from the standard scoring model. The operation of scoring flexibility should be kept under review and if it works well it could be expanded in the evolution of the ACP Scheme

(c) For applications for University Senior Lectureships, the scoring and weighting remain unchanged.

(d) The three-tier committee structure of the SAP Scheme (at Faculty, School, and General Board level) is retained. In the initial consultation two promotions committees rather than three were proposed by the Working Group but many respondents felt strongly that it was important to retain the local, Faculty level, in terms of specialist expertise and decision-making. It is therefore proposed that the SAP Scheme seeks instead to balance the need for multi-level participation and for a more streamlined and simplified process in a different way, where the overlap between the School Committee (SC) and the Faculty Committee is reduced and the FC's role is mainly to evaluate candidates' research/scholarship contribution. By implementing more efficient processes it may be possible for the promotions process to take place over a six-month timeframe. It is also proposed that an online process is developed to support the full move to the ACP Scheme, which would be an important step in achieving these efficiencies without affecting the quality of the promotions decisions. Key details are set out in the paragraphs below, with Annex A setting out in more detail the proposed committee membership, roles, and timetable.

(e) Under these proposals, the FC meets once, with membership agreed by the Council of the School (with the General Board approving the parameters of membership of the FCs rather than the individual members), focusing on assessing research contribution and making a recommendation on teaching and general contributions, with the SC making the final decision on scores.

(f) SC membership is also agreed by the relevant Council of the School, with General Board approval needed only for the membership of the Chair (external to the School) and external (to Cambridge) member. The SC's remit of oversight and moderation in the current SAP process would continue.

(g) The number of SCs is increased to six, to allow for separate committees for the School of Clinical Medicine and the School of the Biological Sciences, in line with requests received from the Heads of both Schools and for administrative efficiency given the number of applications received. Each School would then have a separate promotions committee.

(h) The Head of School or another nominated member of the SC is expected to attend as an observer to the FC, leading to improved feedback as they could support the Head of Department with this process.

(i) A Vice-Chancellor's Committee then makes the final recommendations to the General Board for approval, as in the current SAP process.

(j) A career development process is followed to ensure readiness for promotion, with clear guidance and constructive feedback.

(k) The SAP Scheme (and in due course the ACP Scheme) will be informed by the best current thinking on good equality and diversity practice to widen inclusion, including the use of a CV template and the treatment of contextual factors. The focus on reviewing gender representation, introduced with the 2017 SAP exercise, is retained with the aim of increasing the rate of applications from female academics and expanding the provisions to cover inclusion of under-represented groups. These proposals also include unconscious bias training, annual briefings for committee members on decision-making, and career progression workshops for academics at key points. (Annex B sets out these proposals in more detail.)

7. It is proposed that the following Key Principles underpinning the ACP Scheme be taken forward in the SAP Scheme for 2019, replacing corresponding SAP provisions:

(a) The University of Cambridge is committed, in its pursuit of academic excellence, to equality of opportunity and to a proactive approach that supports and encourages all under-represented groups, promotes an inclusive culture, and values diversity.

(b) All persons involved in administering academic promotions processes should exercise impartiality and fairness and be seen to do so. Declarations of interest should be made at appropriate stages. Appropriate training should be completed.

(c) Members of committees should ensure that their consideration is collective, fair, impartial, and evidence-based.

(d) The University should provide a supportive career development process and academic officers should participate.

- (e) All processes should be organized in a timely and transparent way.
- (f) Constructive, helpful, developmental feedback should be provided at all appropriate stages.
- (g) All applications and documentation should be treated as confidential and in accordance with data protection principles.

8. Broadening the scope to include the Senior Researcher Promotions (SRP) scheme will be reviewed once there is an agreed way forward for the senior academic promotions scheme. If this Report is approved, changes will be made to the 2019 SRP scheme which are in line with the SAP proposals, for example to update its key principles in line with para. 7 above. During the 2018–19 academic year targeted consultation will take place so that a revised SRP Scheme that supports career progression for research staff and is in line with ACP proposals (see paras. 9 and 10 below) can be prepared. Then, if the Report proposing implementation of the ACP Scheme in 2019 is approved, an updated SRP Scheme will also be launched.

9. To achieve the aim of moving fully to the new ACP Scheme in the 2020 exercise will require additional work and further consultation. A subsequent Report will take forward the finalized proposals during the 2018–19 academic year. Current thinking is set out below but these are not final proposals and this section is for information only:

- (a) Evaluative criteria defining academic excellence for promotion to each senior office. The proposed evaluative criteria would be: research; teaching and researcher development; and service. These criteria are similar to the SAP criteria but the proposed teaching criterion would be expanded to include early-career researcher development, thus including all aspects of developing the next generation of academic staff; and the service criterion would make explicit reference to service to the University and to the wider academic community.
- (b) Applicants for promotion would be assessed against the evaluative criteria, informed by indicators of excellence. A limited number of examples of indicators of excellence would be set out under each criterion, informed by experience of what success looks like in the promotions context under the SAP Scheme and also by consultation responses identifying key activities and contributions that should count towards promotion success. The stated indicators would not be intended to be exhaustive. Applicants would be reviewed against these evaluative criteria within the context of relevant disciplinary norms, and committee minutes would record the applicable indicators of excellence, including but not limited to those stated in the ACP Scheme documentation. The publication of these indicators of excellence would enhance the transparency of the Scheme. The proposed evaluative criteria and indicators of excellence for promotion to Professor and Reader respectively have been shared with institutions during consultation and will be further developed over the coming year to ensure they reflect arts and sciences disciplines.

- (c) Probationary arrangements would be aligned with the promotions excellence criteria, with confirmation of tenure carried out by the relevant Faculty Committee. New guidance on managing probation would be introduced to assist in ensuring the process is followed properly.
- (d) Several proposals were put forward during the consultation exercises based on the USL title being conferred by the relevant body on confirmation of tenure. Further consultation will be carried out before putting forward proposals for the USL in the subsequent Report.
- (e) An appropriate budget for the ACP Scheme would be established.

10. The full set of Key Principles would be adopted with the full move to the ACP Scheme in 2020, including the following additional clauses:

- (a) The University should provide a flexible career pathway for established academic officers that gives due recognition to excellence in research, teaching, contributions to the running of the University, and service to the academy including public engagement.
- (b) Appropriate budgetary provision should be made so that deserving candidates receive appropriate recognition and reward.
- (c) All processes should be supported by modern and user-friendly business systems to ensure administrative efficiency, and also to promote fairness and equality by enabling data to be monitored for diversity.

11. The General Board would have the discretion to make changes to the ACP Scheme processes set out above as it deemed necessary, provided that those changes were in line with the Key Principles, and made in the light of experience, for the effective running of future ACP Scheme rounds.

12. The proposals set out in this Report reflect a focus initially limited to a standard ACP Scheme for academic staff and the SRP scheme. Work will continue on possibilities for further evolution of the ACP Scheme, going beyond the proposals already outlined, as follows:

- (a) Developing a distinct exceptional teaching strand and scoring model, to provide recognition of outstanding teaching and educational leadership alongside an effective contribution to research and service. Proposals for this strand were taken forward as part of the second consultation but there was a mixed response, with several respondents commenting that flexibility in scoring across the criteria would be preferable to a separate strand.
- (b) The possible development of a clinical excellence strand, which would be the subject of a separate consultation.

The introduction of (a) or (b) would be preceded by the publication of a Report.

In addition, work will also continue on the development of a career progression scheme for senior teaching-only staff.

13. The General Board recommends:

- I. That, with effect from 1 August 2018, the proposals to take first steps towards establishing a new academic career pathway model, set out in paragraph 6 of this Report are adopted, incorporating these changes into the Senior Academic Promotions Scheme for 2019.
- II. That, with effect from 1 August 2018, the Key Principles underpinning the Senior Academic Promotions Scheme set out in paragraph 7 of this Report are adopted.

2 May 2018	STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i>	MARTHA KRISH	HELEN THOMPSON
	PHILIP ALLMENDINGER	PATRICK MAXWELL	GRAHAM VIRGO
	ABIGAIL FOWDEN	MARTIN MILLETT	MARK WORMALD
	A. L. GREER	RICHARD PRAGER	
	DARSHANA JOSHI	SUSAN RANKIN	

ANNEX A: COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP, ROLES, AND TIMETABLE

Membership

The ACP Scheme seeks to balance the need for multi-level participation and for a more streamlined and simplified process. A three-tier committee structure for considering promotion applications is followed, including a Faculty-level (FC) Committee, School-level (SC) Committee and Vice-Chancellor's Committee (VCC), as set out below.

General Comments

The gender balance of the promotions committee should be as close to 50% male and 50% female as reasonably possible and should normally include a minimum of two members of each gender. Consideration should also be given to the racial and ethnic diversity of the committees.

All members of the promotions committees are responsible for ensuring that the assessment of applications has been conducted fairly and transparently and complies with the ACP Scheme Key Principles. Any member can challenge the process at any time if that member considers that it is not being conducted fairly, transparently, in accordance with the required procedure or the Key Principles.

The University members of the promotions committees are expected to undertake relevant training in equality and diversity matters as specified by the Human Resources Division on behalf of the General Board and to attend an annual meeting covering decision-making.

Meetings should be arranged so that, if possible, all members can attend. The quorum for all committees is two-thirds of the membership, subject to a minimum of four members. Decisions should be made with the concurrence of the majority of members attending the meeting.

Faculty and School Committee membership

The membership of both the FC and SC comprise:

- a minimum of five members and normally not more than nine members, who will be at professorial level and will be chosen to cover the range of disciplines covered by the committee.
- a professorial member of staff in an appropriate subject area who is independent of the institutions covered by that committee.

There should be no overlap in the membership of these committees in any exercise.

Further details about the membership and role of these committees is set out below.

Faculty Promotions Committee (FC)

For each exercise the Faculty Boards will recommend appointment of the Faculty members of the committee for approval by the relevant Council of the School. Where it makes sense in academic terms, Faculty Boards may recommend that a FC be constituted to serve more than one Faculty/Institution, which will consider applications from these Faculties/Institutions. The General Board will approve the parameters of membership of the FCs.

A Chair will be appointed from among the approved FC members. Other attendees at the meeting include:

- a Faculty or Departmental Administrator to act as Secretary, providing advice and guidance as appropriate and together with the Chair overseeing the fair and effective operation of the procedure;
- the relevant Head of School (or another nominated member of the SC) as an invited observer.

The role of the FC is to:

- assist the Chair and Secretary in nominating references. The Secretary will then obtain all references before the meeting;
- review applications, ensuring there is a complete set of documentation for each applicant;
- consider each application at the meeting, evaluating and scoring the candidate's research contribution against the evaluative criteria and recording collective decisions against indicators for this criterion which are illustrative for the particular Faculty/Institution;
- decide overall whether each case meets the criteria across the three areas: research, teaching, and service, confirming its assessment to the SC. The FC may if it wishes assess each candidate against the teaching and general contribution criteria, making recommendations to the SC which will reach the final decision on evaluations, for consideration by the VCC.

School Committee (SC)

There will be six School committees, one for each School. For each exercise the relevant Council of the School will agree membership of the SC, including nominating a Chair from an institution independent of that School for appointment by the General Board. The Head of School will be a member of this committee. The General Board will appoint an external member, who will be distinguished academics, one drawn from each of the SC areas. Members will normally serve on this committee for three years.

Other attendees at the meeting include:

- the relevant HR Business Manager for that School who will act as Secretary, providing advice and guidance as appropriate and together with the Chair overseeing the fair and effective operation of the procedure.

The role of the SC is to:

- review the research evaluation and score for each candidate from the FCs, where necessary making changes it believes are necessary to ensure that they have been applied consistently between candidates and across SCs, recording its decisions against the relevant indicators of excellence for this criterion;
- in addition, to assess and score each candidate against the teaching and general contribution criteria, recording decisions against the relevant indicators;
- decide which applicants meet the required standard of excellence and should be promoted, producing a rank order of total scores for each office;
- agree a feedback statement for each applicant to be provided at their feedback meeting with the Head of Institution.

Vice-Chancellor's Committee (VCC): membership and role

The VCC members comprise:

- the Vice-Chancellor in the Chair;
- the Chair and external member of each SC;
- the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional and International Relations.

Other attendees at the meeting include:

- the Director of Human Resources acting as Secretary, providing advice and guidance as appropriate and together with the Chair overseeing the fair and effective operation of the procedure;
- the Academic Secretary as Secretary of the General Board.

The role of the VCC is to moderate between the SCs to ensure that a consistent standard has been achieved. Therefore, the committee will receive the rank order of candidates for each office and consider the documentary evidence for applicants, deciding whether any adjustments in evaluation are necessary.

The VCC then makes recommendations to the General Board concerning applicants that should be promoted for the academic offices.

The General Board then receives these recommendations and approves cases for promotion.

Launch of the Scheme	Early September
Deadline for submission of documentation from applicants	Early November
Meeting of Faculty Committee to evaluate applications (references have been taken up before committee meets)	During February
Meetings of the six School Committees	During March
Meeting of Vice-Chancellor's Committee	Early May
The meeting of the General Board receives recommendations of the VCC and Report for approval and publication in the <i>Reporter</i>	Early June

ANNEX B: EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The University of Cambridge is committed in its pursuit of academic excellence to equality of opportunity and to a proactive and inclusive approach to equality, which supports and encourages all underrepresented groups, promotes an inclusive culture, and values diversity.

The core value of equality is deeply rooted in the University's ethos of pursuing excellence in education, learning, and research at the highest international levels.

There is an increasing body of evidence suggesting an impact of unconscious bias on the assessment of candidates for promotion and progression. The impact of bias can potentially negatively affect the recruitment, retention, and progression of underrepresented staff members at all levels of career progression.

Putting measures in place to mitigate against potential bias is important at every stage of the career pathway process. Further guidance on how we can mitigate the impact of implicit bias during the promotion process will be made available to Departments and Faculties.

Bias is a cognitive process which can be defined as skewed information processing under the influence of context and accumulated experience. ... These useful, cognitive 'short-cuts' can also mislead us, because they tend to make us pay more attention to information that confirms our expectations and less attention to disconfirming information, thus introducing biases. LERU

Protected characteristics

Protected characteristics are defined in the Equality Act 2010 as Sex, Gender Reassignment, Marriage or Civil Partnership, Pregnancy or Maternity, Race (including Ethnic or National Origin, Nationality or Colour), Disability, Sexual Orientation, Age, or Religion or Belief. The University respects all religious and philosophical beliefs, as well as the lack of religion or belief, and the right of all members of its community to discuss and debate these issues freely.

No member of staff with a protected characteristic as defined by the Equality Act 2010 will be treated less favourably than another because of this protected characteristic.

Underrepresentation in academic positions

Recent research confirms that women, black and minority ethnic (BME), and disabled staff are underrepresented in senior academic positions of the university sector (ECU, 2015).

Existing research reveals several factors contributing to the disparities in the promotion of underrepresented groups to the higher ranks of the university system. These factors include:

- subtle stereotyping and bias (conscious or unconscious)
- long hours culture
- reliance on social normalization that women have family and domestic responsibilities
- structuring of academic work and career paths (Roth and Sonnert, 2010)
- Peer reviewers failing to interpret and apply evaluative criteria in consistent ways (Lee *et al.*, 2013)

On average, female STEM academics reported having significantly:

- more teaching and administrative duties, with less recognition for these efforts
- less time to devote to research
- additional caring responsibilities
- fewer training opportunities and more barriers to training

In contrast, male STEM academics were significantly more likely to enjoy:

- a formally assigned mentor
- opportunities to sit on important departmental committees
- access to senior staff

(2016 Athena Survey of Science, Engineering, and Technology (ASSET)).

The University's response to addressing the underrepresentation of groups at senior levels is to take forward initiatives which aim to target bias and to support individual attributes. These will help to ensure that staff members from underrepresented groups are encouraged and supported within the process.

The University is taking a number of practical steps to bring equality and diversity to the forefront of decision-making within the ACP Scheme. These include:

Support for the Faculty Committee (FC)

Careful consideration of the composition of the committee will be encouraged to ensure broad representation of all groups.

The Chair of each committee will also be prompted to initiate and facilitate a discussion on unconscious bias at the outset of any meeting.

A series of training events will accompany the new ACP (formerly SAP) Scheme. Members of the FC will be advised to attend a workshop which will cover equality and diversity implications of the promotions process. This will include understanding bias in research outputs and how to mitigate for the impact of unconscious bias across the ACP process.

Support for the Head of Department

Heads of Departments will be encouraged to:

- have supportive conversations with all staff eligible to apply for senior promotions
- ensure that the SAP CV scheme is actively promoted to all staff
- actively seek underrepresented staff who are potentially ready for promotion and encourage them to apply
- support underrepresented staff to find a mentor
- discuss promotion pathways with underrepresented staff not yet ready for promotion, discussing career development opportunities through the SRD process.

Allowance for contextual factors

It is agreed that the quality and impact of an applicant's performance should be assessed objectively and on the same basis as other applicants.

It is also important, however, to understand and address contextual factors by making appropriate equality-related adjustments to allow for a fair promotions process where those who have faced these additional barriers will be considered on an even footing. Promotions committees should take into account that not all careers follow a standard and uninterrupted route. All metrics should be considered in context with other factors to ensure that a balanced view is taken of the individual's overall contribution to research or teaching or administration.

Contextual factors may include, but are not limited to:

- part-time working
- ill health or injury
- disability
- caring responsibilities
- periods of leave or unavailability including those related to maternity or parental leave
- bereavement leave

It is important to note and agree that equality-related adjustments do not allow committees to lower the bar when assessing excellence.

For example, any reduction in working time of the candidate due to contextual factors should be taken into account when judging the quality of their work or output. One way of making an appropriate adjustment would be to consider the impact of the issue on the quantity of activity undertaken. In these circumstances committees would still require the candidate to demonstrate the same standard (quality) as other candidates in terms of the excellence of their contribution. However, the quantity of research output would be adjusted.

Advice should be sought at the earliest opportunity from the relevant HR Business Manager in order that any relevant support may be provided.

GRACES

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 10 May 2018

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, unless they are withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105) will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 18 May 2018.

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 3 of the Report of the General Board, dated 27 March 2018, on the establishment and re-establishment of certain Professorships (*Reporter*, 6501, 2017–18, p. 471) be approved.
2. That the recommendations in paragraph 21 of the Report of the Council, dated 18 April 2018, on external finance for income-generating projects including housing solutions in the non-operational estate (*Reporter*, 6502, 2017–18, p. 514) be approved.¹
3. That the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the Report of the Council, dated 18 April 2018, on a new University nursery building (*Reporter*, 6502, 2017–18, p. 516) be approved.²
4. That, on the nomination of Peterhouse, TIMOTHY KEITH DICKENS, M.A., of that College, be appointed a Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2018–19.
5. That, on the nomination of Fitzwilliam College, FRANCIS KNIGHTS, M.Litt., of that College, be appointed a Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2018–19.
6. That, on the nomination of the Vice-Chancellor and the Proctors Designate, TIMOTHY NICHOLAS MILNER, M.A., of Darwin College, be appointed an additional Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2018–19.³
7. That, on the nomination of the Vice-Chancellor and the Proctors Designate, GEMMA LUCY BURGESS, M.A., Ph.D., of Newnham College, be appointed an additional Pro-Proctor for the academical year 2018–19.³
8. That, with effect from 25 May 2018, the amendments to Ordinances relating to the publication of the results of Graduate Students in class-lists outside the Senate-House and subsequently in the *Reporter*, as set out in the Annex to the Council's Notice dated 9 May 2018, be approved.⁴

¹ See the Council's Notice, p. 551.

² See the Council's Notice, p. 552.

³ Also nominated under Special Ordinance C (iii) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 74) for election as a Deputy Proctor.

⁴ See the Notice of the Council and General Board, p. 552.

ACTA**Result of ballot on Grace 2 of 17 January 2018***8 May 2018*

The Registry gives notice that as a result of the ballot held between 27 April and 7 May 2018 the following Grace of the Regent House was **approved**:

2. That, with effect from 25 May 2018, Regulations 4 and 6 of the regulations for the Publication of Lists of Successful Candidates in Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 253) be amended to read as follows:

4. (*a*) Subject to sub-paragraph (*b*) below, all class-lists shall be published by the Registry and subsequently printed in the *Reporter*. A list shall be deemed to have been published as soon as either (i) the Registry has caused a copy of it to be posted outside the Senate-House or (ii) a copy of it has been read in the Senate-House. Any copy of a list read in the Senate-House shall immediately thereafter be posted outside the Senate-House.

(*b*) The publication of a class-list in the *Reporter*, a copy of the class-list issued for posting outside the Senate-House or in any Faculty, Department, or other institution in the University or a College, or read in the Senate-House, shall exclude the names of any candidates who have requested the removal of their names in accordance with a procedure approved from time to time by the General Board.

6. The Chair of Examiners shall communicate to the Registry as soon as practicable a statement of the day on which the Registry may expect to receive the list and whether the list is to be read in the Senate-House.

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

<i>Number of valid votes:</i>	803 (no invalid votes)
In favour of the Grace (<i>placet</i>)	412
Against the Grace (<i>non-placet</i>)	391

The fly-sheets received in relation to this ballot are reprinted on p. 564.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registry*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE ‘REPORTER’

FLY-SHEETS REPRINTED**Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 2 of 17 January 2018 (class-lists)**

In accordance with the Council's Notice on Discussions and Fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 110), the fly-sheets from the ballot on Grace 2 of 17 January 2018 (class-lists) are reprinted below. For the result of the ballot, see p. 563.

Grace 2 of 17th January 2018: Publication of Lists of Successful Candidates in Examinations***Non placet* flysheet**

If approved, this Grace would permit any student, by ticking a box on a website, to opt out of inclusion in the published Tripos list. A student would be able to suppress publication of his or her class not only outside the Senate House, but also from any other form of record accessible to general members of the University, let alone members of the public. It is claimed that this is necessary in order to comply with the EU General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) which come into force on 25th May. However:

Between one quarter and one third of UK graduate job applications lie about their degree class or awarding institution.^{1, 2} It is necessary and in the public interest to combat this, and one of the most effective ways of doing so is to provide open publication of the Class Lists. Further, all involved in teaching students need access not only to current but also to previous and subsequent results of those they teach in order to be able to monitor their own performance. Both these are equally necessary, and therefore justifiable under GDPR Article 6(1)d, e³ which permit publication to protect the vital interests of other natural persons [those who have genuinely done well] or to perform a task in the public interest. It is in any case legal under Article 86⁴ to disclose personal data in official documents [e.g. lists of exam results]. We therefore do not agree that such publication is prohibited by the GDPR (or otherwise⁵); publication is necessary to preserve the high reputational value of a good Cambridge degree and is in the public interest.

We further note that paid legal opinions such as that provided to the University tend to be quite strongly conservative, with an eye towards minimizing the likelihood that the firm providing the advice will incur any legal liability toward the recipient. Moreover, the firm providing the advice has a clear sense of what the recipient wishes to hear, and is naturally inclined to tailor the advice accordingly. We therefore deny that private legal advice is a sufficient basis for determining that a conflict exists with the law of the land, particularly when as now the relevant Bill⁶ is still before Parliament. Such questions can only be finally determined in the Courts.

While UK and EU students pay around £9k per year in fees, the direct costs to the University of educating those students is around double this⁷ and this does not include copious investment of academics' own free time in students. Those in receipt of public money should be publicly accountable for the results achieved.

There are already adequate measures in place for permitting opt-outs from the Senate House lists for those who can show good cause. Any change from the present situation would be counterproductive and we urge the Regent House to vote *non placet* and thereby preserve open publication of Class Lists and the high standing of this University and its degrees.

B. C. ALLANACH
J. D. FIRTH
T. A. FISHER
R. D. HEDLEY
S. JACKSON
P. T. JOHNSTONE

M. H. KRAMER
J. R. LISTER
T. G. MICKLEM
M. G. POLLITT
D. R. PRATT
D. B. SKINNER

M. C. SMITH
D. J. SPIEGELHALTER
J. P. TALBOT
A. G. THOMASON
J. WHALEY
A. ZSAK

¹ The Guardian (<https://www.theguardian.com/careers/careers-blog/lie-degree-cv-jobseekers-graduate>) reported that year on year data from the Higher Education Degree Datacheck (HEDD) organisation shows that about a third of people embellish or exaggerate their academic qualifications when applying for jobs.

² HEDD itself reports (<http://www.hedd.ac.uk>) on false claims made in job applications and offers a means of checking job candidates' degree qualifications. Checks from HEDD cost £12 per candidate and in the case of Cambridge take on average 28 days to complete and require the individual consent of the job candidate, which is too slow and expensive to check all applicants before shortlisting (after which damage has been done). HEDD's current blog (<https://heddblog.wordpress.com/2017/08/> section 'Imperfect Ten') informs us that Risk Advisory surveyed 5,000 CVs in 2017 looking for false claims, and found that 20% contained lies about degree qualifications, and 7% claimed false degree classes. Reed Recruitment reported that when they analysed 10,000 CVs, 24% contained exaggerated degree results.

³ Article 6 section 1 of the GDPR (<https://gdpr-info.eu>) provides that 'Processing [which includes publication (article 4 section 2)] shall be lawful only if and to the extent that at least one of the following applies: ... (d) the processing is necessary in order to protect the vital interests of the data subject or of another natural person; (e) processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest;...'

⁴ Article 86 of the GDPR provides that 'Personal data in official documents held by a public authority or a public body or a private body for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest may be disclosed by the authority or body in accordance with Union or Member State law to which the public authority or body is subject...'

⁵ That no legal right to non-publication of exam results exists before the GDPR has been specifically confirmed by the Information Commissioner.

⁶ Data Protection Bill 2018.

⁷ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6481/section1.shtml#heading2-4>

Grace 2 of 17 January 2018 (class-lists)

Grace 2 allows students to opt out from the publication of their names in the class-lists published outside or read inside the Senate House and also in the class-lists reproduced in the *Reporter* in print and online. Unusually, this fly-sheet is signed by both members of the Regent House and student representatives and students. We all consider that students should have a right to choose whether to have their names and results published. Student choice should be respected, since students themselves are best placed to determine whether they wish to have their results widely known and may have legitimate personal reasons for opting out. It is important to recognise that students have reported that the sharing of data about their results without their consent has affected their welfare. Whilst opt out from publication is presently possible, this can only be done exceptionally with medical evidence being produced in support. This is unnecessarily restrictive and bureaucratic. Further, an easy opt-out from publication is required in order to comply with data protection legislation. It is clear, however, that Faculties, Departments and Colleges have a legitimate interest in receiving and analysing the unredacted class-lists and, as long as they are not published, such receipt will be compatible with the General Data Protection Regulation. Consequently, unredacted class-lists will be circulated to Faculties, Departments and Colleges for their legitimate use, but on the basis that they are not published to those who do not have a legitimate interest in seeing the class-lists.

Consequently, in the light of the new legal regime but also respecting the right of students to choose whether they wish their result to be published, we urge Regent House to vote *placet* to the Grace.

Members of the Regent House:

C. Y. BARLOW	J. GAZZARD	G. T. PARKS
P. J. BARTON	L. R. R. GELSTHORPE	G. J. VIRGO
M. M. BEBER	P. N. HARTLE	G. B. WILLIAMS
J. M. R. BUNBURY	S. MARTIN	D. F. WOOD
M. FRASCA-SPADA	R. PADMAN	

Student Members:

D. J. BRADFORD	L. P. KARAYIANNI	S. THORPE
Y. H. K. CHIN	M. D. KITE	E. O. C. TRAVIS
A. A. COHEN	M. KRISH	G. M. VALE
I. COPPLESTONE	R. J. MOULANGE	R. VINCENT
G. COWPERTHWAITTE	O. M. OLUFEMI	P. D. WARREN
R. S. DE SILVA	F. OULDS	V. C. Y. WONG
D. E. EYRE	T. I. PAVLOV	A. X. YING
M. FRAZER-CARROLL	C. M. S. SMITH	T. ZALETEL
A. L. C. HYDE	M. SONG	
S. A. E. ILLSLEY	S. SWAIN	

Grace 2 of 17 January 2018***Placet fly-sheet***

Grace 2 would allow students to opt out from the publication of their names in the class-lists published outside or read inside the Senate House and also in the class-lists reproduced in the *Reporter* in print and online. It has been prompted both by student desire for the creation of a straightforward opt-out mechanism and by forthcoming changes to data protection legislation arising from the introduction of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) from 25 May 2018. The GDPR will be supplemented by a new UK Data Protection Act, which is still being debated by Parliament, but that Act will not affect the legislative changes summarised below, which will automatically come into effect when the GDPR becomes law.

The GDPR requires organisations to have a valid lawful basis for ‘processing’ (using in any way) an individual’s personal information. The act of publishing class-lists, both outside and inside the Senate House and in the *Reporter*, is an act of processing. There is a comprehensive list of valid lawful bases at Article 6(1) of the GDPR as follows:

- (a) That the individual has consented.
- (b) That the processing is necessary to fulfil a contract with the individual (with the processing being an essential part of fulfilling the contract rather an optional or supplementary one).
- (c) That the processing is necessary to fulfil a legal obligation set out under EU or UK law.
- (d) That the processing is necessary to protect the vital interests of the individual.
- (e) That the processing is necessary to perform a function of a public nature exercised in the public interest.
- (f) That the processing is necessary to fulfil the legitimate interests of the organisation, except insofar as those interests are outweighed by those of the individual.

The publication of class-lists cannot be lawfully justified by reference to bases (b) to (e) above: such publication is not essential to fulfilling a contract; it is not necessary in order to meet a legal obligation imposed by EU or UK law; it is not necessary to protect the vital interests of an individual (i.e. to keep an individual alive); and it is not necessary to perform a function of a public nature exercised in the public interest (meaning a function mandated by EU or UK law). Accordingly, other than through obtaining explicit opt-in consent (basis (a) above), the only potentially applicable basis enabling the lawful public display of class-lists after 25 May 2018 will be basis (f) above, namely that the legitimate interests of the University necessitate the publication of such lists. However, where the processing of personal data takes place under this

lawful basis: (i) it may only proceed so long as the individual's interests have been balanced against the organisation's; and (ii) an individual has the right under Article 21 of the GDPR to object to such processing, and the processing must be stopped unless there are 'compelling legitimate grounds' as to why it needs to continue.

In the context of class-lists, the most obvious mechanism by which to balance individual students' interests against the University's, and through which to collect objections to processing, is to provide a straightforward opt-out from being named in all forms of class-list made available in public. All such opt-outs must be respected under the GDPR because there will be no compelling legitimate grounds which are sufficient to override the objections of the individual. This is so not least because, as we understand it, complete class-lists, including the names of candidates who have opted out of publication, will continue to be circulated confidentially to Faculties, Departments and Colleges for their internal use. In this way, notwithstanding the opt-out mechanism, all teaching staff will continue to have access to the results of students whom they teach. In addition, we are advised that the Student Registry will continue to be able to verify qualifications awarded by the University in accordance with its established procedures.

In short, the approval of Grace 2 is necessary to ensure compliance with UK and European data protection legislation and we consequently urge Regent House to vote *placet* to the Grace.

P. M. ALLMENDINGER
E. V. FERRAN
E. N. FRIEL
L. R. R. GELSTHORPE

D. J. MASKELL
A. D. NEELY
R. W. PRAGER
N. TAMKIN

G. J. VIRGO
A. D. YATES

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 1 May 2018

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Dame Carol Black was presiding, with the Registrar's deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Senior Pro-Proctor, and ninety-two other persons present.

The following Reports were discussed:

Editor's note: *the remarks made on the 'Topic of Concern to the University: Standard of proof applied in student disciplinary cases (Reporter, 2017–18, 6496, p. 396 and 6497, p. 413)' are not yet ready for publication but will be included in the Reporter at the earliest opportunity.*

Report of the Council, dated 18 April 2018, on external finance for income-generating projects including housing solutions in the non-operational estate (Reporter, 6502, 2017–18, p. 514).

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of Council but speak today in a personal capacity.

Ruth Charles and I dissented from this Report on the grounds that we do not have a clear business case with enough detail on how repayments for the new bond will be achieved. We noted in our dissent that the first phase of North West Cambridge does not inspire confidence as it was two years late and £100m over budget. The current rental income is not sufficient to repay the existing bond of £350m when it falls due in 2052, and the case for a second phase is as unconvincing as ever.

I would like to refer Regents to the remarks I made at the Discussion on 3 November 2015 on what went wrong with phase 1.¹ The North West Cambridge Executive realized in March 2014 that the total projected expenditure had risen from £338m to £395m (compared with the £323m authorized by this House). They solved the problem by expanding the scope of the project, bringing forward 164 key worker homes from Phase 2 into Phase 1 and extending the completion deadline from 2016 to 2017.

The Council, of which I was not then a member, placed a Notice in the *Reporter* on 30 July 2014² increasing the borrowing limit from £242m to £311m, followed by a Report to the Regent House on 24 September 2014,³ which claimed that Phase 1 would only be complete by March 2017, but it did not mention cost inflation at all; neither do the Council Minutes. The Syndicate smugly described this in its risk register as 'restructuring'.

I was elected to Council from January 2015 and in March, Council was asked for a further £300m borrowing facility. This was represented as being for development elsewhere, specifically for a shopping mall in the Old Press / Mill Lane site and a hotel on Trumpington Street. The Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor explained that we could borrow money for less than the return we could get by investing in non-operational estate. I dissented, as I did not believe that the Old Schools had the managerial capacity to build and operate a shopping mall or a hotel. Nonetheless the proposal appeared in a Report in May⁴ and was duly Graced on 24 June 2015.⁵ Only then was it admitted to the Syndicate (on 29 June), the Finance Committee (on 8 July), and the Council (on 13 July) that the North West Cambridge project was in financial trouble, with a shortfall of £50m–£80m.

Dr Charles and I exercised our right as Council members to access the papers on the North West Cambridge

Syndicate (as it then was) and wrote a report for Council and the Board of Scrutiny on what went wrong. It is summarized in the remarks I made here on 3 November 2015, to which I refer concerned Regents for the details.⁶ That experience teaches me to look rather closely at proposals like the present one.

Since then North West Cambridge has slipped another fifteen to eighteen months, with completion finally due this year. The Postdocs of Cambridge Society has conducted a survey of residents and found that over half are unhappy. The main complaint is cost, with utility charges coming in for particular criticism, though there are many other issues, from the finish of the apartments through ventilation to cycle paths. Meanwhile the Council is concerned that the rental income is not meeting expectations; unless we get approval from the Council to change the rental model, the rental income will not be sufficient to pay off the first bond when it falls due in 2052. A major underlying problem is the University's ineptitude as a developer. We have been paying £350,000 per unit to build two-bedroom apartments, which is roughly twice what developers pay in West London and four times the cost in the West of Scotland.

I have tried and failed to get straight answers from the North West Cambridge Executive about why the build costs are so high and how they can be reduced if phase 2 goes ahead. I am simply told that those are the numbers that come back from tenders. Perhaps the Vice-Chancellor just needs to phone up three builders and say 'Look, I want 200 two-bedroom apartments built in North West Cambridge; the fixed-price budget is £175,000 per unit; and you're invited to bid on quality. What I mean by that is that we want durable buildings, and we greatly prefer understated classical elegance to architects winning prizes.'

As a member of the Planning and Resources Committee, I am well aware that we have enough difficulty constructing academic buildings on time and on budget, and fixed-price design-and-build procurement may be the best way forward. However, such competence as we have acquired at building labs and lecture theatres does not seem to have translated to residential construction. I am also sceptical that we can suddenly master the art of building shops and hotels, and do not buy the argument that there are guaranteed profits to be had from borrowing money to develop Mill Lane.

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, there is a final consideration. A complaint of Vice-Chancellors both here and elsewhere is lack of free cashflow. Although the University has a lot of income, it is almost all committed, mostly to salaries and student support. An academic leader wishing to undertake bold initiatives finds that they have to be small ones. From the viewpoint of senior management, this is a bug. From my viewpoint, both as an academic and a trustee of the University, it is a feature. It means that growth is bottom-up rather than top-down.

In business, angels might back ten startups for every one that works. Academia is much the same; you try a whole lot of things, and eventually one of them gets traction. The grants roll in and the students beat a path to your door. Bureaucracies, however, are different; once the leader has made it policy to work on X, then X becomes too hard to kill.

For these reasons I oppose borrowing £600m without any credible plan to repay it.

¹ *Reporter*, 6403, 2015–16, p. 140

² *Reporter*, 6356, 2013–14, p. 761

³ *Reporter*, 6357, 2014–15, p. 11

⁴ *Reporter*, 6387, 2014–15, p. 548

⁵ *Reporter*, 6392, 2014–15, p. 680

⁶ *Reporter*, 6403, 2015–16, p. 140

Professor D. J. MASKELL (Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, and Wolfson College), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the University issued a public bond for £350m on 17 October 2012. In March 2015, approval of the Regent House was sought and given in principle, until May 2019, for further borrowing by the University up to a ceiling of £300m for income-generating projects, should the business opportunities be confirmed and borrowing conditions remain favourable. In this Report, the Council is seeking to increase the limit on this authority from £300m up to a total of £600m, and is recommending that Council be given authority to arrange external finance on the advice of the Finance Committee.

While the University has significant capital needs for its operational academic estate, it also needs capital to fund other major projects and developments. These include the provision of further housing for staff, nurseries, the potential commercial elements of development schemes such as Old Press Mill Lane, the development of commercial research facilities at West Cambridge, and environmental sustainability improvements that can generate a reasonable risk-adjusted rate of return. These projects are important for the University and can deliver financial returns capable of meeting interest and principal repayments on a bond issue.

Further investment in housing for University staff is a priority. There are several options to achieve this outcome, in addition to the obvious opportunity via phase 2 of the Eddington development. Detailed work is currently being undertaken to develop a proposal for Eddington phase 2 that delivers high-quality housing at an affordable cost, within a high-quality environment, with reasonable financial returns. I remain confident that it will be possible to develop such a proposal, thus allowing a development that is both strategically important to the University and capable of meeting the interest on and principal repayment of the bond, while also generating a surplus even under adverse scenarios. But if such a proposal does not meet with the approval of Regent House, there are many other developments, as outlined above, that can similarly be undertaken and which will repay the bond. Council is not seeking approval for any specific investment proposal at this juncture.

The reason for looking to raise bond finance now, ahead of the finalization of full cases for further development, is that interest rates are close to historic lows and there is a real risk that long-term interest rates might start to increase in the UK, as has been the trend recently in the USA. If there were to be a one percentage point increase in long-term interest rates before the University were able to borrow, this would represent £300m of additional interest on a £600m bond issue over 50 years. Adding such costs to future generations would not seem to be the best course of action. Long-term interest rate movements are by their nature uncertain, but current market conditions and expert opinion suggest that there is an excellent opportunity now to raise enough capital finance for the University's medium-term strategic needs at a very low rate of interest.

In conclusion, approval for a bond issue is being sought now so as to lock in currently low interest rates. The money raised will support revenue-generating social, environmental, and commercial projects that are of real strategic benefit to the University and should generate a surplus over the cost of finance. Funds will be invested only after rigorous business case approval with appropriate oversight, including, where required, by Regent House.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I read this Report with concern. It took time and much searching to find any definition anywhere of 'non-operational estates' and I am still not clear of its exact meaning. The meaning of the expression as used in a Cambridge context ought surely to be spelt out for the Regent House with absolute clarity.

It appears that this gigantic sum is to be borrowed for speculative expenditure on buildings (and perhaps just land), in mere hope of a profit being made. Paragraphs 6–10 are masterpieces of obfuscatory explanation. Before the Regent House Graces this proposal it should expect to see a far more detailed breakdown of these vague descriptions.

I for one strongly support the dissenting note signed by two members of the Council.

Report of the Council, dated 18 April 2018, on a new University nursery building (Reporter, 6502, 2017–18, p. 516).

Dr D. R. THOMAS (Department of Computer Science and Technology, the West Cambridge Active Travel Group and the Cycling and Walking Working Sub-Group, and Peterhouse), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the University's current nurseries are excellent and so this plan to provide an additional nursery is another important step towards addressing the long waiting list. The current nurseries operated by Childbase provide an excellent quality of care, both in my experience and according to Ofsted. They are also good value as, while they are expensive, the list price is about £10 per day less than similar private nurseries in the city, and also eligible for salary sacrifice. Hence, the existing University nurseries represent one of the few excellent staff benefits that the University offers. It is therefore important to ensure that this new nursery attains the same level of quality and price as existing provisions.

From personal experience of the West Cambridge Nursery, and from submissions to the Cycling and Walking Working Sub-Group of the Transport Working Group of the Environmental Sustainability Strategy Committee about the Edwinstowe Close Nursery, I know of one area of deficiency in the current nurseries. Both lack sufficient cycle parking, both for the parking of cycle child trailers during the day and for drop-off. In addition, the most dangerous part of my child's journey to nursery is probably the journey from the cargo bike to the nursery gate because a child could easily run out in front of the speeding traffic on Charles Babbage Road at that point. While drop-off by car to the nurseries will always be necessary, we should aim to ensure that drop-off by cycle and by walking is made practical for as large a proportion of parents and carers as possible. My understanding is that a survey was recently carried out of drop-offs by car to the West Cambridge Nursery – but that other modes were not counted.

In summary, the existing nurseries are excellent: let's make this new nursery even better.

Report of the General Board, dated 27 March 2018, on the establishment and re-establishment of certain Professorships (Reporter, 6501, 2017–18, p. 471).

No remarks were made on this Report.

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Hughes Hall

Elected to an Honorary Fellowship with effect from 1 May 2018:

His Royal Highness, The Duke of York, KG

King's College

Elected into a Professorial Fellowship with immediate effect:

Richard Bourke, Ph.D., *K*

Elected into Bye-Fellowships with immediate effect:

Krishna Kumar, Ph.D., *K*

Ben Ravenhill, Ph.D., *K*

Fraz Mir, M.A., *Cambridge, FRCP, London*

Elected to an Honorary Fellowship with immediate effect:

Michael Cook, B.A., *K*

Vacancies

Corpus Christi College: Non-Stipendiary Research Fellowship 2018 (any subject); tenure: up to three years from 1 October 2018; closing date: 31 May 2018; further details: <https://www.corpus.cam.ac.uk/about-corpus/people/vacancies>

Peterhouse: Fixed-Term Early Career College Lectureships and Fellowships (one in Mathematics and one in History); fixed term: five years; stipend: £28,935 plus benefits; closing date: 4 June 2018 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.pet.cam.ac.uk/vacancies>

Other Notices

Gonville and Caius College

Memorial service for Professor Roger Carpenter

A memorial service for Professor Roger Hugh Stephen Carpenter, M.A., Ph.D., Sc.D., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, and University Professor of Oculomotor Physiology (2008–12), will be held in the College Chapel at 11 a.m. on Saturday, 30 June 2018.

The service will be followed by refreshments in the SCR of Gonville and Caius College.

SOCIETIES, ETC.

Postdocs of Cambridge (PdOC) Society**Annual General Meeting: 28 June 2018**

The Postdocs of Cambridge (PdOC) Society announce that the 2018 Annual General Meeting (AGM) will be held on 28 June 2018 at 6 p.m. in the Lightfoot Room, St John's College. All postdocs associated or affiliated with the University of Cambridge, its Colleges, and partner institutions are welcome to attend. For more information on the agenda, nominations for the committee, and a link for registration, please see <http://www.pdoc.cam.ac.uk>.

EXTERNAL NOTICES

Oxford Notices

Faculty of History: Roy Foster Irish Government Senior Scholarship in the History and Culture of Ireland (attached to Hertford College) under the aegis of the Foster Professor of Irish History; tenure: one year from 1 October 2018; benefits: membership of the Hertford Middle Common Room, accommodation, a maintenance grant, appropriate Senior Common Room dining rights, and fees where applicable; limited teaching may be available; closing date: 14 June 2018; further information: <http://www.history.ox.ac.uk/home>

Balliol College: Head of Development; salary: £45,428–£57,505; closing date: 31 May 2018; further details: <https://www.balliol.ox.ac.uk/balliol-people/vacancies/2018/may/head-of-development>

Christ Church: Stipendiary Lecturers in Mathematics (three posts); fixed terms: 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2019 (one post), Michaelmas Term 2018 (one post), and Hilary Term 2019 (one post); stipend: £13,248–£14,900 *pro rata*; closing date: 5 June 2018 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.chch.ox.ac.uk/vacancies/four-stipendiary-lectureships-mathematics-mathematics-statistics>

Stipendiary Lecturer in Mathematics and Statistics; tenure: 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2020; stipend: £6,624–£7,450; closing date: 5 June 2018 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.chch.ox.ac.uk/vacancies/four-stipendiary-lectureships-mathematics-mathematics-statistics>

Oriel College: Eugene Lee Hamilton Prize of £60 for the best Petrarchan Sonnet in English submitted by an undergraduate of Oxford or Cambridge; submission date: Thursday, 24 May 2018 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.oriel.ox.ac.uk/about-college/eugene-lee-hamilton-poetry-competition>

St Catherine's College: Stipendiary Lectureship in French; salary: £26,495; closing date: 29 May 2018; further details: <https://www.stcatz.ox.ac.uk/SLFrenchT18>

Stipendiary Lectureship in Philosophy; salary: £13,248; closing date: 29 May 2018; further details: <https://www.stcatz.ox.ac.uk/SLPhilosophyT18>

Development Officer (Regular Giving); salary: £25,728–£33,518; closing date: 25 May 2018; further details: <https://www.stcatz.ox.ac.uk/Vacancies>

Development Assistant; salary: £21,585–£24,983; closing date: 25 May 2018; further details: <https://www.stcatz.ox.ac.uk/Vacancies>

Conference Officer (fixed-term); salary: £23,557–£25,728 *pro rata*; closing date: 28 May 2018; further details: <https://www.stcatz.ox.ac.uk/conferenceofficer>