

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6672

WEDNESDAY 19 OCTOBER 2022

VOL CLIII No 5

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	51
Discussion on Tuesday, 8 November 2022	51
Appointment of Chair of Cambridge University Endowment Trustee Body	51
Report of the Council on the period of appointment of external members of the Council: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	51
Online information session about the University Council: 26 October 2022	52

Vacancies, appointments, etc.

Electors to the Professorship of Education (2008)	52
Vacancies in the University	52

Events, courses, etc.

Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.	52
--	----

Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

Annual meetings of the Faculties	53
Law Tripos, 2022–23: Half-papers and seminar courses	53
Master of Accounting, 2022–23	54
Master of Corporate Law (M.C.L.), 2022–23: Designated papers	55
Master of Law (LL.M.), 2022–23: Designated papers and prescribed subjects	56
Chancellor's Medal for English Law, 2022–23: eligible papers	57

Reports

Twenty-seventh Report of the Board of Scrutiny	57
--	----

Graces

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 19 October 2022	67
Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 21 October 2022	68
Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 22 October 2022	68

Acta

Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 5 October 2022	68
--	----

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Report of Discussion: 11 October 2022

Topic of Concern to the University: North West Cambridge Phase I	69
Second-stage Report of the Council on the construction of the National Centre for Propulsion and Power and re-development of the Whittle Laboratory	72
Report of the Council on the period of appointment of external members of the Council	74
Report of the Council on the membership of the Regent House of certain officers	74

College Notices

Elections	75
Vacancies	75

Societies, etc.

Cambridge Philosophical Society	75
---------------------------------	----

External Notices

Oxford Notices	75
----------------	----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES**Calendar**

20 October, *Thursday*. End of first quarter of Michaelmas Term.

21 October, *Friday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m. (see p. 68).

22 October, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m. (see p. 68).

8 November, *Tuesday*. Discussion by videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

8 November

22 November

6 December

Congregations

21 October, Friday at 10 a.m.

22 October, Saturday at 10 a.m.

26 November, Saturday at 10 a.m.

Discussion on Tuesday, 8 November 2022

The Acting 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 **by videoconference** on Tuesday, 8 November 2022 at 2 p.m. The following item will be discussed:

1. Twenty-seventh Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 3 October 2022 (p. 57).

Contributors unable to attend the Discussion may email their 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 may 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 for discussion 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/.

Appointment of Chair of Cambridge University Endowment Trustee Body

17 October 2022

Further to its Notice published on 27 July (*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 646), the Council has approved the appointment of Mr Mark Lewisohn as the inaugural Chair of the Cambridge University Endowment Trustee Body. The appointment was made on the recommendation of its *ad hoc* Nominating Committee chaired by external Council member Ms Sharon Flood. Mr Lewisohn's appointment is for three years from 1 November 2022. The Trustee Body is expected to be fully constituted early in the Lent Term 2023.

Report of the Council on the period of appointment of external members of the Council: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

18 October 2022

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 11 October 2022 on the above Report (*Reporter*, 2022–23: 6669, p. 12; 6672, p. 74).

The Council thanks Professor Evans for her commentary on the Report. It notes that, for Council appointments, the external nomination process normally takes at least 6 months compared to the usual 1.5-month election process.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 2, p. 67) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report.

Online information session about the University Council: 26 October 2022

An online town hall meeting about the role of the University Council will be held on **Wednesday, 26 October 2022 from 1–2 p.m.** Acting Vice-Chancellor, Dr Anthony Freeling (Chair of the Council) and Mark Lewisohn (Deputy Chair) will host the meeting alongside a panel of other experienced Council members, who will answer questions about the role of the Council and its members. The event will be particularly useful for members of the Regent House considering standing for election to the Council this term (see *Reporter*, 6670, 2022–23, p. 29). To register for the event, visit <https://www.eventbrite.co.uk/e/online-town-hall-meeting-the-role-of-the-university-council-tickets-441518362307>.

The University Council is the principal executive and policy-making body of the University and its members are the charity trustees of the University. The Council has general responsibility for the administration of the University, for defining its mission, for the planning of its work and for the management of its resources. Further information about the Council is available on its website at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/>.

Elections are taking place this term to appoint eight members of the University Council for four years from 1 January 2023. The deadline for nominations is 12 noon on Friday, 11 November 2022 and full details of the nomination procedure and election timetable were published in the *Reporter* on 5 October 2022.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Electors to the Professorship of Education (2008)

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Professorship of Education (2008) as follows:

Dr Jessica Gardner, *SE*, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Gert Biesta, *University of Edinburgh*

Professor Qing Gu, *University College London*

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

Professor Pauline Rose

Professor Merrilyn Goos, *University of the Sunshine Coast*

Professor Tim Harper, *M*

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

Professor Linda Fisher, *HO*

Professor Howard Stevenson, *University of Nottingham*

Professor Andreas Stylianides, *HH*

Vacancies in the University

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

Professorship of English (2001) in the Faculty of English; tenure: from 1 October 2023 or as soon as possible thereafter; informal enquiries: Professor Raphael Lyne, Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: rtrl100@cam.ac.uk); closing date: 15 December 2022; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/37601/>; quote reference: GG33694

The University actively supports equality, diversity and inclusion and encourages applications from all sections of society.

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

EVENTS, COURSES, ETC.

Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.

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

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

<i>Classics</i>	Corbett Lecture 2022: <i>Once and ever: Waiting for the future in Homer's Iliad</i> , by Professor Alex Purves, UCLA, on Thursday, 3 November 2022 at 5 p.m. in Room G.19, Faculty of Classics, Sidgwick Avenue; open to all members of the University and others who are interested.	https://www.classics.cam.ac.uk/seminars/special-lectures
-----------------	---	---

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.**Annual meetings of the Faculties***Classics*

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Classics gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at **9 a.m. on Thursday, 10 November 2022** in Room G.19, Faculty of Classics, Sidgwick Avenue. The main item of business will be the election of two members of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve from 1 January 2023, in accordance with the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 621).

Nominations for election and notice of any other business should be received by Mr Nigel Thompson (nmt24@cam.ac.uk), Faculty of Classics, Sidgwick Avenue, not later than Friday, 4 November 2022.

Clinical Medicine

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held from **1 p.m. to 1.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 8 November 2022**, in the Committee Room, School of Clinical Medicine. The Annual Meeting will be followed by a Faculty Board meeting which will take place from 1.15 p.m. and is for members of Faculty Board and Clinical School Professors (Observers) only.

The business of the Annual Meeting will include a report by the Chair and the election of members of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine in class (c) in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Ordinance on Faculty Membership and Regulation 1(c) of the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 621) to fill five vacancies to 31 December 2026. Two will be filled by holders of an NHS appointment at Consultant level, who are certified by the Faculty Board to give instruction to clinical medical students; two will be filled by University Officers in the Faculty, one of whom is not a Professor (Grade 12) or Associate Lecturer; and one will be filled by a Representative of Health Education England, East of England.

Nominations for these elections, signed by the proposer (who must be a member of the relevant constituency mentioned above) and by the nominee indicating willingness to serve if elected, and notice of any other business should be sent to the Secretary of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine via email (FacultySec@medschl.cam.ac.uk), to arrive no later than 12 noon on Tuesday, 1 November 2022.

Members of the Faculty who are not members or observers at Faculty Board meetings should contact the Secretary of the Faculty Board for the papers and Zoom link for the Annual Meeting.

Law Tripos, 2022–23: Half-papers and seminar courses

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 380)

The Faculty Board of Law gives notice that, in accordance with Regulation 17, the subjects prescribed as half-papers for Paper 49 of the Law Tripos and seminar courses for Paper 50 in Part II of the Law Tripos in 2022–23 are as listed below:

Half-papers for Paper 49

Historical foundations of the British constitution

Landlord and tenant law

Law of succession

Personal information law

Topics in European legal history

Topics in legal and political philosophy

Animal rights law

Seminar courses for Paper 50

Select issues in criminal law and criminal justice

Family in society

Law and ethics of medicine

Private law

Public law

Select issues in international law

Tax law and policy

Master of Accounting, 2022–23

The Faculty Board of Business and Management gives notice that, in the academic year 2022–23, the subjects for examination for the degree of Master of Accounting will be as listed below. The method of examination is shown for each subject.

Option B: Two-year part-time course

2022–24 CLASS

(a) Compulsory modules

Michaelmas Term 2022

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC1 Global financial reporting	Group assignment (40%) and take-home exercises (60%)
MACC2 Strategic performance management	Individual assignment (40%) and University examination (60%)
MACC3 Internal and external audit	Individual assignment (100%)
MACC4 Probability and statistics	Individual assignment (100%)

Lent Term 2023

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC5 Conference: Critical issues in accounting	Group assignment (100%)
MACC6 Change management and negotiations	Individual assignment (100%)

Easter Term 2023

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC7 Sustainability	Individual assignment (60%) and University examination (40%)
MACC8 Descriptive analytics	Individual assignment (100%)
MACC9 Predictive analytics	Individual assignment (100%)

(b) Elective modules: None.

(c) Project work: None.

2021–23 CLASS

(a) Compulsory modules

Michaelmas Term 2022

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC11 Analytics for financial accounting and risk management	Individual assignment (60%) and University examination (40%)
MACC12 Financial statement analysis	Group assignment (100%)

Lent Term 2023

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC10 Interpersonal dynamics	Individual assignment (100%)
MACC13 Analytics for managerial accounting and operations management	Group assignment (100%)
MACC14 Conference 2: Critical issues in accounting	Group assignment (100%)

Easter Term 2023

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC15 Current issues in financial reporting, governance and ethics	Individual assignment (100%)

(b) Elective modules**Michaelmas Term 2022:** None.**Lent Term 2023:** None.**Easter Term 2023**

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC21 Elective equity valuation	Individual assignment (100%)
MACC22 Elective leadership in organisations	Individual assignment (100%)
MACC23 Elective mergers and acquisitions	Individual assignment (100%)
MACC24 Elective introduction to accounting research	Individual assignment (100%)
MACC26 Elective tax for finance professionals	Individual assignment (100%)

(c) Project work**Michaelmas Term 2022:** None.**Lent Term 2023**

Subject	Form of assessment
MACC16 Team consulting project	Group assignment (100%)

Easter Term 2023: None.**Master of Corporate Law (M.C.L.), 2022–23: Designated papers***(Statutes and Ordinances, 2021, p. 483)*

The Faculty Board of Law gives notice that, in accordance with Regulation 6, the following designated papers have been prescribed for the Master of Corporate Law examination in 2022–23:

Paper no.	Paper title	Form of examination
7	Corporate insolvency law	3
8	International financial law	3
9	Corporate finance law	3
10	Corporate governance	3
14	Competition law	3
M1	The legal and economic structure of corporate transactions	c
M2B	Shareholder litigation	2
M2D	Corporate taxation	2
M2E	International merger control	2
M2G	The law firm as a business	2
M2I	Law and the digital economy: The corporate dimension	2
M2J	Shareholder activism	2

Explanation of forms of examination:

- ‘3’ indicates a subject in which a five-hour final examination is required; a candidate has no option of substituting a dissertation or a two-hour examination and an essay.
- ‘2’ indicates a subject in which a three-hour final examination is required; a candidate has no option of substituting a dissertation.
- ‘c’ indicates a subject in which candidates will be evaluated by coursework prescribed by Faculty Board from time to time.

Master of Law (LL.M.), 2022–23: Designated papers and prescribed subjects

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 485)

The Faculty Board of Law gives notice that, in accordance with Regulations 1 and 2, it has prescribed the following papers and forms of examination for the Master of Law examination in 2022–23:

Paper no.	Paper title	Form of examination	Designation(s)
1	Law, medicine and life sciences	d	
2	International commercial tax	d	c, i
3	International commercial litigation	3	c, i
4	Law of restitution	d	c
5	Economics of law and regulation	d	c, e
7	Corporate insolvency law	3	c
8	International financial law	3	c
9	Corporate finance law	d	c
10	Corporate governance law	3	c
12	Intellectual property	d	c, e, ip
14	Competition law	3	c, e, ip
17	EU trade and digital law	3	e, i
22	Advanced labour law	d	e, i
23	The law of the WTO and free trade agreements	d	i, ip
24	International criminal law	d	i
25	International human rights law	d	i
29	International investment law	d	i
30	Jurisprudence	3	
31	Topics in legal and political philosophy	3	
35	History of English civil and criminal law	d	
36	International intellectual property law	d	c, e, i, ip
38	Public law		
39	Legislation	3	
41	Advanced private law	d	
42	English, comparative and transnational secured transaction law	d	c
43	Criminal justice and human rights law	3	
44	International law as a legal system	d	i

Explanation of forms of examination:

- A candidate may take a written paper of five hours' duration in all the subjects listed above, other than Paper 38.
 - *Paper 38: Seminar Paper.* Paper 38 shall be examined by the submission of a dissertation which shall not exceed 18,000 words, including footnotes and appendices but excluding bibliography, on a topic approved by the Faculty Board which falls within the scope of the following seminar course prescribed for 2022–23:
 - (a) Public law
- 'd' indicates a subject in which a candidate may submit a dissertation in lieu of a final examination. The dissertation shall not exceed 18,000 words, including footnotes and appendices but excluding bibliography. It shall be on a topic approved by the Faculty Board falling within the field of the subject.
- '3' indicates a subject in which a five-hour final examination is required, the candidate having no option of substituting a dissertation.

Chancellor’s Medal for English Law, 2022–23: eligible papers

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 827)

The Faculty Board of Law gives notice that the following papers prescribed for the LL.M. examination in 2022–23 are deemed to be papers in English Law and Legal History for the purpose of the award of the Chancellor’s Medal for the encouragement of the study of English law (*Endowments*, 1904, p. 398):

Paper no.	Paper title
1	Law, medicine and life sciences
3	International commercial litigation
4	Law of restitution
7	Corporate insolvency law
8	International financial law
9	Corporate finance law
10	Corporate governance law
12	Intellectual property
22	Advanced labour law
30	Jurisprudence
35	History of English civil and criminal law
39	Legislation
41	Advanced private law
43	Criminal justice and human rights law

REPORTS

Twenty-seventh Report of the Board of Scrutiny

The BOARD OF SCRUTINY begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. The Board of Scrutiny was established on the recommendation of the Wass Syndicate (*Reporter*, 5399, 1988–89, p. 617) to provide independent analysis and oversight on behalf of the Regent House by examining the Annual Report of the Council (including that of the General Board to the Council); the Abstract of the Accounts; and any Report of the Council proposing allocations from the Chest. It has the right to comment on related matters that it believes should be drawn to the attention of the University, including issues of policy. Further information can be found on the Board’s website¹ and in *Statutes and Ordinances*.² The Board has the right of reporting to the University and this is its Twenty-seventh annual Report.

2. The Board encourages members of the Regent House, as the University’s governing body, to think about and engage in governance as part of a process intended to be complementary to, not in conflict with, the Council and the General Board. Nevertheless, the intention of the Wass Syndicate was to provide an additional mechanism for holding the Council to account for the increased powers it had acquired, particularly in relation to the items that the Board is required by Statute to examine.

3. Although the Board aims to assist the Council in its work, it is important to note that the Board is a constitutionally separate body, exercising the responsibilities and powers conferred by Statute as well as engaging with the conduct of business by, e.g., commenting at Discussions, or opposing, supporting, amending or promoting Graces. The Board may be able to comment more freely than the Council, or to give greater attention to certain areas of business, and although it has some capacity to act on its own account, it can neither supplant the responsibilities of the Regent House collectively nor perform the work of the Council. We hope to encourage discussion and collaborative thinking across the University.

Activity of the Board, 2021–22

4. Eleven meetings of the whole Board took place in person and by Zoom, including four at which senior officers attended as guests: the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Stephen Toope; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategy and Planning, Professor David Cardwell; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Enterprise and Business Relations, Professor Andy Neely; the Registrar, Ms Emma Rampton; and the Academic Secretary, Dr Michael Glover.

5. Working groups of members met with the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education, Professor Graham Virgo; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for University Community and Engagement, Professor Kamal Munir; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and International Partnerships, Professor Anne Ferguson-Smith; the Head of Education Services, Ms Alice Benton; the Head of the Disability Resource Centre, Mr John Harding; the Director of Estates, Mr Graham Matthews; the Chief Financial Officer, Mr Anthony Odgers; the Director of Finance, Mr David Hughes; the Director of Human Resources, Ms Andrea Hudson; the Head of the University Research Office, Dr Peter Hedges; the Chair of the Council’s

¹ <https://www.scrutiny.cam.ac.uk/>.

² Statute A VII, <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/pdfs/2021/statutea.pdf>, and Ordinances, <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/pdfs/2021/ordinance01.pdf>.

Governance Review Working Group, Dr Nicholas Holmes; the Deputy Head of Education Services (Student Support, Access and Wellbeing), Ms Natalie Acton; the Postgraduate Widening Participation Manager, Dr Kath Powlesland; the Deputy Head of Education Services (Admissions and Participation), Mr Mike Nicholson; the Head of the Cambridge Centre for Teaching and Learning (CCTL), Dr Meg Tait; and the Director of University Information Services (UIS), Professor Ian Leslie.

6. Further information and assistance were provided by the Director of Governance and Compliance, Dr Regina Sachers; by the University Draftsman, Ms Ceri Benton; and by the Council Secretariat. The Board is duly grateful to all of them for their time and thought and hereby records its thanks. The Board again also records its thanks to Ms Rachel Rowe for producing agendas and commendable notes and minutes in another challenging year.

Context of the Board's Report

7. The academic year began with the Vice-Chancellor's announcement that he would step down after five years' service on 30 September 2022. The recruitment of his successor did not begin fully until March 2022 (*Reporter*, 6652, 2021–22, p. 325) following consultations with the collegiate University about the strategic priorities for, and attributes of, the role. The Board welcomes the extent of consultation and communication about the recruitment process which concluded with the recommendation of Professor Deborah Prentice as Vice-Chancellor for seven years from 1 July 2023 (*Reporter*, 6668, 2022–23, p. 2). However, because of the delay between Professor Toope's announcement and the start of the search it was almost inevitable that a successor would not be in post by 1 October 2022.

8. Accordingly, the Council announced a vacancy for an Acting Vice-Chancellor to cover the *interregnum* and Dr Anthony Freeling was subsequently appointed for a period of six months, with the possibility of extension for up to another six months until the successor can take up office. The unexpected change of senior leadership creates some uncertainty and risk for the University; the Board hopes the Acting Vice-Chancellor will not be seen simply as a caretaker but will be able to bring his substantial experience of the collegiate University to bear on all aspects of the role and ease the transition for the new Vice-Chancellor.

9. The last academic year saw a phased return to 'business as usual' after the restrictions and uncertainties arising from the Covid-19 pandemic. Most teaching was delivered in person, while examinations were conducted both in person and online. For the first time since 2019 our students were able to receive their degrees in person and celebrate with their families and friends. The Board commends all involved with these ceremonies who have worked hard to reduce the very substantial backlog of students wishing to graduate or celebrate degrees conferred *in absentia* because of Covid-19 restrictions. The Board encourages the Council to satisfy itself that the administrative and the ceremonial aspects of degree ceremonies are adequately resourced, over and above the recent authorisation of a new post of Degree Congregations Manager, to accelerate the reduction of the backlog and to accommodate the long-standing steady increase in the numbers of degrees being awarded.

10. The Council's strategic response to the pandemic is the Recovery Programme (*Reporter*, 6613, 2020–21, p. 470) comprising thirteen projects to be undertaken over at least three years and expected to make a 'transformative contribution' to the University. The Council gave a further update in its Annual Report noting that £17m out of a budget of £28m had been committed. In a Notice, dated 22 March 2022 (*Reporter*, 6652, 2021–22, p. 327), the General Board announced the formation of a Change and Programme Management Board, as a sub-committee of the General Board, to manage significant change programmes, including the delivery of projects in the Recovery Programme. The Board has some concerns about this development: the high degree of *ex officio* membership (including sponsors of programmes), the somewhat unusual position of a Board constituting another Board without the authority of Statute A VI, and the ability of the new Board to deliver the necessary return on investment on the initial time frame of the Recovery Programme. The Board of Scrutiny will continue to monitor the Recovery Programme and the activity of the new Board in the coming year.

11. The self-governing structure of the University with its foundations in the Middle Ages is an increasingly rare privilege in British universities. The current membership of the Regent House is over 7,000 people and it is reasonable to expect the elected Council to get on with the running of the University in accordance with the Statutes and Ordinances, while referring major policy matters and decisions to the Regent House. However, members also need to play their part by, for example, keeping up with major developments, participating in Discussions, and standing for election to the Council and other bodies such as the Board of Scrutiny. The Board's perception is that engagement has not returned to pre-Covid levels. This is concerning in the context of maintaining the University as a self-governing community of scholars, and members should be alert to opportunistic attempts to circumvent the Regent House if the Regent House is perceived as passive.

12. On the other hand, it is important not to confuse the preservation of academic freedom with *ad hoc* institutional autonomy over non-academic procedures and policies. During our investigations our attention has been drawn to operational areas where there are significant variations of practice across the University resulting in unnecessary complexity, cost and inefficiency. Specific activities are referred to in this Report where it appears to be in the collective interest to adopt more unified systems and policies which would have no impact on either research or teaching.

13. Such changes are likely to cause work, perhaps significant work, in the short term as new systems and policies are developed and implemented. But where there is no better reason for the current variation in practice than historical accident, and where that variation leads to persistent and significant costs – whether direct financial cost, or less easily quantifiable costs such as overworked colleagues, or difficulties hiring and retaining staff – the Regent House must honestly address the question of whether it is in the best interests of the University to persist with such heterogeneity.

14. The Board's Twenty-sixth Report repeated concern (first expressed in its Twenty-fourth Report) about pressures on the system of academic self-governance within the Governance and Compliance Division and encouraged the Council to satisfy itself that resources were sufficient to discharge the functions expected of it. The Council did not take up that

observation in its response. The Board's concerns remain with recent evidence of an ongoing problem including the erratic and often late publication of Special numbers of the *Reporter*, e.g. Special No 5, *Members of University Bodies*, the withdrawal of Graces, the publication schedule of the *Reporter* during the vacation, and the continuing publication of the *Reporter* in PDF form only. The Board acknowledges the pressure on staff and once again commends the expertise and commitment of the small team concerned. However, the Board cannot escape the conclusion that the system is struggling and under considerable strain.

15. The Board recommends that the Council undertake a review of the administration of the University's self-governing machinery, particularly the timeliness and adequacy of information provided to the Regent House and the scope for increased use of digital means to improve the provision and accessibility of up-to-date information.

FINANCE

Allocations Report

16. The Board notes the distinctly cautious tone of this year's Allocations Report (*Reporter*, 6664, 2021–22, p. 578). The University is emerging from the Covid pandemic in reasonably good financial shape. This is attributed to a 'Covid dividend' resulting from the suspension in large part of expensive operations and reduced operating costs coinciding with a windfall of £21.5m from EU students transitioning to international student fees. However, the University now faces very significant challenges from rising inflation, energy costs, the justifiable need to increase pay, pensions and benefits to help recruit and retain academic and non-academic staff, and Government-controlled income streams failing to keep pace with inflation.

17. For the sixth consecutive year, the Allocations Report proposed a deficit Chest budget. Although modest in scale, the Report models a range of deficits of £16.9m to £65m before settling on a most likely case of a deficit of £42.7m. Unspent allocations continue to accumulate in Schools, Faculties and Departments as real spending has lagged allocations. Most recently this has been due to pandemic-related delays to planned projects, but longer-standing issues of recruitment and retention have also led to budgeted projects not progressing after multiple years. The Board continues to hold views expressed in previous Reports: although the deficits are thought manageable in the overall context of the University, this is ultimately unsustainable; the trend is not encouraging; the range of uncertainty in the size of deficits suggests the budget-setting lacks rigour; and the constant message that the University is living beyond its means is damaging to morale and mitigates against creation of a positive environment for new developments.

18. To slow down the accumulation of reserves, 5% of Allocations (10% for UIS and UAS), amounting to £48m, will be 'held back' rather than made available for immediate expenditure at the start of year, pending a demonstration of need during the year. To be clear, 100% of Allocations will be underwritten by the University, but the availability for expenditure of the holdback will be deferred. The Board notes that the 'holdback' mechanism was the preferred method of the three considered, the other two being percentage cuts applied either universally or to pre-selected Schools and Faculties. The Board further notes that underspends in one year do not result in lower allocations for future years, avoiding perverse incentives. It remains to be seen whether this light-touch measure will arrest the accumulation of reserves or prompt increased spending in the second half of the year.

19. This Allocations Report for 2022–23 essentially 'hopes' that the University will not run at a financial loss because not all Allocations will be spent, or will be spent within the year, as the previous headwinds to academic activity will continue to reduce real spending and spread it over a greater time frame. Annex 3 to the Allocations Report provides an update on the status of the Enhanced Financial Transparency project (EFT) envisaged as a new approach to planning and budgeting. The 2022–23 Allocations Report should be the last to be solely based on the Chest allocation approach; information from EFT will begin to influence budgeting from 2023–24. In a separate Notice (*Reporter*, 6665, 2021–22, p. 607) the Council set out a timetable and necessary changes to Statutes and Ordinances to achieve the transition to a budget based fully on EFT by Easter Term 2025.

20. The Board sensed some caution in its discussions with senior officers about the likelihood of the University leveraging the new mechanism to enable delivery of the savings needed to balance Chest expenditure and produce a regular surplus for investment. The Board notes the requirement for academic and non-academic institutions to adapt their planning and budgeting models to use EFT data to inform decision-making and lead to savings. The Board believes that a clear focus by the senior leadership on engagement with University processes, and good communication with the Regent House, will increase the chances of success. Nonetheless, some prioritisation of academic activities may become necessary, in the interests of maintaining key areas of education and research which cannot be based only on profitability data obtained through EFT. Further information is needed as to how, when, and by whom these decisions will be made.

21. The Board has received conflicting views as to just how serious is the University's financial deficit. Noting its recommendation last year, and the Council's response, it seems that the EFT programme is the only current proposed means to provide the necessary information to address the widely reported structural deficit. The Board wonders whether more might be required.

22. The EFT programme continues with the pressing need now to focus on implementation, within the broader Finance Transformation Programme (FTP), noting particular dependencies on the new Chart of Accounts design within the ultimate CUFSS replacement. The Board is informed that much is underway, but it is likely that at least three more years' work remains to navigate the full transition of systems, data, reporting and behavioural change to enable EFT-based budgeting, empowering Department-level decision-making based on improved financial visibility. The Board welcomes the reflective approach and FTP's action to learn from CAPSA by moving steadily with EFT rollout, communicating regularly with all stakeholders and maintaining a focus on human issues. The use of experienced external advisors is likely to improve the chance of achieving long-term savings and the effort appears resourced for success. Nonetheless, early savings may be possible, and the Board encourages the team to remain vigilant for any opportunities.

Strategic finance

23. The Board recognises that a new team is now in place at University of Cambridge Investment Management Ltd (UCIM) and, compared to the previous management of CUEF, visibility has improved, while the new Investment Board and the Chief Financial Officer continue to have access to fund managers' names. However, the Board notes that income generation is increasingly disconnected from the Regent House as Syndicates are replaced by Boards with reduced membership from, and duty to report to, the Regent House, e.g. in connection with the Property Board, Cambridge Advance Online, and Cambridge University Press & Assessment. As such, Regents may continue to feel their visibility into University finances is limited and that they are asked simply to trust the judgement of appointed officers and Boards to manage those finances.

24. Income generation is overseen by the Chief Financial Officer with the aim of reducing the structural deficit. Income sources include Cambridge University Press & Assessment, disposal of unused and energy-inefficient parts of the estate, long-term investments via the CUEF, and elements of the Covid recovery plan that seek to establish infrastructure for the future, including Cambridge Advance Online. The Board has not seen a timeline for, or quantification of, any income generation targets.

25. The Board recommends that the EFT programme be implemented carefully but rapidly to enable the Council to establish and then publish just how serious the deficit problem is, along with a plan to resolve it and, through collaboration with the Chief Financial Officer, to set specific quantified targets for revenue generation.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment (CUPA)

26. The Board notes that the merger of Cambridge University Press and Cambridge Assessment was implemented, and the Board has been told that the leadership teams are aligned, the organisation is restructuring, and that the merger is working well financially.

27. The Board would like to see a clear understanding between the new CUPA and the Academic University over the future return of surpluses to the University and the basis on which reinvestment in the business is balanced with the delivery of income to the University; the Board recommends a continuation of the Finance Committee's regular reviews on a three-year cycle.

28. Given its importance to the University's finances, the Board intends to monitor the progress of CUPA as the merger continues, including arrangements for return of surpluses.

SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES

29. The Board's Twenty-sixth Report noted again that the University's administrative systems and processes continued to be extremely heterogeneous and thus inefficient. As a result, it commented on the Finance Transformation Programme (FTP) and Reimagining Professional Services (RPS) programmes culminating in a recommendation that such transformational programmes need effective resourcing, monitoring and sponsorship in ways that are immune to the turnover of senior officers. The appointment of an Acting Vice-Chancellor and turnover among the Pro-Vice-Chancellors provides a natural experiment to observe whether such sponsorship is now in place.

Projects vs Programmes

30. The Board was pleased to hear several senior officers speaking well of the relatively recently introduced Portfolio system, and how it had provided a way for effective prioritisation to be implemented during the pandemic: having the portfolio-holder responsible for arguing for and obtaining resource so that UIS can deliver some function, rather than having UIS argue for the resource directly, means both that proper academically-informed prioritisation can take place and that UIS can straightforwardly be held accountable for delivering those functions required of it by the collegiate University.

31. However, the view was expressed to the Board that the way that IT is developed and deployed in the University still tends to be too 'project-focused', paying attention to a specific piece of the puzzle but with little interest or mechanism to pay attention to the bigger picture across the entire collegiate University estate, or the longer-term strategy. Given the rampant complexity and heterogeneity of the University's many processes, programmes to replace core University functions such as CUFs (finance) and CHRIS (human resources) will require some way for the University to take this broader, more holistic view.

32. For example, the Board understands that the CHRIS replacement could be relatively straightforward as it is effectively a standard ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system, though it remains important for a full account to be given of the underlying decision-making process given the very substantial spend and wide-ranging impact involved. The CUFs replacement pursued by the Financial Transformation Programme remains a major challenge however, with the potential for very significant disruption to the University's core activities, as those who recall CAPSA will know.³ Given the significant risks in changing both the process and the system simultaneously, potentially leading to a new system that only partially implements a new process that no-one knows and so for which no workarounds exist, the Board wonders whether it might be possible to find a more evolutionary path by first changing the process (and with it the Chart of Accounts) and supporting this with relatively simple overlays on and adjuncts to the existing software system that would, importantly, mean that existing understanding and emergency workarounds remained applicable.

³ Reporter, 5861, 2001–02, p. 153.

Defragmentation of the Digital Estate

33. The Board was interested to learn about the proposed Defragmentation of the Digital Estate,⁴ a medium-term (perhaps 10-year) programme being embarked upon to take a more holistic view of the University's systems and processes. At heart, this programme seemed very sensible and has the potential to simplify and streamline many current administrative processes where, for example, significant differences exist within both academic and non-academic institutions, leading to significant and ongoing cost savings, important in light of the ongoing discussion over the size and significance of the University's annual deficit.

34. However, this is also the sort of programme that will require the steady sponsorship that the Board recommended in its Twenty-sixth Report: in such a decentralised University, change cannot be forced, so even incremental implementation will inevitably involve some spend before cost savings are realised so that benefits can be demonstrated to incentivise the desired change.

35. Perhaps even more difficult, institutions will need to shift resources to UIS and ultimately to modify long-standing processes to conform to a common standard. This will inevitably entail a loss of autonomy which many Regents may instinctively react against. The Board notes that the Reimagining Professional Services (RPS) programme may enable similar opportunities while presenting similar challenges. However, the Board believes these sorts of changes are absolutely required as current practices become increasingly difficult to sustain.

36. For example, some research funders are already beginning to require that HEIs can demonstrate how they meet cyber security requirements such as Cyber Essentials.⁵ While the University leadership will no doubt engage in constructive dialogue with such bodies, it is unlikely this direction of travel can be avoided forever. Another example that was brought to the Board's attention is procurement: a narrow and deep supply chain can be managed far more effectively and can allow the University to leverage its buying power in ways that a broad and fragmented supply chain simply cannot.

37. The only way that this will be feasible is if institutions and, more generally, the Regent House are engaged in holding UIS to account, and if UIS is able to build confidence and trust of institutions and the Regent House over time. This will become increasingly important as it seems clear that UIS' role in the University and its operation is going to increase in coming years.

Decommissioning Hermes

38. Hermes, the University's in-house email system of thirty years' standing, has now been decommissioned. This was unfortunately necessary: while a leading system in its day, the underlying open-source components on which Hermes was based were no longer receiving the level of support and update that they once had, and the University was ill-placed to take on the burden of maintaining, supporting and extending such a critical but also complex and relatively niche piece of software itself.

39. The decommissioning of Hermes and the migration to Exchange highlighted the need to rationalise access to *cam.ac.uk* email accounts. Understandably, this generated a great deal of consternation among many, particularly those who joined the University in an era when personal email systems were not widely available and commonly used, and for whom their Cambridge *cam.ac.uk* account (or even *hermes.cam.ac.uk* account) was their primary or even only email address.

40. This consternation was not initially well handled by UIS and the Board understands a number of processes have been improved based on lessons learned around how to manage communications to the wider University about such apparently straightforward and, from a technical standpoint, obviously necessary changes. However, the process did serve as another reminder to those concerned with implementation of just how complex the University is in terms of the relationship it has with its members, both past and current, and just how much it depends on their goodwill. The University is not an organisation that is structured or can be operated straightforwardly as a business.

41. The Board recommends that the Council sets out how it will ensure proper accountability of UIS to the Regent House, while also encouraging and incentivising defragmentation of systems and processes across all institutions so that UIS is able to fulfil its growing role.

ESTATES

42. The Estates Division has been going through a transformation for the last two years. The senior management is largely new and there is now substantial energy for real change. Estates operates under several constraints that are not within their control and which could usefully be addressed more broadly, as well as facing some internal issues which could be dealt with independently. The Board highlights the following areas for attention.

Non-operational estate management and oversight thereof

43. Financial returns on this part of the estate are low, often for good reason such as deliberate provision of discounted rents for key workers. Some projects, most notably North West Cambridge, have a community/intangible long-term value to the University as an academic institution, for example providing housing to recruit and retain key workers and talent; others will generate money for the core mission of the University through their disposal or rental. However, more should be done to agree and communicate the link between skilful management of non-operational assets and benefits to the core mission.

44. More broadly, being clearer on the purpose and performance of the non-operational estate, under the oversight of the new Property Board, is an overdue but positive step forward. The work involved in managing this estate and creating value from it should not be underestimated and will take a significant amount of resource from within the Estates Division if the University is to benefit fully from its assets. The right resources need to be in place to manage the disposals and investments to create value for the University and manage its risk exposure.

⁴ *The Case for Defragmentation of the Digital Estate v1.0*, received by the Council at its meeting on 22 June 2022 (Minute 681).

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cyber-essentials-scheme-overview>

Culture change and communications

45. As a large team (300–400 people) with limited HR support and some significant issues to address, culture change within the Estates Division is both necessary and difficult. The Division appears not to be held in high regard across much of the University and needs to do more to communicate a strategy, associated constraints and a delivery plan. Having done much good work to restructure the senior team and with the wider structure also being reshaped over the coming six months, a more inclusive process might avoid conflicts and increase the chances of raising productivity. For example, are the right people being recruited? do those people understand the wider University culture properly and what the University requires? is enough effort going into aligning with University needs and ways of working? and finally, is the University paying at appropriate levels to recruit and retain staff of the requisite calibre? Better communicating a desired culture and direction, more clearly in lockstep with the University's aims, with staff internally and with 'customers', might help improve reputation and the ability to deliver across the various institutions.

Joined-up planning across the University

46. The shared spaces booking system being rolled out is a positive step and will provide more visibility of and access to spaces to allow increased usage, and the process to allocate and use academic spaces through the Programme Board for Education Space (PBES) is somewhat functional, but wider planning seems to be very *ad hoc* and the Board could not find a statement of the current overall space needs and associated plan for the University as a whole; the latest is from 2016.⁶ The development of this plan is not within the control of Estates, and there is no obvious owner for such a plan. The absence of such an up-to-date plan across the University, and the prioritisation it would enable leads, in part, to large segments of the estate being undeveloped/unprioritised/delayed such as the Mill Lane, Downing and New Museums sites. This is both inefficient and means that the data necessary to allay concerns that resources are not being optimally deployed are not available.

47. Developing a clear prioritisation, starting with the mechanisms by which priorities are to be set would address this, as would improved communication per the above point. We note the West Cambridge Shared Facilities Hub is an excellent example of cross-departmental consolidation and co-operation, yielding an asset that is efficient and perceived as high quality.

48. There is a need for a single body able to develop coherent academic strategies and from these determine likely space requirements, allowing Estates to develop effective estates strategies in response. The Board hopes that the proposed Estates Committee will provide such a delivery mechanism.

49. Any review of space requirements must also consider changed working practices resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic. For example, it is vital that all education spaces be properly equipped with IT/AV facilities to take account of technology-enhanced learning, to cater for potential hybrid teaching, given the uncertainty about future pandemics, and that all space has proper ventilation.

Governance

50. In part linked to the above point, governance for the total operational estate is unclear. A desired end state of operational property being overseen by some kind of 'Estates Committee' and non-operational property being overseen by the Property Board will be welcome, although a mechanism to ensure there is a linkage between these will be key to ensure non-operational property is truly that and is managed appropriately. The operational estate is currently subject to several bodies which could be simplified (PBES, Planning and Resources Committee, etc.). The apparent lack of University strategic forums remains problematic and there is an argument for the return of a planning function in some form to support such integrated thinking. An oversight body might also allow better implementation of initiatives to extract economies of scale (e.g. catering, cleaning) or reduced risk (e.g. continuity planning) as it would provide a logical clearing house to review and adopt such initiatives, rather than the current, inevitable but less efficient, 'create and persuade' model of adoption.

Efficient running of the operational estate

51. Reduction of the maintenance backlog is an area of considerable success. For example, the Board has expressed concern in the last three Reports (*Reporter*, 6633, 2021–22, p. 62 and references therein) about compliance issues, but these are now 95% completed, a great improvement over the historic level of 55%. However, questions remain. First, is funding sufficient despite it having recently almost doubled to £33m/year? And second, is the delivery organisation fit for purpose if more money were made available? The Board heard real concerns that more money would not be able to be spent effectively currently.

52. The maintenance organisation is a small in-house team that is starved of investment. Around 80% of spend goes to external contractors, with little strategic procurement. The plan to consolidate and procure an integrated maintenance contractor, potentially saving £8–9m per year, encountered significant problems in implementation that could have been avoided through better and more timely consultation. We understand these have now been resolved but close attention should be paid to the ongoing delivery of the maintenance plans. Further, it is not clear whether changes in working practices and expectations post-pandemic have been incorporated.

53. The Board heard of and agrees with strategic financial concerns due to the cost of maintenance and heating of older buildings. Retention of these properties may not make financial sense while other parts of the estate are underutilised. The disposal of less energy-efficient properties could deliver one-off income and ongoing savings in the short to medium term by moving to a smaller, greener estate. The Board was persuaded by Finance and Estates' view that this should be achievable after careful consultation and would improve conditions for those 'tenants' currently enduring poorer facilities and greater heating costs while better facilities are unoccupied or underoccupied.

⁶ https://www.em.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/em_report_for_web_april17.pdf

54. The Board notes in conclusion that the additional future workload from decarbonisation/de-gassification at a potential £1–2bn cost is yet to be funded and such work will also require a robust organisational model in order to be delivered successfully. Significant cost savings are available here, as well as income from disposals of some less green buildings.

55. The Board recommends that a structure assigning responsibilities between the Property Board and the Estates Committee is supported, and that both bodies should produce annual reports, with the Estates Committee beginning by updating the six-year-old Estates Strategy in light of the effects of the pandemic on working practices, changes to the plans for certain key sites, and the creation of the Property Board.

EDUCATION

Strategic Review of Mental Health and Wellbeing

56. The Board commends the commitment to implementing the recommendations of the review in full, particularly more data sharing and joined-up thinking between the Disabilities Resource Centre (DRC) and the University Counselling Service (UCS) and better relations with the NHS to provide diagnostic pathways. The incidence of student deaths has called greater attention to an issue that has been increasing in seriousness for some time, as evidenced by increasing rates of intermission and non-continuation of students with mental health conditions. How far the reform of Student Wellbeing will mitigate these issues remains to be seen, but as it develops it will be important to get College buy-in, given that historically the University centrally has not always been able to deliver as intended and Colleges have had to fill in the gaps.

57. We remain concerned about the ratio of disability advisers to students with disabilities, which may continue to stand in the way of good intentions for the DRC to work more closely with Faculties and Departments on inclusive teaching, learning and assessment practices. The transition period towards full implementation of the recommendations of the review will need careful management and additional funding in the short term.

Postgraduate admissions

58. We welcome the removal of the postgraduate application fee for doctoral studies, and the reduction of the fee for non-doctoral postgraduate study for almost all programmes, not least because it encourages students of widening participation backgrounds to feel able to apply. We commend the work of the Postgraduate Widening Participation Manager to map the backgrounds of applicants and entrants and to engage with institutions to raise awareness of barriers. The University should consider whether it would be appropriate to set postgraduate widening participation targets in the future.

59. The growth in postgraduate student numbers, particularly on one-year non-doctoral courses, not only impacts College capacity but could also damage the postgraduate student experience and culture in Colleges. The University must consider how it can make adequate provision for increasing one-year non-doctoral students.

60. The Board is very concerned that the number of Ph.D. applications and entrants has declined this year, and about the linked issue of availability of funding for doctoral studies, not least due to a decline in participation in doctoral training programmes. The Board is aware of the £21m additional income from EU students paying international fees which, possibly alongside some of the additional fee income from one-year non-doctoral students, could be invested in the Cambridge Trusts to provide additional studentships.

61. The Board recommends that the Council devise a deliverable strategy for increasing the funding available for Ph.D. studies, to include investing in the Trusts and ensuring maximum participation in doctoral training partnerships.

Undergraduate admissions

62. The Board commends the increasing numbers of students from underrepresented groups and increasingly diverse backgrounds being admitted. However, it is vital that all students are adequately supported throughout their time in the University and the level of support provided must keep pace with the increasing demand.

63. The Board has serious concerns over the apparently increasing fragmentation amongst the Colleges in undergraduate admissions practices. There are obvious and significant risks for the University's Office for Students (OfS) targets and the requirement for equitable treatment of all applicants. While College autonomy is of course important, it would be unfortunate to undermine the significant progress that has been made in recent years through a unified approach.

Teaching, learning and assessment

64. The changes to degree classification methods with the general move to an overall degree classification, explicitly weighting earlier years in the final outcome, put a greater emphasis on earlier years of study at undergraduate level. The impact of this on awarding gaps in relation to students from underrepresented groups must be carefully monitored.

65. The Board received the Digital Learning Research Report commissioned in response to experiences from the Covid-19 pandemic, but we question the extent to which this review can adequately inform future developments post-pandemic, due to limitations in its scope. We understand that the Technology-Enhanced Learning (TEL) review is in its final stages. However, at first sight some of the surveys being circulated appear narrow in focus, and circulation to academic staff appears piecemeal. There is a real risk that any recommendations arising from this work to strategise a re-enhancement of technology-enabled education over a 3–5-year period will not be underpinned by a sufficiently rigorous methodology.

66. The University needs to recognise that major programmes of transformation of existing practice, such as the Technology-Enhanced Learning (TEL) programme, and the support and training that can be facilitated by CCTL, need an ongoing resource commitment not only for TEL and CCTL but also into Faculties and Departments which are integral to the delivery of change.

67. The Board recommends that the scope and design of ongoing reviews of technology-enhanced teaching, learning and assessment are sufficiently broad and rigorous, and that further work continues to be undertaken following the end of the Technology-Enhanced Learning review to inform future strategy.

RESEARCH

68. In January 2021, Professor Anne Ferguson-Smith assumed a newly configured role as Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and International Partnerships. This reframing of the position should enable more strategic planning of how the University's research can be better catalysed and communicated by building long-term partnerships with international institutions. The advantages of this are particularly obvious in some of the University's major research areas, such as Artificial Intelligence and Climate Change. The development of broader international collaborations might mitigate the adverse impact of the ongoing uncertainty over support for the UK's continued participation in Horizon programmes.

69. The major research event of recent years has been the preparation of the return, delayed by Covid-19, for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021, which was submitted in March 2021 with the outcome announced in May 2022.⁷ The result was greeted as a success: 93% of the University's submissions were rated as world-leading or internationally excellent (90% in STEM), and the TES rankings showed Cambridge to be the leader among UK universities that cover a broad range of disciplines.

70. To help achieve this result, the University's Research Operations Office was able to preserve much of the collective memory of REF 2014 by retaining staff and doubling the size of the team in preparation for REF 2021. In addition, seventeen full-time employees were embedded at departmental level to help preparations on the ground and reduce the heavy administrative burden. Although this required a significant investment in personnel of some £8m, this cost is likely to be a small proportion of the University's income from Research England over the next seven years.

71. To establish how the University can engage productively with the outcome of the REF 2021 exercise, meetings have been held with all Unit of Assessment chairs. While views differ about what 'success' looks like, there is a collective desire both to encourage positive engagement with the exercise and to incentivise the immense work that goes into submitting the return.

72. The University's return for REF 2021 comprised 2,892 research-active staff, marking an increase of 25% in full-time employees since its last iteration in 2014. Beyond reflecting a steady growth in active researchers, this uplift attests to a broadened understanding of what research is assessed and from what quarters. The 2021 return included appreciably more researchers from several University museums, galleries and libraries, as well as academic staff employed by the Colleges, especially College Teaching Officers and Junior Research Fellows. Since it seems likely that future REF returns will require all College researchers to be submitted, there is a pressing need for closer interaction between Colleges and University departments in the coordination and communication of research that is currently underway or forecast. It is hard to see at present what effective forum exists for putting College-wide research activity in dialogue with the University at large.

73. Although the University performs well against other UK universities in the size of its total research income, it has had less success in securing very large grants. Since there is no obvious reason for this, it is encouraging that a working group has been set up to investigate ways in which University academics can be helped to take on the exacting and exhausting task of coordinating bids to lead on large grants. A Large Collaborative Bids fund has been launched to support the most substantial applications, offering a sum up to 10% of the grant sought to help resource the preparation of the submission.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Remuneration

74. In its response to the Board's Twenty-sixth Report, the Council welcomed in principle the Board's recommendation that when determining the salary of the next Vice-Chancellor an upper limit should be set of 10 times the median salary. It remains to be seen how this acceptance is translated into practice on the appointment of Professor Toope's successor. The Board will continue to monitor the salary in terms of both the multiplier of the median salary, and the ranking relative to other Russell Group institutions. In the year ending 31 July 2021 the total emoluments of the Vice-Chancellor amounted to £475,000, and the basic salary was 10.7 times the median pay of staff compared to a multiplier of 10.9 in 2019–20. In the most recent report on Vice-Chancellors' pay and benefits 2019–20, published on 12 November 2021 by the Office for Students (OfS 2021.50), Cambridge was ranked second in terms of basic pay and fifth in terms of total remuneration.

75. The Council's Annual Report noted the launch of a new academic Teaching and Scholarship career pathway which had been approved by Grace 1 of 12 May 2021. However, there appear to be some serious teething problems. First, there is a lack of clarity on how promotions of non-Chest-funded staff will be paid for and the Board is concerned that some institutions may therefore not allow such staff on open-ended contracts to apply for promotion. The aim to have comparable and equitable opportunities for career development was stated in the Joint Report of the Council and General Board (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 454) recommending the adoption of the new career path; the Report made no suggestion that the source of funds should limit opportunities for promotion. This has serious implications for equality of opportunity.

76. Second, the General Board's Notice of 24 June 2022 (*Reporter*, 6665, 2021–22, p. 610) set out changes to the Committee structure for the pathway and sought approval by Grace to prevent staff on the Teaching and Scholarship pathway from transferring to the Research and Teaching pathway. The apparent lack of consultation about, and explanation for, this late change led to the submission of the necessary signatures requesting a ballot on the Grace, which was subsequently withdrawn (*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 639). The Report setting up the Teaching and Scholarship pathway stressed commitment to parity of treatment of both Teaching and Scholarship and Research and Teaching staff, and any mechanisms for transfer between pathways need to reflect this.

77. The Board recommends that the Council and the General Board urgently work to resolve concerns over inequitable treatment of non-Chest-funded staff and lack of parity between the two promotion pathways.

⁷ <https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/REF-2021>

Equality, diversity and inclusion

78. The latest Equality and Diversity Information Report was published on the website⁸ and provides a mass of detailed information, including reports on the Gender Pay Gap, the Equal Pay review and Staff Statistical Information. The authors are to be complimented on the comprehensive and clear presentation of the data. The headline median gender pay gap has reduced from 11.1% to 9% and there has been a welcome increase in the proportion of women in Grade 12 roles.

79. However, the Board is concerned that existing initiatives to improve the diversity of the workforce are too passive and it encourages the central bodies to take a more proactive approach. For example, disaggregating the published data to at least School or institution level would prompt greater reflection and might indicate those areas where greater focus should be given to the existing programmes to improve performance against the University's objectives.

Pay and pensions

80. The Board welcomes the University taking a leadership role in the national negotiations over the 2020 valuation of USS and the publication of a joint statement with Oxford University, and the respective UCU branches, directed at achieving an enhanced benefit structure that is affordable to members and employers. However, there is little tangible progress to report on improving pay levels across the University. In 2020–21 there was no pay uplift, apparently because of the impact of Covid-19 on the higher education sector, and in 2021–22 an offer of 1.5% was implemented. In Cambridge the impact of Covid-19 turned out to be less adverse than had been feared at the outset and the University made a one-off payment of £1,000 to all staff in June 2022.

81. This unconsolidated award, followed by a 3% increase on most scale points (*Reporter*, 6667, 2021–22, p. 701) will do little to help staff cope with the current cost of living crisis and we strongly encourage the University to think creatively about ways of boosting the pay of staff, particularly those around the median pay level. Although the Board recognises the constraints imposed by national pay negotiations, it encourages the use of greater local discretion where possible, for example in connection with role analysis and setting grade boundaries.

82. The Board is also concerned about the University's ability to recruit professional staff e.g. in Finance, IT and Estates in the face of market competition where salaries may be up to 50% higher. The benefits of working for the University may allow for a 'discount' on market salaries but there are clear risks of both the inability to recruit and of recruiting low calibre staff who may find it difficult to adapt to the University's consultative ethos and ways of working, which the Board believes may usefully be made clearer during recruitment. Some of these problems may be mitigated through market supplements, but the Board considers that current arrangements have reached the limit of what can be achieved by incremental tinkering at the margins and that the pay and reward structure, including the grading methodology and single spine, urgently requires attention by the HR Committee.

Human Resources organisation and policies

83. The Board is aware of the ever-increasing volume and range of business that falls to the HR Division. The last major restructuring of the Division took place over ten years ago when HR Business Managers were appointed for the Schools and groups of Non-School Institutions to provide dedicated HR support. Since then, matters have become more complex with, for example, the management of significant institutional change. The Board suggests it would be appropriate to review this structure, including consideration of the distribution of expertise between the central HR Division and that devolved to institutions, to ensure that sufficient specialist expertise is available and that support is delivered consistently across the University.

84. The Council's Annual Report reported that the HR Committee had launched a review of how the University manages its casual workers and uses fixed-term contracts (*Reporter*, 6641, 2021–22, p. 185 at p. 190). This is an important aspect of the University's employment arrangements which affect many staff on whom the University relies for the delivery of core teaching, other instruction and research. It is an area in which the University has the flexibility to act without national negotiation.

85. The Board welcomes the Council's acceptance of the recommendation in the Board's Twenty-sixth Report that the HR Committee be instructed to devise a policy and criteria for determining whether a post should be established or unestablished. The Board will await the Committee's conclusions with interest. In the last year the position has become more complicated. First, the academic Teaching and Scholarship career pathway (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 454) made provision for such posts to be held on either an established or unestablished basis. In response to remarks made in the Discussion, the Council observed that 'there may be good reasons of business efficiency' for needing on occasion to appoint to unestablished academic Teaching and Scholarship roles. The Board awaits the HR Committee's explanation of what such business reasons might be.

86. Second, in the last two years, the General Board has recommended the establishment of several Professorships for named persons, for a fixed term and coterminous with the individual's tenure of an externally funded role by a body such as the MRC (Medical Research Council). In practice this means the individual's security of tenure is dependent on the willingness of that body to continue to fund the post, notwithstanding that the University as the employer has obligations under the University Statutes and the law. These risks to the University could be mitigated to some extent by making such appointments in an unestablished capacity as a Director of Research. Accordingly, there appears to be an inconsistency between the General Board's willingness to establish these fixed-term offices of Professor on 'soft money' and, on the other hand, the reasons of 'business efficiency' why Professorial posts on the teaching and scholarship track should be unestablished.

87. The Board recommends that the Council announce a timetable for the completion of the reviews on casual workers and use of fixed-term contracts, and on the use of established and unestablished posts including establishment of fixed-term Professorships supported by external funding, resulting in publication of suitable policy proposals in Reports.

⁸ <https://www.equality.admin.cam.ac.uk/>

GOVERNANCE

88. The Council's proposals to move to a system in which membership of the Regent House by University staff is dependent on the grade of the individual's post, specifically Grade 9 and above, were approved by ballot in the Michaelmas Term 2021. The Board understands that subsequently the Council's Governance Working Group has been stood down. The Board is interested to know how the Council intends to take forward any 'unfinished business' from the Group including representation of staff below Grade 9 in the Regent House and whether there should be consequential changes to the composition of the Council in the light of the enlargement of the Regent House.

89. In July 2021 the Council published a response to the remarks made at the Discussion on a topic of concern in July 2020 on the decisions taken to manage the University's activities at the start of the Covid-19 pandemic. In acknowledging that there were shortcomings in the actions taken from the outset, particularly as regards keeping the University informed and seeking authority for emergency action, the Council agreed it was important to put in place formally a scheme governing strategic decision-making in a crisis for prior approval by the Regent House. A Report which the Council expected to publish in the Michaelmas Term 2021 has not yet been published.

90. The Board recommends that a Report on the management of future crises is published as a matter of priority.

91. The Council's Annual Report (*Reporter*, 6590, 2020–21, p. 15) reported new guidelines⁹ implemented by the Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs (CBELA) to govern the acceptance of donations and other external funding to the University in relation to climate change, a further review by the Committee of all proposed funds from the energy sector and consideration of a subsequent longer report on four firms within the energy sector. This work clearly has potentially wide-ranging implications, of interest to the collegiate University, for both existing and future sources of funds.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **The Board recommends that the Council undertake a review of the administration of the University's self-governing machinery, particularly the timeliness and adequacy of information provided to the Regent House and the scope for increased use of digital means to improve the provision and accessibility of up-to-date information.**
2. **The Board recommends that the EFT programme be implemented carefully but rapidly to enable the Council to establish and then publish just how serious the problem is, along with a plan to resolve it and, through collaboration with the Chief Financial Officer, to set specific quantified targets for revenue generation.**
3. **The Board recommends that the Council sets out how it will ensure proper accountability of UIS to the Regent House, while also encouraging and incentivising defragmentation of systems and processes across all institutions so that UIS is able to fulfil its growing role.**
4. **The Board recommends that a structure assigning responsibilities between the Property Board and the Estates Committee is supported, and that both bodies should produce annual reports, with the Estates Committee beginning by updating the six-year-old Estates Strategy in light of the effects of the pandemic on working practices, changes to the plans for certain key sites, and the creation of the Property Board.**
5. **The Board recommends that the Council devise a deliverable strategy for increasing the funding available for Ph.D. studies, to include investing in the Trusts and ensuring maximum participation in doctoral training partnerships.**
6. **The Board recommends that the scope and design of ongoing reviews of technology-enhanced teaching, learning and assessment are sufficiently broad and rigorous, and that further work continues to be undertaken following the end of the Technology-Enhanced Learning review to inform future strategy.**
7. **The Board recommends that the Council and the General Board urgently work to resolve concerns over inequitable treatment of non-Chest-funded staff and lack of parity between the two promotion pathways.**
8. **The Board recommends that the Council announce a timetable for the completion of the reviews on casual workers and use of fixed-term contracts, and on the use of established and unestablished posts including establishment of fixed-term Professorships supported by external funding, resulting in publication of suitable policy proposals in Reports.**
9. **The Board recommends that a Report on the management of future crises is published as a matter of priority.**

3 October 2022

RICHARD MORTIER (*Chair*)

ROBERT DOUBLEDAY

MARK PURCELL

GRAHAM ALLEN (*Secretary*)

SEB FALK

MARK SMITH

DAVID BUTTERFIELD

JOHN FAWCETT

ORSOLA RATH SPIVACK

GILLY CARR

GAVIN FLYNN

JOCELYN WYBURD

⁹ <https://www.cam.ac.uk/about-research/energy-sector-partnerships>

GRACES**Graces submitted to the Regent House on 19 October 2022**

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*, 2021, p. 111), will be deemed to have been approved at **4 p.m. on Friday, 28 October 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 recommendations in paragraph 15 of the Second-stage Report of the Council, dated 26 July 2022, on the construction of the National Centre for Propulsion and Power and re-development of the Whittle Laboratory (*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 674) be approved.¹
2. That the recommendation in paragraph 6 of the Report of the Council, dated 28 September 2022, concerning the period of appointment of external members of the Council (*Reporter*, 6669, 2022–23, p. 12) be approved.²
3. That the recommendation in paragraph 2 of the Report of the Council, dated 28 September 2022, concerning the membership of the Regent House of certain officers (*Reporter*, 6669, 2022–23, p. 13) be approved.
4. That, on the recommendation of the Council and the Nominating Committee, Ms SHARON FLOOD be reappointed a member of the Council in class (e) for four years from 1 January 2023.
5. That the Churchill Professorship of Mathematics for Operational Research (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 723) be retitled the Churchill Professorship of Mathematics of Information, and consequential changes made to the regulations for the Churchill Professorship of Mathematics for Operational Research Fund (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 830).³
6. That the Professorship of Cardiovascular Ageing (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 727) be retitled the Professorship of Epidemiology of Ageing.⁴
7. That the Herchel Smith Professorship of Molecular Genetics (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 739) be reassigned from the Department of Genetics to the Department of Biochemistry for the tenure of the current holder of the Professorship.⁵

¹ The Council thanks Professor John Dennis, Professor Richard Prager and Professor Robert Miller for their remarks in support of this Report's recommendations and is submitting a Grace for the approval of those recommendations.

² See Council's Notice, p. 51.

³ The Council, on the recommendation of the General Board and with the support of the Fund Managers, the Head of the Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics and the Head of the School of the Physical Sciences, the donor and the current holder of the Professorship, is proposing this change in title to update the description of the field of study of the Professorship, established in 1966. The new title is more permissive but mainly because the range of available mathematical techniques relevant to the optimisation of algorithms for the discovery of information has grown massively since 1966.

⁴ The Council, on the recommendation of the General Board and with the support of the Head of the Department of Public Health and Primary Care and the Head of the School of Clinical Medicine, is proposing this change in title to update the description of the field of study of the Professorship, established in 1987. The new title is considered to be less restrictive, enabling both clinically-qualified and non-clinically-qualified individuals to be considered for appointment, and also clearer about the field of study and more likely to attract very high quality candidates.

⁵ The Council, on the recommendation of the General Board and the Faculty Board of Biology and with the support of the Head of the Department of Genetics, is proposing the temporary reassignment of the Professorship held by Professor Eric Miska, following the latter's appointment as Head of the Department of Biochemistry.

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

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 21 October 2022

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on Friday, 21 October 2022:

That the following persons be admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by incorporation:

1. ELISABETH CLARA KENDALL, Mistress of Girton College, Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Oxford (1998).
2. DANIEL PETER JAMES MOULIN, Fellow of Jesus College, University Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Oxford (2014).

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

3. DAVID ALAN BOSWORTH, Director in the Press and Assessment Department.
4. BENJAMIN THOMAS DOWZELL, Technology Director, Education in the Press and Assessment Department.
5. JILL MARIE DUFFY, UK Education Group Managing Director in the Press and Assessment Department.
6. KEVIN MICHAEL EBENEZER, Head of Global Recognition in the Press and Assessment Department.
7. PER OLA KRISTENSSON, Fellow of Trinity College, Professor of Interactive Systems Engineering in the Department of Engineering.
8. CLAIRE ASHLEY MCCAULEY, Assistant Director in the Press and Assessment Department.
9. SERGI RENE SIMO, Head of Finance and Enterprise Resource Planning Solutions in the Press and Assessment Department.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 22 October 2022

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on Saturday, 22 October 2022:

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

1. SANJAY KUMAR BOBBY AGRAWAL, Associate Lecturer in the School of Clinical Medicine.
2. FAMILA ALAGARSAMY, Associate Lecturer in the School of Clinical Medicine.
3. SANI ALIYU, Associate Lecturer in the School of Clinical Medicine.
4. MARIO AMADO-MONTERO, Fellow of Clare Hall.
5. RONITA BARDHAN, Fellow of Selwyn College, University Associate Professor in the Department of Architecture.
6. YURY KOROLEV, Fellow of Hughes Hall.
7. JULIAN PARKHILL, Fellow of Wolfson College, Marks and Spencer Professor of Farm Animal Health, Food Science and Food Safety (1996) in the Department of Veterinary Medicine.
8. BÉNÉDICTE SANSON, Professor of Development Morphogenesis (Grade 11) in the Department of Physiology, Development and Neuroscience.

ACTA

Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 5 October 2022

All the Graces submitted to the Regent House on 5 October 2022 (*Reporter*, 6670, 2022–23, p. 37) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 14 October 2022.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 11 October 2022

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor Nicola Padfield was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Senior Pro-Proctor, the Junior Proctor and ten other persons present.

The following items were discussed:

Topic of Concern to the University: North West Cambridge Phase 1

(*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 641)

Professor R. M. MORTIER (Department of Computer Science and Technology and Christ's College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, until recently I was Chair of the Board of Scrutiny and it was in that capacity that I helped request this Topic of Concern. I remain a member of the Board of Scrutiny but have now stepped down as Chair; I make these remarks in a personal capacity. I understand that the petition was closed having received some thirty-seven signatures in favour of holding this Discussion, so it seems I was not alone in being concerned.

As the publication of the Notice that triggered our concern was several months ago, on 8 June 2022 (*Reporter*, 6661, 2021–22, p. 539), I had briefly to remind myself of its content in preparing these remarks. A short Notice, just over a page long, it appeared to strike a positive tone as if there was nothing really to be concerned about: multiple factors were considered, a past review had identified a number of issues, subsequent reporting of relatively small cost increases had taken place, and the review therefore made just five observations before going on to note that Phase 1 has 'already delivered an award-winning new neighbourhood, which will continue to serve the needs of the University and the local community well in the decades to come'. Inclusion of some additional developmental and operating costs had led to a 'material deterioration' of some financial indicators that, not being a financial expert, perhaps I was not alone in finding slightly opaque, but presumably these were not thought really significant to the Regent House, being reported in such a short Notice published at the end of the Easter Term when many members are distracted by examinations. After all, a weighty matter would have required a proper Report to the Regent House.

Slightly closer examination gave rise to the questions set out in this Topic of Concern, of which I would like particularly to highlight three points.

First, the revelation that the material deterioration in those indicators was sufficient to require Council to approve a further sixty-two million pounds (£62m) of expenditure simply to complete Phase 1. This appears to be higher than the annual Chest budget deficits that cause so much concern and trigger so much angst about the need to control costs, as well as coming on top of the previous substantial cost overruns that the North West Cambridge development has suffered. The costs and overruns that created the need for increased expenditure were apparently not included in the financial model – but the previous cost overruns triggered a substantial investigation following which the Council proposed changes in management (including the appointment of a Chief Financial Officer) and governance that were supposed to prevent them happening again (*Reporter*, 6426, 2015–16, p. 545). What happened? Was the 2015 revised financial appraisal's

caution against complacency not observed? It is not reassuring that life-cycle management costs such as replacement of windows were apparently not taken into account as late as 2019.

Second, and perhaps even more worryingly, the Notice indicates that beliefs about cash flow have now changed and the North West Cambridge development might now fail to be in a position to make its budgeted contributions to the bond repayment. Having again failed to take into account all the costs is one thing, but now to believe that the outcome of the investment will be substantially less than anticipated raises questions about how we will actually repay the 2012 bond, noting that we are already a quarter of the way through the repayment schedule.

Third, and finally, noting the Acting Vice-Chancellor's Annual Address and at the risk of presaging elements of the Board of Scrutiny's upcoming Twenty-seventh Report, I think it would be helpful to the engagement of the Regent House in the governance of the University if the Council could avoid such opaque language as used in this Notice. For example, paragraph (iv) reads:

to continue to implement the new governance process that disaggregates the assessment and control of the long-term financial performance of the development from the short-term control of the remaining development expenditure and plot disposals (including the update and management of the financial model, the authorisation of development and capital expenditure, the controls applied to capital expenditure once approved, and the reporting regime supporting this activity);

in what I infer is probably the setting out of 'the more effective monitoring and control processes' referred to earlier in the Notice. Instead, will the Council explain why it will continue to implement governance processes that seem not to have worked effectively – or is this 'new governance process' an even newer governance process that it is confident will now work? If so, on what grounds is it now so confident and how actually will this process operate?

All-in-all, notwithstanding the award-winning nature of the North West Cambridge development, I think it would be useful if the Council could clearly articulate, in plain language, in a substantive Report, exactly what is the financial situation with the development, what the implications of that situation are for the rest of the University's finances, and what actions the Council will take so that the University might avoid any further failures of governance of this ill-fated development.

Mr G. P. ALLEN (Wolfson College and Secretary to the Board of Scrutiny), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, having signed the request for this Discussion I regret that I am unable to be present today.

At the outset I want to make clear that I am a supporter of the North West Cambridge project; we are fortunate that thanks to the foresight of our predecessors the University has the capacity to accommodate its ambitions and space needs for decades to come. I am also realistic enough to acknowledge that in a project of this scale and complexity all will not always go to plan or budget.

Turning to the Council's Notice of 6 June 2022 (*Reporter*, 6661, 2021–22, p. 539) announcing further cost increases amounting to a deterioration of £62m in the financial position of the project, we have of course been here before. At the outset of the North West Cambridge project there was a view in the University that the project should be managed by a different sort of governance

structure than is customary in the University – the subtext being that the project should be run by property professionals with minimal opportunity for meddling by academics. The result was the establishment of the West and North West Cambridge Estates Syndicate which, following cost overruns on Phase 1 of the development, was the subject of two investigations by the North West Cambridge Audit Group. On that occasion the Council itself had the good grace to call a Discussion on a Topic of Concern on 3 November 2015 (*Reporter*, 6403, 2015–16, p. 140); the Council responded, in its Report of 16 May 2016 (*Reporter*, 6426, 2015–16, p. 545), with substantive proposals to revise the governance arrangements for the development of the West and North West Cambridge Sites including:

- (a) the reconstitution of the Syndicate as the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board with reduced Regent House membership; and
- (b) the creation in the University of a new senior role of Chief Financial Officer to oversee such non-academic and commercial activities.

The Report went on to note the agreement of the Council with the Audit Group that the Council itself should be expected to ‘assume overarching executive decision-making responsibility in respect of large-scale commercial undertakings’. In responding to the Discussion of the Report (*Reporter*, 6433, 2015–16, p. 753) the Council acknowledged ‘shortcomings in financial reporting and control’. In relation to the creation of the post of Chief Financial Officer the Council noted that the appointee and the Registrary would ‘work closely together; both would be under the direction of the Council and would report in the first instance to the Vice-Chancellor’.

To complete the history I should mention the establishment of the Property Board (*Reporter*, 6590, 2020–21, p. 30) to oversee the development, management, and stewardship of the University’s non-operational estate, including the West and North West Cambridge sites, and reporting to the Finance Committee. To its credit the Property Board appears to have rapidly got to grips with its inheritance from the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board.

However, the Council’s Notice of 6 June 2022 strikes a note of complacency given the unhappy history of the project. Clicking on the link to the review undertaken by the Property Board¹ reveals, in paragraph 30, the need for improvements in relation to the authorisation of development/capital expenditure, the controls applied to capital expenditure once approved, and the reporting regime to provide transparency as to ongoing capital expenditure. These fundamental aspects of project management sound identical to the shortcomings which the Council acknowledged in responding to the 2015 Discussion. Against this background of lightning striking twice the Regent House deserves a fuller explanation of what went wrong with the overhauled governance structure and operational oversight of the project, who or which body was asleep on the job, and what remedial action will be taken to strengthen the level and frequency of reporting on the funding of the project to both the Council (given its overarching executive responsibility) and to the Regent House so as to avoid the need for another such Discussion in five years’ time.

¹ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2021-22/weekly/6661/NWC-Phase1Update-2022.pdf>

Mr A. L. ODGERS (Chief Financial Officer), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as an attendee of the Property Board and its predecessor in the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board, and as the University’s Chief Financial Officer, I would like to address the concerns raised (*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 641) in relation to the Council’s Notice of 6 June 2022 (*Reporter*, 6661, 2021–22, p. 539).

The requirement for effective monitoring, control and governance for the North West Cambridge development is well understood within the University and came into focus following the review of the project in 2015–16 and the subsequent recommendations of the Audit Group. Established in 2020, the Property Board replaced the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board and was the result of an extended process to determine the best way to provide the University with professional property development capability and oversight. It put in place a governance structure designed to reinforce checks and controls, in line with the recommendations of the Audit Group and ensure commercial discipline is applied.

The creation of the Property Board was noted as the turning of a new leaf in the oversight of the University’s non-operational estate, of which the North West Cambridge development is a significant component (*Reporter*, 6596, 2020–21, p. 147). The Finance Committee oversees the performance of the Property Board and receives Quarterly Reports from the Board, delivered by the Director of Property Development, the Estates Finance Director and, where appropriate, the Chair of the Property Board. The Quarterly Report covers project progress as well as financial monitoring. The Property Board operates with the autonomy to make certain decisions within a framework approved by the Finance Committee. All material decisions at key milestones remain subject to Finance Committee approval – and, where appropriate, they will continue to be subject to the approval of the Regent House.

I will now describe the 2021 review of the financial model for Phase 1 of the North West Cambridge development. Upon establishment of the Property Board in 2020, the integration of the North West Cambridge development team into the Estates Division, and the appointment of new personnel to Estates Division in 2021, a detailed review of all the key assumptions and inputs to the financial model for the North West Cambridge development was undertaken to establish the latest financial position of Phase 1, and any variances from the previous forecast provided to the Finance Committee in May 2019.

Additional development, construction and prolongation costs came to light with a large proportion of the additional expenditure required to be spent on pre-existing commitments, including site servicing costs that are required to enable the sale of land parcels to third party housebuilders, and s.106 payments arising from the planning agreements in place. The review also identified that life-cycle replacement costs were not included in the May 2019 financial model. An initial estimate of these annual costs is now included in the updated financial model, along with the changes needed to reflect the current operating costs more closely. The financial model and the bond repayment profile is very sensitive to changes made to the operating cost assumptions due to the length of the cash flow.

I emphasise that the long-term operating costs are still undergoing assessment as part of a full review of operating performance following the integration of the North West Cambridge operations team into the Estates Division operations team. Significant inflationary pressure continues to affect certain aspects of housing and estate management

costs and as such there is a material risk that operating costs will increase further beyond the estimates made in the existing forecast.

The review of the operational performance will likely result in a change to the current external facilities management service provision model, which has been found to be underperforming in several areas. I, along with the Property Board, will scrutinise the review of the long-term operating performance and any changes required to the operating model, prior to recommendations being made to the Finance Committee and Council.

It is not clear to the current team why the additional costs were not factored into the forecast produced by the former North West Cambridge development team in 2019. All Estates Division employees now responsible for the development and management of the assets have been appointed into their roles since 2020 and have the appropriate property, development and/or finance expertise to carry out this activity.

The 2021 review identified the need to improve the processes governing the management of the financial model, the governance of capital expenditure and the control of project spend once approved. The remaining development expenditure and any future uncommitted plot disposals will be scrutinised in detail by the Property Board prior to approvals being sought from the Finance Committee. Capital expenditure will be considered separately from the overall blended financial performance of the project to provide greater transparency and control of the expenditure associated with this large complex project.

Financial controls are in place at operational level to monitor spend against the approved capital budget. The monthly budget review and re-forecast is carried out by finance and property professionals within the Estates Division and supported by external cost consultancy advice. This provides formal and regular oversight, control and reporting of expenditure. Variances against forecast are tracked monthly along with emerging project and programme risks. The use of reserve contingency requires explicit approval from the Property Board. In addition, the University's Internal Audit team will be providing an objective review of the processes and the improvements required for the remaining capital expenditure activity under Phase 1 and any future Phases. The findings and recommendations of the audit will be implemented and overseen by the Property Board reporting to the Finance Committee.

The Finance Committee has approved the formation of the Bond Repayment Portfolio principally comprising the assets of the non-operational estate (including North West Cambridge), the remaining financial proceeds of the three bonds issued by the University in 2012 and 2018 and the interest and repayment liabilities of those bonds. Interim funding for continuing capital requirements for North West Cambridge will be funded from the financial assets of that Portfolio. Future land disposal proceeds and cash flow generated at North West Cambridge will be returned to the Portfolio to contribute towards the bond interest and repayment obligations.

In layman's terms, compared to original expectations, the capital cost of North West Cambridge Phase 1 has been significantly higher than originally anticipated (and its future cash flow generation is likely to be somewhat later and lower). Consequently, the University has invested a greater proportion of the proceeds from its bonds which might otherwise have been invested in other income-earning opportunities. It is still expected that the assets and future cash flows of the Bond Repayment Portfolio will be

more than sufficient to meet the University's liabilities in respect of its three bonds when due, but the adverse change in the economics of North West Cambridge Phase 1 means that any excess cash flows returned from the Portfolio to the Academic University to support its operating and capital budgets will occur later than might otherwise have been the case.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, 'What plans are there for periodic reports to the Regent House?' was one of the questions which were put in calling this Topic of Concern. The first Report on the North West Cambridge project appeared in 2000, the second in 2004, with a cluster of enabling Reports in 2011–14, and another in January this year on 'emerging spatial options'. The latest offering was not a Report, but a mere 'Update' on 8 June.

The 'Update' says the North West Cambridge project was originally intended to be funded in full by the University, at an estimated overall/gross cost of £1 billion. Warning noises began, and grew louder for years. In July 2015, the 'Update' says, 'the Finance Committee was formally notified that the cost of Phase 1 had increased significantly'. PWC was engaged to conduct an independent review. The findings of the Property Board's own ensuing financial review were discussed at its meeting on 11 January 2022. The resulting paper considered by the Council at its own March meeting may now be read online.¹ The 'Update' admits that:

the cash-flow generated by the development will be insufficient on its own to consistently meet the annual coupon obligations and the scheduled contribution to the bond repayment reserve (both in respect of the 2012 bond) until the 2046–47 financial year...

It bases this 'on a 3.5% growth/inflation assumption, which will be subject to fluctuation'. That assumption certainly looks in need of review.

Cambridge's Statement for the Knowledge Exchange Framework which has now joined the REF and the TEF as the KEF put the University's endowment 'at nearly £6 billion'.² This funds teaching and research. Unable to 'fully fund' ventures which were not for such purposes as hoped at first, the University has taken out gigantic loans which are now recognised not to be covering themselves in their results. That makes the scale of the expansion of the University's capital investment in 'non-operational assets' look distinctly risky.

The 'Update' explains that 'the Council discussed the review in depth at a briefing and at a meeting'. The Council received its 'detailed briefing' on 15 March. Minute 636 of the Council's 21 March meeting says it considered the 'findings' relating to 'the remaining phases of the development, as well as to the broader non-operational portfolio'. Why did no Report to the University follow?

The Regent House has delegated its powers in this area, permitting the Council to content itself with this mere 'Update'. The West and North West Cambridge Estates Syndicate, established by Grace 2 of 19 May 2011, was (s.16) the body 'authorized where relevant to exercise in the name of the University the powers of the University' for the purposes of disposal or allocation of its land. That Grace approved the recommendations of the Report of the Council on the governance arrangements for the North West Cambridge project and for the development of West Cambridge (*Reporter*, 6218, 2010–11, p. 618), which had

stated that ‘a model that provides significant delegated powers’ to a Syndicate ‘would be paramount in ensuring the success of the project’.

Special Regulations for Syndicates were to be amended to include authorisation to exercise ‘in the name of the University in relation to the affairs of the Syndicate all the powers of the University, except in so far as the Statutes and Ordinances expressly or by necessary implication provide otherwise’ with the restriction of its application including ‘the management, development, and stewardship of the North West Cambridge Estate (being the University’s land and property holdings in the area between Madingley Road, Huntingdon Road, and the M11 motorway)’.

However, the Syndicate has now been replaced by the Property Board,³ with its new Regulations and its specific and new powers in connection with a wider non-operational estate, including ‘to optimise the positive net present value of the non-operational estate (and so financial returns to the University) through its development, operation and/or disposal’.

The now financially important distinction of non-operational and operational land was still something of an innovation when it was given as a reason for the creation of the Property Board in 2020 to look after the ‘non-operational’. The term appears in the Statutes with reference to the University (rather than a College), after the approval of Grace 2 of 10 May 2018 allowing the Bonds of 2018 to be taken out. The resulting Special Ordinance A (ix) sets out the conditions, including the use of the capital, raised for ‘non-operational’ purposes and so as to meet ‘appropriate thresholds of commerciality’. Only in a Notice in response to Discussion remarks on the Changes to the Operation of the Land Fund on 6 July 2022 (*Reporter*, 6665, 2021–22, p. 606) did the Council agree ‘that the terms “operational estate” and “non-operational estate” should be defined in Ordinances’.

It now seems that those Reports of 2011, 2012 and 2014 were not sufficiently tightly drafted to prevent mission drift, especially now that the ‘non-operational’ has become so bulky in the University’s affairs. In the Report of 2011, sale from the University’s land bank was not thought to require a Grace if it was not land deemed ‘operational’:

it is not envisaged that approval of the Regent House will be sought in respect of sales or leases of individual properties or plots of land, since these will not form part of the University’s operational estate.

Has it ever been put to the Regent House that its land not in use for academic purposes could be sold without asking it? I think not.

The Report of 2012 (*Reporter*, 6282, 2012–13, p. 59) said that while the University intended ‘to maintain over the long term its freehold interests in much of the site’, ‘for commercial and other reasons it is proposed to dispose of freehold interests for private housing, with some commercial disposals by long leaseholds’. There was mention of ‘700 units for sale on a market basis by residential developers under land sale agreements’. It seems from the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board minutes that whether it was in the University’s best interests to sell the freehold or keep a leasehold on land sold was asked but not followed up. In Eddington, Knights Park houses are now for sale freehold. On 29 August this year *The Times* carried an article claiming that Cambridge was about to see the ‘first houses built for rental’. ‘Present Made, family rental division of Apache Capital’ had ‘bought land’ from the University, 150 hectares to build 373 houses, a ‘communal pavilion, a gym, playgrounds and co-working space’ worth £160m.

It is true that in the past parcels of land might be used for changing purposes within the University land bank, but without this formal distinction between its operational and non-operational use. For example the University Farm was first located at Impington in 1900 to meet the needs of the newly established Department of Agriculture at Cambridge. In 1910 the Farm moved to Gravel Hill, just off Huntingdon Road. In 1972 when the Department of Agriculture closed, the Farm was linked to the Department of Applied Biology. In 1997 it was moved to Park Farm, Madingley, so as to release land for the West and North West Cambridge developments. It is now run by Estates on a commercial basis, though still providing a teaching resource for Veterinary Medicine.⁴

All this matters because it affects the requirement to Grace decisions. Under the present Sites and Buildings Regulations (1.2) a Grace is required for the disposal of

land of present or prospective use to the University ... Disposal of land means the sale or transfer of any freehold or leasehold property or the grant of a lease for more than 60 years.

The Finance Committee is responsible under the Council for financial management and stewardship of all assets and land, whether PPU Land or land held for investment. But is it clearly the case that it can constitutionally – or indeed safely – continue to do as it pleases out of sight of the Regent House?

How bad do things have to get before the Regent House gets its next Report on the runaway risks emerging in connection with its non-operational estate?

¹ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2021-22/weekly/6661/NWC-Phase1Update-2022.pdf>

² <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/university-cambridge>

³ Grace 1 of 18 November 2020, Statute A VI 1 and Ordinance.

⁴ <https://www.em.admin.cam.ac.uk/what-we-do/estate-operations/university-farm-rural-estate/about-farm>

Second-stage Report of the Council, dated 26 July 2022, on the construction of the National Centre for Propulsion and Power and re-development of the Whittle Laboratory

(*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 674)

Professor J. S. DENNIS (Head of the School of Technology), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, for the School of Technology, redevelopment of the Whittle Laboratory has been the very highest capital and academic priority, because of the Laboratory’s research excellence, international significance and global influence. The Laboratory has unquestionable worldwide academic leadership. Globally, the Whittle is the best research laboratory in propulsion and power by a considerable margin. For example, its researchers have won the American Society of Mechanical Engineers’ highest international award an unprecedented fifteen times. No other laboratory – including those in the USA – has come close to this.

The Whittle Laboratory achieves notable industrial and social impact. To exemplify, its two REF 2021 Impact Cases for REF Unit of Assessment 12 have reduced CO2 emissions from aviation by at least 1.2 million tonnes per year. To put this in context, these two innovations alone are equal to about 22 times the University’s Scope 1 and

Scope 2 annual emissions. Of course, the cost of decarbonising the University will be much greater than the cost of this project.

The Laboratory works seamlessly and uniquely with industry, pioneering new approaches to the adoption of new technology. As a result, the Whittle brings in about 9.5% of the University's industrial income. In decarbonising aviation, the sector is facing its largest technological disruption since the advent of the jet engine, which was invented by Frank Whittle in the Engineering Department at Cambridge. The Laboratory is working closely with leading companies in developing technologies for aircraft powered by sustainable fuels, batteries and hydrogen. Just as important, through its Aviation Impact Accelerator project, it is revolutionising thinking about how one deploys combinations of these new technologies, given the demand for, and availability of, renewable feedstocks for fuels. On hydrogen engines, a notable recent (2022) patent filing will improve, radically, efficiency and hence aircraft range.

When this case was brought before the University's Planning and Resources Committee in December 2018, the Department of Engineering and the School promised that there would be exhaustive exploration of all fundraising possibilities. As a result, fundraising has been the most diligently pursued and planned ever undertaken in the School in living memory, involving the combined efforts of the Laboratory itself, under the direction of Professor Miller, the Department of Engineering, CUDAR, members of the University's Senior Leadership Team, CISL (especially Dame Polly Courtice and Mr Eliot Whittington) and many others. Of special note is that, soon after December 2018, the Department of Engineering requested that the Development Office recruit a fundraiser to prioritise the project and this was achieved with the appointment of Ms Victoria Thompson. Victoria has been critical in securing the major funding contribution from Mr Peter Bennett.

In pursuing external funding for decarbonising aviation, the profile of the project has been massively increased externally with global industry, the UK government, the former Prince of Wales, the World Economic Forum and many other stakeholders involved in the energy transition. There have been two meetings hosted in Cambridge by the former Prince of Wales and many of the key industrial leaders in the discipline. The first meeting was attended by Nadhim Zahawi, who was a minister in BEIS at the time. The second meeting, in early 2022, was attended by Kwasi Kwarteng. Direct contact has been made with George Freeman as part of the fundraising process and a detailed personal conversation was held with Elon Musk (amongst many, many others). Professor Miller, the Director, sustains an unprecedentedly high level of contact with industry leaders, UK government (e.g. Patrick Vallance, numerous MPs, Department for Transport, etc.) and has had many private meetings with the former Prince of Wales to discuss aviation.

With practical progress, globally, towards net-zero carbon lagging ambition, approval for the upgraded Whittle Laboratory would be a pertinent statement of the University's commitment to lead and drive that transition, as well as a firm endorsement of its commitment to the highest quality of research and educational excellence and societal impact.

Professor R. W. PRAGER (Head of the Department of Engineering and Queens' College), read by Professor Miller:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as Head of the Department of Engineering I wholeheartedly support this proposal to create a new National Centre for Propulsion and Power at the Whittle Laboratory. It is vital that a way is found to rapidly decarbonise the power and propulsion sector. The Whittle initiative has been designed specifically to address this critical challenge.

Despite the scale and complexity of the organisational and technical issues involved there are many reasons why the Cambridge team confidently expect to be successful. The Whittle has technical mastery unparalleled in the world and reflected in more international awards than any other research lab in the field. This is coupled with a unique approach to collaborative innovation that brings industry and academia together and reduces the time taken to deliver major innovations by two orders of magnitude. This is a particularly relevant and important dimension of the approach given the urgency of the climate emergency. We simply do not have time to work through conventional development cycles.

Fully decarbonising power and propulsion is a complex set of interconnected challenges that will necessitate a graduated sequence of solutions that move from the current state to a zero carbon approach while maintaining a viable level of travel and power along the way. There is no single simple answer. We need a multi-faceted approach that draws on many different technologies and engages with society in a variety of different ways.

Both the new Whittle building and the initiative that it will accommodate have been designed to break down the boundaries between disciplines and encourage an intrinsically multi-disciplinary approach. The close collaboration with the Institute for Sustainability Leadership as well as other university departments will ensure that matters in the domains of economics and policy will be addressed in an integrated way with purely scientific challenges.

The Whittle Laboratory has had a distinguished past, addressing fundamental technical challenges in the development of the jet engine. This transformational project opens up a completely new scope and focus to reimagine power and propulsion in a zero carbon world. It is fortunate that through this partnership between the Whittle and the Institute for Sustainability Leadership, Cambridge is in a position to lead the vital transformation of power and propulsion that the world now needs.

Professor R. J. MILLER (Director of the Whittle Laboratory and Gonville and Caius College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the new Whittle Laboratory, and the National Centre for Propulsion and Power which it houses, have been designed to cut the time required to achieve zero carbon flight by years.

The project is based on two recent pioneering trials, undertaken in the Whittle Laboratory in collaboration with our industrial partners. The first was aimed at cutting the time to demonstrate new zero carbon technologies. This was achieved by changing both the culture and tools which were used to design, make and test new concepts. In a formal trial in 2018, funded by the UK government's Aerospace Technology Institute, we demonstrated that we could take four technologies from idea to demonstration in under a week – in 2005 it took us two years; a reduction in time by a factor of 100.

The second project was aimed at harnessing expertise from across the University of Cambridge to look at a wider range of technologies and how we could decarbonise the wider sector. To do this we set up the Aviation Impact Accelerator, a group of over eighty international experts from a broad range of disciplines assembled and led by the Whittle Laboratory and Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership. The project is in partnership with the World Economic Forum and the Sustainable Markets Initiative. The aim is to build evidence-based tools to engage decision makers and the wider public in a discussion on the pathways to net zero flight, in a similar way to what David Mackay did in the energy sector. This model was first demonstrated by the former Prince of Wales and Kwasi Kwarteng, former Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, in March this year.

The new Whittle Laboratory has been designed to scale these two capabilities to a broader range of problem. Working at the interface between scientific discovery and engineering development, the new Whittle Laboratory has been designed as a disruptive innovation laboratory, bringing together skills from across the University with the Whittle Laboratory's global network of industry and academic partners to take on the net zero challenge.

Just as fifty years ago, at the opening of the current Whittle Laboratory, Cambridge and its industrial partners faced the challenge of making the dream of mass air travel a reality, I believe that today the new Whittle Laboratory and the National Centre will ensure that Cambridge, and its industrial partners, will lead the challenge of decarbonising the world's propulsion and power sectors.

Report of the Council, dated 28 September 2022, on the period of appointment of external members of the Council

(*Reporter*, 6669, 2022–23, p. 12)

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

In a Discussion of the proposal to add external members to the Council held on 16 October 2002, a speaker commented on the importance of 'the discipline of having to run the gauntlet of the Regent House'.¹ Fortunately the present proposal has to run that gauntlet, but if approved it would remove an element of that protection in the case of the appointment of external members of the Council.

This Report argues that:

it would be appropriate for the Council to have the ability to choose a longer or shorter period of appointment for external members, after having regard to the need for continuity. Granting the Council this authority will also enable it to confirm the length of the appointment at the earliest stage, providing certainty for candidates.

The Recommendations include the grant of power to the Council to appoint external members 'for such period or periods as the Council shall determine, normally up to a maximum of four years on first appointment'.

The reasons given for this are two-fold. Avoiding gaps in Council membership arising from casual vacancies, where the process of nomination and approval by Grace to fill them can be lengthy. However the process for filling a vacancy occurring among the elected members can also take some time.

But there is another argument altogether in this Report, that a full complement of external members at all times is somehow more important, for they are specially desirable:

those sought for appointment as external members were in demand and therefore offering a short appointment was likely to discourage some good candidates from putting themselves forward.

That seems to hint at a recognition that the names of a relatively small number of individuals tend to hold multiple high-profile positions simultaneously. Such external members may be too busy to put Cambridge high in their priorities. This was already a worry in 2002:

Among academic colleagues responding some hesitations have been expressed about the proposal, such as to whether persons of appropriate stature prepared to devote the necessary time to the Council's business could be identified.²

The current 'other commitments' of the present external members can easily be looked up online.

¹ <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5898/19.html>

² Paragraph 23 of the Report of the Council on governance (the Regent House, the Council, the Vice-Chancellor, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellors), (*Reporter*, 5890, 2001–02, p. 945 at p. 950).

Report of the Council, dated 28 September 2022, on the membership of the Regent House of certain officers

(*Reporter*, 6669, 2022–23, p. 13)

No remarks were made on this Report.

COLLEGE NOTICES**Elections***Gonville and Caius College*

Elected into an Unofficial Fellowship with effect from 1 October 2022:

David Nathanael Hosking, M.Math.Phys., D.Phil., *Oxford*
 Victoria Ann Baena, B.A., *Harvard*, M.A., M.Phil.,
 Ph.D., *Yale*
 Vaithish Velazhahan, B.S., *Kansas State*, Ph.D., *SID*

Elected into a Supernumerary Fellowship with effect from 1 October 2022:

Lionel David Smith, B.Sc., *Toronto*, LL.B., *Western Ontario*, LL.M., *CAI*, D.Phil., M.A., D.C.L., *Oxford*, LL.B., *Montréal*
 Erik Gunnar Niblaeus, M.Phil., M.A., *SID*, Ph.D. *KCL*
 Li Wan, B.Arch., *Huazhong University of Science and Technology*, M.Phil., Ph.D., *DOW*
 Franco Giuseppe Giacinto Basso, Laurea in Lettere, *Pisa*, Licenza in Lettere, *Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*
 Dunecan Charles Osborne Massey, M.A., M.B. B.Chir., Ph.D., *CAI*, FRCP, *London*
 Zoë Benedicte McCourt Fritz, M.A., *CAI*, M.B.B.S., *Imperial*, Ph.D., *Warwick*, MRCP
 Jason Head, B.Sc., *University of Michigan*, M.Sc., Ph.D., *Southern Methodist University*
 Fotis Vergis, LL.B., LL.M., *Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*, LL.M., Ph.D., *HH*

Appointed into a Bye-Fellowship with effect from 1 October 2022:

Megan Isobel Jane Daffern, M.A., *SID*, M.A., D.Phil., *Oxford*
 Aaron Koller, B.A., Ph.D., *Yeshiva University*
 José Vitor Paiva Miranda De Siqueira, B.Sc., *Brasília*, M.A.St., Ph.D., *CHR*
 Russell Moore, M.A., *K*, Ph.D., *CAI*

Vacancies

Darwin College: Non-stipendiary Research Fellowships 2023 (any subject; several available); tenure: three years from 1 October 2023, with the possibility of renewal for one further year; closing date: 27 November 2022; further details: <https://www.darwin.cam.ac.uk/vacancies> or contact the College Registrar, Janet Gibson, at Darwin College, Cambridge, CB3 9EU, or by email at jg323@cam.ac.uk

SOCIETIES, ETC.**Cambridge Philosophical Society**

The Society's second talk of the Michaelmas Term will take place in the Bristol-Myers Squibb Lecture Theatre, Department of Chemistry, Lensfield Road, on Monday, 24 October 2022 at 6.30 p.m. Professor Helen Anne Curry, Kranzberg Professor of the History of Technology, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA, will give a lecture entitled *Banks, bunkers and backup: Securing crop diversity from the Cold War through the Internet Age*. Free entry but booking recommended. Further details and booking: <https://www.cambridgephilosophicalsociety.org/events/event/banks-bunkers-and-backup-securing-crop-diversity-from-the-cold-war-through-the-internet-age>

EXTERNAL NOTICES**Oxford Notices**

Harris Manchester College: Clerk of Works; full-time, permanent; salary: £43,414–£51,805; closing date: 14 November 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.hmc.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

Merton College: Admissions Officer; full-time, permanent; salary: £29,000–£32,000; closing date: 8 November 2022 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.merton.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

Schools Liaison and Access Officer; full-time, permanent; salary: £26,000–£31,000; closing date: 31 October 2022 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.merton.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

University College: Lectureship in Academic Skills; part-time; salary: £13,962–£15,703; closing date: 31 October 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.univ.ox.ac.uk/jobs-at-univ-2>

© 2022 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 organisations 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.