

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6649

WEDNESDAY 2 MARCH 2022

VOL CLII No 20

CONTENTS

Notices			
Calendar	282	Class-lists, etc.	
Discussion on Tuesday, 8 March 2022	282	Act for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine	298
Election to the Nominating Committee for External Members of the Council	282	Obituaries	
Twenty-sixth Report of the Board of Scrutiny: Notice in response	283	Obituary Notice	298
Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2020–21: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	290	Graces	
Update on the Universities Superannuation Scheme: 2020 valuation	291	Grace submitted to the Regent House on 2 March 2022	298
Grace for submission under Special Ordinance A (ii) 5: Universities Superannuation Scheme	292	Acta	
Vacancies, appointments, etc.		Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 16 February 2022	298
Vacancies in the University	294	Congregation of the Regent House on 26 February 2022	299
Awards, etc.		<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Sedgwick Prize	294	Report of Discussion: 22 February 2022	
Regulations for Examinations		Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on changes to the recruitment process for clinically qualified academics to Professorships	304
Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos, Parts IA and IB	294	College Notices	
Philosophy Tripos, Parts IB and II	296	Elections	304
Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.		Vacancies	304
Natural Sciences Tripos, Part III: Entry requirements, 2022–23	297	External Notices	
		Oxford Notices	304



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

4 March, *Friday*. End of third quarter of Lent Term.

8 March, *Tuesday*. Discussion via videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).

18 March, *Friday*. Full Term ends.

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

8 March

22 March

Congregations (Saturdays unless otherwise stated)

25 March (Friday), 10 a.m.

26 March, 10 a.m.

1 April (Friday), 10 a.m.

2 April, 10 a.m.

Discussion on Tuesday, 8 March 2022

The Vice-Chancellor invites members of the Regent House, University and College employees, registered students and others qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 111) to attend a Discussion via videoconference on Tuesday, 8 March 2022 at 2 p.m. The following items will be discussed:

1. Report of the Council, dated 16 February 2022, on the refurbishment of space at 17 Mill Lane, Cambridge, for the Gates Cambridge Trust (*Reporter*, 6647, 2021–22, p. 265).
2. Report of the Council, dated 16 February 2022, on the refurbishment of space within the Cambridge Clinical Research Centre (*Reporter*, 6647, 2021–22, p. 266).
3. Report of the General Board, dated 22 February 2022, on the establishment of certain Professorships (*Reporter*, 6648, 2021–22, p. 277).

Those wishing to join the Discussion by videoconference should email UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk from their University email account, providing their CRSid (if a member of the collegiate University), by 10 a.m. on the date of the Discussion to receive joining instructions. Alternatively contributors may email remarks to contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk, copying ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk, by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion, for reading out by the Proctors,¹ or ask someone else who is attending to read the remarks on their behalf.

In accordance with Grace 3 of 12 January 2022, the Chair of the Board of Scrutiny or any ten members of the Regent House² may request that the Council arrange for one or more of the items listed above to be discussed in person (usually in the Senate-House). Requests should be made to the Registry, on paper or by email to UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk from addresses within the cam.ac.uk domain, by no later than 9 a.m. on the day of the Discussion. Any changes to the Discussion schedule will be confirmed in the *Reporter* at the earliest opportunity.

General information on Discussions is provided on the University Governance site at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions/>.

¹ Any comments sent by email should please begin with the name and title of the contributor as they wish it to be read out and include at the start a note of any College and/or Departmental affiliations held.

² <https://www.scrutiny.cam.ac.uk/> and https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/regent_house_roll/.

Election to the Nominating Committee for External Members of the Council

2 March 2022

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that he has received the following nominations for election to the Nominating Committee for External Members of the Council (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 118), and that it has been certified to him that the candidates have consented to be nominated.

Class (c): one member elected by the Regent House from among those who at the time of election are current members of the Council in classes (a), (b) and (e)*Candidate*

Dr PHILIP MICHAEL KNOX, *K*

Dr PIETER JACOB VAN HOUTEN, *CHU*

Nominated by

Professor R. T. R. Lyne, *MUR*, and Professor N. Zeeman, *K*

Professor J. M. Browne, *K*, and Professor D. W. Runciman

Class (d): two members of the Senate elected by the Regent House*Candidate*

Professor ANTHONY RICHARD GREEN, *Q*

Dr LOUISE MARGARET JOY, *HO*

Dr MÓNICA GABRIELA MORENO FIGUEROA, *DOW*

Nominated by

Professor B. Gottgens and Professor B. J. P. Huntly, *CAI*

Dr S. J. Wadsley, *HO*, and Dr J. Partner, *TH*

Professor M. S. Desai, *N*, and Dr E. E. McPherson, *Q*

There will be two elections, the first to elect one member from among the two candidates in class (c) and the second to elect two members from among the three candidates in class (d), to serve with immediate effect until 30 September 2025.

Ballot timetable

The elections will be conducted by ballot under the Single Transferable Vote regulations. Online voting will open at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, 16 March 2022 and close at **5 p.m. on Friday, 25 March 2022**. Hard-copy voting papers and supporting materials will be distributed not later than 16 March to those who opted in November 2021 to vote on paper; the last date for the return of voting papers will be 5 p.m. on Friday, 25 March 2022.

Twenty-sixth Report of the Board of Scrutiny: Notice in response

24 February 2022

The Council has received the Board of Scrutiny's Twenty-sixth Report and the remarks made at the Discussion on 9 November 2021 (*Reporter*, 2021–22: 6633, p. 62; 6637, p. 139). It has provided its response below to the Board's recommendations and the remarks made at the Discussion of the Board's Report. It has also provided its perspective on the performance of the Cambridge University Endowment Fund and noted a correction to the Board's Report. The Council apologises for the delay in providing this response, which resulted from further review of the Board's comments following feedback from the Council. Recently agreed changes to the process for producing the response will allow Council members to have input at an earlier stage and should result in swifter publication.

The Board acknowledges the 'exceptional commitment, creativity, and patience shown by staff throughout the collegiate University' during another year marked by disruption as a result of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, to which the Council adds its own tribute. The Board has continued its work, uninterrupted by the pandemic, which is also to be commended.

The opening paragraphs of the Board's Report, as Professor Evans notes, are helpful in framing the Board's role within the Cambridge context, as complementary but distinct from the roles of the Council and the Regent House. The Council continues to value the Board's input in providing a form of internal audit of those matters within its remit, including decisions made by the Council and the clarity of the Council's communications about them.

For the Board's scrutiny to be effective, it must be fair and objective and recognise that the Board and the Council operate as part of a shared endeavour to ensure that the University is in the best possible position to thrive and continue to support its mission. The Board must be free to comment independently. However, the counterpart is that the Council must also have the freedom, having noted the Board's concerns, to decide whether those concerns merit action and, if they do, to determine the best way of addressing them.

In recent years, the Council has adopted many of the recommendations made by the Board. This year, whilst the Board has made helpful recommendations on some topics which the Council is pleased to support, there appears to be less common ground in other areas. There are also misunderstandings about the intentions behind some projects, which suggests that the information provided about those projects was not sufficiently clear or complete, for which the Council must take some responsibility. The Council hopes that its explanations here, in response to the Board's recommendations, provide sufficient detail to explain the rationale for its views, and why in some cases it does not feel able to support the Board's recommended course of action.

RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE BOARD'S REPORT

1. The Board recommends that Council insists on recommending a balanced Allocations budget from now on, i.e., one that returns the University to a sustainable financial framework. Only in exceptional circumstances should the Council recommend an Allocations budget that is materially out of balance and, in such circumstances, the Council should explain to the Regent House what those exceptional circumstances are and how it will ensure that the Chest will be brought back into balance within a reasonable timeframe.

The Council agrees with the view implicit in this recommendation that the Chest allocations budget model is not working. However, its view is that there are significant issues with founding the academic University's budget on Chest allocations (*Reporter*, 6593, 2020–21, p. 84). It has therefore shifted its focus towards providing an alternative basis for planning and budgeting that is expected to provide better insight into the academic University's overall finances, founded on activity-based income and expenditure. Assuming there is support for this alternative, the expectation is that Chest allocations would be phased out and replaced by that new approach.

The balancing of income sources flowing to the Chest, with aggregate expenses associated with activities funded through Chest allocations, has been an important indicator of the financial health of the academic University. While Chest sources were dominant in scale in the past, this was certainly the case, while 'non-Chest' Research income was perceived to naturally match associated direct (if not indirect) costs by definition. However, as the funding mix has evolved and Research volumes have grown, the progressive reduction of the proportion of overall University finances represented by the Chest and the lack of direct correlation between Chest income sources and the range of Chest-supported activities, means that this measure is no longer fit for purpose in isolation. So, while a like-for-like deterioration of the balance of the Chest year on year should still give cause for review and challenge, the University's critical objective must be to achieve a balance in the overall academic University operating cash flow at the enterprise level (i.e. Chest and non-Chest).

Well-intentioned workarounds, complex practices and inconsistency in treatments over an extended period have led to a lack of transparency of the true financial performance drivers and a disproportionate focus on a somewhat unrepresentative Chest allocations boundary. Reserves are a complex and sensitive part of this jigsaw, noting there has been a growth in Chest-sourced reserves (including Research Grants and Contracts indirect funding flows which form part of Chest mechanisms) over time which may be indicative of systemic over-allocations for expenditure and overhead recoveries that are out of kilter. There will always remain a place for appropriate local reserves, but this needs review at a more sophisticated level than the legacy approach supports.

The University's approach has been:

- (a) to enhance the legacy budget process in support of short term tactical cost savings;
- (b) to set in motion initiatives that should allow material improvements to be made to the University's revenues (Surplus Improvement Fund projects), and cost efficiencies (Strategic Procurement and Purchasing, Re-imagining Professional Services, and Re-shaping the Estate); and
- (c) to develop a new approach to planning and activity-level financial transparency through Enhanced Financial Transparency (EFT) – recognising that the balancing of Chest allocations is not in itself a solution to the wider challenge of academically prioritising activities within a financially sustainable footprint.

There is still a great deal more to do before the University has better financial information to support decision-making. The core objective of the EFT project within the Finance Transformation Programme (FTP) is to demystify the income, direct and indirect costs and hence the overall financial 'contribution' of all activities (teaching, research, and other) at a granular level. EFT will develop tools that can be used to support key decision-makers at all levels on the future evolution of research and teaching activities in a financially sustainable way, guided by the evolving School academic strategies and overarching University research and teaching priorities.

EFT will *not* represent a transfer of budgetary control from the Schools, Departments and Faculties to the centre, rather it will provide improved levels of information and analysis, and a means for a collective optimisation of the component 'contributions' necessary to ensure overall balance and financial sustainability. However, it will not dictate the answers or force changes. EFT will not make decisions on behalf of Heads of Institution / budget-holders, but it will aid their collective decision-making process.

In what will remain an impact-maximising, cross-subsidised University, EFT aims to:

- support academically prioritised decision-making consistent with achieving a modest but sustainable operational cash-flow surplus (to allow appropriate investment in renewal and a reduced reliance on Cambridge University Press & Assessment distributions);
- naturally incentivise surplus-enhancing activities, recognising the academic vision and breadth of academic disciplines must continue to be supported, regardless of their individual capacity to deliver financial surplus;
- help the University develop a shared understanding of the costs associated with research and the impact of continuing growth in external research income on our finances;
- enable Departments, Faculties and individual academics to make informed choices when considering issues such as the most appropriate funding source for specific projects.

While the financial transparency anticipated by EFT will take a number of planning rounds, noticeable improvements will be delivered along the way as a 'shadow system', in parallel with the legacy approach. Indeed the first prototype, rough as it is, is already providing a hint of the insights to come, in a way that the RAM analysis could not provide.

The project will include a significant communication and stakeholder engagement effort, to ensure all users are able to make the most of the new tools and data. EFT will also have an important work stream on aspects of policy and governance. The Council envisages significant communication and consultation with the Regent House over a prolonged period. The expectation is that both the Chest allocation system and EFT will run alongside one another, with the pace of transition based on the acceptance of the revised approach. From 2023–24 there should be a full EFT view of the budget, at which stage it is hoped that there will be a better understanding and appreciation of the benefits of EFT over the existing Chest-based approach. Assuming there is support for EFT, the Council will publish a Report recommending changes to aspects of the *Statutes and Ordinances* to implement the transition from Chest allocations to EFT.

The root of the financial transparency problem the University is trying to solve does in part relate to the underlying financial systems, data structures and quality of financial management reports. The Finance Transformation Programme (FTP) is seeking address these issues. However, in parallel, EFT is seeking to address issues with the 'wiring' of existing financial models (including RAM and TRAC) which have not kept pace with the organisational complexity and growth. Both need to be addressed. EFT will not in itself save money or create the right balance in contributions, but it will inform academic management in making those decisions in a more financially transparent and objective basis over time.

2. The Board recommends that the Council carries out an independent review into the Environmental, Social and Governance performance of CUEF. The Board further recommends that the terms of reference for this review should be broad-ranging and include an analysis of the level of transparency within the reporting and operations of CUEF and a comparison with other, similar, institutions with market-leading ESG strategies both in the UK and abroad.

The Council notes that three reviews of Environmental, Social and Governance in relation to the strategy of the Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF) have taken place during the past five years. In conjunction with the publication of the most recent of these, the report 'Divestment: Advantages and Disadvantages for the University of Cambridge', Cambridge Investment Management Limited (CIML) announced a comprehensive sustainable investment strategy, centred on the three pillars of *investing, engaging* and *reporting* in a manner consistent with the CUEF's successful investment model.

CIML's mission is to serve the University, Colleges and Trusts invested in the CUEF by delivering world-class, sustainable, investment performance. Consideration of environmental, social and governance issues is core to the investment philosophy, investment process, and investment monitoring frameworks the new CIML team has implemented since the Chief Investment Officer joined CIML in January 2020. All managers appointed by CIML are screened for the highest standards of governance and ethical business practices, while a comprehensive due diligence exercise is conducted to ensure compliance with all applicable legislation.

CIML believes that climate change is the key systemic issue for the CUEF's portfolio, affecting society and the environment globally, and has a publicly stated ambition for the portfolio to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2038. In addition, as a small team with limited resources, CIML's view is that a thematic approach to sustainability, primarily focused on climate change, will enable the team to drive the greatest positive impact on the economy and society. CIML's climate change investment strategy was outlined in the Council Statement published on 1 October 2020.¹

The Board's Report pre-dated the publication of the CUEF's annual report at the end of November 2021,² in which a detailed update on progress made against the goals announced on 1 October 2020 was laid out, as follows:

Investing: In October 2020, CIML committed to maintaining zero direct investments in fossil fuels, eliminating investments in fossil fuel focused funds as quickly as possible, reducing all meaningful indirect fossil fuel investment by 2030, making significant investments in renewable energy by 2025, and investing in fossil-free options where possible. A summary of actions to June 2021 is shown below:

- December 2020: all investments with public equity managers specialised in conventional energy investment terminated;
- January 2021: the CUEF's first investment in a multi-strategy hedge fund screened to exclude fossil fuels;
- March 2021: a core public equity manager within the CUEF's portfolio announced fossil fuels to be removed from its investment universe, effective immediately;
- March 2021: the CUEF made its first investment into a dedicated renewable energy infrastructure fund;
- June 2021: the CUEF made its second investment into a dedicated renewable energy infrastructure fund.

CIML is committed to reducing the fossil fuel exposure of the CUEF. Since June 2019 the CUEF's exposure to the conventional energy sector has halved from 4% to 2%.³ In the year from June 2020 to June 2021, the CUEF's conventional energy exposure held at 2% even though oil prices increased over 80%, due to CIML's actions to reduce the number of fossil fuel holdings. The majority of remaining indirect investments in fossil fuels are private investments which were made before CIML's climate strategy was formulated. These investments will run down over time and no new commitments will be made to fossil fuel specialist asset managers.

At 30 June 2021, the carbon footprint of the CUEF's public equity investments was 30% lower than an equivalent investment in global equity markets.⁴

Engaging: As the CUEF's current asset managers have more than USD \$250bn under management, engaging with these partners magnifies the potential impact of our actions. CIML has committed to using the University's influence to engage on sustainability-related issues with fund managers across the entire portfolio.

In 2021, CIML and the Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership launched Net Zero by 2038, an education programme designed to assemble a community of fund managers who can learn together, work together and co-create an effective approach to deliver financial performance in a carbon constrained world. Five asset managers representing over £45bn of assets under management participated in the pilot programme, gaining access to leading research on climate change from the University.

Notwithstanding its primary emphasis on emissions reduction, during the past twelve months CIML has also engaged with the CUEF's asset managers and actors within the broader investment industry to challenge lack of diversity in the industry and support initiatives to improve opportunities for women and ethnic minorities. Examples of CIML's actions include collecting diversity data from the CUEF's asset managers, challenging underperforming asset managers to improve their practices, and welcoming interns from Girls are Investors and 100 Black Interns to CIML's summer internship programme.

Reporting: CIML has committed to increasing the transparency of the CUEF portfolio as well as progress towards its sustainable investment goals, both via enhanced investor reporting as well as via detailed updates in the CUEF's public annual report. CIML also hosted a town hall meeting on 31 January 2022, during which members of the University had an opportunity to ask the CIML team questions.

The Council is encouraged by the significant progress made by CIML on behalf of the CUEF against both its fossil fuel divestment and broader sustainability-related engagement goals. It also notes the significantly enhanced transparency provided to stakeholders. The University is becoming a leader among comparable endowment management organisations on matters of environmental sustainability. The Council is committed to monitoring ongoing progress, and will carry out further reviews in the future whenever it deems them appropriate.

¹ See: <https://www.cam.ac.uk/notices/news/council-statement-1-october-2020>.

² See https://www.cambridgeinvestmentmanagement.co.uk/system/files/documents/cuef_report_2021.pdf

³ The Energy Sector comprises companies engaged in exploration & production, refining & marketing and storage & transportation of oil & gas and coal & consumable fuels. It also includes companies that offer oil & gas equipment and services.

⁴ CIML uses Weighted Average Carbon Intensity as the primary carbon footprint metric for the CUEF; the iShares MSCI ACWI UCITS is used to represent the global equity market.

3. The Board recommends that the Council takes steps to ensure that major systems (and other) transformation programmes (such as the RPS and EFT) are effectively resourced, monitored and sponsored on an on-going basis. This sponsorship will potentially need to be immune to the turnover of senior officers viz Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellors, and needs to be accompanied by the delivery of tangible and specific achievements to an agreed timetable.

The Council agrees with the Board that achieving and maintaining a genuine cross-programme view supported by robust programme-level and cross-programme governance is of critical importance if its major change programmes are to succeed. Each of the programmes, which have been established to improve the way the University works and build the University of the future, through better collaboration and streamlined and simplified services and systems, have submitted their business cases for resourcing to the Planning and Resources Committee and have established project teams to ensure effective implementation, with a sponsor and an operational lead. The change programmes cover operations in finance, human resources and research.⁵

The General Board has responsibility for the overall coordination and monitoring of the Recovery Programme as its projects enter their implementation phase, and for the delivery of the change programmes. This coordinated supervision provides a sustainable and continuous basis to help to pace the University's programmes and to oversee the transition from change programme to business as usual. The General Board and the Council receive regular updates on the Recovery Programme and change programmes and their progress against deliverables.

The General Board, at its meeting on 16 February 2022, endorsed a proposal to form a Change and Programme Management (CPM) Board as a sub-committee of the Board, supported by a Change and Programme Management Office. The CPM Board will provide an overarching framework for both the Recovery Programme and the change programmes, by supporting integrated ways of working across projects, highlighting interdependencies (for example, through a consolidated timetable) and making best use of finite resources and, where appropriate, escalating issues to the General Board and/or the Planning and Resources Committee.

4. The Board reiterates its recommendation from last year that the Council carries out a formal review of the externally necessitated move to online provision in Easter Term 2020 to understand how successful it has been so as to inform the University's future digital strategy, both short-term in response to Covid-19 and in the longer term. The review should specifically consider the implications on workload management, student experience, intellectual property, reputational risk, and financing.

The Education Committee of the General Board (GBEC) has established the Technology-Enabled Learning, Teaching and Assessment Working Group to provide broad, cross-disciplinary consideration of matters relating to the use of technology within teaching, learning and assessment. The Group has been constituted initially for three years, at the end of which GBEC will revisit its remit and consider whether it has a continuing role. The Group will, in the first instance, have a 'bridging' role, to assist the development of institutional strategy for the General Board. Development of strategy will be informed by two projects:

- (a) research undertaken by the Faculty of Education on 'Digitally enabled teaching & learning at Cambridge during the disrupted period: lessons learnt and priorities for supporting the enhancement of residential education in the recovery period'. The project includes three strands:

Strand 1: A rapid evidence review, synthesising existing evidence and literature on digitally-enabled teaching and learning in Cambridge and a sample of other research-rich, residential higher education institutions.

Strand 2: Understanding Cambridge practices and cultures around teaching and learning in person and online, from the beginning of the disrupted period (March 2020) onwards.

Strand 3: Understanding the patterns of institutional support and training put in place for teaching staff and students, from the beginning of the disrupted period (March 2020) onwards.

- (b) a Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) Service design project. This focuses on the support for academics who engage with new modes of delivery and new technologies for teaching, learning and assessment. The project aims to address issues that result from the fragmentation and poor alignment of service teams supporting those academics. This work will include an analysis of activities, load on staff and resources required to properly support this endeavour.

The Council has asked the General Board to reflect on experiences during the pandemic to prompt discussion about future provision for both teaching and assessment, drawing on the above projects.

The Board appears to have conflated Cambridge Advance Online (CAO) with the greater use of digital technologies to support residential learning. The two are aimed at different learning communities, and the styles of teaching – including the use of technologies – are very different. The Council does not accept the view that a review of the use of online learning by the academic University during the pandemic is needed to inform the pedagogical approaches adopted by CAO.

⁵ For further information on the programmes, see their websites (Raven access required):

<https://universityofcambridgecloud.sharepoint.com/sites/COVIDRecovery/SitePages/The-Recovery-Programme-all-staff.aspx>;

<https://www.finance.admin.cam.ac.uk/ftp>;

<https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/authors/hr-transformation-programme>.

5. The Board recommends that the Council and General Board publish a Report setting out the case for setting up Cambridge Advance Online, its resourcing and governance arrangements, including the protection of the Cambridge brand.

There are a number of misunderstandings in the Board's presentation of the aims, governance and operation of Cambridge Advance Online (CAO) in its Report and in the remarks of Professor Evans, to which the Council would like to respond. The Council believes these misunderstandings have led to the conclusion that a Report is necessary to sanction the activities of CAO.

Online education through short courses is a reasonably well-established area of activity among many of the University's competitors. It is delivered by universities and commercial organisations and by partnerships between the two. Even before the launch of CAO, online courses were being run on a considerable scale by the Cambridge Judge Business School and the Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership. Furthermore, external providers with no connection to the University have been offering courses drawing on Cambridge staff for some time.

The learning design team at Cambridge University Press & Assessment (previously part of the University Press) has significant experience in this type of educational offering and has collaborated with many parts of the University over several years. The quality of the CAO offering is grounded in their expertise in the delivery mechanism as well as on the authority of Cambridge academics over their own subjects.

The University was late entering this area of activity in a systematic way. There could have been reputational risk in delaying coherent engagement still further. The partnership with Press & Assessment provides a unique opportunity to catch up and offer courses that are complementary to existing residential and executive education programmes offered by the University.

Cambridge thrives on diversity. Cambridge Advance Online has been created to work alongside existing activities as a peer. This is the best way for this type of activity to grow in a Cambridge context. Press & Assessment has the expertise and resource to scale up significantly and has been given the remit to offer commercial services that may, where appropriate, replace other commercial deals. It does not really matter whether or not all the other providers choose to work with CAO. It is however beneficial that they will have this option.

Authors of courses are paid at an appropriate rate, as are tutors (tutors are not paid supervision rates). The work is analogous to publishing a book with Press & Assessment, commercialising activities with Cambridge Enterprise, or indeed working on courses for external providers (as some Cambridge staff have already chosen to do). The rates have been set to be fair to all concerned. Care is taken not to undermine the ability of Departments and Faculties to recruit staff for other forms of university teaching.

The primary responsibility for protection of the Cambridge brand in this context is the Online Education Committee. This body contains academics from across a broad spectrum of disciplines; it is modelled on the Academic Publishing Committee of Cambridge University Press. Like the Academic Publishing Committee, it reports to the Syndicate and the Press and Assessment Board. The Online Education Committee approves all new courses and has oversight of the quality systems used in the creation and delivery of the online courses.

The Council concludes that embarking on a collaboration with Press & Assessment to provide the infrastructure for developing online courses with University academics, as an addition to the existing online executive and continuing education provision, is within the authority of the General Board and Press & Assessment. However, it recognises its part in causing this confusion, by not providing sufficient information about CAO prior to its launch in May 2021. It hopes that the information provided in this response is sufficient to allay concerns. The Council remains mindful of the importance of seeking Regent House approval for new developments where these fall outside existing approved arrangements.

Professor Evans asks about the level of the courses and whether they are credit-bearing. CAO courses are not aimed at specific levels. The courses are aimed at a postgraduate audience; however, they are designed to work for mixed levels of experience as there are no specific entry requirements for most courses. For example, activities are designed to support learners with less knowledge or experience, whilst also giving extension opportunities for those that are able to push their thinking further. The courses are not credit-bearing and there are no plans to award credits, although this will be kept under review.

6. The Board recommends that the University should have the necessary infrastructure (systems and people) for optimal data capture for future impact case studies in place well in advance of the next REF round.

The Council shares the Board's view of the importance of bedding down the appropriate infrastructure and has initiated work in this area. In consultation with the REF Project Board and Steering Group, the Research Office has undertaken the necessary steps to retain a number of the central REF Impact Team to ensure continuity of support for the development of impact case studies for future REF exercises. The team will be deployed flexibly over the early stages of the anticipated next REF cycle. It is managed as part of a multidisciplinary Impact and Knowledge Exchange team whose responsibilities also include administrative leadership of the University's UKRI Impact Acceleration Accounts and the University's participation in the forthcoming Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) and Knowledge Exchange Concordat. A core part of the REF Impact Team's objectives at this early stage will be securing the appropriate provision of people, systems and infrastructure to ensure that data on the impact of research is captured in real time, working in close partnership with staff across the six Schools. In addition, future development of IT systems support for impact activities, including for the purposes of REF, will be addressed as one of a number of work streams within the Research Support Transformation Programme following approval from the Planning and Resources Committee for phase one of the Programme at its December 2021 meeting.

7. The Board recommends that, with a view to improving success rates, strategic partnerships, cross-disciplinary ventures, and high value grants should receive priority support.

The Council agrees with the Board that this is a priority. In Michaelmas Term 2021, the University initiated a new funding scheme (the Large Grant Contributions Fund), established under the stewardship of the Research Policy Committee (RPC), to encourage and support large collaborative research applications and maximise the University's outward-facing impact (<https://www.research-strategy.admin.cam.ac.uk/research-funding/application-support/large-grant-contributions-fund>). In addition, resources continue to be made available to enable the preparation of large collaborative bids (via the Bid Preparation Fund <https://www.research-strategy.admin.cam.ac.uk/research-funding/application-support/bid-preparation-fund>). Furthermore, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International Partnerships) has recently initiated a consultation process to identify the challenges and structures that make it difficult for Cambridge to apply successfully for large collaborative grants and respond to and lead on major strategic initiatives, and to identify actions to increase success. The RPC has approved its oversight of this work, with dedicated staff support provided as required by the Strategic Partnerships Office, the Research Strategy Office and Development and Alumni Relations. Close coordination will be required with colleagues across the University to contribute to, develop and support enabling processes that will enhance strategic partnerships and major funding applications and gifts, to maximise the value of these and deliver impact.

8. The Board recommends that, in advance of the recruitment of the next Vice-Chancellor, the Council reviews the basis for determining the salary by setting an upper limit as a multiplier of the median salary (e.g. x 10). This would be known to potential candidates at the outset and define the scope (and limits) for negotiation once a preferred candidate had been identified. Such a methodology might reasonably be expected to bring an end to the continued growth in certain senior salaries relative to those of the median academic at Cambridge.

The Board's recommendation to use a multiplier is timely and welcome, as Professor Toope has announced that he will complete his term as Vice-Chancellor on 30 September 2022 and therefore the search for the next Vice-Chancellor has started. The Council approved, on the recommendation of the Remuneration Committee, an outline remuneration package for the next Vice-Chancellor at its meeting on 22 January 2022. When considering its recommended remuneration package, the Remuneration Committee had regard to the Board's recommendation and noted in its report to the Council that the proposed salary was below the Board's suggested limit of 10 x the median salary. The Remuneration Committee observed that there are a wide range of ratio results based on the median salary indicator across the sector because the calculation is dependent on the workforce structure in each institution. The Council considered that setting the salary based purely on the multiplier formula would not be practical, but agreed that it should be made clear to candidates during the search process that the Vice-Chancellor's salary would not be expected to increase at a higher rate than median academic salaries at the University of Cambridge.

The Council notes that the monitoring and disclosure use of a multiplier of median salary as an indicator is in keeping with the measures already in place to provide transparency and accountability; publishing the ratio of the median pay of staff to the Vice-Chancellor's basic salary is one of the indicators introduced by the CUC Remuneration Code for Higher Education to enable senior pay to be compared across the sector.⁶ The Council will continue to monitor the ratio of the Vice-Chancellor's basic salary to median academic salaries as an indicator, using available benchmarking, as well as the UCEA analysis of the median salary ratio with size of institution and the x 10 multiplier of the median salary going forward.

9. The Board recommends, again, that the Human Resources Committee be instructed to devise a policy and criteria for determining whether a post should be established or unestablished and that such a policy be published.

The Council agrees with this recommendation and notes that the HR Committee will review the use of established and unestablished roles in the University. The Council will publish the findings of the review. Given the complexity of the issues involved and the workload associated with existing projects in 2021–22, the HR Committee expects to start work on the review in 2022–23.

10. The Board recommends that the Audit Committee be asked to undertake a review of the robustness of the Council's Committee structure and that the Council should itself review the nature and timing of the reports about potential funding partners it receives from the CBELA.

The Council agrees there are lessons to be learnt from the errors made in relation to the Change the Culture Campaign in summer 2021. The Board's Report mentions a number of steps already taken by the Council and the HR Committee to ensure a successful re-launch of the Campaign in the future. In addition to those steps, the Council notes that the Anonymous Reporting Working Group reported its findings to the General Board's Education Committee in November 2021 and the HR Committee in December 2021. The General Board and the Council are being kept informed of all developments and will receive proposals for changes to the Report and Support Tool as well as any associated policy changes for approval. The approval process will also include further consultation with members of the University. In addition, the Governance and Compliance Division has put in place a protocol that sets out clearly the sign-off and approval processes for University-wide policies.

The Council notes that the Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs (CBELA) operates in the context of heightened concerns over reputational risks. CBELA has put in place a number of principles for automatic referral of items for further scrutiny by the Committee. CBELA requires that all gifts and potential research contracts from certain sources be flagged for its consideration, and all bar low risk engagements are referred to the Committee, no matter the level of gift. This includes all gifts from sources in China, Russia, and select Middle Eastern countries (including the UAE). All potential gifts or research funding from fossil fuel companies are also automatically referred to CBELA for decision. The Committee regularly reviews its principles for automatic referral.

⁶ The ratio is published in the Remuneration report each year (see paragraph C1 of the report, *Reporter*, 6617, 2020–21, p. 646).

CBELA routinely receives detailed due diligence reports to aid its scrutiny of the reputational risks of proposed sources of funds. New, material evidence emerging in relation to a source of funds, which CBELA has previously positively reviewed, triggers renewed scrutiny by CBELA.

The proposed donation by the UAE was closely scrutinised by CBELA on several occasions during 2020 and 2021. New allegations against the UAE emerged on 19 July 2021 in a series of press reports claiming evidence of a large-scale surveillance effort by the UAE against not only suspected criminals, but also activists, dissidents, political opponents and human rights advocates following a data leak from the Pegasus Project. The reporting of the allegations triggered the CBELA review process. The Committee met nine days later, on 28 July 2021, to consider the new evidence. CBELA advised the Vice-Chancellor to pause discussions over the next six months before re-evaluation in early Lent Term 2022. When taking this decision, CBELA considered it possible that there would be further media coverage on Pegasus over the coming months and wished to take any further information into account before reaching a final view. The General Board, the University body overseeing the proposed collaboration, was kept informed throughout the process and the Council received an update at its next meeting, which was in September 2021.

The Council agrees with the Board that appropriate and timely reporting from its sub-committees is important to ensure that the University's governance processes work effectively. However, the Council notes that the errors associated with the Change the Culture Campaign have not manifested themselves elsewhere. This suggests that the shortcomings in relation to the approval processes of the Change the Culture Campaign were a result of human error rather than indicative of systemic issues. The Council believes that providing better guidance to members of the Unified Administrative Service and other central bodies such as University Information Services on the University's governance processes, rather than looking at systems, will ensure that a repeat of such errors can be avoided in the future. The Council believes the protocol on policy sign-off will provide that guidance and has asked the Governance and Compliance Division to monitor its use closely and provide additional support as required.

In relation to CBELA's work, the Council is conscious of the need to balance increasing public scrutiny of the University's external activities with the need for confidential internal discussions. In Easter Term 2021, the Council and CBELA agreed that the minutes of the Committee's meetings would provide more detail on the discussion of items to allow Council members to better understand the rationale of the Committee's decision-making. CBELA minutes are provided to the Council as soon as possible after their accuracy has been formally confirmed by the Committee. Council members are routinely given the option to refer an item to the Council meeting for discussion.

RESPONSES TO OTHER POINTS RAISED IN THE BOARD'S REPORT AND AT THE DISCUSSION

Responses to Discussion remarks

Both the Board and Professor Evans comment on the responses to issues raised at Discussions, with the Board suggesting that it would be better for Council to amend or withdraw a Report when substantive reservations are expressed in Discussion and Professor Evans noting a 'thanks but no thanks' tone and that the responses are still often too long delayed. The Council is aware that its Business Committee takes considerable trouble to make sure that the responses acknowledge all pertinent points, making changes to the recommendations of Reports where appropriate, and that they address all significant concerns. However, sometimes the best course of action, when there are divided views on a proposal, is to take a vote on it. The Council has already apologised for the long delay in providing responses to some remarks. However, it also observes that they take some time to prepare. If proper consideration is to be given to the remarks made, those who are responsible for the proposal need to consider the comments, then provide a draft response to the General Board and/or the Council for comments, and sometimes also to other relevant committees, depending on the bodies involved in presenting the Report.

CUEF investment returns

The Board notes, in paragraph 28 of its Report, that annualised returns of the CUEF from inception to 30 June 2020, at 9.0% exceeded both the Fund's absolute target of CPI plus 5% (which averaged 7.0% per annum during the same period) and its composite benchmark comprising 65% equities and 35% bonds and UK property (which averaged 8.5% per annum during the same period). The Board points out that the MSCI All Country World index (the leading benchmark for global equities) returned 9.8% per annum during the period, exceeding the return of the CUEF.

The Council believes it would be inappropriate for a fund such as the CUEF, which is obliged to distribute approximately 4% of its value per year in the form of cash payments to its investors, to operate with a 100% allocation to equities. This is because the performance of equity markets is highly volatile; an investor with significant liabilities who held all of its portfolio in equities would at times be forced to sell equities at low prices, crystallising losses in order to meet its funding obligations. So the CUEF operates with approximately 65% total equity exposure, with the balance of its investments in categories which are less exposed to equity market returns, reducing the volatility of the Fund (and preserving the purchasing power of the CUEF through market downturns). Through this diversification, the annualised volatility of the CUEF is typically approximately two-thirds of that of the MSCI All-Country World Equity Index ('MSCI ACWI') as measured in Sterling. Accordingly, the 65:35 benchmark referenced above is the most fitting point of comparison for the CUEF, as it represents the closest proxy portfolio that an investor could readily access. As noted, the CUEF exceeded this benchmark by 0.5% per year over the twelve years leading up to the date referenced by the board.

Further, the most recent financial year paints a different picture. The CUEF returned 24.1% in the financial year to 30 June 2021, the highest single annual level of performance in the Fund's history. This result exceeded the 65:35 benchmark by 7.6% in the year; the FY 2020–21 result further lifted the CUEF's outperformance of the same benchmark since inception to 1% per annum. The Council believes that these results represent a strong endorsement of the CUEF model and its central tenet that well-directed active management allows unconstrained investors, with very long-term investment horizons, to outperform passive investments over time, net of fees, by exploiting the short-term distortions that emerge in financial markets. This model represents a significant source of financial strength for the University over the long term, with an annual distribution that supports the objective to balance in-year operational cash flows for the academic University.

Looking ahead, concerns about inflation are increasing, making central banks' very accommodative policies more difficult to sustain, while supply chain issues post pandemic are adding risk to the recovery of the global economy. With record high Public Equity valuations in the US, no obvious catalysts for valuations in other developed markets, and regulatory changes adding risk to growth in China, CIML's view remains that allocating more assets from Public Equities to Absolute Return and Private Equity strategies will produce superior investment returns over the long term. CIML is convinced that this allocation strategy, coupled with a focus of partnering with best-in-class managers and capturing the illiquidity premium offered by longer duration investments, will ultimately continue to yield world-class returns for its investors.

CORRECTION

In advance of the Board's submission of its Report to the Council, the Board forwards a draft of the Report to the Registry for sharing with others, to identify errors of fact. Unfortunately, one factual correction was missed. In paragraphs 65 and 66 of its Report, the Board suggests that the Council had failed to provide a Report on a major expansion at West Cambridge prior to seeking planning approval. The relevant Report was published in 2015 and its recommendations subsequently approved by Grace (*Reporter*, 2014–15: 6387, p. 544; 6392, p. 680). Following protracted discussions with the local authorities, Cambridge City Council's Planning Committee resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to completion of a section 106 planning obligation. The section 106 obligation is not yet complete; its details will be presented to the Planning and Resources Committee in Lent Term 2022 for approval, prior to completion. The business case for the West Cambridge development is also being prepared for submission to the Property Board and the Finance Committee, and initial findings will also be available around the same time.

Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2020–21: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

24 February 2022

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 25 January 2022 concerning its Annual Report (*Reporter*, 2021–22: 6641, p. 185; 6645, p. 250).

Professor Evans notes that the Council's Annual Report includes no mention of a Report proposing 'a scheme governing strategic decision-making in a crisis situation', which was mentioned in a Notice in July 2021 (*Reporter*, 6627, 2020–21, p. 768). The Council's Business Committee has commented on a draft Report concerning the scheme; a final draft is expected to be submitted to the Council before the end of this academic year.

Professor Evans also suggests that communications about the Recovery Programme have not been published in the *Reporter*. As Professor Evans notes, a Notice published in April 2021 provided an overview of the Programme (*Reporter*, 6613, 2020–21, p. 470). This Notice included details of the Programme's thirteen projects. It also provided information on the Programme's governance, including the oversight of the General Board and the part played by the Programme Management Office. A Discussion was held to give members of the Regent House and others an opportunity to comment on those projects whilst they were in development. Most importantly, this Discussion took place before the Regent House was asked to approve the recommendations of the Report recommending allocations from the Chest for 2021–22, published on 23 June 2021. This included funding of £1.3m to meet operating costs associated with the Programme, together with funding for several individual projects from the Investment Fund (some of the more substantial projects are expected to be funded from existing resources; see paragraph 7 of the Report and the related footnotes: *Reporter*, 6623, 2020–21, p. 717). Further information is published on the Recovery Programme SharePoint site, <https://universityofcambridgecloud.sharepoint.com/sites/COVIDRecovery/SitePages/The-Recovery-Programme-all-staff.aspx> (Raven access only).

Professor Evans queries whether the Recovery Programme is in reality a strategic plan. The Council can confirm that the Recovery Programme is not a strategic plan. It is a group of projects that aims to capitalise on opportunities identified or highlighted by experiences during the pandemic. The projects have been brought together under the Programme's banner to make sure that resources are focused where they can deliver most impact, with dedicated support and a consistent approach to the management and review of the projects. As the General Board's Annual Report notes in the text quoted by Professor Evans, scrutiny of the business cases for the projects is taking place under existing processes. Those processes culminate in approval by the Planning and Resources Committee within funding parameters set out in the June 2021 Report, since approved by the Regent House.

The document discussed by the Council in May 2021 and mentioned in the Council's Annual Report, to which Professor Evans refers, proposed a vision for the University's enterprise and business relations (E&BR) over the next ten years.¹ This vision will be used as a basis for future action plans for the internal stakeholders already involved in E&BR activities. As one of the first steps, Cambridge Enterprise and Cambridge Innovation Capital have been asked to develop their own vision for how they will work together to support the development of the Cambridge cluster through to 2030. If actions arising from these more detailed action plans require Regent House approval, proposals will be submitted for approval.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 298) for the approval of its Annual Report for 2020–21 (which incorporates the General Board's Annual Report).

¹ The current vision will be available shortly to those with Raven access on the Business and Enterprise website at: <https://www.cam.ac.uk/business-and-enterprise>.

Update on the Universities Superannuation Scheme: 2020 valuation

28 February 2022

The Council at its meeting on 21 February considered alternative proposals put forward by the University and College Union (UCU) to close the USS 2020 valuation. It also considered an amendment to the employers' proposal to defer the imposition of a 2.5% inflation cap on revaluing benefits built up in the scheme.

The proposals put forward by UCU and considered by all participating employers as part of a formal consultation are as follows:

- that UUK call on USS to issue a moderately prudent, evidence-based valuation of the financial health of the scheme as at 31 March 2022, to be issued for consultation in June (at the latest);
- that employers agree to provide the same level of covenant support as for their own proposals to facilitate a cost-sharing of current benefits throughout the 2022–23 scheme year, starting on 1 April 2022 at 11% member/23.7% employer until 1 October 2022, and 11.8%/25.2% thereafter;
- that employers agree to pay a maximum of 25.2% and members a maximum of 9.8% from 1 April 2023 so as to secure current benefits or, if not possible, the best achievable as a result of the call on USS to issue a moderately prudent, evidence-based valuation.

The Council did not support the UCU proposals¹ but did agree to support the deferral of the inflation cap. While not a major change in its own right, the deferral of the inflation cap is important because it protects members from high levels of inflation in the short term, is an important signal that a 2.5% inflation cap should not be normalised into benefit design, and buys a realistic amount of time to find a way to remove the cap permanently.

The main reasons for not supporting the UCU proposals are as follows:

- There is no clear evidence that a 2022 valuation would deliver an acceptable cost for the current benefits, in large part because there is no clear evidence that the valuation methodology adopted by the USS trustee and regulator would differ meaningfully from the approach they have used in the most recent valuations.
- Additionally, a 2022 valuation would almost certainly delay the evaluation and implementation of a long-term sustainable solution (see below).
- As many people have pointed out, the scheme's assets have increased substantially since the valuation date of March 2020. However, USS has signalled that the reduction in deficit contributions would be largely offset by the increase in the cost of future benefits. A material change is only likely with significant reform to the scheme and approach to risk from USS. Without this, even the contribution increase to 35% of salary as proposed by UCU would not avert the large majority of the benefit cuts from April 2022 (albeit they would be deferred until April 2023).
- Pursuing a 2022 valuation would distract attention from exploring an alternative scheme design, which the University believes is the most likely way of restoring benefits on a sustainable basis.

The Council would like to address some concerns about how it voted on the UCU proposals. It would like to clarify that all members of the Council were able to participate in the discussion. Only those members of the Council who are not active members of the USS voted on the matter. This approach, which reflects Council members' fiduciary duties as charity trustees, was agreed by the whole Council at successive meetings in 2018 and has been followed since then for all matters relating to the USS.

A detailed message explaining the latest developments relating to USS will be sent to all Cambridge members of the scheme by the Chief Financial Officer and published on the University website at <https://www.staff.admin.cam.ac.uk/latest-information-on-uss/2020-valuation>.

¹ See https://www.staff.admin.cam.ac.uk/system/files/download/response_to_uuk_consultation_on_ucu_proposal_final.pdf.

Grace for submission under Special Ordinance A (ii) 5: Universities Superannuation Scheme

2 March 2022

The Council has received the following Grace which has been initiated under Special Ordinance A (ii) 5 by 294 members of the Regent House:

That this Regent House, as the governing body of the University,

- (i) reaffirms its commitment to adequate pension provision as an essential part of the University's recruitment and retention strategy at all levels;
- (ii) notes the leading role which the University has taken, in partnership with the Cambridge branch of the University and College Union, in exploring ways of improving the benefits delivered to Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) members through alternative scheme design;
- (iii) calls on the Universities Superannuation Scheme to undertake a new, moderately prudent, evidence-based valuation of the financial health of the scheme, as at 31 March 2022 if feasible;
- (iv) agrees to provide the covenant support required to facilitate a cost-sharing of the benefits currently available as of February 2022, pending a new, moderately prudent, evidence-based valuation;
- (v) expects the University
 - (a) to take every reasonable step to deliver a nationally and internationally competitive Defined Benefit pension scheme; and
 - (b) to publish a Report to the Regent House by the division of Michaelmas Term 2022 on detailed alternative means of maintaining, in the short and medium term, the total remuneration and retirement package of the University's USS members, in the event that the benefits delivered under the 2020 valuation or a new valuation are materially less than those available to those members as of February 2022;
- (vi) in respect of the longer-term position of the USS, expects the University to support every effort to find a solution that offers an attractive, sustainable, and fair pension settlement acceptable to the University's USS members; and
- (vii) expects the University, through the Council, to keep the Regent House fully updated on progress towards these objectives.

A list of the signatories is set out in Annex A.

The Council will consider the Grace at its meeting on 21 March 2022.

Annex A

R. H. ABBOTT
S. A. ABEL
J. W. AJOKA
J. S. ALDRED
B. C. ALLANACH
G. P. ALLEN
H. D. ALLEN
G. A. J. AMARATUNGA
P. S. ANDERSON
J. D. D. ASHBY
D. E. ASTLE
W. J. ASTLE
G. W. ATKINS
A. J. ATTAHERI
A. BAEZ ORTEGA
R. BAKER
N. BAMPOS
R. J. BARNES
J. S. M.-P. BARRAU
M. S. K. BARUA
C. A. BASSETT
D. C. BAULCOMBE
P. M. BAYS
S. J. BEARD
M. B. BECKLES
M. N. BEG
D. S. A. BELL
C. E. BLACKMUN
A. J. BLADON
E. C. BLAIR
S.-J. BLAKEMORE
M. J. BOYD

O. BRANSON
M. T. BRAVO
R. W. H. BRICHENO
C. R. BROOKE
PIETE BROOKS
M. BRUNA ESTRACH
B. J. BURCHELL
C. BURT
R. D. CAMINA
R. P. CARLYON
G. C. CARR
D. M. CARRINGTON
P. G. B. CARTER
C. CASTELNOVO
A. CATES
M. E. CATES
C. P. CAULFIELD
P. R. CAVILL
J. H. CHALFEN
H. A. CHALMERS
C. E. CHAMBERS
L. G. CHEKE
A. N. CHESTER
M. G. CHINCA
D. J. H. CLIFFORD
M. T. CONDE
P. J. CONNELL
D. P. COTTERELL
S. J. COWLEY
D. L. CRAM
E. R. CREMA
N. CRISAFI

G. M. CRONIN
J. A. CROWCROFT
G. CSÁNYI
P. J. CUNNINGHAM
D. E. A. CURTIS
A. DA COSTA
O. DA ROLD
P. L. DE BOLLA
L. M. DELAP
T. J. DENMEAD
M. S. DESAI
M. M. DIXON-WOODS
N. DOREY
A. L. DU BOIS-PEDAIN
J. H. DURRELL
M. J. EDWARDS
S. J. EGLENN
J. A. ELLIOTT
G. E. EMERSON
K. C. ETTENHUBER
T. G. EUSER
G. R. EVANS
S. FENNELL
S. M. FLOOD
W. F. P. FOKS
T. J. FORD
D. FUSCO
C. GAGNE
R. GAGNÉ
F. GALLO
G. F. GILMORE
P. J. GIRLING

R. E. GOLDSTEIN
 C. J. GONDA
 D. J. GOODE
 P. GOPAL
 W. T. GOWERS
 P. M. GRAY
 J. B. R. GREEN
 I. GROJNOWSKI
 M. W. GROSS
 V. M. GRUAR
 D. C. GRUBE
 R. J. GRUIJTERS
 J. A. GUARNERI
 N. S. M. GUYATT
 S. HAGGARTY
 S. K. HAIGH
 S. E. HAKENBECK
 A. E. HALFPENNY
 A. C. HANSEN
 E. B. HARTMANN
 M. HATZIMICHALI
 R. HAYNES
 G. J. E. HENNEQUIN
 F. HOLLFELDER
 M. B. HOLNESS
 R. R. HORGAN
 A. HOUEN
 S. HOUGHTON-WALKER
 D. R. HOWARTH
 P. M. R. HOWELL
 I. R. B. M. HUSSAIN
 J. M. E. HYLAND
 M. J. HYVONEN
 L. JANIK
 A. S. JEFFREY
 C. A. JONES
 J. P. JOY
 E. G. KANTARIS
 S. KAPILA
 A. M. KEATING
 A. P. A. KENT
 R. R. KERSWELL
 A. KONTOLEON
 T. W. KÖRNER
 N. KRISHNASWAMI
 J. KROMDIJK
 S. T. LAM
 M. LANDGRAF
 P. J. LANE
 J. LASENBY
 H. N. LATTER
 D. F. LAUGA
 E. J.-M. LAUGA
 M. R. LAVEN
 S. W. C. LAW
 K. S. LILLEY
 H. T. E. LINDENTHAL
 E. R. LINES
 C. M. LIZIERI
 H. R. MCCARTHY
 R. G. MACFARLANE
 A. M. MCMAHON
 L. C. MCMAHON
 E. E. MCPHERSON
 A. V. S. MADHAVAPEDDY
 S. MAGHENZANI
 S. H. MANDELBROTE
 P. MANDLER
 T. MANLY
 N. J. F. MANSLEY
 G. F. MANTILLA CASAS
 F. MARKOWETZ
 STUART MARTIN
 J. M. R. MATHESON
 R. J. MAYHEW
 L. G. MELLOR
 P. MENDES LOUREIRO
 S. C. MENTCHEN
 M. MESQUITA DA COSTA
 T. G. MICKLEM
 JONAH MILLER
 A. L. MILTON
 A. D. MING
 F. P. L. MOORE
 M. G. MORENO FIGUEROA
 J. E. MORGAN
 C. MORGENSTERN
 R. MORIEUX
 R. M. MORTIER
 A. MOSTERIN HOPPING
 H. R. MOTT
 C. G. A. MOUHOT
 S. M. MURK-JANSEN
 A. MYCROFT
 J. F. K. NALL
 D. P. NALLY
 N. NAQVI
 D. NIETLISPACH
 Y. NOBIS
 E. M. NUGENT
 T. C. O'CONNELL
 A. D. OLIVER
 R. A. OLIVER
 S. M. OOSTHUIZEN
 K. OTTEWELL
 DARERCA OWEN
 E. G. OZYUREK BAER
 R. PADMAN
 G. P. PEARCE
 T. J. PEDLEY
 A. F. A. PELLEGRINI
 L. PELLEGRINI
 C. PENASCO PATON
 A. M. L. F. PENZAERT
 A. M. PITTS
 H. E. PORTER
 R. C. POWELL
 D. R. PRATT
 R. R. RAFIKOV
 P. RAMOS PINTO OLIVEIRA DA SILVA
 S. RANGANATHAN
 O. RATH-SPIVACK
 R. RAU
 H. S. REALL
 D. I. REDHOUSE
 W. G. REES
 J. D. RHODES
 J. E. ROBB
 D. S. ROBERTSON
 M. A. RUEHL
 C. RUSSELL
 P. A. RUSSELL
 S. RUSSELL
 J. C. SANDERS
 A. O. SCALLY
 J. E. SCOTT-WARREN
 S. SEAMAN
 S. E. SEBASTIAN
 B. D. SHERWIN
 S. M. SHORROCK
 E. M. A. SILVA
 J. S. SIMONS
 S. P. SIVASUNDARAM
 P. J. SLOMAN
 C. W. J. SMITH
 K. E. SPENCE
 U. SPERHAKE
 S. SRINIVASAN
 R. A. W. STALEY
 M. J. STERNBERG
 S. K. F. STODDART
 Z. A. M. SVENDSEN
 S. R. S. SZRETER
 D. TALMI
 P. N. TAYLOR
 G. L. THOMAS
 D. M. THOMPSON
 E. TITI
 D. TONG
 C. A. TOUT
 T. TREGEAR
 D. TROCMÉ-LATTER
 D. H. P. TUAL
 A. W. TUCKER
 P. TUCKER
 T. TWINING
 M. UBIALI
 P. J. VAN HOUTEN
 L. VENKATASUBRAMANIAN
 J. O. VICARY
 G. VINNICOMBE
 B. VIRA
 C. E. WALLACE
 R. F. WALLER
 P. S. WARDE
 SHEILA WATTS
 STEPHEN WATTS
 A. A. R. WEBB
 T. T. WEIL
 D. H. WEISS
 J. J. WELCH
 O. M. WELLER
 S. R. WHITE
 N. G. WICKRAMASEKERA
 L. B. WILCOX
 G. A. N. WILLIS
 A. M. WILSON
 E. F. WILSON
 H. J. R. WILTON
 M. B. WINGATE
 J. WOLF
 J. D. G. WOOD
 P. C. WOODLAND
 A. WOOLGAR
 L. C. WRIGHT
 G. S. WYATT-MOON
 N. A. S. ZAIR
 Q. ZHAO

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.**Vacancies in the University**

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

Esquire Bedell (University Ceremonial officer) in the Governance and Compliance Division of the University Offices; tenure: permanent, part-time (hours as required by events and associated duties) from 9 May 2022; salary: £6,178; closing date: 13 March 2022; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/33698/>; quote reference: AJ30207

Assistant Esquire Bedell (University Ceremonial officer) in the Governance and Compliance Division of the University offices; tenure: fixed-term, part-time (hours as required by events) from 19 April 2022; £30 per hour; closing date: 13 March 2022; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/33739/>; quote reference AJ30247

KPMG Professorship of Management Studies in the Judge Business School; informal enquiries: Dr Andreas Richter (email: a.richter@jbs.cam.ac.uk) or Professor Mauro Guillén, Director of the Cambridge Judge Business School (email: m.guillen@jbs.cam.ac.uk); tenure: from 1 September 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 11 April 2022; further details: <http://www.berwickpartners.co.uk/85416> or elizabeth.james@berwickpartners.co.uk;

University Assistant Professor of Early American History in the Faculty of History; tenure: from 1 October 2022; salary: £42,149–£53,348; closing date: 23 March 2022; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/33600/>; quote reference: JJ30124

University Assistant Professor (Political Psychology) in the Department of Psychology; tenure: from 1 October 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; salary: £42,149–£53,348; closing date: 27 March 2022; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/33451/>; quote reference: PJ29999

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.

AWARDS, ETC.**Sedgwick Prize**

(Statutes and Ordinances, 2021, p. 987)

The Woodwardian Professor of Geology gives notice, on behalf of the Examiners, that the subject for the Sedgwick Prize for 2022 is either ‘A proposal for a programme of geological field-work’, or ‘A proposal for the use of collections in Earth Sciences research’.

Submissions should be sent to the Registry via the Sedgwick Prize Administrator (by email to ab78@cam.ac.uk) to arrive no later than 1 April 2022.

The Prize is open to University officers and Fellows of Colleges, and to other persons employed by the University to carry out research in the Faculty of Earth Sciences and Geography, who have resided sixty days during the twelve months preceding 1 October 2022. It is open to candidates to incorporate in their essays material which they have already published, but they are expected to submit a connected presentation of their case.

The value of the Prize is likely to be £10,000. This Prize is offered every second year.

REGULATIONS FOR EXAMINATIONS**Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos, Parts IA and IB**

(Statutes and Ordinances, 2021, p. 284)

With effect from 1 October 2021

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, has approved amendments to the regulations for the Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos so as to introduce an intermediate Chinese pathway at Part IA.

PART IA**Regulation 15.**

By adding the following papers:

- C.4 Modern Chinese translation and writing 2
- C.5 Modern Chinese texts 2
- C.7 History of dynastic China
- C.8 Globalisation in China, 1850 to the present (an essay of 8,000 words, to be submitted not later than the first day of Full Easter Term)

Regulation 16.

By amending sub-paragraph (a) to read as follows:

(a) *East Asian Studies*

Candidates shall offer:

- (i) Paper EAS.1;
- (ii) *either* Papers C.1–3 and an oral examination in Chinese;
or Papers C.3–5 and an oral examination in Chinese;
or Papers J.1–3 and an oral examination in Japanese.

The oral examination shall be offered under conditions set out by the Faculty Board from time to time.

With effect from 1 October 2022

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, has also approved amendments to the regulations for the Asian and Middle Eastern Studies Tripos so as to introduce an intermediate Chinese pathway at Part IB and to restructure the Japanese pathway at Part IB.

PART IB

Regulation 18.

By adding the following papers:

- C.9 Special Chinese language option
- J.O Japanese oral
- J.5A Introduction to premodern Japanese
- J.5B Modern Japanese texts
- J.6A Japan's premodern history
- J.6B Japan's modern history
- J.8A Modern and contemporary Japanese literature
- J.8B Premodern and early modern Japanese literature
- J.10A The politics and international relations of Japan
- J.10B The politics and international relations of Korea

By removing the following papers:

- J.5 Modern Japanese texts 2
- J.6 Japanese history
- J.8 Japanese literature
- J.10 Japanese politics

Regulation 19.

By amending sub-paragraph (a) to read as follows:

(a) *East Asian Studies*

Candidates shall offer:

- either*
 - (i) Papers C.4–6;
 - (ii) one paper chosen from C.7–8;
 - (iii) one further paper chosen from C.7–8, J.6, J.8–10, AMES.1, X.3, and the additional papers announced by the Faculty Board under Regulation 8;
 - (iv) an oral examination in Chinese;
- or*
 - (i) Paper C.6;
 - (ii) Paper C.9;
 - (iii) Papers C.7–8;
 - (iv) two further papers chosen from J.6, J.8–10, AMES.1, and the additional papers announced by the Faculty Board under Regulation 8;
- or*
 - (i) Papers J.4, J.5A, J.5B;
 - (ii) six half-papers (no more than three per term) taken from the following selection and with the following conditions:
 - (a) a minimum of one half-paper from each of the following three strands: history strand (J.6A, J.6B); literature strand (J.8A, J.8B); social sciences strand (J.9, J.10A, J.10B). J.9 is a full paper and therefore counts as two half-papers.
 - (b) where the above condition is met, students may select any additional half-paper on offer as per above, as well as the J.7 half-paper, or one of the following: AMES.1, C.7, C.8, X.3, and the additional papers announced by the Faculty Board under Regulation 8;
 - (iii) an oral examination in Japanese.

The oral examination shall be offered under conditions set out by the Faculty Board from time to time.

Philosophy Tripos, Parts IB and II

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 432)

With effect from 1 October 2021

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Philosophy, has approved the following amendments to the regulations for the Philosophy Tripos to no longer offer a paper borrowed from the Theology, Religion, and Philosophy of Religion Tripos at Part II and to move the paper on Aesthetics from Part II to Part IB and to retitling it in Part IB. Both papers will be available in academic year 2021–22 to ensure that no students are disadvantaged by the change; Paper 11 will be permanently removed from Part II with effect from 1 October 2022.

PART IB

Regulation 5.

By amending sub-paragraph (a) as follows:

By adding *Aesthetics and philosophy of art* to the list of papers available in Part IB as Paper 9 and renumbering the existing Paper 9 as Paper 10.

By amending sub-paragraph (b) to read as follows:

(b) Subject to the provision of sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) of this regulation, a candidate for Part IB shall offer papers as follows:

- either* (i) Papers 1 and 10, and three papers from Papers 2–7, and 9;
or (ii) Papers 1 and 8, and two papers from Papers 2–7, and 9.

The weighting of Paper 8, for those who offer it, shall be double that of other papers.

By amending sub-paragraph (d) to read as follows:

(d) In place of any one of the Papers 2–3 and 5–7 and 9 a candidate may submit two essays, each of not less than 3,000 words and not more than 4,000 words in length, including footnotes and appendices but excluding bibliography, on two topics approved by the Chair of Examiners, which shall both fall within the syllabus of that paper; provided that a candidate who chooses to submit essays under the provisions of this sub-paragraph shall not write in Paper 10 an essay on a subject that overlaps significantly with either of the submitted essays.

PART II

Regulation 6.

By adding a footnote against Paper 11 stating that it will only be available for 2021–22.

Regulation 7.

By removing the reference to Part IIB of the Theology, Religion, and Philosophy of Religion Tripos.

SCHEDULE

By removing Theology, Religion, and Philosophy of Religion Tripos Paper C11. *Truth, God, and metaphysics* from the list of papers available from other Triposes that may be taken in Part II.

With effect from 1 October 2022

PART II

Regulation 6.

By removing Paper 11. *Aesthetics* from the list of papers available in Part II and renumbering Paper 12 as Paper 11.

Regulations 7 and 8.

By amending references to Papers 1–11 to read Papers 1–10 and references to Paper 12 to read Paper 11 throughout.

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.**Natural Sciences Tripos, Part III: Entry requirements, 2022–23**

The Committee of Management for the Natural Sciences Tripos, in consultation with the Faculty Boards of Physics and Chemistry, Biology, Earth Sciences and Geography, and the Board of History and Philosophy of Science, has defined the standards required for entry to each subject of Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos (see Regulation 5(a) for the Tripos (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 419)), **with effect from the courses commencing in the academic year 2022–23**, as follows:

Astrophysics

In order to be a candidate for honours in Astrophysics in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Astrophysics or Physics, or in Part II of the Mathematical Tripos. Candidates will be considered on a case-by-case basis so that it can be ascertained that they have a good grasp of at least three appropriate applied mathematics courses in the examination.

Biochemistry

In order to be a candidate for honours in Biochemistry in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Biochemistry in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Chemistry

In order to be a candidate for honours in Chemistry in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Chemistry in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Earth Sciences

In order to be a candidate for honours in Earth Sciences in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should normally:

- either* have obtained at least a II.1 in Earth Sciences in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos;
- or* have obtained a II.1 in Part II Physical Sciences with at least 70% in Half Subject Earth Sciences.

Materials Science

In order to be a candidate for honours in Materials Science in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Materials Science in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

History and Philosophy of Science

In order to be a candidate for honours in History and Philosophy of Science in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in History and Philosophy of Science in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Students who have not taken History and Philosophy of Science in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos will be considered on a case-by-case basis. These students should have obtained at least a high II.1 overall class in Part II.

Physics

In order to be a candidate for honours in Physics in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Physics in Part II.

Students who have not taken Physics in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos (for example, those who have read Part II of the Mathematical Tripos, Part II Astrophysics, or Part II Physical Sciences Half Subject Physics) will be considered on a case-by-case basis. These students should usually have obtained at least a high II.1 overall class in Part II and have covered an appropriate range of courses in physics.

Systems Biology

In order to be a candidate for honours in Systems Biology in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student from the Natural Sciences Tripos should:

- (1) *either* have obtained at least 55% in either Mathematics or Mathematical Biology in Part IA of the Natural Sciences Tripos;
- or* have obtained at least 55% in Mathematics in Part IB of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

And

- (2) have obtained at least a II.1 in a single-subject in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Participation by students from the Mathematical Tripos will be considered on a case-by-case basis and a II.1 in Part II is normally expected.

All subjects

In addition to the standards mentioned above, candidates should have fulfilled any subject prerequisites as outlined in the appropriate programme specification.

The application process for each subject is defined on the subject webpage together with details of any constraints on numbers or additional information that may be required.

Consideration of special cases

A student who has not met the required standard or who has not offered the required subjects as specified above, or who has not complied with the published deadline for receipt of applications, may request consideration as a special case. A request for special consideration should be forwarded by the student's Director of Studies or Tutor to the Secretary of the relevant Faculty Board using the pro forma provided, at the earliest opportunity and, at the latest, within two weeks of the results being announced. The Director of Studies or Tutor should state the reasons for requesting dispensation, confirm that the College supports the request and is able to support the student, and believes that the student will be capable of undertaking the Part III course successfully. The application must be accompanied by copies of supervision reports, and a detailed breakdown of the student's marks, year by year and subject by subject. The Committee nominated by the Faculty Board to consider special cases is not expected to consider circumstances of a nature on which the Applications Committee would normally make a judgement.

Representations regarding progression decisions are allowed for under the review procedure for examinations for undergraduate and certain other qualifications.

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

We hereby certify that the following candidate has kept the Act and been approved for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine:

This content has been removed as it contains personal information.

OBITUARIES**Obituary Notice**

Dr JENNIFER MARY EDMONDS, M.A., FLS, formerly Fellow of Darwin College, Linnean Tercentenary Medallist, died on 20 February 2022, aged 77 years.

GRACES**Grace submitted to the Regent House on 2 March 2022**

The Council submits the following Grace to the Regent House. This Grace, unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 111), will be deemed to have been approved at **4 p.m. on Friday, 11 March 2022**. Further information on requests for a ballot or the amendment of Graces is available to members of the Regent House on the Regent House Petitions site.[§]

1. That the Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2020–21, dated 14 December 2021 (*Reporter*, 6641, 2021–22, p. 185), be approved.¹

¹ See the Council's Notice, p. 290.

[§] See <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/key-bodies/RH-Senate/Pages/RH-Petitions.aspx> for details.

ACTA**Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 16 February 2022**

All the Graces submitted to the Regent House on 16 February 2022 (*Reporter*, 6647, 2021–22, p. 268) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 25 February 2022.

Congregation of the Regent House on 26 February 2022

A Congregation of the Regent House was held at 10 a.m. All the Graces submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6648, 2021–22, p. 279) were approved.

The following degrees were conferred:

This content and pages 300, 301 and 302 have been removed as they contain personal information.

This content has been removed as it contains personal information

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 22 February 2022

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Dr Jessica Gardner was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Senior Pro-Proctor and one other person present.

The following Report was discussed:

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 9 February 2022, on changes to the recruitment process for clinically qualified academics to Professorships

(*Reporter*, 6646, 2021–22, p. 256).

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I have some concerns about the risk of debasement of the Professorial title in the wake of the recent changes to titles and the introduction of the Academic Career Pathways. This Report seems to admit such a risk in its comment that ‘since the implementation of the changes in academic titles ... the offices are Professor (Grade 11) and Professor, so the change in title is now less distinctive’.

This Report includes a provision to amend the:

Ordinance for Emeritus Officers (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 679, as amended by Grace 5 of 29 July 2020): by inserting a reference to Clinical Professors before the references to Readers.

That seems to suggest that the *emeriti* are ‘Officers’. However, this Ordinance is still headed simply ‘Emeritus Professors and Readers’. Some tidying up seems to be needed.

I raise the point because the ‘Consultation on the principles of a new policy governing the use and allocation of @cam.ac.uk email addresses’ which ended on 18 February¹ seemed to have forgotten about the *emeriti*. It seems worth asking in this Discussion whether the *emeriti*, in future to include the Clinical Professors, will be allowed to continue to use their ‘@cam.ac.uk’ email addresses. They keep their titles for life, and apparently in now recognised ‘Offices’. Can it be right to expect them to move all their email correspondence to Google while still bearing a Cambridge title?

¹ *Reporter*, 6646, 2021–22, p. 255.

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Girton College

Elected to an Official Fellowship from 1 December 2021:

Simon Nicholas Fairclough, M.A., *CHR*

Elected to an Official Fellowship from 11 February 2022:

John Alphonse Tadross, B.Sc., Ph.D., M.B.B.S., *Imperial*, FRCPath

Vacancies

Corpus Christi College: William Cook Early-Career Research Fellowship/College Lectureship in Economics; tenure: four years from 1 September 2022; salary: £36,382; closing date: 21 April 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.corpus.cam.ac.uk/about-corpus/people/academic-vacancies>

Darwin College: Cambridge Zero David MacKay Research Associates; tenure: one year from April 2022; closing date: 18 March 2022 at 5 p.m.; further details: <https://www.darwin.cam.ac.uk/vacancies>

Murray Edwards College: Postdoctoral Bye Fellowships (up to ten available); tenure: one year from 1 October 2022 in the first instance; closing date: 31 March 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <http://www.murrayedwards.cam.ac.uk/about/work-us>

St John's College: Harper-Wood Creative Writing & Travel Award for English Poetry & Literature; purpose: creative writing project-related travel and study for creative writers in the early stages of their careers; closing date: 4 May 2022; further details and information: <https://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/harper-wood-creative-writing-travel-award>

EXTERNAL NOTICES

Oxford Notices

St Cross College: ‘Around the world in 12 folk tunes’, a concert by acclaimed accordion duo, Aine McLoughlin and Ilona Suomalainen, on 31 March 2022 at 7 p.m. livestreamed via YouTube; the concert is free but booking is required; further details: <https://www.stx.ox.ac.uk/event/st-cross-around-the-world-in-12-folk-tunes>

University College: Associate Professorship (or Professorship) of the History of Modern France and the Francophone World; tenure: from 1 October 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; salary: £48,835–£65,574 plus collegiate benefits and allowances; closing date: 28 March 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.univ.ox.ac.uk/jobs-at-univ-2/>