

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6509

WEDNESDAY 6 JUNE 2018

VOL CXLVIII No 33

CONTENTS

Notices

| | |
|--|-----|
| Calendar | 662 |
| Discussion on Tuesday, 12 June 2018 | 662 |
| Annual Report of the Council for the academical year 2016–17 and Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2017: Notice in response to Discussion remarks | 662 |
| Topic of concern to the University on the standard of proof applied in student disciplinary cases: Notice in response to Discussion remarks | 663 |
| Report of the Council pursuant to Special Ordinance A (i) 7(b) concerning an initiated Grace relating to the University and the Universities Superannuation Scheme: Notice in response to Discussion remarks | 663 |
| Vacancies, appointments, etc. | 663 |
| Vacancies in the University | 663 |
| Electors to Professorships: | |
| Professorship of Finance | 664 |
| Churchill Professorship of Mathematics for Operational Research | 664 |
| Professorship of Media and Culture | 664 |
| Professorship of Organic Chemistry | 665 |
| Herchel-Smith Professorship of Pure Mathematics | 665 |
| Elections, appointments, reappointments, and grant of title | 665 |
| Awards, etc. | 666 |
| Scholarships and Prizes, etc. awarded | 666 |

Notices by the General Board

| | |
|--|-----|
| Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages | 667 |
| Director of Sedgwick Museum of Earth Sciences | 667 |

Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chemical Engineering Tripos, Part IIb, 2018–19 | 667 |
| Geographical Tripos, Parts Ib and II, 2019 | 668 |
| Micro- and Nanotechnology Enterprise for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018–19 | 669 |
| Scientific Computing for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018–19 | 669 |
| Physical Science (Nanoscience and Nanotechnology) for the M.Res. Degree, 2018–19 | 670 |

Form and conduct of examinations, 2018–19

| | |
|--|-----|
| Examinations in Environmental Policy; in Planning, Growth, and Regeneration; in Real Estate Finance; and in Land Economy Research, for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018–19 | 670 |
|--|-----|

Reports

| | |
|---|-----|
| Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the governance of examinations and assessment | 672 |
| Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on Professorships established for a fixed term | 678 |
| Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the establishment of an Education Division, Research Division, and Strategic Partnerships Division | 679 |

Class-lists, etc.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Act for the degree of Doctor of Medicine | 681 |
|--|-----|

Graces

| | |
|---|-----|
| Graces submitted to the Regent House on 6 June 2018 | 681 |
|---|-----|

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Report of Discussion

| | |
|----------------------|-----|
| Tuesday, 29 May 2018 | 682 |
|----------------------|-----|

College Notices

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Vacancies | 688 |
|-----------|-----|

External Notices

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Oxford Notices | 688 |
|----------------|-----|



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES**Calendar**

- 8 June, *Friday*. End of third quarter of Easter Term.
 12 June, *Tuesday*. Discussion in the Senate-House at 2 p.m. (see below).
 15 June, *Friday*. Full Term ends.
 20 June, *Wednesday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 2.45 p.m. (Honorary Degrees).
 25 June, *Monday*. Easter Term ends.

Discussions (at 2 p.m.)

12 June
 19 June
 26 June
 10 July
 17 July

Congregations

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, 12 June 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, 12 June 2018 at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Topic of concern to the University: Grace 3 of 10 May 2018 (proposed University nursery building) (*Reporter*, 6507, 2017–18, p. 578).
2. Report of the Council, dated 21 May 2018, on the financial position and budget of the University, recommending allocations from the Chest for 2018–19 (*Reporter*, 6508, 2017–18, p. 632).

The Reports published in this issue (pp. 672, 678, and 679) will be discussed on 19 June 2018.

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

**Annual Report of the Council for the academical year 2016–17 and
 Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2017:
 Notice in response to Discussion remarks**

4 June 2018

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 23 January 2018 (*Reporter*, 6493, 2017–18, pp. 371 and 373) concerning the above Reports (*Reporter*, 6489, 2017–18, p. 195).

The Council thanks the Chair of the Board of Scrutiny for his reminder about the ability of members to provide comments to the Board on these Reports. The Council also notes Professor Anderson's remarks which confirm that the Investment Board has been asked to consider the question of access to information about the University's investments both for members of the Council and for members of the University.

Professor Evans draws attention to induction materials for new members of staff. The Council agrees with Professor Evans that there should be a link to the governance site included in the online training and this change will be made. The wording of the conditions for booking an online course will also be reviewed. With regard to Professor Evans's comments on the People Strategy, the Council notes that that document identifies themes for further work and consultation; the approval of the Regent House will be sought, as appropriate, as the strands of the work under the People Strategy are completed.

Dr Rutter asks about the level of staff costs that the University can afford, in the context of the information about its income, and about the information that has been shared with the Universities and Colleges Employers Association in the annual discussions about pay and with Universities UK (UUK) in the recent consultation about the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS). The information provided to UUK is available on the University's website at <https://www.staff.admin.cam.ac.uk/general-news/uss-pension-valuation>. In responding to the UCEA 2018–19 national pay negotiation survey, the University proposed that a 2% increase would be regarded as the minimum and desirable outcome. The Council is submitting a Grace for the approval of its Annual Report (which includes the General Board's Report) (Grace 1, p. 681).

Topic of concern to the University on the standard of proof applied in student disciplinary cases: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

4 June 2018

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 1 May 2018 (*Reporter*, 6507, 2017–18, p. 595) regarding the topic of concern to the University on the standard of proof applied in student disciplinary cases (*Reporter*, 2017–18; 6496, p. 396 and 6497, p. 413).

The Council acknowledges the remarks made by a large number of speakers, and notes in particular the personal experiences offered by student members in relation to the topic of concern.

The Council notes the ongoing period of consultation regarding proposed changes to the University's student disciplinary procedure, which included an invitation to comment on the standard of proof to be applied. The Council confirms that all of the remarks made at the Discussion will be provided to its Review Committee on Student Discipline, so that the Review Committee can consider those comments alongside the responses to the consultation before finalizing its recommendations. It is anticipated that, following further scrutiny of the proposals by the relevant University and College committees, a Report proposing changes to the student disciplinary procedure will be published in 2018–19, with changes to take effect by 1 October 2019.

Further information regarding the consultation on the student disciplinary procedure is available at: <https://www.studentcomplaints.admin.cam.ac.uk/consultation>. The consultation period remains open until Friday, 22 June 2018.

Members of the University can access materials relating to the prevention of harassment and sexual misconduct, the support for those who have been affected, and the reporting of incidents at: <https://www.breakingthesilence.cam.ac.uk/>.

Report of the Council pursuant to Special Ordinance A (i) 7(b) concerning an initiated Grace relating to the University and the Universities Superannuation Scheme: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

4 June 2018

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 15 May 2018 (*Reporter*, 6507, 2017–18, p. 620) concerning the above Report (*Reporter*, 6504, 2017–18, p. 539).

The Council notes Dr Rutter's comments on the Grace. The drafting of paragraph (v)(b) is intended to leave all options on the table in considering how best to maintain the total remuneration and retirement package of the University's USS members, if the negotiations deliver an outcome offering benefits that are materially less than those currently available to members. The timetable given for the Council reporting on those options is the latest date that such a report would be published. The Council agrees with Dr Rutter that there should be no undue delay; if the Council can report earlier, it will do so.

The Council also notes Mr Goode's request that the Vice-Chancellor take his remarks as a representation under Statute A IX 1(a) that there has been a breach of compliance with the Statutes and Ordinances by the Council in its Report to the Regent House of 1 May 2018 and subsequent submission of a Grace on 2 May 2018. It understands that he has subsequently formally made a representation in writing to the Vice-Chancellor in accordance with the requirements of Statute A IX 1(a).

In order to allow the Regent House to make its determination whether to approve the Council's decision to withhold authorization of the initiated Grace, the Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 2, p. 681) for the approval of the recommendation of this Report.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Vacancies in the University

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

Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum and Marlay Curator; closing date: 5 July 2018; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/17755/> or contact Joanna Kill of Liz Amos Associates (email: joanna.kill@lizamosassociates.com; tel.: 020 3004 4701); quote reference: DA15792

Clinical Lecturer in Public Health in the Department of Public Health and Primary Care (fixed-term); tenure: four years in the first instance; salary: £32,47–£57,444; closing date: 25 September 2018; further details: <http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/17597/>; quote reference: RH15647

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.

Electors to the Professorship of Finance

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

Professor Ian White, *JE*, in the Chair, as the Vice Chancellor's Deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Hanno Lustig, *Stanford University*

Professor Richard Prager, *Q*

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

Professor Gishan Dissanaike, *HH*

Professor Eilis Ferran, *CTH*

Professor Leonid Kogan, *MIT Sloan School of Management*

(c) *on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Business and Management*

Professor Bart Lambrecht, *Q*

Professor Christoph Loch, *PEM*

Professor Kathy Yuan, *London School of Economics*

Electors to the Churchill Professorship of Mathematics for Operational Research

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Churchill Professorship of Mathematics for Operational Research as follows:

Professor Dame Athene Donald, *CHU*, in the Chair, as the Vice Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Lindsay Greer, *SID*

Professor Judith Rousseau, *University of Oxford*

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

Professor Francis Bach, *École Normale Supérieure*

Professor Leslie Ann Goldberg, *University of Oxford*

Professor Stephen Wright, *University of Wisconsin*

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

Professor Frank Kelly, *CHR*

Professor Gabriel Paternain, *T*

Professor Richard Samworth, *JN*

Electors to the Professorship of Media and Culture

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Professorship of Media and Culture as follows:

Professor Andy Neely, *SID*, in the Chair, as the Vice Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Philip Allmendinger, *CL*

Professor Dame Henrietta Moore, *University College London*

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

Professor Ash Amin, *CHR*

Professor Simon Goldhill, *K*

(c) *on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Human, Social, and Political Science*

Professor Sarah Franklin, *CHR*

Dr Ella McPherson, *Q*

Dame Barbara Stocking, *MUR*

Electors to the Professorship of Organic Chemistry

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

Professor Geoff Ward, *HO*, in the Chair, as the Vice Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Annette Doherty, *Cambridge and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust*

Professor Guy Lloyd-Jones, *University of Edinburgh*

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

Professor Matthew Gaunt, *M*

Professor Lindsay Greer, *SID*

Professor Christopher Schofield, *University of Oxford*

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

Professor Erick Carreira, *ETH Zürich*

Professor John Pyle, *CTH*

Professor David Spring, *T*

Electors to the Herchel-Smith Professorship of Pure Mathematics

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Herchel-Smith Professorship of Pure Mathematics as follows:

Professor Chris Abell, *CHR*, in the Chair, as the Vice Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Viviane Baladi, *Sorbonne University*

Professor Lindsay Greer, *SID*

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

Professor Martin Hairer, *Imperial College London*

Professor Daniel Huybrechts, *University of Bonn*

Professor Rafe Mazzeo, *Stanford University*

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

Professor Emmanuel Breuillard

Professor Mihalis Dafermos

Professor Gabriel Paternain, *T*

Elections, appointments, reappointments, and grant of title

The following elections, appointments, reappointments, and grant of title have been made:

ELECTIONS

Professor William Cristobel Ocasio, B.A., *Puerto Rico-Mayaguez*, M.B.A., *Harvard*, Ph.D., *Stanford*, John L. and Helen Kellogg Distinguished Professor of Management and Organizations, Northwestern University, elected Sandra Dawson Visiting Professor of Marketing, Strategy, and Innovation (2002) from 8 May 2018 until 7 June 2018.

Professor Nicholas Oliver Alan Bullock, *K*, and Mr Spencer Thomas de Grey, *CHU*, re-elected Visiting Professors of Architecture for a further year from 1 October 2018 until 30 September 2019.

APPOINTMENTS

University Senior Lecturer

Computer Science and Technology. Dr Andreas Vlachos, Ph.D., *PET*, B.Sc., *Athens*, M.Sc., *Edinburgh*, appointed from 1 October 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

University Lecturers

Classics. Dr John Weisweiler, M.Phil., *PEM*, Ph.D., *JN*, appointed from 1 September 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Computer Science and Technology. Dr Alice Jill Hutchings, B.A., Ph.D., *Griffith*, *Australia*, appointed from 1 October 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Engineering. Dr Letizia Mortara, B.Sc., *Bologna, Italy*, Ph.D., *Cranfield*, appointed from 1 May 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics. Dr Julia Wolf, B.A., Ph.D., *CL*, H.D.R., *Paris-Sud (Orsay)*, appointed from 1 September 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Clinical Lecturer

Oncology. Dr Syed Saif Ahmad, Ph.D., *PEM*, M.B. Ch.B., *Sheffield*, PG.Cert., *Nottingham*, M.Sc., *London*, MRCP, FRCP, appointed from 2 July 2018 until 1 July 2022 and subject to a probationary period of twelve months.

Associate Lecturers

Veterinary Medicine. Professor Geert Opsomer, D.V.M., M.Sc., Ph.D., *Ghent*, and Dr Eleanor Raffan, Ph.D., *CL*, B.V.M.S., *Edinburgh*, appointed from 1 April 2017 until 31 March 2022.

Principal Assistant Registry

University Offices (Registry's Office). Dr Regina Beate Sachers, M.Phil., Ph.D., *CTH*, appointed from 4 May 2018 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of nine months.

REAPPOINTMENTS

Head of Department

Physics. Professor Andy Parker, *PET*, reappointed from 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2022.

Associate Lecturers

Veterinary Medicine. Dr David Leonard Williams, *JN*, reappointed from 1 January 2016 for a further five years. Dr Christine Elizabeth Latham, *R*, reappointed from 1 October 2016 for a further five years.

GRANT OF TITLE

Affiliated Lecturer

Human, Social, and Political Science. Dr Francoise Barbira Freedman has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2017 for a further two years.

AWARDS, ETC.**Scholarships and Prizes, etc. awarded**

This content has been deleted as it contains personal information.

This content has been deleted as it contains personal information.

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD

Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages

With immediate effect

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages, has approved changes to the membership of the Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages, in order to reflect recent governance changes, to ensure that membership is up to date and appropriate, and to reflect the changes outlined in the Report of the General Board on the Reorganization of the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages.¹

Schedule I to the regulations for Classes of Faculty Board Membership, Elections, and Periods of Office (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 607) has been amended such that the number of members in class (a) (i) is none, (a) (ii) is six, (c) is nine, (d) is six, and the total is 29.

¹ See paragraph 5 (*Reporter*, 6469, 2016–17, p. 651).

Director of Sedgwick Museum of Earth Sciences

With immediate effect

Following a review of the Sedgwick Museum of Earth Sciences in December 2017, the General Board has agreed that the Director of the Sedgwick Museum of Earth Sciences should be an office in its own right and not held in conjunction with another University office in the Department of Earth Sciences. The General Board has therefore approved the deletion of Regulation 2(a) of the regulations for the Sedgwick Museum of Earth Sciences (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 624) and the renumbering of the remaining sub-paragraphs of that regulation; and the removal of the reference to the five-year tenure of the Director in Regulation 3(a).

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.

Chemical Engineering Tripos, Part IIB, 2018–19

The Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology Syndicate gives notice that the modules available for study in the academical year 2018–19 will be as follows.

Topics in Group A and Group D are compulsory for all candidates. The regulations specify that each candidate takes a total of six modules from Groups B and C. The Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology Syndicate imposes the restriction that at least two of these modules should be chosen from Group B, and at least two should be chosen from Group C. Further, at least two of the six modules chosen from Groups B and C should be assessed principally or entirely by written examination.

| Group | Number and title of module | Mode of assessment |
|-------|---|--------------------|
| A | A1: Compulsory topics | Examination |
| | A2: Chemical product design | Coursework |
| B | B1: Advanced transport processes | Examination |
| | B3: Pharmaceutical engineering | Examination |
| | B4: Rheology and processing | Examination |
| | B5: Computational fluid dynamics | Coursework |
| | B6: Fluid mechanics and the environment | Examination |
| C | B7: Interface engineering | Examination |
| | C2: Optimization | Examination |
| | C4: Entrepreneurship | Coursework |
| | C5: Foreign language | Coursework |
| | C6: Biosensors | Coursework |
| | C7: Bionanotechnology | Exam + coursework |
| D | C8: Biophysics | Examination |
| | Research project | |

Geographical Tripos, Parts IB and II, 2019

The Faculty Board of Earth Sciences and Geography gives notice that, for the examination for Part IB and Part II of the Geographical Tripos to be held in 2019, the papers to be offered will be examined as shown in the tables below.

In these tables, the following terms are defined:

1. 'Two+1 examination': The assessment of such papers will consist of a conventional two-hour examination in which candidates will be asked to attempt two questions from a choice of not fewer than six questions. The papers will be undivided. In addition, there will be assessed coursework to be submitted not later than the division of the Easter Term in the year of the examination. The nature of the coursework required will be determined by the University Teaching Officer responsible for the co-ordination of the course, who will provide written details of the procedures which will be followed. The coursework will be equivalent to one question in quantity and for assessment in determining an overall mark for the paper.
2. 'Three-hour examination': The papers will be examined by a conventional unseen three-hour examination in which candidates will be asked to attempt three questions from a choice of not fewer than nine questions. The papers will be undivided.

PART IB

| <i>Paper</i> | <i>General titles</i> | <i>Courses offered 2018–19</i> | <i>Mode of assessment</i> |
|--------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| 1 | Living with global change | Part i: Cultures of risk Part ii: Geographies of environmental hazard Part iii: Making geographical knowledges | Two+1 examination |
| 2 | Human geography I | Austerity | Two+1 examination |
| 3 | Human geography II | Development theories, policies, and practices | Two+1 examination |
| 4 | Human geography III | Citizenship, cities, and civil society | Two+1 examination |
| 5 | Physical and environmental geography I | Quaternary climates and environment | Two+1 examination |
| 6 | Physical and environmental geography II | Glacial processes | Two+1 examination |
| 7 | Physical and environmental geography III | Biogeography | Two+1 examination |

PART II

| <i>Paper</i> | <i>General titles</i> | <i>Courses offered 2018–19</i> | <i>Mode of assessment</i> |
|--------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | A prescribed topic or topics in human geography I | The geographies of global urbanism | Three-hour examination |
| 2 | A prescribed topic or topics in human geography II | Geographies of the Arctic | Two+1 examination |
| 3 | A prescribed topic or topics in human geography III | Political ecology in the global south | Three-hour examination |
| 4 | A prescribed topic or topics in human geography IV | Demographic continuity and change | Two+1 examination |
| 5 | A prescribed topic or topics in geography I | Environmental knowledges and the politics of expertise | Three-hour examination |
| 6 | A prescribed topic or topics in geography II | Political appetites: geographies of food and power | Three-hour examination |
| 7 | A prescribed topic or topics in geography III | Legal geographies | Two+1 examination |
| 8 | A prescribed topic or topics in geography IV | From Earth observations to the climate system | Three-hour examination |
| 9 | A prescribed topic or topics in physical geography I | Glaciology | Three-hour examination |
| 10 | A prescribed topic or topics in physical geography II | Volcanology | Three-hour examination |
| 11 | A prescribed topic or topics in physical geography III | Muddy coasts and estuaries | Two+1 examination |
| 12 | A prescribed topic or topics in physical geography IV | Biogeography: biological processes and environmental change | Two+1 examination |

Examination in Micro- and Nanotechnology Enterprise for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018–19

The Degree Committee for the Faculty of Physics and Chemistry gives notice that the modules available to candidates for examination in Micro- and Nanotechnology Enterprise for the degree of Master of Philosophy in the academical year 2018–19 will be as below.

All modules assessed by examination will be examined in two three-hour examinations.

| Reference | Name | Mode of assessment |
|-----------|---|--------------------|
| NE.01 | Characterization techniques | Examination |
| NE.02 | MEMS design | Coursework |
| NE.04 | Nanofabrication techniques | Examination |
| NE.05 | Nanomaterials | Examination |
| NE.06 | Nanochemistry | Examination |
| NE.07 | Physics at the nanometre scale | Examination |
| NE.08 | Bionanotechnology | Examination |
| NE.09 | Nanoelectrochemistry | Examination |
| NE.10 | Energy harvesting | Examination |
| NE.11 | Nano self assembly | Examination |
| | Science and communication in business | Coursework |
| | Science and communication in media | Coursework |
| | Science and communication in research | Coursework |
| | Societal and ethical dimensions of nanotechnology | Coursework |
| NMIS | Nurturing and managing innovation in science | Coursework |

Examination in Scientific Computing for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018–19

The Degree Committee for the Faculty of Physics and Chemistry gives notice that the following papers are available for the examination in Scientific Computing for the degree of Master of Philosophy in the academical year 2018–19:

| | |
|----------|--|
| Paper 1 | Fundamentals in numerical analysis |
| Paper 2 | Numerical integration and ordinary differential equations |
| Paper 3 | Numerical differentiation and partial differential equations |
| Paper 4 | Linear systems |
| Paper 5 | Electronic structure |
| Paper 6 | Atomistic modelling of materials |
| Paper 7 | Machine learning |
| Paper 8 | Mesoscale and coarse-grain modelling |
| Paper 9 | Data science for materials modelling |
| Paper 10 | Computational continuum modelling |
| Paper 11 | Advanced continuum modelling |
| Paper 12 | Introduction to computational multiphysics |

Candidates should choose a minimum of three papers.

Papers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 will be examined by a two-hour written examination consisting of three questions, of which candidates will be required to answer two.

Paper 5 will be examined by a two-hour written examination consisting of four questions, of which candidates will be required to answer all.

At the discretion of the Course Director, students may also be able to choose options available under other Masters' Degrees offered by the Departments of the Schools of the Physical Sciences, Technology, and Biological Sciences.

Examination in Physical Science (Nanoscience and Nanotechnology) for the M.Res. Degree, 2018–19

The Degree Committee for the Faculty of Physics and Chemistry gives notice that the modules available for examination for the degree of Master of Research in Physical Science (Nanoscience and Nanotechnology) in 2018–19 shall be as follows:

| | | | |
|------------|---|----------|---|
| NE.01 | Characterization techniques | Core | Examination |
| NE.04 | Nanofabrication techniques | Core | Examination |
| NE.05 | Nanomaterials | Core | Examination |
| NE.06 | Nanochemistry | Core | Examination |
| NE.07 | Physics at the nanometre scale | Core | Examination |
| NE.08 | Bionanotechnology | Core | Examination |
| NE.09 | Nanoelectrochemistry | Optional | Examination |
| NE.10 | Energy harvesting | Optional | Examination |
| NE.11 | Nano self assembly | Core | Examination |
| Coursework | Science communication in media, business, and research | Core | Coursework |
| Coursework | Societal and ethical dimensions of nanotechnology | Core | Coursework |
| Coursework | Nurturing and managing innovation in science | Core | Coursework |
| Practicals | Practical training course | Core | Coursework |
| Projects | Mini project I (up to 3,000 words) plus Mini-project II (up to 3,000 words), plus Midi-project (up to 10,000 words) | Core | Written reports, feedback from supervisors |
| Proposal | Formulation and defence of a Ph.D. project proposal | Core | Written report, oral presentation, oral examination |

FORM AND CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS, 2018–19

Notices by Faculty Boards, or other bodies concerned, of changes to the form and conduct of certain examinations to be held in 2018–19, by comparison with those examinations in 2017–18, are published below. Complete details of the form and conduct of all examinations are available from the Faculties or Departments concerned.

Examinations in Environmental Policy; in Planning, Growth, and Regeneration; in Real Estate Finance; and in Land Economy Research, for the M.Phil. Degree, 2018–19

The Degree Committee for the Department of Land Economy gives notice that, for the examinations to be held in 2018–19, the form of examination for each module offered will be as follows:

Please note: In instances where Land Economy Research students opt to take modules normally assessed by written examination, the Examiners will be asked to provide a separate assignment. Where a module is usually in a combination of forms it is also likely that the candidate will be set a separate assignment. Details of any such substitute assignments will be notified to the candidate(s) concerned once they have been confirmed with the relevant Examiners.

MICHAELMAS AND LENT TERM MODULES

EP01 International environmental law

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project in the Lent Term (50% of total mark) and by a two-hour written examination in the Easter Term (50% of total mark).

EP02 Environmental economics and policy

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project in the Lent Term (50% of total mark) and by a two-hour written examination in the Easter Term (50% of total mark).

PGR01 Urban and environmental planning

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project in the Lent Term (50% of total mark) and by a two-hour written examination in the Easter Term (50% of total mark).

PGR02 Urban and housing policy

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project in the Lent Term (50% of total mark) and by a two-hour written examination in the Easter Term (50% of total mark).

RE01 Corporate finance and real estate

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project in the Lent Term (50% of total mark) and by a two-hour written examination in the Easter Term (50% of total mark).

RE02 Real estate finance and investment

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project in the Lent Term (50% of total mark) and by a two-hour written examination in the Easter Term (50% of total mark).

MICHAELMAS TERM MODULES

RM01 Research methods

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

EP03 Environmental values

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

EP08 Comparative environmental policy

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

PGR04 Institutions and development I

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

RE04 The macroeconomy and housing

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

LENT TERM MODULES

RM02 Further topics in quantitative methods

The module will be examined by a two-hour written examination.

EP04 Innovation policy and climate change

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

EP06 Energy and climate change

The module will be examined by a two-hour written examination.

EP07 National, comparative, and European environmental law and policy

The module will be examined by a two-hour written examination.

EP09 Rural environment: property, planning, and policy

The module will be examined by a two-hour written examination.

EP10 Science, evidence, and environmental policy

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

PGR03 Spatial economics

The module will be examined by a two-hour written examination.

PGR05 Institutions and development II

The module will be examined by a two-hour written examination.

RE03 Property development processes

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

RE05 Legal issues in land use and finance

The module will be examined by a 4,000-word project.

Rules of general application for written examinations*(i) Duration of written examinations*

Where modules are examined by means of a written examination this will consist of a two-hour unseen written paper unless otherwise specified.

(ii) Relative weighting

Unless otherwise specified in the paper:

- (a) within each paper, all questions will carry equal weight;
- (b) within each question, all parts carry equal weight.

(iii) Use of Statute and other materials in examinations

Where candidates are permitted to use their own materials, no markings will be allowed in those materials nor will candidates be permitted to attach anything or insert anything within those materials. No spare copies of permitted materials will be made available for candidates in the examinations. Candidates infringing this rule may be required to surrender their copy and may be reported for the infringement. Except for essential valuation tables, candidates who have to surrender their copy will not be provided with replacement material to use in the examination.

(iv) Use of calculators

The permitted calculators for use in the Land Economy M.Phil. examinations will be the standard University calculator CASIO fx 115 (any version); CASIO fx 570 (any version) or CASIO fx991 (any version); the Hewlett Packard HP 10BII or HP10BII+. Candidates may only bring one model of calculator into the examination hall. Candidates may not bring into the examinations external media associated with any calculator, such as instruction manuals, magnetic cards, or memory modules, but they may bring in spare batteries. Candidates are warned that the Examiners are not prepared to make allowances, when marking, for the malfunction of a candidate's calculator for whatever reason.

(v) Use of dictionaries

Candidates may not bring into the examinations dictionaries of any sort.

Rules of general application for projects, essays, and coursework

The following rules apply unless otherwise specified on assignments and essays:

- (i) one hard copy of all assignments for examination should be submitted by the specified deadline, in addition to an electronic version in MS Word/PDF/Excel/PowerPoint submitted via Moodle;
- (ii) candidates should not put their name on any piece of work submitted for examination; they should instead use their Departmental Candidate Number;
- (iii) loose-leaf submissions are not acceptable, although candidates may choose to secure their work however they wish, i.e. file, binding, staple, etc.;
- (iv) candidates will be required to submit a Project Declaration Form as a separate piece of paper with each project, indicating the module number/name, candidate number and name, and stating that it is all their own work, within the word limit, and that they agree to their work being checked by plagiarism detection software (Turnitin UK), should the need arise;
- (v) penalties will be applied by the Board of Examiners in the event of late submission. This includes the late submission of the required electronic version;
- (vi) penalties will be applied by the Board of Examiners in the event that the prescribed word limit is exceeded.

REPORTS**Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the governance of examinations and assessment**

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

1. In 2014–15, the General Board's Education Committee and the Board of Examinations established a working group, chaired by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), to conduct a review of examination processes and strategies for all examinations, except those examinations by thesis and oral. A consultation was launched by Notice published in the *Reporter* on 29 July 2015 (*Reporter*, 6395, 2014–15, p. 820).

2. The review reported to the Council and the General Board in the Michaelmas Term 2017. This Report seeks to take forward recommendations made by the review in respect of the governance arrangements for the oversight of examinations and assessment. The recommendations have the support of the Council, the General Board, the Board of Examinations, the Applications Committee, the Education Committee, and the Senior Tutors' Committee.

3. The review considered the roles of the bodies currently responsible for examinations. It noted that responsibility for examinations and assessment is currently split between the Education Committee of the General Board, the Board of Examinations, and the Applications Committee of the Council. The Council and the General Board endorsed the review in its conclusion that the fact that there is no single body with responsibility for examination and assessment matters poses a risk to the University both in terms of the integrity of examinations and academic standards.

4. In response to the review, the Council and the General Board recommend that a single body be established to assume responsibility for examinations. To this end it is proposed that the Board of Examinations be dissolved and that a new Examination and Assessment Committee be established in its place. This new Committee would assume responsibility for quality assurance of examinations, maintenance of standards, and for ensuring the integrity of the examination process for all courses of study except those graduate courses assessed by thesis and oral only which would remain under the jurisdiction of the Board of Graduate Studies. Terms of reference and membership for this new Committee are given in Annex A of this Report.

5. Examination access arrangements for individual students are currently the responsibility of the Board of Examinations, whilst consideration and remedy of mitigating circumstances fall to the Applications Committee. Currently consideration of case work is divorced from examination policy and quality assurance. The review concluded that this separation of responsibility is unhelpful, and poses risks to the integrity and fairness of the system. The Council and the General Board therefore recommend that a new Examination Access and Mitigation Committee be established to take responsibility for, and bring together, the examination adjustments procedures of the Board of Examinations that deal with pre-examination applications and the post-examination work of the

Applications Committee. To ensure integration of policy and operational matters and case work, this new body would be a sub-committee of the Examination and Assessment Committee. The Examination and Assessment Committee would be responsible for overarching policy, and the Examination Access and Mitigation Committee for the enactment of that policy. It is not currently proposed to alter the arrangements for consideration of cases by the Board of Graduate Studies. The Examination and Assessment Committee, once established, will consider future arrangements for taught Master's degree examinations (and those leading to postgraduate diplomas and certificates) in consultation with the Board of Graduate Studies. Proposed terms of reference and membership of the Examination Access and Mitigation Committee are given in Annex B of this Report.

6. The General Board has broad oversight of student issues and equality legislation, and responsibility for teaching quality. Given the importance of the links between teaching and assessment, the Council and the General Board recommend that the proposed Examination and Assessment Committee should report to the General Board through its Education Committee.

7. The Board of Examinations is established by Special Regulation and has two main roles: (i) to assign lecture-rooms under authority delegated by the Council; and (ii) to take responsibility for the arrangements for the conduct of all University examinations, other than those under the authority of the Board of Graduate Studies. On dissolution of the Board, it is proposed that responsibility for operational aspects of examinations – providing and preparing suitable rooms for examination; examination timetabling; instruction and payment of supervisors, invigilators, and attendants; and recording attendance of candidates at examinations – should fall to the Registry. The new Examination and Assessment Committee would take responsibility for issuing rules for the guidance of candidates and the prevention of misconduct and for fines. Proposed amendments to Ordinances and procedures to reflect these changes are set out in Annexes D and E.

8. With the creation of the new Examination Access and Mitigation Committee as a sub-committee of the Examination and Assessment Committee, it is proposed that the current powers of the Council to make allowances to candidates for examinations be transferred to the General Board, with the current procedures as set out in the Council's

Notice and published in Ordinances largely unchanged. The new Examination Access and Mitigation Committee would also assume responsibility for alternative modes of assessment as detailed in the General Board Code of Practice: Reasonable Adjustments for Disabled Students.

9. As part of the review, some amendments to the Ordinances covering allowances are proposed (see Annex C). These simplify the wording of the regulations and bring them into line with established practice. More substantive changes, which have been endorsed by the Applications Committee and the Senior Tutors' Committee, are proposed to simplify the range of allowances as set out in Regulation 3 of the regulations for Allowances to Candidates for Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 244). It is proposed that:

- (a) consideration of whether or not to declare a candidate to have deserved honours would be restricted to those candidates who are in their final year of study and in a position to graduate;
- (b) consideration of other candidates in earlier years of study will be in respect of whether or not to allow them to progress to the next year of study.

In line with guidance from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, Regulation 3(d) has been amended to make provision for the Examination Access and Mitigation Committee to require Examiners to move a candidate's name to a higher class provided the Examiners are satisfied that the candidate has performed at the standard of the higher class in all but a relatively small part of the examination, rather than simply giving the Examiners authority to do so as currently.

10. Under current arrangements the Council does not have the power to allow candidates to offer non-standard combinations of papers. This responsibility rests with the General Board. It is proposed that, in future, these powers are exercised through the new Examination Access and Mitigation Committee.

11. Although it is established practice that the Applications Committee may set conditions for return after a period of intermission, this is not currently codified in the Ordinances nor in the notice of procedure. It is proposed that the regulations be amended to give the General Board explicit powers, exercised through the new Committee, to set conditions for return to study.

12. The Council and the General Board recommend, with effect from 1 October 2018:

- I. That paragraph (ii) of Special Ordinance A (vi) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 69) be rescinded and the remaining paragraphs renumbered.
- II. That the regulations for the Board of Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 120) be rescinded.
- III. That authority to make allowances to candidates for examinations be transferred to the General Board and that the regulations for Allowances to Candidates for Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 244) be amended as shown in Annex C.
- IV. That Regulation 1 of the regulations for the B.A. Degree (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 438) be amended to reflect the transfer of responsibility for allowances from the Council to the General Board by replacing the references to the Council with references to the General Board.
- V. That the changes to Ordinances as set out in Annex D be approved.

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 4 June 2018 | STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> | ANTHONY FREELING | FIONA KARET |
| | ROSS ANDERSON | NICHOLAS GAY | SUSAN OOSTHUIZEN |
| | RICHARD ANTHONY | DAVID GREENAWAY | MICHAEL PROCTOR |
| | R. CHARLES | JENNIFER HIRST | JOHN SHAKESHAF |
| | STEPHEN J. COWLEY | NICHOLAS HOLMES | SARA WELLER |
| | DAISY EYRE | DARSHANA JOSHI | JOCELYN WYBURD |
| 6 June 2018 | STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> | MARTHA KRISH | SUSAN RANKIN |
| | ABIGAIL FOWDEN | PATRICK MAXWELL | HELEN THOMPSON |
| | A. L. GREER | MARTIN MILLETT | GRAHAM VIRGO |
| | NICHOLAS HOLMES | RICHARD PRAGER | MARK WORMALD |
| | DARSHANA JOSHI | | |

ANNEX A:
EXAMINATION AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

1. The Examination and Assessment Committee shall be a sub-committee of the Education Committee of the General Board.

2. The Committee shall consist of:

- (a) a member of the General Board, appointed as Chair, who shall also be a member of the Education Committee;
- (b) three persons appointed by the General Board;
- (c) two Senior Tutors appointed by the Senior Tutors' Committee;
- (d) a person nominated by Cambridge Assessment who has expertise in assessment;
- (e) a member of the Proctorial body nominated by the Proctors;
- (f) two student members appointed by the Education Committee.

Members in classes (a)–(d) shall serve for three years. The Secretary shall be appointed by the Registry.

The Chair shall have authority to invite others to attend meetings, where relevant to the discussion.

A meeting of the Committee shall be quorate if at least four of the members in classes (a)–(c) are present.

3. The Examination and Assessment Committee shall be responsible for oversight of the quality assurance of all examinations except those for graduate courses assessed by thesis and oral which are the responsibility of the Board of Graduate Studies. Such oversight shall include:

- (a) oversight of policy for assessment and examination (including development of new methods of assessment; and review of volume of assessment);
- (b) quality assurance of examinations to ensure appropriateness of assessment and maintenance of degree standards (including review of External and Senior Examiners' reports including adequacy of Faculty Board and Degree Committee responses; and identification of good practice and areas of concern);
- (c) policy in respect of examination access arrangements, including reasonable adjustments and alternative modes of assessment pre-examination; and in respect of mitigating circumstances post-examination;
- (d) oversight of implementation of policies, and annual reporting to the General Board and Council on cases managed by the Examination Access and Mitigation Committee;
- (e) the integrity of the examination process (including setting of rules for candidates to ensure proper conduct of examinations and imposition of fines for infringement of the rules for candidates; receiving reports from the Proctors; examination security, cheating, and procedural irregularities; and the budget for examinations).

4. Minutes of the Committee's meetings, and such other reports as may be requested from time to time, shall be provided to the Education Committee.

ANNEX B:
EXAMINATION ACCESS AND MITIGATION COMMITTEE

1. The Examination Access and Mitigation Committee shall be a sub-committee of the Examination and Assessment Committee.

The Committee shall consist of:

- (a) a member of the Examination and Assessment Committee appointed by the Education Committee who shall be Chair;
- (b) three Senior Tutors appointed by the Senior Tutors' Committee;
- (c) six Medical Advisors;
- (d) a member of the Health and Wellbeing Committee;
- (e) two persons appointed by the General Board.

Members in classes (a)–(e) shall serve for three years.

A meeting of the Committee shall be quorate if seven of the members are present.

2. The Committee shall develop and maintain oversight of procedures to implement policies and associated guidance from the Examination and Assessment Committee relating to all students except those under the authority of the Board of Graduate Studies, concerning the following:

- (a) examination access arrangements (including consideration of examination adjustments and alternative modes of assessment);
- (b) coursework extensions;
- (c) disregarding terms;
- (d) examination allowances including resit examinations (including consideration of mitigating circumstances; allowances to enable students to progress, or to receive the award, or to have paper(s) disregarded or permission to attempt an examination);
- (e) remission of University Composition fees in respect of all courses except those under the authority of the Board of Graduate Studies.

3. The Committee may delegate to the Secretary of the Committee or to other persons or bodies the processing of applications under procedures (a)–(e) and decisions made on the basis of the Committee’s published guidance. Where applications fall outside the guidance, the Committee will consider applications. In exercising its responsibilities for oversight, the Committee will receive reports regarding the outcomes of applications made under its procedures and make recommendations regarding improvements to those procedures and associated processes, guidance, and policies.

4. Minutes of the Committee’s meetings, an annual report of cases managed by the Committee, and such other reports as may be requested from time to time, shall be provided to the Examination and Assessment Committee.

ANNEX C:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REGULATIONS FOR ALLOWANCES TO CANDIDATES FOR EXAMINATIONS

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 244)

ALLOWANCES TO CANDIDATES FOR EXAMINATIONS

1. The General Board shall have power:

- (a) to admit to candidature for an examination or for a University Studentship, Scholarship, Exhibition, Prize, or Medal, a person who is not qualified by Ordinance to be a candidate, and
- (b) to determine that for the purposes of candidature for an examination or competition one or more terms may be disregarded in reckoning the standing of a particular candidate,
- (c) to refer for consideration under the Procedure to Determine Fitness to Study any person in respect of whom an application is made under these regulations; and
- (d) to set conditions for a student to resume keeping terms by residence following an authorized period of intermission.

2. No person who is not qualified by Ordinance, or under the foregoing regulation, or by special Grace, shall be admitted to an examination leading to a degree, diploma, or certificate, except with the approval of the General Board who shall have power to determine the conditions of such admission and the fee, if any, to be paid for such admission. The name of a candidate admitted under this regulation to an Honours Examination shall, if he or she satisfies the Examiners, be published in a separate list under the heading:

The following, who are not candidates for honours, have satisfied the Examiners.

3. The General Board, on satisfactory evidence supplied by a candidate’s Tutor that the candidate has been hindered by illness or other grave cause in preparing for or taking any University examination, except one for which candidates are required to be Graduate Students or one leading to the M.B., B.Chir. Degrees, or the Vet.M.B. Degree, shall have power, when they think fit to:

- (a) allow the candidate to progress to the next academical year, where the candidate would otherwise not be of standing;
- (b) where the candidate is a candidate for the B.A. Degree, and if the candidate has kept the requisite number of terms to qualify for the degree:
 - (i) declare the candidate to have attained the honours standard; or
 - (ii) declare the candidate to have deserved the Ordinary B.A. Degree;
- (c) where the candidate is a candidate for a degree other than the B.A. Degree:
 - (i) declare the candidate to have attained the honours standard; or
 - (ii) approve the candidate to receive the degree or such other award as may be allowed under the regulations for the degree.
- (d) to require the Chair of Examiners, or a deputy appointed by the Chair from among the Examiners, to move the candidate’s name to a higher class, provided that such an amendment shall not be made unless the Chair of Examiners or deputy, after consulting at least two other Examiners, is satisfied that the candidate has performed at the standard of the higher class in all but a relatively small part of the examination.

4. The General Board shall consider the cases of candidates who for sufficient reasons apply to be examined under other than the ordinary conditions, or at other times than those previously advertised, and shall give or withhold permission for them to be examined otherwise. It shall also determine the conditions under which such permission may be given.

5. When the General Board allows a candidate an examination which is an Honours Examination, such a candidate shall thereby have obtained honours therein.

6. The General Board shall not, save in exceptional circumstances, normally make an allowance to a candidate for the B.A. Degree of an examination under Regulation 3 on more than one occasion, save that, for the purpose of this regulation, an allowance under Regulation 3(d) shall not be regarded as such an allowance.

7. The names of students to whom the General Board make allowances under Regulation 3 shall not be appended to the lists of successful candidates for the examinations for which they were severally entered, but shall be published by the Registry in accordance with the regulations for the publication of lists of successful candidates in examinations.

8. Where the regulations for an examination provide for a candidate to submit by a specified date a dissertation, thesis, essay, or other coursework in addition to the written papers or in substitution for one or more of them, the General Board may, with the concurrence of the Chair of Examiners or the Senior Examiner, grant a brief extension to a specified date by which the work shall be submitted. A dissertation, thesis, essay, or other coursework submitted later than the date specified by the General Board, or in the regulation concerned if no extension has been granted, shall not be accepted.

9. In the case of a candidate who has been declared to have deserved honours under Regulation 3(b), the following statement shall be appended to any certificate issued by the Registry relating to that examination:

This candidate, who was absent from part of the examination for good cause, performed with credit in a substantial part of it. In accordance with the University's regulations the authorities concerned are of the opinion that it would be unfair to classify the candidate on the basis of the incomplete performance since they believe that this would not adequately represent the candidate's attainment. They have accordingly agreed to declare the candidate to have deserved honours in this examination.

10. A student may request a review of a decision made under these regulations. A request for review shall be made under the Procedure for the Review of Decisions of University Bodies established by the General Board.

ANNEX D: CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES TO ORDINANCES

1. By replacing references to the Board of Examinations with references to the General Board in the following regulations and adding a footnote to indicate the delegation by the General Board of its authority to the Examination and Assessment Committee:

Regulation for Fines (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 196)
Natural Sciences Tripos (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 405): Regulation 30
General Regulations for the degree of Master of Research (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 547): Regulation 2

2. By deleting references to the Board of Examinations in the following regulations and adding a footnote to indicate the delegation by the General Board of its authority to the Examination and Assessment Committee:

General Regulations for Preliminary Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 258): Regulation 2

3. By replacing references to the Board of Examinations or receipt by the Board of Examinations or the Secretary to the Board of Examinations with references to the Registry or receipt by the Registry in the following regulations:

Entries and Lists of Candidates for Examination (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 246): Regulations 2, 4, 6, and 8–15
Dates of Examinations and Publication of Class-lists (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 249): Regulations 1 and 2
Regulation for Interviews (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 252)
General Regulations for Examiners and Assessors (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 254): Regulation 7
Payments to Examiners and Assessors (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 255): Regulations 5 and 6(a)
Evans Prize Fund (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 827): Regulation 4
Jeremie Prizes (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 865): Regulation 3

4. By amending Regulation 6(c) of the Procedure to Determine Fitness to Study (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 239) to read as follows and adding a footnote to indicate the delegation by the General Board of its authority to the Examination and Assessment Committee:

(c) from the General Board or the Board of Graduate Studies.

ANNEX E:
OTHER CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES

The following changes will be made if the recommendations of this Report are approved.

1. The Examination and Assessment Committee will adopt the Rules for the Guidance of Candidates and for the Prevention of Misconduct in Examinations (reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 121) made by the Board of Examinations.

2. The General Board will replace the reference to the Board of Examinations in the first sentence of its University-wide statement on plagiarism (reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 194) with a reference to the Examination and Assessment Committee.

3. The General Board will replace the reference to the Board of Examinations in paragraph 4.7 of the Examination Review Procedure (reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 212) with a reference to the Examination and Assessment Committee.

4. The General Board will amend the Procedure for the Review of Decisions of University Bodies (reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 216)

(a) to replace the references to the Applications Committee of the Council with references to the Examination Access and Mitigation Committee in Schedule A; and

(b) to replace the references to the Board of Examinations with references to the Examination Access and Mitigation Committee in Schedule X.

5. The General Board will adopt the revised Notice on Leave for Allowances to Candidates for Examinations (reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 245) as set out below, retaining footnotes.

LEAVE FOR ALLOWANCES TO CANDIDATES FOR EXAMINATIONS: NOTICE

The General Board has approved the following procedure for dealing with applications under these regulations through its Examination Access and Mitigation Committee (the Committee):

- (i) No application is considered unless it is submitted by the candidate's Tutor.
- (ii) An application must state under which regulation or regulations it is made.
- (iii) An allowance made under Regulation 1(b) is normally granted in respect of up to three terms of an academical year. Exceptionally it may be granted in respect of the terms of more than one academical year.
- (iv) Where a student has been out of residence for more than a term, the Committee shall make such recommendations to the student's College as the Committee thinks fit and shall have the power to set conditions for return, including, but not limited to, one or more of the following:
 - (a) satisfactory evidence of fitness to study, as determined by the Committee;
 - (b) in the case of a disabled student, ensuring reasonable adjustments, as appropriate, to support the student in her or his study and examination are in place;
 - (c) in the case of a medical or veterinary student, confirmation from the relevant Fitness to Practise Committee that the student is currently fit to continue on the course of study.
- (v) An application made on medical grounds must be supported by medical evidence. The Committee may determine which type of evidence it requires in relation to applications under particular regulations.
- (vi) An application must include a detailed statement of reasons and be accompanied by copies of all supervision reports.
- (vii) An application for exemption from an academic condition for taking a particular examination is not normally approved unless the Faculty Board or similar body concerned have given their concurrence, and that concurrence is indispensable in the case of examinations forming part of the requirements for a professional qualification.
- (viii) The Committee is empowered to give permission for a candidate to offer a non-standard combination of papers, whether within one examination or from more than one examination, which is not provided for by Ordinance or by regulations made under Ordinance. Such permission will not be granted unless the Faculty Board or other authority concerned are in agreement.
- (ix) The Committee shall issue notes on procedures adopted in its consideration, on behalf of the General Board, of applications for allowances under these regulations.
- (x) The Committee is authorized to agree a procedure for referral of cases to the Fitness to Study Panel.

6. In the footnote attached to paragraph 7 of the Notice of the Council and the General Board concerning additional payments for administrative responsibility (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 689) the reference to the Board of Examinations will be replaced with a reference to the Registry.

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on Professorships established for a fixed term

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

1. Under Special Ordinance C (ii) 12 and Regulation 1(f) of the General Regulations for University Officers (*Statutes and Ordinances*, pp. 72 and 675), University officers may be appointed for a fixed term, provided that the competent authority has determined that there is objective justification for doing so, and there is no provision in Statute or Ordinance prohibiting such an appointment. Special Ordinance C (vii) A. 6 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 77) enables a Professorship to be established for a fixed term, which is anticipated to expire after a specified period. This Report proposes an amendment to Special Ordinance C (vii) A. 6 so that the term of such a Professorship can expire in any of the circumstances prescribed by law, including the occurrence or non-occurrence of a specified event.

2. The Council and the General Board support these changes, which have been proposed by their HR Committee in order to enable coterminous appointments to be made in circumstances where it is appropriate for the holding of a

Professorship to be contingent on the holding of another specified role. In those circumstances, if the individual concerned decides to relinquish that other role, or that other role terminates for any reason, the Council and the General Board agree that the University should not be expected to continue to fund the Professorship, potentially until retirement.

3. The Council and the General Board recognize that there will be limited circumstances in which a coterminous appointment will be the most appropriate arrangement. Examples of the circumstances in which a coterminous appointment would be made under the proposed amendment include an appointment to a Professorship of the holder of another role within the University, and where the other role is an external contract, such as an honorary contract from an NHS body which is required to enable that officer to undertake clinical duties and responsibilities.

4. The Council and the General Board recommend:

I. That Special Ordinance C (vii) A. 6 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 77) be amended to read as follows:

6. Subject to the provisions of Statute C and this Special Ordinance regarding the age of retirement, the University shall have power to establish a Professorship limited to a fixed term, including to the tenure of one Professor only, or to direct that election to a Professorship (being neither a Professorship to which appointments are made by the Crown nor a Professorship governed for the time being by a trust expressly providing otherwise) shall be for a fixed term.

| | | | |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| 22 May 2018 | STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> ROSS ANDERSON RICHARD ANTHONY R. CHARLES STEPHEN J. COWLEY ANTHONY FREELING NICHOLAS GAY DAVID GREENAWAY | JENNIFER HIRST NICHOLAS HOLMES ALICE HUTCHINGS DARSHANA JOSHI FIONA KARET UMANG KHANDELWAL MARK LEWISOHN | SUSAN OOSTHUIZEN MICHAEL PROCTOR JOHN SHAKESHAF SUSAN SMITH SARA WELLER MARK WORMALD JOCELYN WYBURD |
| 6 June 2018 | STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> ABIGAIL FOWDEN A. L. GREER NICHOLAS HOLMES DARSHANA JOSHI | MARTHA KRISH PATRICK MAXWELL MARTIN MILLETT RICHARD PRAGER | SUSAN RANKIN HELEN THOMPSON GRAHAM VIRGO MARK WORMALD |

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the establishment of an Education Division, Research Division, and Strategic Partnerships Division

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

1. The Council and the General Board have recently reviewed the role of the Academic Secretary and the administration undertaken by the Academic Division. At present, administration relating to research, education, and strategic partnerships sits within the Academic Division under the supervision of the Academic Secretary. However, the demands placed upon administrative activity relating to education and research have grown significantly in both size and complexity. For example:

- (a) since 2011–12, research income has increased by 52%¹ and the number of research contracts processed by 83%. Since January 2014, research income has increased by 14% with research contract transactions doubling over the same period. This indicates that research funding is becoming much more complex to manage with a trend towards larger, multidisciplinary, multi-partner projects requiring a significant level of contract support;
- (b) undergraduate applications have increased by 10% (16,431 to 18,126) since 2015;
- (c) postgraduate applications have increased by 32% (16,456 to 21,716) since 2015;
- (d) in the Disability Resource Centre, 1,890 students disclosed a disability in July 2015; this has increased to 2,705 in 2018 – or 43% increase in 2½ years, leading to an advisor to student ratio of 1:564;
- (e) undergraduate admissions assessments have been introduced and scripts and results for c. 8.5k applicants are now processed; and
- (f) new student complaints procedures have been introduced in response to the new OIA Framework; new procedures have been developed in the light of the global debate on sexual misconduct and a new office (the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints, and Appeals) has been established to handle these matters.

This increase in activity in these areas of administration has exacerbated some of the disadvantages with this arrangement. In particular, as research and education are one level below that of other Divisions within the Unified Administrative Service (UAS), the voices within these teams are much less strong, leading to differential and often disadvantageous treatment in the Planning Round. Submissions for resource to support the two core areas of the University's activity first have to be judged against one another before the collated bid is assessed against other needs within the UAS.

2. In light of these challenges, the Council and the General Board have agreed to propose that three new Divisions of the University Offices be established to strengthen the University's administrative structures. The three new Divisions would sit alongside the other Divisions (including the Academic Division) within the UAS.

The new Divisions would be established as follows:

- (a) an Education Division, including Educational and Student Policy, Student Operations and Registry, Student Counselling, the Disability Resource Centre, and Admissions;
- (b) a Research Division, including the existing Research Strategy and Research Operations Offices; and
- (c) a Strategic Partnerships Division.

3. The Academic Division would remain the Division with responsibility for School, faculty, and departmental administration under the supervision of the Academic Secretary (hence the retention of the title Academic Division). The objective of the Division would be to integrate School, departmental, and faculty activity more closely together and also to interweave them more effectively with the rest of the UAS, with the other Non-School Institutions (NSIs), and with the Colleges. The Academic Secretary, as Head of the Academic Division, would have responsibility for providing support for academic strategy and planning across the University, and in particular to ensure that there are effective connections across the Schools and also between the Schools, the NSIs, the Colleges, and the University's administration.

4. The Academic Secretary would be the principal administrative support for the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategy and Planning. However, given the cross-cutting and co-ordinating nature of the role, the Academic Secretary would also work very closely with the other Pro-Vice-Chancellors and the Heads of Schools. The Academic Secretary would also have a strong working relationship with the Academic and Financial Planning and Analysis team within the Finance Division so as to rebalance the emphasis of that team onto academic objectives. Duties currently attached to the role of Academic Secretary will be reviewed to consider whether they remain appropriate to the role in its revised form.

5. Each of the new Divisions would be led by a Director. The Director of the Research Division and the Strategic Partnerships Division are already in place, whilst the Director of the Education Division is a new position, the funding for which was approved in the 2016 Planning Round. The Directors of the new Divisions would report to the Registry, as is the case for other Directors of Divisions within the UAS.²

6. As a consequence of the new structure, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors would each have a principal senior administrator with whom they would work closely on matters within their remit.

7. The proposals are resource-neutral. Funding for the Academic Secretary, and for the Directors of the Education, Research, and Strategic Partnerships Divisions are already accounted for within the UAS budget.

¹ Not adjusted for inflation.

² See Regulation 3 of the regulations for the Unified Administrative Service (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 693).

8. The Council and the General Board recommend, with effect from 1 August 2018:
- I. That the arrangements for the administration relating to research, education, and strategic partnerships be as described in paragraphs 1–4 of this Report.
 - II. That Regulation 1 of the regulations for the Unified Administrative Service (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 693) be amended so as to read:
 1. The staff of the University Offices shall form a Unified Administrative Service which shall be under the supervision of the Council and shall comprise the following Divisions:
 - Academic Division
 - Education Division
 - Estate Management
 - Finance Division
 - Health, Safety, and Regulated Facilities Division
 - Human Resources Division
 - Registrary's Office
 - Research Division
 - Strategic Partnerships Division

| | | | |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| 4 June 2018 | STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> RICHARD ANTHONY R. CHARLES DAISY EYRE ANTHONY FREELING | NICHOLAS GAY DAVID GREENAWAY JENNIFER HIRST DARSHANA JOSHI FIONA KARET | MICHAEL PROCTOR JOHN SHAKESHAFT SARA WELLER JOCELYN WYBURD |
|-------------|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| 6 June 2018 | STEPHEN TOOPE, <i>Vice-Chancellor</i> PHILIP ALLMENDINGER ABIGAIL FOWDEN A. L. GREER | DARSHANA JOSHI MARTHA KRISH PATRICK MAXWELL MARTIN MILLETT | RICHARD PRAGER SUSAN RANKIN GRAHAM VIRGO |
|-------------|---|---|--|

NOTE OF DISSENT

Institutions in the University are either under the supervision of the Council or the General Board; as such University Governance has a bicameral nature. Traditionally the Academic Secretary has been Secretary of the General Board and, more importantly, like the Registrary, has been one of the administrative officers in the University with a broad and comprehensive understanding of the University. This arrangement, with both the Registrary and the Academic Secretary having the right to attend key committees, has worked well. Whilst the arrangement might suggest an element of duplication, when both posts were filled it meant that an officer with a holistic view of the University was present at key meetings (which has not always been the case in recent months). *De facto*, it is now proposed to dilute the role of Academic Secretary.

Further, having had years of devolution from the Central Bodies to the Schools, we now learn that the 'objective of the [reformed Academic] Division would be to integrate School, departmental and faculty activity more closely together and also to interweave them more effectively with the rest of the UAS, with the other Non-School Institutions (NSIs), and with the Colleges'. How? No details are given.

For many years, the Planning and Resource Allocation Office (PRAO) worked well. It was part of the Academic Division, and was one of the jewels in the administrative crown. Following the move of the PRAO to the Finance Division, it was recently reported to the Council 'many have commented that, in their view, the academic planning function has been diminished rather than enhanced' by this move. Presumably in response, the Report states that there is a need to 'rebalance the emphasis of that team onto academic objectives', but there is no suggestion of, say, reversing the move of the PRAO, or by what means or with what tools this rebalancing is to take place.

Further, one of the arguments for the creation of the two new Divisions is that 'submissions for resource to support the two core areas of the University's activity first have to be judged against one another before the collated bid is assessed against other needs within the UAS'. This is not an argument for two new Divisions, but instead possibly indicates a planning failure within the *Unified Administrative Service*; 'possibly' because evidence might suggest otherwise. Administrative posts in the UAS and the Vice-Chancellors Office have risen from 283 in 2012 to 474 in 2018. With a 67% increase, it would appear that submissions for increased resource within the UAS have already been successful (as evidenced by the pre-emptive funding of the post of Director of Education).

In 2004 there were Reviews of the Personnel and Research Services Divisions, with detailed reports published in the *Reporter* (<https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2003-04/weekly/5972/4.html>). By comparison, the case for the changes proposed in this Report, which are arguably more far-reaching, has not been made.

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 5 June 2018 | ROSS ANDERSON | STEPHEN J. COWLEY | SUSAN OOSTHUIZEN |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|

CLASS-LISTS, ETC.**Act for the degree of Doctor of Medicine**

This content has been deleted as it contains personal information.

GRACES**Graces submitted to the Regent House on 6 June 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, 15 June 2018.

1. That the Annual Report of the Council for the academical year 2016–17 (*Reporter*, 6489, 2017–18, p. 195) be approved.¹
2. That the recommendation in paragraph 8 of the 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) be approved.²

¹ See the Council's Notice on p. 662.

² See the Council's Notice on p. 663.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 29 May 2018

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Lord Eatwell was presiding, with the Registrar's deputy, the Senior Pro-Proctor, the Junior Pro-Proctor, and nine other persons present.

The following Report was discussed:

Report of the General Board, dated 2 May 2018, on arrangements for senior academic promotions (*Reporter*, 6505, 2017–18, p. 556).

Professor E. V. FERRAN (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Institutional and International Relations):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, this Report proposes the first steps towards implementing a new Academic Career Pathway Scheme aligned to academic titles, which is intended to replace the Senior Academic Promotions Scheme and current probationary arrangements.

This work is being undertaken as part of the People Strategy. The proposals for change have arisen further to the recommendations of a Working Group formed in 2016 to review the University's current arrangements for academic promotion and probation. They also reflect feedback given during two consultation exercises with Schools and departments.

The current Report covers the first stage of the changes towards the new Academic Career Pathway Scheme. If this Report is approved, these changes will take effect by way of incorporation into the existing Senior Academic Promotions Scheme for 2019. The main proposed changes are:

- revising the weighting of the evaluative criteria for Professorship and Readership applications to place more emphasis on teaching excellence, with flexibility in exceptional circumstances to adjust the scores between the research and teaching or general contribution criteria;
- maintaining the three-tier Committee structure but balancing this with a more streamlined and simplified process;
- updating the equality and diversity guidance, and offering new training and development to reinforce the University's commitment to increasing the number of women, BME staff, and other underrepresented groups in senior academic offices; and
- revising the key principles underpinning the Scheme.

The consultation exercises indicated broad support for these changes.

Looking ahead, and subject to further consultation on a limited number of unresolved issues, the Academic Career Pathway Scheme is expected fully to replace the Senior Academic Promotions Scheme from 2020. Academic probation will be incorporated into the new Scheme. Once the Scheme is fully implemented, the expectation is that the criteria for academic excellence will act as a 'golden thread' running through the academic probation and promotion processes.

When the Academic Career Pathway Scheme is finalized, a review exercise will be conducted to align the Senior Research Promotions Scheme with the new model for academic progression. Finalization of the Academic Career Pathway Scheme will also pave the way for the long-awaited review of the career progression of teaching-only staff.

I strongly support this proposal as the first stage towards adopting a model that will allow the University to take forward academic career progression using a more streamlined, transparent approach, underpinned by principles that emphasize fairness and inclusion, and that will also enable the extension of this approach to research and teaching-only staff.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the Council and the Human Resources (HR) Committee, but I speak in a personal capacity. As a Senior Lecturer I have a conflict of interest as I am eligible to apply for promotion.

While there is much to be welcomed in this Report (and, indeed, I supported the general tenor of the Report at the HR Committee), there are two issues that I would like to raise.

First, despite the claim that the changes 'will represent a new beginning in how the University recognizes excellence in teaching', to me this is a case of opportunity lost. As noted in the Report, the proposed level of flexibility in the weighting of research, teaching, and general contribution is not as extensive as was recommended by the original Working Group. The reasons for watering down that proposal are given as:

- being too complex to operate;
- and placing a [too] heavy load on Heads of Institution (HoIs).

However, in an institution such as ours brimming with talent, if there was a will surely a way of making it operate would have been found. As to a heavy load on HoIs, I accept that responsibilities have been heaped on them in recent years, hence the current consultation on the role of HoIs. However, the development of academic staff is surely one of the most important roles of a HoI, and if this particular load is too heavy, then why not reduce or devolve some other parts of the bureaucracy?

A more honest reason for the dilution of the flexibility might be found in the consultation response of the Faculty of Mathematics:

The Faculty does not agree with changing the scoring to 50:30:20 from 60:20:20 as this reduces the value of research from 60% of the total marks available to 50%.

A response that, I might note in passing, was not formally approved by members of the Faculty Board of Mathematics (of which I am one), nor, to the best of my knowledge, has the response been circulated to the Board as of this morning.

In case I am misunderstood, let me be clear that I agree that the reputation of the University, particularly its international reputation, primarily stands or falls by the quality of its research. However, the role and importance of teaching has been steadily devalued whilst I have been a member of the University, and in many respects this is understandable. Since 2002 the number of academic staff has increased from 1,514 to 1,633, an increase of 8% (all my numbers come from the *Reporter*). Over the same period:

- the number of undergraduates whom they teach has increased by 2%;
- the number of postgraduates whom they teach and supervise has increased by 34%;
- the number of research staff for whom they first write research grants, and with whom they then collaborate, has increased by 89%.

For comparison, the number of assistant staff has increased by 28% and the number of academic-related staff has increased by 131%.

In such circumstances, something has had to give. Recently the Faculty of Mathematics determined that only about 30% of the University Teaching Officers (UTOs) were giving undergraduate supervisions, at an average of just over 40 hours a year. At a meeting of Directors of Studies in Mathematics held last November, about 20% of those attending were UTOs; this compares with nearly 60% from two decades ago. My conclusion is that increasingly UTOs just do not have the time, if not the will, to devote to teaching.

Moreover, whereas two or more decades ago UTOs started life at the bottom of the University Assistant Lecturer scale (as I did), this then changed to the bottom of the University Lecturer scale, then to the top of the scale (as stipends failed to keep up with inflation), and now increasingly UTOs start at the top of the scale with market pay and/or an advanced contribution supplement (sometimes sufficient to take them up to the lower steps of the professorial scale, or more). Further, at least in theory, such supplements can terminate after five years if the UTO concerned has not been promoted. The bottom line is that the best interests of newly appointed UTOs are served by concentrating almost exclusively on their research (with promotion in mind); moreover, this aligns with the interests of HoIs as regards the REF. My experience is that the TEF is held in far less fear.

The University may pay lip service to excellence in teaching, but its incentive structure, possibly for good reason, is not aligned. Therefore, it is not surprising that at the recent Teaching Forum, of over 190 delegates only 11, i.e. about 6%, were Professors (and two of those were the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education).

Professor Parker and his Working Group proposed a level of flexibility in the weighting of research, teaching, and general contribution for good reason. Did the proposals need tuning? Probably yes. Did they deserve to be watered down to the extent that they have been? Not, in my opinion, if the University values teaching.

My second point concerns the proposal in the Report that:

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.

Yes, the General Board should have discretion to make **minor** changes, announced by Notice. However, anything other than a minor change should be the subject of a Report. In my recent experience, too often Statutes and Ordinances have been interpreted legalistically, rather than in the spirit of the Report initiating them; 50-member Graces being a case in point.

Dr A. L. DU BOIS-PEDAIN (Faculty of Law and Magdalene College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I come from a Faculty where, of the tiny number of staff promoted to a Professorship in the last three promotion rounds, two were already well over the age of 60. Since they were promoted, we have had a glimpse of what their careers could have been, had they been promoted a decade earlier. One immediately became a magnet for prospective research students, the other for international research collaborations. Both will have to retire before their increased reach and international presence can fully flourish.

Such ‘sunset promotions’ are no rarity across the University. They are a sign that staff are not promoted when they should be. Promotions happen too late for people to be able to maximize their career value. This harms the institution as much as it harms the individuals concerned.

I am a mid-career academic and the career trajectories of my colleagues are a warning to me. I can see no reason why what has happened to them won’t happen to me. Indeed, I am still waiting to be promoted to the academic office for which I first applied five years ago, already in that first application round scoring in the top band of the research component for promotion to this office, and in the top and second-top bands in the two others.

The root cause for the failure of the Senior Academic Promotions process has, in my view, less to do with the criteria for promotion that are being used than it has to do with the absence of a commitment by this University to promote all its deserving staff members when they are ready to be promoted. Distinctions drawn between applicants within the top field are spurious and often enough implausible, especially when comparisons are drawn between Faculties.

Finances should no longer be used as an excuse to persevere with an unjustifiable system of home-made scarcity. The difference in annual income between what someone currently earns in the top rung of a University Senior Lectureship, and the bottom rung of a Readership, is less than £4,000 per year. Against this backdrop, it is absurd to suggest that this University is unable to afford promoting its academic staff when they deserve to be promoted. It would be alone among leading universities if this were true.

As regards the proposals for reform, I welcome the intention to abolish promotion to University Senior Lectureship, replacing this step with an automatic progression. Beyond the intended abolition of promotion to Senior Lectureships, however, the new Academic Career Pathway model increases rather than ameliorates my concerns. In increasing the weighting of teaching and academic contribution for what are still meant to remain research-led promotions, we are giving greater weight to criteria that external referees will not be able to comment on. This exposes applicants to an increased risk of having their applications massaged in one direction or another at departmental levels, in ways that are not accountable or comparable between Faculties. It also exposes those with significant research grants that come with shorter periods of partial teaching buy-outs to a risk that their applications will be scored less favourably than they would currently be.

Ms S. C. MENTCHEN (Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Magdalene College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a Senior Language Teaching Officer in German, in the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages (MML). I am speaking with the support of the two co-Chairs of the MML Faculty Board and my colleagues in MML. Like all my Language Teaching Officer (LTO) colleagues, I am in the middle of examining Tripos papers. I set Tripos papers, I teach Tripos papers, I design the curriculum, I train and mentor new colleagues. I serve on appointment panels for new LTOs. I have been on my Faculty's Board for many years, I am currently the Director of Outreach and Schools Liaison for my Faculty. I am also a Fellow at Magdalene College, where I am Director of Studies and Tutor, and I have served as Admissions Tutor. I list all these offices to put the description of my post as 'academic-related', and my remarks, into context.

In its Report of 2 May 2018, on arrangements for senior academic promotions,¹ the General Board reports on the Academic Career Pathway (ACP) which will replace the Senior Academic Promotions Scheme (SAP), in 2019. The General Board says that the new scheme 'will respond to concerns' and then lists reasons why the current scheme is not fit for purpose. Under point 4(k) we read:

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.

Even though this was recognized, such 'other academic roles' are only mentioned again under point 12, which is described as 'going beyond the proposals already outlined', and which deal with promotions for Professors, Readers, and Senior Lecturers. It says:

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

Even if this is not the intended interpretation, this reads very much like an afterthought.

How did we get here? In its Report of 2 July 2014, the General Board recommended the establishing of Lectureships and Senior Lectureships with a focus on teaching.² At that time, this included colleagues in language teaching explicitly. This recommendation had come after consultations of all relevant Faculties and Schools. It seems therefore that we are going backwards, at least where colleagues with teaching-only contracts are concerned.

In October 2014, strong support was expressed for the creation of such posts (and thereby of the creation of a career pathway) by the then Chair of the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, Professor Ian Roberts, who had the support of the Chairs of the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies and Classics, respectively.³

In 2015, the General Board 'regret[s] the delay' of the implementation of its recommendations.⁴ Part of the reason for this delay was the establishment of a Working Group, set up to look into language teaching across the School of Arts and Humanities. Again, my colleagues and I were assessed and reviewed. One of the recommendations of this Working Group, of which I was a member, was:

Given the difficulty of fitting language teaching posts into the existing categories the Group recommends that the University gives consideration as to whether it might be desirable, in the longer term, to create a third category of post which allows for those who are involved in Teaching and Scholarship. Further, the Group

*recommends that should the wider working group propose a career path for teaching, this decision should not prejudice any future recommendations regarding different contract types e.g. teaching only contracts.*⁵

Hope rested with this 'wider working group', which now, at the very end of its report, states that 'work will continue'! It is very dispiriting to be told time and again that the University is looking into the issue of promotion. To us, it appears very much like we are stuck.

In 2014, Professor Roberts said that he hoped that the matter could be resolved 'during the period of tenure of the current post-holders'. By the end of this academic year, two colleagues in MML will have retired.

¹ See *Reporter* of 10 May 2018 (*Reporter*, 6505, 2017–18, p. 556), at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6505/section8.shtml#heading2-13>

² See *Reporter* of 16 July 2014 (*Reporter*, 6355, 2013–14, p. 745), at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2013-14/weekly/6355/section7.shtml#heading2-47>

³ See *Reporter* of 22 October 2014 (*Reporter*, 6361, 2014–15, p. 69), at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2014-15/weekly/6361/section10.shtml>

⁴ See *Reporter* of 29 July 2015 (*Reporter*, 6395, 2014–15, p. 786), at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2014-15/weekly/6395/section1.shtml#heading2-4>

⁵ Taken from the report to the Council of the School of Arts and Humanities, August 2017

Mr F. G. G. BASSO (Faculty of Classics), read by Ms S. C. Mentchen:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the last sentence of the Report of the General Board on arrangements for senior academic promotions reads:¹

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

It is not clear what the phrase 'senior teaching-only staff' is supposed to mean. What is clear is that the statement is little more than an afterthought and that it makes it painfully evident that no detailed thought has been given to the issue. This is extremely disappointing.

A Report of the General Board of 2 July 2014² provided a detailed review and a comprehensive criticism of the lack of career structure for teaching-only staff and recommended the establishment of the University offices of Lecturer (teaching) and Senior Lecturer (teaching).

A comprehensive 'Review of Language Teaching Arrangements', undertaken by the Council of the School of Arts and Humanities as a result of the Report of the General Board of 2 July 2014 and published in August 2015, endorsed both the General Board proposal for the creation of 'Lectureships (Teaching)' and 'Senior Lectureship (Teaching)' as appropriate for Language Teaching Officers in the School, and the proposal that holders of these posts should be eligible for the SAP (according to appropriately modified criteria).

Following the review in the School of Arts and Humanities, a Notice of the General Board of 27 July 2015 stated:³

The General Board, on the advice of the Human Resources Committee, have agreed that the recommendations of that review cannot be considered in isolation, but should be taken into account as part of a review of the academic career structure about which the central bodies, through the HR Committee, will

consult in due course. The Board regret the delay that this will entail in the implementation of their original proposals and those recommended by the review initiated by the Council of the School. [emphasis added]

Despite the fact that the Report of the General Board of 2 July 2014 approached the lack of career structure for ‘teaching only’ as an issue in need of urgent attention, and recommended widening the SAP criteria to include ‘teaching only’ staff, it now appears that the ‘central bodies’ and ‘the HR Committee’ referred to in the last communication of the General Board on this matter have simply chosen to postpone the issue yet again.

By failing even to mention the Report of the General Board of 2 July 2014 on the establishment of the University offices of Lecturer (teaching) and Senior Lecturer (teaching) and replacing it instead with a vague phrase on ‘the development of a career progression scheme for senior teaching-only staff’ the proposed Report of the General Board on arrangements for senior academic promotions represents an unacceptable step backwards.

It is simply disheartening to the Language Teaching Officers in the Faculty of Classics that the ‘Academic Career Paths’ proposals should have failed to uphold the statement made by the General Board in its Notice of 27 July 2015. Almost three years later, the final sentence of that statement:

The Board regret the delay that this will entail in the implementation of their original proposals and those recommended by the review initiated by the Council of the School

reads as mockery.

¹ See *Reporter* of 10 May 2018 (*Reporter*, 6505, 2017–18, p. 556), at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6505/section8.shtml#heading2-13>

² See *Reporter* of 16 July 2014 (*Reporter*, 6355, 2013–14, p. 745), at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2013-14/weekly/6355/section7.shtml#heading2-47>

³ See *Reporter* of 29 July 2015 (*Reporter*, 6395, 2014–15, p. 786), at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2014-15/weekly/6395/section1.shtml#heading2-4>

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, that the Regent House should approve ‘Talent Management’ in the University of Cambridge would once have seemed improbable, but I expect it will. Yet the Cambridge promotions process remains competitive. That creates a profound mismatch between the promise of a benevolent and helpful monitoring of the ‘development’ of academic staff along an Academic Career Pathway from Probation to Professorship, and the awkward fact that because the process is competitive ‘deserving’ is not enough to take anyone further along that pathway once safely past the period of probation.

This anomaly was resolved for a few years in the course of the recent Cambridge history of Senior Academic Promotions. In the autumn of 1994, a Discussion was called on a Topic of Concern. At that Discussion it was pointed out that ‘the artificial constraint on the number of promotions is financial’.¹ Further calls followed for this to end. By 1999 it was conceded that the money had to be found to catch up on the waiting queue of the deserving:

*The General Board have agreed that personal promotions should be primarily determined by the assessment of academic merit, without budgetary restriction. If necessary the Council will ensure that funds are available to meet the additional cost of promotions recommended by the Board.*²

How that came about, with links to the series of calls and protests, may be read in the report of my own remarks, in the *Reporter* of 16 June 1999.³ The principle that all who deserved it should be promoted was honoured for several years and then dropped in a return to ‘competition’ via the Report on Allocations from the Chest for 2006–07, which stated that:

*£0.6m has been budgeted for short-term transitional costs of promotions and regradings for all categories of staff.*⁴

That particular tension is less in Oxford where there is ‘recognition of distinction’ not ‘promotion’, though the award of the title of full Professor carries a salary rise.

The General Board’s Working Party behind the Report we are discussing recognized a need to compare notes with other universities:

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.

But it does not say what it made of any comparison with Oxford. Oxford opens the way to that title to a far wider range of its academics. In Cambridge there is merely a promise to revisit the question of the ‘Talent Management’ of academics currently not eligible:

*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.*⁵

What of the often-expressed fears about the exercise of patronage? In the years of Discussions of proposals for reform of the Cambridge promotions procedures last time round, concern was expressed about the behaviour of the ‘local barons’. When the proposal to create a single procedure to be used for applications for Senior Lectureships as well as Readerships and Professorships was discussed on 12 November 2002, Professor Dumville put the concern powerfully:

*These proposals constitute a barons’ charter. But they are unlikely to be remembered as this University’s Magna Carta. Rather, they give a green light for Heads of institutions to exercise or to withhold patronage. Those of us who have experienced great changes in our circumstances arising from the succession of a new Head of Department or the megalomaniacal rush of blood to the head of an existing superior or the decision of a senior colleague to begin a campaign of bullying or vilification will know all too well what the changes proposed here must portend.*⁶

The difficulty is to design a procedure which such ‘barons’ and any exercise of patronage cannot subvert. It has probably passed from the memories of many now eligible for promotion in Cambridge that there was a time when there was no procedure at all. Professor Dumville described what used to happen in those bad old days:

*A professorial colleague, with whom I had a conversation a few days ago, was reminded by this Report of the time when he first attended a Faculty Committee dealing with promotions, when not a sheet of paper was to be seen in the room and the fates of individuals were wilfully decided.*⁷

That practice had been brought to an end when the High Court held that something more was needed, a transparent procedure which would ensure that the General Board, formally the decision-maker, had not merely approved ‘baronial’ choices. What was needed, the judgement said, was that:⁸

*without repeating the entire onerous exercise undertaken by the committee the [General] Board could see how it had arrived at its recommendations and either approve them or seek, if it wished, to consider the basis upon which one or more of them had been reached.*⁹

To that end the University would need, it added:

*to ensure that the Board has in digestible form the evaluations upon which the recommendations of the committee are based, curing the problem of over-delegation; and it is likely to be in a position to tell candidates, using the same evaluation format, the reasons for the judgement reached by the committee upon them.*¹⁰

Words from that judgement have always been quoted down the years since, in the Report of the outcomes of the Senior Academic Promotions process.¹¹ The Report of 2017, for example, still states that:

*The Board was able to see how recommendations had been arrived at so that, without repeating the entire exercise, it could either approve the recommendations or, if it so wished, consider the basis on which any of the recommendations had been made.*¹²

But in the present Report we read that the Working Group concluded that this did not seem to be the reality:

The current promotions guidance set out evidence to be provided but included only limited information on the assessment criteria. This meant that the S[enior] A[cademic] P[romotions] 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.

This suggests that progress has not been as enduring as the High Court had hoped.

In any case, Professor Dumville was not convinced that adding ‘plenty of paper’ would mend the problem of the ‘local barons’:

*Repeatedly through this Report, the would-be applicant is reminded of the necessity to consult his Head of institution or another senior colleague before making an application.*¹³

That appears to be recommended still in the present Report, for the Working Party found that:

Eligible academics did not always seek appropriate advice before applying, as provided for in the SAP guidance.

Can it be assumed that every possible candidate may go confidently to the local baron for a steer?

Since the last time the University of Cambridge grappled with the ‘academic promotions’ problem two decades ago, requirements and priorities have changed. Senior Lectureships have been introduced; the balance between research, teaching, and general contribution has been revisited; ‘equality and diversity’ has become a high profile issue, to the point where I see it is proposed to ensure equal numbers of both sexes on some decision-making bodies on the assumption that that will make things fairer. That could prove tricky if individuals are going to be allowed to

declare a change of gender at will, but in any case it is surely a dangerous doctrine to assume that a member of a ‘category’ alleged to be under-represented will (or should) promote the interests of that category?

One thing has certainly not changed. Academics in Cambridge will still have to compete with one another for promotion and they will still in reality be at the mercy of those local barons. I hope the generations now seeking to progress along that Academic Career Pathway will help design a system where that will not be a risk.

¹ *Reporter*, 1994–95, p. 256

² <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/1998-99/weekly/5775/25.html>

³ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/1998-99/weekly/5778/25.html>

⁴ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2005-06/weekly/6039/20.html>

⁵ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2017-18/weekly/6505/section8.shtml#heading2-13>

⁶ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5904/18.html>

⁷ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5904/18.html>

⁸ Judgement published in Notice in *Reporter* of 20 October 1997, <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/1997-98/weekly/5716/4.html>

⁹ Judgement published in Notice in *Reporter* of 20 October 1997, <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/1997-98/weekly/5716/4.html>

¹⁰ Judgement published in Notice in *Reporter* of 20 October 1997, <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/1997-98/weekly/5716/4.html>

¹¹ For example.

¹² <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2016-17/weekly/6469/section6.shtml#heading2-20>

¹³ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5904/18.html>

Professor G. J. VIRGO (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education), read by the Junior Pro-Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, in my capacity as Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education, I am pleased to recommend approval of this Report concerning arrangements for senior academic promotion.

The proposals in this Report include enhancing the weighting for teaching contribution when evaluating promotion applications. This reflects a greater recognition by the University of the vital importance of contribution to and excellence in teaching and learning support within the collegiate University as a key component in fulfilling the University’s mission. This increased emphasis on teaching excellence will be taken forward with the further evolution of the Academic Career Paths Scheme and with the expected review of the career progression of teaching-only staff.

Professor P. B. JONES (School of Clinical Medicine), read by the Junior Pro-Procutor:

As a member of the Academic Career Paths Working Group and a member of the Regent House I support the proposals set out in this Report concerning amended arrangements for senior academic promotions. These new arrangements are important steps towards implementing the new Academic Career Pathway model that seeks to address concerns with the current promotions and probationary schemes. Having been a Head of Department, a member and Chair of a Faculty Promotions Committee, and a member of a Promotions Sub-Committee I am aware that, under the current arrangements, applicants can be unclear about the criteria against which their cases are assessed.

I welcome the move towards defining criteria for academic excellence. This will lead to greater transparency for candidates regardless of whether their particular strengths lie in research, education, or a combination of these academic activities.

The proposal to introduce separate promotions committees for the School of Clinical Medicine and the School of the Biological Sciences is welcome. Unlike other Schools they have operated for many years as a combined committee. I also support the proposal to follow a career development process, with clear guidance and constructive feedback at each stage. This aligns with the arrangements currently operated in the School of Clinical Medicine.

Finally, I believe that adopting the proposals that are based on principles of fairness and inclusion would be a very positive move for the University.

Dr C. GAGNE (Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Churchill College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a Senior Language Teaching Officer in the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages (MML). I am also a Fellow of Churchill College where I hold an academic fellowship and where I have been Director of Studies for Modern Languages. I am not currently Director of Studies but I will be next year. I design and teach courses which are an integral part of the MML Tripos. I also examine for those papers. I have also in the past taught and examined for what in MML parlance we call 'scheduled papers'. Over the twenty years I have been working for this University, I have been a member of various Faculty committees: Faculty Board, Undergraduate Studies Committee, CALL Committee, which as CALL Director I have been chairing for the last ten years. I have been involved in various outreach and access events, Open Days, and residential courses. Yet, in spite of the nature of my work, my post is not categorized by our University as 'academic' but as 'academic-related', in the same way as administrative staff. While I understand that my position does not require that I do research, I nonetheless find this anomalous.

Another puzzling fact about being a Language Teaching Officer is that there is no natural progression from Language Teaching Officer to Senior Language Teaching Officer, nor indeed beyond that. Any Language Teaching Officer who wishes to become senior has to go through a regrading process. I have gone through this process myself, as have some of my colleagues in MML. It is a long, stressful, and arduous process. Had it not been for the strong support of my then Head of Department, who took decisive action so that I could be regraded, the process might have taken longer, and might not have had a successful outcome.

In July 2014, the creation of teaching-only lectureships was put forward by the University.¹ Myself and other colleagues in my Faculty saw this as a very positive prospect, as it meant that the University might at long last recognize our contribution as 'academic'. More importantly, the new scheme also meant that career progression might become a reality. Other Language Teaching Officers in MML and myself approached our Chair of Faculty, Professor Ian Roberts, who unequivocally gave us his support and read an extremely supportive statement in this very room in autumn 2014.²

As a result of the discussion we had kick-started, the School our Faculty belongs to decided to launch a Working Group to look into this issue more closely. Language Teaching Officers were consulted: we had to account for what we do, and our contribution to the good running of our Faculty was scrutinized to a high level of detail. The Working Group produced a report in spring 2015 that reiterated the fact that should teaching-only Lectureships be created, Language Teaching Officers should be considered for the scheme. Subsequently to this, the School created yet another Working Party with different and yet similar terms of reference. This process involved regrading all language teaching posts across the School (Language Teaching Officers as well as hourly-paid staff and people on other grades). The central objective of the Working Group was to increase comparability between those on the same salary grade. Language Teaching Officers had to produce CVs and once again their work was scrutinized by colleagues who hold different posts (UTOs mostly). This process was scheduled over several months (summer, autumn, and winter of 2017); the outcome of the process was in the spring of this year. This was a particularly stressful process as it involved the possibility of being downgraded to a lower salary grade. The Group agreed that Language Teaching Officers do not naturally fit into an academic-related contract, and that should teaching-only Lectureships be created, Language Teaching Officers should be part of that scheme.

At a time when the University is considering academic career paths, I would urge the University to recognize the academic nature of the work I and my colleagues do. I would also urge the University to extend the proposed Academic Career Pathway model to all Teaching Officers. Language Teaching Officers currently have no career path whatsoever; not only is it unfair on those already in post but it also has a negative impact on recruitment. For the last four years we have been told that this matter would not be 'kicked into the long grass'; evidence to the contrary remains to be seen. At a time when the University is about to launch its festival of wellbeing, I would also like to point out that there is great review fatigue amongst Language Teaching Officers. In my view, having one's work probed to the level we have experienced in the last four years would be detrimental to anyone's wellbeing. What we need is not yet another review and more discussions; what we need is action.

¹ See *Reporter* of 16 July 2014 (*Reporter*, 6355, 2013–14, p. 745), at <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2013-14/weekly/6355/section7.shtml#heading2-47>

² See *Reporter* of 22 October 2014 (*Reporter*, 6361, 2014–15, p. 69), at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2014-15/weekly/6361/section10.shtml>

COLLEGE NOTICES**Vacancies**

Pembroke College: Undergraduate Admissions Officer; tenure: from 1 September 2018; salary: £30,688–£34,520; closing date: 2 July 2018; further details: <http://www.pem.cam.ac.uk/the-college/job-vacancies/>

EXTERNAL NOTICES**Oxford Notices**

All Souls College: Five-year Post-Doctoral Research Fellowships in Literature in English, Mathematics, Modern Languages, and Social and Political Sciences; stipend: £41,231–£44,052, including housing allowance of £9,533 if eligible; closing date: 7 September 2018 at 4 p.m.; further details: <https://www.asc.ox.ac.uk/appointments>

Visiting Fellowships 2019–20; duration: for one, two, or three terms during the 2019–20 academic year; all subject areas considered; no stipend but entitlement to accommodation, a study in College, and meals without charge; closing date: 24 August 2018 at 4 p.m.; further details: <https://www.asc.ox.ac.uk/appointments>

Examination Fellowships; scholarship award: up to £15,480, plus £5,603 housing allowance if eligible; closing date: 3 September 2018 at 4 p.m.; further details: <https://www.asc.ox.ac.uk/appointments>

© 2018 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

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

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

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

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

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