

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6756

WEDNESDAY 23 OCTOBER 2024

VOL CLV No 5

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	57
Discussion on Tuesday, 5 November 2024	57
Ballot of the Regent House: Voting open until 1 November 2024	57
Elections to the Council: Reminder	57
University salaries and stipends	58

Vacancies, appointments, etc.

Elections, appointments and grants of title	62
Vacancies in the University	63

Events, courses, etc.

Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.	63
--	----

Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

Annual meetings of the Faculties	64
----------------------------------	----

Reports

Twenty-ninth Report of the Board of Scrutiny	65
--	----

Graces

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 23 October 2024	80
Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 25 October 2024	81
Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 26 October 2024	81

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

College Notices

Elections	82
Vacancies	82
Events	82
Awards	82

Societies, etc.

Cambridge Philosophical Society	82
---------------------------------	----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

25 October, *Friday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.

26 October, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.

1 November, *Friday*. All Saints' Day. Scarlet Day.

3 November, *Sunday*. Commemoration of Benefactors. Scarlet Day. Preacher before the University at 11.30 a.m., Canon Loretta Minghella, OBE, Master of Clare College and Lay Canon of Ely Cathedral (*Lady Margaret's Preacher*).

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

9 November, *Saturday*. Michaelmas Term divides.

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

5 November

10 December

Congregations (at 10 a.m. unless otherwise stated)

25 and 26 October

30 November

Discussion on Tuesday, 5 November 2024

The Vice-Chancellor invites members of the Regent House, University and College employees, registered students and others qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 111) to attend a Discussion by **videoconference** on Tuesday, 5 November 2024 at 2 p.m. The following item will be discussed:

1. Twenty-ninth Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 8 October 2024 (p. 65).

Those wishing to join the Discussion by videoconference should email UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk from their University email account, providing their CRSid (if a member of the collegiate University), by 10 a.m. on the date of the Discussion to receive joining instructions. Alternatively contributors may email 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 the regulations for Discussions, 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/.

Ballot of the Regent House: Voting open until 1 November 2024

The following ballot is currently open for voting by members of the Regent House:

- Ballot on Grace 2 of 17 July 2024 (Chancellor fixed term)

Voting closes at 5 p.m. on Friday, 1 November 2024 and members who were listed on the Roll of the Regent House promulgated on 6 November 2023 are eligible to vote. Voting information, including candidate statements and links to the voting portal, is available online at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/ballots/voting/> [University account required].

Elections to the Council: Reminder

Elections are taking place this term to appoint eight members of the Council for four years from 1 January 2025. The deadline for nominations in these elections is **12 noon on Thursday, 14 November 2024**. Full details of the nomination procedure and election timetable, including a link to a nomination form, were published in the *Reporter* on 2 October 2024 (*Reporter*, 6753, 2024–25, p. 26).

University salaries and stipends

17 October 2024

The Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA) has proposed a pay settlement for the 2024–25 pay round to be implemented in two stages. The first portion of £900 will be effective from 1 August 2024, with the remainder effective from 1 March 2025. The settlement provides for a total increase of between 2.5% to 5.5%, for the salaries and stipends of non-clinical staff on spine points 15 to 50 and 2.5% for non-clinical staff on spine point 51 and above. A summary of the proposed settlement and timing is as follows:

<i>Point</i>	<i>Amount effective from August 2024</i>	<i>Amount effective from March 2025</i>	<i>Total award</i>
34 and below	£900	£300	£1,200
Points 35 to 50	£900	£250	£1,150
51 and above	£900	Variable	2.5%

It should be noted that the New Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (New JNCHES) trade unions remain in dispute over the offer. However, UCEA has confirmed that the formal dispute resolution procedure set out in the New JNCHES agreement has been exhausted and has therefore advised that implementation of the pay settlement should proceed.

The stipends and salaries of certain University staff require the approval of the Regent House. The Council is accordingly submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 80) to the Regent House for the approval of an increase of 2.5% to 5.5% (as specified above) to these stipends and salaries. An updated Cambridge general stipend and salary scale, showing the proposed new stipends and salaries for each spine point, is included in this Notice. Changes will also be applied to associated payments directly linked to a single spine stipend/salary point.

If the Grace is approved:

- the corresponding increases will be implemented in the stipends of those offices which do not require the approval of the University as well as in the salaries of analogous unestablished staff; and
- it is expected that the first portion of the increase will be paid to staff in the November 2024 payroll, with the remainder in the March 2025 payroll.

SCHEDULE

Notes to the University of Cambridge Single Salary Spine as at 1 August 2024

Note 1:	An asterisk (*) denotes a contribution point and progress through these is awarded on merit.
Note 2:	Grade T is for staff who are studying for an approved qualification or undergoing 'in-service' training.
Note 3:	On 1 January 2010 the first contribution points of Grades 2, 3, and 4 became service points and on 1 January 2015 the first contribution points of Grades 1, 5, and 6 became service points.
Note 4:	Assistant Professors and Associate Professors (Grade 10) will be appointed to Grades 9 and 10 respectively. Assistant Professors/Associate Professors (Grade 9) may progress through service points 1–9 of Grade 9. Associate Professors (Grade 10) may progress through service points 1–3 and contribution points 4–5 of Grade 10. Professors (Grade 11) will be appointed to Grade 11. From 1 October 2024, Professors (Grade 11) can be appointed to any point in Grade 11. Prior to this date, Professors (Grade 11) could only be appointed to point 2 in Grade 11 (spine point 63). Senior Research Associates will be appointed to Grade 9. Research Associates will be appointed to Grade 7 spine point 41 from 1 October 2017. Research Assistants appointed to Grade 5 will not be paid below spine point 36 from 1 August 2024. Until changes from 1 October 2025 are implemented, the contribution points in Grade 9 do not apply to Assistant Professors/Associate Professors (Grade 9) and likewise the contribution points in Grade 11 do not apply to Professors (Grade 11). They apply to academic-related staff. See <i>Reporter</i> , 6751, 2023–24, p. 856. The minimum for Professors at Grade 12 will be point 68 in band 1 of Grade 12.
Note 5:	For academic staff (other than Professors at Grade 12) contribution will be recognised through the promotions procedure as now and not by use of contribution points. Associate Professors (Grade 10) will also have access to the Academic Career Pathways scheme under which they may be awarded contribution points 4–5 in Grade 10.
Note 6:	Academic-related professorial-equivalent staff will be appointed on the contribution bands of Grade 12 according to the HERA points boundaries for each level.
Note 7:	Specific arrangements will apply to progression in service-related points on some grades in compliance with the Memorandum of Understanding.
Note 8:	Incremental progression through the service-related points occurs on the incremental date which will normally be on the anniversary of appointment or 1 April, 1 July or 1 October respectively for staff engaged on terms and conditions for Manual, Clerical/Secretarial and Technical Division appointments.
Note 9:	Points 32 and 50 were aligned to the National Single Pay Spine for Higher Education Academic and Support Staff, as negotiated by the Universities and Colleges Employers Association on behalf of UK higher education employers, with effect from 1 January 2014.
Note 10:	UCEA has removed spine points 13 to 16 from the National Spine and therefore they are no longer included in Grade 1.
Note 11:	Direct employees of the University appointed to Grade 1 will not be paid below spine point 21 from 1 November 2022.
Note 12:	Direct employees of the University appointed to Grade 2 will not be paid below spine point 23 from 1 November 2023.

Notes to the University of Cambridge Single Salary Spine as at 1 March 2025

-
- Note 1: An asterisk (*) denotes a contribution point and progress through these is awarded on merit.
-
- Note 2: Grade T is for staff who are studying for an approved qualification or undergoing 'in-service' training.
-
- Note 3: On 1 January 2010 the first contribution points of Grades 2, 3, and 4 became service points and on 1 January 2015 the first contribution points of Grades 1, 5, and 6 became service points.
-
- Note 4: Assistant Professors will be appointed to Grade 9.
Senior Research Associates will be appointed to Grade 9.
Research Associates will be appointed to Grade 7 spine point 41 from 1 October 2017.
Research Assistants appointed to Grade 5 will not be paid below spine point 36 from 1 August 2024.
The minimum for Professors at Grade 12 will be point 68 in Band 1 of Grade 12.
-
- Note 5: Academic-related professorial-equivalent staff will be appointed on the contribution bands of Grade 12 according to the HERA points boundaries for each level.
-
- Note 6: Specific arrangements will apply to progression in service-related points on some grades in compliance with the Memorandum of Understanding.
-
- Note 7: Incremental progression through the service related points occurs on the incremental date which will normally be on the anniversary of appointment or 1 April, 1 July or 1 October respectively for staff engaged on terms and conditions for Manual, Clerical/Secretarial and Technical Division appointments.
-
- Note 8: Points 32 and 50 were aligned to the National Single Pay Spine for Higher Education Academic and Support Staff, as negotiated by the Universities and Colleges Employers Association on behalf of UK higher education employers, with effect from 1 January 2014.
-
- Note 9: UCEA has removed spine points 13 to 16 from the National Spine and therefore they are no longer included in Grade 1.
-
- Note 10: Direct employees of the University appointed to Grade 1 will not be paid below spine point 21 from 1 November 2022.
-
- Note 11: Direct employees of the University appointed to Grade 2 will not be paid below spine point 23 from 1 November 2023.
-

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.**Elections, appointments and grants of title**

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

ELECTIONS

Dr JAMIE BLUNDELL, M.A., M.Sci., Ph.D., *SID*, Group Leader, Early Cancer Institute, elected Ursula Zoellner Professor of Cancer Research with effect from a date to be determined.

Professor ANTHONY TERENCE ANGHIE, B.A., LL.B., *Monash University*, LL.M., J.S.D., *Harvard University*, Samuel D. Thurman Professor of Law, University of Utah, elected Arthur Goodhart Visiting Professor from 1 October 2024 until 30 September 2025, assigned to the Faculty of Law.

APPOINTMENTS**University Associate Professors (Grade 10)**

Astronomy. Dr William James Handley, M.Sci., M.A., Ph.D., *CAI*, appointed from 1 October 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Biochemistry. Dr Claudia Bonfio, B.Sc., *Siena*, M.Sc., *Padova*, Ph.D., *Trento*, appointed from 1 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Computer Science and Technology. Dr Rika Antonova, B.S., B.S., *Denison*, M.S., *Northeastern*, Ph.D., *KTH Royal Institute of Technology*, appointed from 8 October 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Physics. Professor Teuta Pilizota, Diploma in Physics, *Zagreb*, Ph.D., *Oxford*, appointed from 1 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

University Assistant Professors

Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics. Dr Nicole Christine Shibley, B.Sc., M.Phil., Ph.D., *Yale*, M.A.St., *CL*, appointed from 3 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Archaeology. Dr John Joseph Rowan, Jr, B.A., *Stockton*, M.A., Ph.D., *Arizona State*, appointed from 1 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Architecture. Dr Yu Zhang, B.A., *Southwest Jiaotong*, M.Sc., *MIT*, D.Phil., *ETH Zurich*, appointed from 1 December 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Engineering. Dr Ayush Tewari, B.Tech., *IIIT Hyderabad*, M.Sc., *INRIA and Grenoble Institute of Technology*, D.Eng., *Saarland*, appointed from 1 February 2025 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years. Dr Shangzhe Wu, B.Sc., *HKUST*, D.Phil., *Oxford*, appointed from 1 March 2025 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

English. Dr Ryan James Heuser, B.A., *Florida*, M.A., Ph.D., *Stanford*, appointed from 2 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Land Economy. Dr Dongxiao Niu, B.A., *Shandong*, M.A., *Peking*, Ph.D., *Tsinghua*, appointed from 1 July 2025 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics. Dr Doyle David Calhoun, B.A., *Boston College*, M.A., *KU Leuven*, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D., *Yale*, appointed from 4 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of three years.

Music. Professor Margaret Faultless, M.A., *CL*, appointed from 31 August 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Politics and International Studies. Dr Ekin Kurtic, B.A., *Boğaziçi*, M.A., Ph.D., *Harvard*, appointed from 2 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years. Dr Yunan Xu, B.S., *Hohai*, M.Sc., Renmin University of China, Ph.D., *Erasmus University Rotterdam*, appointed from 1 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

GRANTS OF TITLE**Affiliated Lecturers**

Engineering. Dr Bryn Pickering, *G*, has been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2024 until 30 September 2025.

Divinity. Dr Suf Amichay, *TH*, and Dr Paul Dominiak have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2024 until 30 September 2026. Ms Nadira Auty, Dr Andrew Jason Byers, Dr Sarah Dunlop, Dr Jonathan Duquette, Dr James Gardom, *PEM*, Dr Philip Johnston, *HH*, Dr Dirk Jongkind, *ED*, and Dr Reuven Leigh have been granted the title of Affiliated Lecturer from 1 October 2024 for a further two years.

Vacancies in the University

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

Research Associate in the Faculty of Education (part-time, fixed term); tenure: from as soon as possible until November 2026 in the first instance; salary: £36,024–£44,263 (pro rata); closing date: 3 November 2024; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/48784/>; quote reference: JR43701

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.

Cambridge University Libraries

Sandars Lectures 2024: *Resistance to Bibliography*; two lectures, delivered by Timothy Young (Yale Center for British Art), will take place from 5–6 p.m. on 19 and 20 November 2024, in person in the Umney Theatre, Robinson College, and online via livestream; all welcome, free to attend, booking required; further details and individual lecture titles: <https://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/sandars>

Faculty of Classics

Corbett Lecture 2024: This year's lecture, entitled *Targeting the good: Archery as an image of wisdom in Aristotle and Plato*, delivered by Professor Gabriel Richardson Lear (University of Chicago), will take place at 5 p.m. on 7 November 2024, in person in G.19, Faculty of Classics; all welcome; further details and registration: <https://www.classics.cam.ac.uk/events/corbett-lecture-2024>

MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology

John Kendrew Lecture 2024: This year's lecture, entitled *Wiring Specificity of Neural Circuits*, delivered by Liquan Luo (Stanford University), will take place at 11 a.m. on 4 November 2024, in person in the Max Perutz Lecture Theatre, MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Francis Crick Avenue only; further details: <https://www2.mrc-lmb.cam.ac.uk/news-and-events/scientific-seminars/>

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

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held **from 10–10.15 a.m. on Tuesday, 12 November 2024**, in the Committee Room, School of Clinical Medicine. The Annual Meeting will be followed by a Faculty Board meeting which will take place from 10.15 a.m. and is for members of the Faculty Board and invited 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), to fill two vacancies to 31 December 2028, 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*, p. 605). Both vacancies 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.

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, 5 November 2024.

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.

Computer Science and Technology

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Computer Science and Technology gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held **at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 5 November 2024** in Lecture Theatre 1 of the Department of Computer Science and Technology, William Gates Building, JJ Thomson Avenue.

Law

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Law gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held **at 1 p.m. on Thursday, 14 November 2024**, and it will be possible to attend the meeting either in person or online.

The main item of business will be the election of two members of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve from 1 January 2025, in accordance with Regulation 1 of the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 605).

Nominations for election, confirmed by the proposer and seconder, for which the consent of the candidate must be obtained, and notice of any other business, should be received by Ms Helen Waring (email: hw441@cam.ac.uk) not later than 12 noon on Monday, 4 November 2024.

REPORTS

Twenty-ninth 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-ninth annual Report. Previous Board reports may be found online;³ a summary of last year's recommendations, the Council's responses and the Board's comments on those is in the Annex to this Report.

2. The Board encourages members of the Regent House, as the University's governing body, to 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, for example, 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 collaboration across the University.

Activity of the Board 2023–24

4. Seven meetings of the whole Board were held in person or online, where senior officers attended as guests. These were: the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Deborah Prentice; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research, Professor Anne Ferguson-Smith; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategy and Planning, Professor David Cardwell; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Enterprise and Business Relations, Professor Andy Neely; the Chief Financial Officer, Mr Anthony Odgers; the Registrar, Ms Emma Rampton; and the Academic Secretary, Dr Michael Glover.

5. Members also met on specific themes with various officers and others, including two non-officer members and two external members of Council; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education, Professor Bhaskar Vira; the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for University Community and Engagement, Professor Kamal Munir; the Head of Student Admissions and Access, Mr Mike Nicholson; the Head of Strategic Change and Delivery, Ms Lucy Hargreaves; the Head of the Accessibility and Disability Resource Centre (ADRC), Mr John Harding; the Head of Admissions and Data Services, Ms Helen Reed; the Head of Education Services, Ms Alice Benton; the Director of Estates, Mr Graham Matthews, and the Director of Property Development, Ms Katherine Rodgers. Members of the Finance Committee also met the Board's finance and governance group.

6. Further information and assistance were provided by the Director of Governance and Compliance, Dr Regina Sachers. The Board is grateful to all of the above for their time and thought. The Board once again records its thanks to Ms Rachel Rowe for her administrative support.

Introduction

7. On 2 October 2023, Vice-Chancellor Professor Deborah Prentice gave her first annual address to the University. Professor Prentice began by highlighting the importance of alignment within the devolved University and went on to describe the University as a composite of three entities: a community of scholars, a public institution serving society, and a modern organisation focused on effectiveness. The Vice-Chancellor identified her role as helping to 'cultivate, nurture, and support' alignment and 'repair it when it goes awry' (*Reporter*, 6712, 2023–24, p. 26).

8. In recent years the Board of Scrutiny has been of the view that alignment has been lacking between the three elements of the University identified by the Vice-Chancellor. This may be due in part to increasing financial pressures and regulatory demands placed on the University. It may also be because some of the trust and informal routines of collaboration have yet to be repaired after the pressures of the Covid-19 pandemic. Whatever the causes, the Board's view is that there is an opportunity and necessity to improve arrangements.

9. Last year's Board of Scrutiny Report opened by questioning the University's capacity for long-term strategic decision-making. This year's Report adds to this concern the more profound challenge about our collective capacity to make difficult decisions and implement the outcomes.

10. In this Report, we focus on the importance of including financial considerations in planning and decision-making. The Board welcomes efforts to increase the quality of financial information through the Enhanced Financial Transparency (EFT) and the budgetary discipline imposed by the announcement of 5% cuts over the next two years. However, of greater importance is the need for better decision-making.

¹ <https://www.scrutiny.cam.ac.uk>

² See Statute A VII (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 9) and the Ordinance for the Board of Scrutiny (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 120).

³ <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/key-bodies/Pages/scrutiny-annual-reports.aspx>

11. The Board welcomes the recognition of the opportunity for more effective operational delivery. For example, efficiencies should be gained by avoiding duplication of roles and responsibilities at the centre, Schools and Faculties/ Departments. At the same time, the University suffers from too many silos and not enough co-ordination, for example when it comes to education and teaching. Finally, the Board welcomes the recognition that while the Transformation programmes are essential, there is the need for greater prioritisation, sequencing and overall operational grip.

12. In addition to recommendations concerning finance and operations, the Board also welcomes recent progress on the Teaching Review, Environmental Sustainability and People Strategy. In all cases, the Board calls for greater co-ordination and an emphasis on implementation.

EDUCATION AND COLLEGIATE CAMBRIDGE

13. The Board reviewed a broad range of areas related to the provision of education and education services in the University this year, with a specific focus on the relationship between the University and the Colleges. This included admissions, widening participation and the delivery of undergraduate education, three core areas of activity where a good working relationship between the University and the Colleges, as well as among Colleges, is important. The University's reaction to Justice4CollegeSupervisors⁴ and the campaign's threatened boycott by supervisors last year exposed some of the siloed thinking in the University that saw the provision of supervisions as simply a College matter. It has been good to see some of this thinking challenged in the University this year and a greater recognition of the strategic role of the University, particularly through the Review of Teaching.⁵

14. The Board is pleased to see the establishment by the Council of the Review of Teaching as partial fulfilment of the Board's recommendation in its previous Report to 'establish a review, with representation from the Colleges' Standing Committee, to produce a strategy for facilitating the Colleges' task of arranging supervisions'.⁶ The Board worries at times that the remit of this review was not set as widely as the Board had originally hoped. Nevertheless, it is also heartened to hear that the University alongside the Colleges plan to develop an education strategy for undergraduate studies across the collegiate University over the course of the next term.

15. The Board recommends that the Review of Teaching ensures that the new education strategy outlines concrete actions and structural reforms where necessary rather than simply providing warm words. Furthermore, the Review of Teaching should consider methods of increasing the supply of supervisions rather than, as at present, seeing this in terms of limiting the demand for supervisors by increasing the average number of students in each supervision. The latter should be avoided as much as possible given that the University's reputation for education is based on the strength of its small-group supervision system, which should be protected and defended as much as possible.

16. The Board has followed with interest the implementation of the recommendations of the Strategic Review of Mental Health Provision, which has already shown results for example in reducing waiting times for students accessing the University Counselling Service (UCS) and the Mental Health Advice Service. The Board also notes the work over the past academic year in implementing the Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Plan, involving the transfer of responsibilities and resources in this area from Colleges to the University for more complex cases. The Board plans to scrutinise the effectiveness of the mental-health change programme in more detail in its next Report.

17. The Board is pleased to hear that a review has been launched looking at the University's overall approach to supporting disabled students, including compliance with the Equality Act and implications of recent legal changes related to the Abrahart case. The Board feels that work is needed in this area because of the exceptional levels of demand on Accessibility and Disability Resource Centre (ADRC) services, poor feedback received from students, academic staff and assistant staff, and lack of consensus across University on the role of the ADRC and how the University should be supporting students. Nevertheless, given the University's and the Colleges' financial situation, the recommendations from this review will also need to be sensitive to the cost implications. Even so, there are still significant improvements that could be made, such as by the ongoing Student Support Document (SSD) CamSIS project and the move from the existing College allocation of ADRC case-work to a discipline-based approach, centred in individual Faculties and Departments. The Board looks forward to scrutinising the outcome of the review in its next Report.

18. The Board recommends better assessments of policy changes from educational services on (a) staff time across the University and (b) equality, diversity and inclusion impact assessments. This is needed given the level of transformation in education services in the University, as there is a risk that these reforms occur in a piecemeal or siloed way without full assessment or mitigation of the consequences on other stakeholders in the University.

19. The Board is particularly worried about the negative impact of the use of Inespera examination software on students from financially disadvantaged families and schools/colleges, the unintended narrowing of the criteria for registration to become a University club/society as a result of the society-tier system reforms, and the costs (e.g. living costs and lost earnings over the summer) associated with introducing retakes, which may limit access to these according to the financial means of the students affected. These are not insurmountable problems with these proposals, but in the future the risks and issues involved should be identified and mitigated in a preventative way before the proposal is implemented.

⁴ <https://www.ucu.cam.ac.uk/category/justice4collegesupervisors>

⁵ *Reporter*, 6722, 2023–24, p. 197.

⁶ *Reporter*, 6714, 2023–24, p. 52 at p. 54.

20. The Board scrutinised the University's proposed Access and Participation Plan (APP), which the University submitted to the Office for Students earlier this academic year.⁷ The Board particularly agrees with the change in emphasis in undergraduate widening-participation targets from the share of state-school educated students towards those indicators that are more likely to identify more severe socio-economic deprivation and educational disadvantage, such as the share of students who received free school meals at school, which are more difficult to achieve. The Board congratulates all those in the University involved in delivering the impressive range of widening-participation activities described in the APP. Nevertheless, it feels that further attention could be given to reduce awarding gaps as well as boosting postgraduate widening-participation (such as the School of the Biological Sciences' pioneering Experiencing Life Sciences scheme).

21. The Foundation Year has been the flagship of the University's efforts to widen participation from under-represented backgrounds in recent years. It has attracted applicants from backgrounds who would never have otherwise thought Cambridge was for them and has worked particularly well as a way into Cambridge undergraduate study from mature applicants who have previously been educationally underserved. The Board notes the positive outcome of the first year of the Foundation Year (2022–23):

47 students joined the Cambridge Foundation Year's first cohort, with 39 (83%) successfully completing the course in July this year and receiving a CertHE qualification from the University of Cambridge. Of these, 31 (79.5%) are now continuing at Cambridge as undergraduates. Those who completed the course but are not continuing at Cambridge have been supported in securing a place at another top UK university. Six students who began the programme in 2022 paused their studies until the 2023 programme, and two withdrew. It means that two-thirds of students (66%) who started the course last year have progressed to degrees at Cambridge.⁸

The Board also understands the reputational and regulatory need for the programme. Nevertheless, the Board of Scrutiny is worried about whether this model is scalable given the scheme's cost, the University's current financial constraints and the fixed-duration donation that funds it. The University needs to work out the real cost of the scheme including the overheads. Given that the cost of educating a Cambridge undergraduate is £28,000, and the official £20,000 per student cost of the Foundation Year includes generous bursaries for the students, the full economic cost of the programme per student is likely to be higher than that currently estimated.

22. The University should investigate scaling up other schemes for developing a pipeline of competitive applicants from widening-participation backgrounds, such as STEM SMART, which has resulted in 87 students from educationally underserved backgrounds achieving Cambridge undergraduate offers in STEM subjects between the 2022 and 2023 admissions rounds, at a fraction of the per-student cost of the Foundation Year. The University should encourage the scheme, which is currently focused on the natural sciences, engineering and computer science to expand to embrace all other subjects that the University offers as degree courses.

23. The Board broadly supports the current proposal for admissions governance reforms that the University and the Colleges are currently considering. The Board also strongly supports the use of Bridging Courses and Preparation Weeks as a cost-efficient way for Colleges and University departments to promote the inclusion of students from educationally underserved backgrounds, as well as a way of addressing awarding gaps and promote belonging and inclusion.

24. The Board is particularly concerned about the lack of co-ordination between Colleges on admissions processes. For instance, the University is at a competitive disadvantage to Oxford because there is no consistent policy between Colleges about whether interviews are held online or in person. Short-term fixes should be implemented, but admissions governance reform beyond the current proposed reforms is needed to address the underlying issues.

25. The Board recommends the University and the Colleges work to improve co-ordination of admissions processes and widening-participation schemes. The Board is particularly concerned about the lack of co-ordination between Colleges on admissions policies. The Board recommends that the University should do everything in its power to encourage agreement on admissions governance reform and then to swiftly implement it. In the medium term, the Board recommends that the University should promote the use of Bridging Courses and Preparation Weeks and encourage greater co-ordination between Colleges and Faculties/Departments over their delivery to maximise economies of scale.

PEOPLE

26. Under the general heading of People, the Board considered staff recruitment and retention, diversity and inclusion, HR processes and the development of the University's People Strategy.

Staff recruitment and retention

27. Addressing pay and the cost of living in Cambridge is central to the recruitment and retention of staff. The Board welcomes the recent announcement of an interim pay and benefits package focused on staff at spine point 48 and below (*Reporter*, 6751, 2023–24, p. 856). However, it is likely that the University will have to move further to address pay and the cost of living, given the representations the Board received that the University was losing competitive advantage in attracting and retaining the highest calibre academics due to the high cost of residing in or close to Cambridge. Oxford was cited as an example of success in working to address issues of attraction and retention.

28. The Board welcomes the introduction of a career path up to professor-level for people in teaching-focused roles via the Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) Pathway (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 454) and more open-ended rather than fixed-term contracts.

⁷ See Council Minute 947 of the Council's meeting on 3 June 2024.

⁸ <https://www.foundationyear.cam.ac.uk/news/students-begin-degrees-after-new-foundation-year>

Staff diversity and inclusion

29. The Board welcomes the publication of the Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Information Report 2022–23, which highlights recent progress and the significant work still to be done. The Board’s attention was drawn to the issue of the diversity of academics and other staff recruited to the University. It was noted that there were little meaningful data to help the University understand the equity and diversity of its recruitment processes. In particular, whether people from under-represented backgrounds, especially from lower socio-economic backgrounds, had been successfully recruited and retained.

30. The Board notes the recent vote of members of the Regent House to retain the Employer Justified Retirement Age (EJRA) for academic officers but to increase the retirement age from 67 to 69 (*Reporter*, 6750, 2023–24, p. 828). With the new policy coming into effect from 1 September 2024, this too will have important ramifications for University recruitment and retention. It also has the potential to impact on the University’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) agenda which will need to be monitored carefully. The Penty review,⁹ commissioned by the University in advance of the vote, observed that

In addition to other Equality Diversity and Inclusion measures in place at the University, the Review Group concluded that the EJRA creates the conditions and opportunities for the academic community at the University to slowly become more diverse through opening up vacancies that would otherwise not have been available. This attracts more women and BAME appointees to University officer posts. It was therefore agreed that the EJRA complemented other measures to increase diversity in the workforce.

31. The Board recommends the University should collect more and better EDI data relating to recruitment, including socio-economic background, to guide further development of strategy and policy in this area.

HR processes

32. The Board received concerns that the time taken to investigate and conclude staff complaints and grievance processes were unduly lengthy. The Board notes the University is updating and streamlining its policy, with the aim to respond in a timely manner. A new investigations team has been established with funding set aside for the case management team. More mediators have been employed to resolve as many issues as possible in an informal manner; this is to be commended.

People Strategy

33. The Board welcomes the University’s plans to develop a People Strategy and encourages the Council to factor EDI matters fully into the University’s thinking and priorities. The Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2022–23 set out five main elements of the emerging Strategy: recruitment and offer; career progression and retention; culture and institution; pay and benefits; and diversity and inclusion. The aim is for the University to be the ‘prime place to work in Cambridge and an attractive employer in the global market by offering staff a good life, affordable housing and competitive salary and pension’. It was also reported that the Strategy should place kindness and respect as central to the culture of the University, which in turn creates an environment where staff feel valued and excellence is rewarded. Other areas covered will relate to relationships between the University and the Colleges, recruitment and grading, performance management and professional development (*Reporter*, 6720, 2023–24, p. 131).

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

34. The Board welcomes recent progress on climate and environmental sustainability. In recent months the Council has implemented positive changes in response to the Topping Study, and the Research Policy Committee is considering a bold Climate and Environmental Sustainability Research Strategy, set out by a Working Group established in Lent Term 2024. However, the Board believes that the University should have moved further and faster over the seven years since the Council established the Divestment Working Group (*Reporter*, 6507, 2017–18, p. 580). The many studies, reports, discussions and strategies since have come to similar conclusions: that the University should be an active leader in the transition to resilient and sustainable zero-carbon world; we should ambitiously build on our research, educational, and convening strengths; and that our leadership will only carry weight if the University also leads in reducing our direct and indirect impact on the climate and environment.

Progress implementing Topping Study recommendations

35. In July 2022 members of the Regent House initiated a Grace calling on the University to end all relationships with companies involved in exploiting new fossil fuels (*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 640). In response, the Council commissioned Nigel Topping, former UN Climate Change High Level Champion for COP26, to study the implications of the proposed Grace (*Reporter*, 6673, 2022–23, p. 84).

36. The Topping report was published a year later in July 2023 and recommended launching a major fundraising initiative at the scale of £1bn to address the climate crisis; reforming Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs (CBELA) processes to be more stringent and transparent in scrutinising fossil fuel funding; and introducing climate alignment expectations for all companies with whom the University has a relationship (*Reporter*, 6709, 2023–24, p. 854).

37. The Council accepted the Topping recommendations and set out its detailed response in December 2023. This included proposing an additional Pro-Vice-Chancellor for sustainability and developing an academic strategy on climate and environmental sustainability. The Council also committed to a clear framework for assessing the acceptability of fossil fuel funding and making progress on sustainable procurement. Finally, the Council announced the development of a new comprehensive strategy covering the University’s academic and operational activities (*Reporter*, 6722, 2023–24, p. 195).

⁹ *Reporter*, 6741, 2023–24, p. 578.

38. However, the Council's proposal for a new Pro-Vice-Chancellor for sustainability was rejected by the Regent House, which has led to some extra delay and the separation of the academic and operational leadership of the environmental sustainability agenda. Despite this setback, the Board welcomes recent concrete progress.

39. In July 2024, the Council announced that academic leadership for environmental sustainability would be added to the portfolio of Professor Bhaskar Vira, the current Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education. Operational leadership for environmental sustainability is to be provided by a fixed-term appointment reporting to the Vice-Chancellor. This role will be recruited in 2025 following an assessment of the University's current operational sustainability performance (*Reporter*, 6750, 2023–24, p. 804).

40. The Board welcomes the new transparent and externally validated approach CBELA will use to scrutinising research and philanthropic funding from fossil fuel companies. The Council notes that 'under the new policy and process, the University will not accept research or philanthropic funding from fossil fuel companies whose business models do not align with net zero 2050 (NZ2050) targets, unless there are exceptional circumstances... No fossil fuel company is currently understood to have a business model that aligns with NZ2050 targets', although subsidiaries focused on clean energy should be exempted (*Reporter*, 6749, 2023–24, p. 780).

41. The Board also welcomes the recent work of the Climate and Environmental Sustainability Research Working Group set up by the Research Policy Committee (RPC) in Lent Term 2024. The Working Group sets out a bold research strategy and clear ambitions for the University to deliver on the Topping-level fundraising recommendation.

42. The Board recommends that the University accepts the recommendations made to RPC for a bold climate and environmental research strategy, and that appropriate resources are committed to support the strategy and associated fundraising effort.

Risk of delays implementing operational sustainability commitments

43. The Board believes that the University could have moved further and faster since the adoption of a new Carbon Reduction Strategy in 2018 (*Reporter*, 6507, 2017–18, p. 580) and the announcement of a tighter set of science based targets to 'reduce its energy-related carbon emissions to absolute zero by 2048, with a steep 75% decrease on 2015 emissions by 2030'.¹⁰

44. Concerted action is urgently needed to meet our commitments to reduce energy-related carbon emissions to absolute zero by 2048, with a steep 75% decrease on 2015 emissions by 2030. The Board is concerned that a sense of urgency is not shared across the distributed decision-making of the University. One example is the recent announcement that the Estates Committee has decided not to pursue the proposed development of a solar farm on University land at Lord's Bridge (*Reporter*, 6750, 2023–24, p. 805), despite this option being included in the University's 2018 Carbon Reduction Strategy.

45. The Board believes the Council's current approach to operational environmental sustainability risks introducing delays to the University's carbon reduction commitments. The plan is to commission another study (Stage 1), before hiring a leader for a fixed-term reporting to the Vice-Chancellor to deliver the University's operational environmental sustainability commitments (Stage 2). The aim is to have this plan in place by the end of 2025, which will leave scant time to deliver the 75% decrease on 2015 emissions by 2030.

46. This approach raises the question of who will provide leadership on operational environmental sustainability during Stage 1 and then beyond this fixed-term post. It is important that ongoing work to improve the environmental performance of the estate and supply chain needs to continue in parallel with the development of the new strategy. We cannot put everything on hold or delay decisions until the new strategy is in place. Strong, long-term leadership is required if we are to succeed in making necessary improvements to our buildings, infrastructure and supply chain.

47. The Board takes note of ongoing discussions in the University to sign the Concordat for the Environmental Sustainability of Research and Innovation Practice. We welcome those discussions and hope the University will equip researchers planning to apply to the Wellcome Trust or Cancer Research UK in 2025 to comply with all environmental sustainability and other net zero requirements.

48. The Board recommends that long-term leadership is needed on operational environmental sustainability. The Board calls on the Council to clarify to relevant committees the Council's expectations on each committee for delivering against current commitments on environmental sustainability, including its carbon reduction target. It is important that that progress on existing commitments is not slowed whilst the assessment and development of a new strategy is undertaken.

Comprehensive institutional strategy covering academic and operational activities

49. An unintended consequence of Regent House's rejection of the proposal for a new PVC for sustainability has been the separation of the academic and operational leadership for environmental sustainability. This introduces risks of missed opportunities for joined-up responses, and sets back the Council's commitment to come up with a comprehensive strategy covering both academic and operational activities.

50. The Board believes that recent commendable progress in response to the Topping Study must be seen as a starting point for action. As is often noted, the University has significant research strengths across all disciplines relevant to the interlinked social, technological and environmental challenges of the climate and ecological crises. In addition to the bold and ambitious research strategy charted by RPC's Climate and Environmental Sustainability Research Working Group, the University could draw more effectively and consistently on its research strengths to support operational progress. We should be drawing on, and properly funding our existing strengths, such as Cambridge Zero, Cambridge Conservation Initiative, Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership, and the relevant Interdisciplinary Research Centres.

¹⁰ <https://www.cam.ac.uk/news/university-of-cambridge-adopts-science-based-target-for-carbon-reduction>

51. The Board recommends that the Council publishes a comprehensive update to the Regent House by July 2025 on progress towards the University’s environmental sustainability commitments, covering both academic and operational activities. The Board also recommends that key committees such as the Estates Committee, Environmental Sustainability Strategy Committee and Research Policy Committee should report annually to the Council on the progress they are making in supporting delivery towards the University’s commitments.

FINANCE

52. For the last few years, the University has been in the process of reforming its budgeting process. At present, budgeting (but not accounts) is split into Chest and Non-Chest parts, where Chest allocations and expenditure cover the majority of the recurrent pay costs of the University’s academic and professional services posts, whilst Non-Chest expenditure covers almost all research activity, some teaching activity and some other activities.¹¹ The Council is required to make an annual Report to the Regent House recommending allocations from the Chest to Schools, institutions and centrally administered funds. Under the forthcoming reforms to planning and budgeting, as part of the Enhanced Financial Transparency (EFT) project within the Finance Transformation Programme (FTP), the aims include¹²

- providing reliable and transparent financial information so that institutions can make better informed decisions and plan and budget in generally accepted and efficient ways; and
- attributing income where earned, with costs aligned to those income streams where incurred, and indirect costs such as libraries or the Research Operations Office, attributed according to a fair and equitable set of drivers.

53. EFT evolved from a proposal in August 2018 to reform, inter alia, the Resource Allocation Model (RAM). This was initially expected to take a year or so, but by June 2019, as noted in the Report of the Council on the financial position and budget of the University, recommending allocations from the Chest for 2019–20,¹³ a more ambitious reform had been embarked upon ‘with a focus on defining and delivering the University’s academic vision within a financially sustainable framework’. At that stage the former tried and tested, if somewhat clunky, planning process, which included income and expenditure incentivisation models, was abandoned. Instead, it was replaced by ‘strategic academic planning that will no longer be bound up with the annual Planning Round; Schools will instead undertake a comprehensive strategic review, in pairs, approximately every three years’.

54. The pre-reform Chest deficit for 2019–20 was predicted to be £16.1m ‘with similar deficits forecast each year until 2022–23’.¹⁴ However the budget and actual Chest deficits for 2022–23 were £42.7m and £56.4m, respectively, while the 2023–24 and 2024–25 Chest deficits are now projected to be £89.4m and £62.5m respectively.¹⁵ The intervening years included the pandemic, during which the Chest outturn (if not the budget) was in surplus (£28.3m and £29.4m for 2019–20 and 2020–21 respectively),¹⁶ but in each of those years the Non-Chest actual deficits (£66.5m and £48.1m respectively)¹⁷ more than wiped out the Chest surplus.¹⁸

55. In addition to the pandemic, like the whole Higher Education sector, the University has faced inflationary pressures (including increased expenditure on energy), no increase in home-fee income, and the shock of Brexit. However, the above figures suggest to the Board that the abandonment of the former planning process, before the new planning process was in place (now predicted to be in 2027), was misguided. To a certain extent, the University seems to have been ‘flying blind’ (particularly so since the Non-Chest forecasts or actuals have not been reported in the last two Allocations Reports).

¹¹ As explained in the Report of the Council recommending the budget and allocations from the Chest for 2024–25, ‘Chest income comprises unrestricted general income to the University principally from Research England and the Office for Students, student fees and endowment income, and a share of the ‘overhead’ element from research grant income, which is brought into the Chest to offset costs incurred in support of research. Non-Chest income consists principally of research grants, trust funds and other restricted funds, specific donations and trading activity carried out by departments and institutions. It is, for the most part, received and managed directly by relevant local institutions’ (*Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 670).

¹² See Annex 2, *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 677.

¹³ *Reporter*, 6552, 2018–19, p. 699.

¹⁴ *Reporter*, 6552, 2018–19, p. 699 at p. 700.

¹⁵ See Annex 1, *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 675.

¹⁶ See Annex 2, *Reporter*, 6664, 2021–22, p. 585.

¹⁷ See Schedule 1, *Reporter*, 6623, 2020–21, p. 722. The figure for 2020–21 is for the *budget* non-Chest deficit.

¹⁸ The budget non-Chest deficits for 2019 and 2020–21 were smaller at £23.8m and £32.8 respectively. For comparison, from 2002–03 to 2015–16, budget Non-Chest expenditure was roughly in balance, with a maximum predicted surplus of £8.0m (2012–13) and a maximum predicted deficit of £8.4m (2015–16).

56. However, Chest Allocations are not the full story. The University's accounts are, in some sense, the bottom line. As noted in the most recent Financial Statements:¹⁹

The University considers the best measure of underlying recurrent operating performance to be the adjusted operating surplus/(deficit) for the year, being the surplus for the year adjusted for gains and losses on investments, the CPI-linked bond fair value adjustment, the change in USS pension deficit recovery provision, donations, endowments, and capital grant income, and the CUEF income on a distribution basis.

57. The Group deficit for 2022–23 was £9.5m, but that figure includes the healthy surplus from Cambridge University Press & Assessment (CUPA). The Academic University adjusted operating deficit is £72m (£47m in 2021–22), which includes a £39m 'Add-back' uplift from CUPA (a sum traditionally used for capital expenditure). A deficit of this size for the Academic University is not sustainable because, again as noted in the Financial Statements:

Our ambition remains to achieve a modest, sustainable surplus for the Academic University cash flow in the long run, in order to maximise the funds available for reinvestment into the University's mission and provide greater resilience across funding sources.

58. The adjusted operating deficit for the Academic University will not be available until the accounts are published next year. According to the Report of the Council recommending the budget and allocations from the Chest for 2024–25,²⁰ the Ten-Year-Model (TYM) projected deficit for 2023–24 is now £53m (a deterioration relative to a projection of £40m on a like-for-like basis for 2023–24 at this time last year), with a predicted deficit of £47m for 2024–25 (the Finance Committee's long-term financial objective is a £30m surplus).²¹ The Academic University income and expenditure from the EFT prototype similarly predicts deficits of £59.6m, £53.1m and £44.8m for 2023–24, 2024–25 and 2025–26 respectively. However, the Board understands from the Chief Financial Officer that since these figures were published, the projected deficit has increased by the order of £15m.

59. The Board has sought explanations for the deficit over and above the explanations applicable to all Higher Education institutions. However, worryingly this has not been fully traced to source, with the result that there is no clear understanding of what has happened, or why. The loss level of 4.5% of income in one year is not dramatic in itself. However, the deficit appears to be structural and will be at the cost of the endowment (and subsequently a reduced income from such). This implies a lack of budgetary control which is not in the long-term best interests of the University.²²

60. Concerns about the state of the University's finances, and the need for rapid action, have been expressed to the Board in meetings with the Vice-Chancellor, the Chief Financial Officer, and external members of both the Council and the Finance Committee. Some preliminary changes have been instigated, e.g. the Vice-Chancellor is now Chair of the Planning and Resources Committee. However, while the Board understands that the University has an interim plan to reduce, if not eliminate, the deficit, there is no fully worked-out proposal to return to a positive annual net income, say of £30m, within the next five years. Further, while the Board accepts that there has been a range of shocks which has impacted the finances of every University in the country, it is the absence of a clear timeline to reverse this trend which is most concerning. The continued deficit puts in doubt some of the longer-term aims of the University (such as on estates, the People Strategy and environmental sustainability). The University should not be seen as benefiting current students and staff while depriving future generations.

61. While the Board welcomes the interim plan of a 5% cut in Chest allocations,²³ as a first positive step to re-establishing budgetary control, this will not bear fruit until 2026 and the implementation will require careful management, especially if the stated aim of protecting research and academic interests is also to be achieved. In particular, while a 5% cut that is evenly distributed across the University may have attractions in postponing difficult decisions, there is a risk that 'salami slicing' and tightening of belts, will lead to unhelpful cuts to academic posts in some Schools – cuts which could be self-defeating, given that part of the future income improvement is expected to come from more postgraduate taught courses. A more strategic, planned approach to priorities is surely required.

62. The Board recommends, as a matter of urgency, that the University should better understand where there has been increased expenditure in the last decade, and why, and having done so, closely consider a more strategic approach to implementing the interim 5% cut than 'salami slicing'.

63. To this end, the Board notes that academic staff engaged in teaching and research increased by 2% between 2016 and 2023 (rising from 1,587 to 1,614), while staff not on an academic contract increased by 29% (from 4,092 to 5,875). One of the explanations given to the Board for this increased level of overheads was that the culture of 2015 was one of 'a time of plenty', when new needs tended to be met in the annual planning round. However, figures from the Allocations Reports do not support the 'time of plenty' view (the Chest allocations have been in deficit since 2016–17, and the Chest and Non-Chest budget has been in deficit since 2015–16). The Board wonders whether a 'time of plenty' culture in some parts of the University may have resulted in areas of over-expansion; if so, there may be opportunities to reduce costs in those areas in greater proportion than 'salami slicing' suggests.

¹⁹ *Reporter*, 6731, 2023–24, p. 298.

²⁰ *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 670.

²¹ *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 670.

²² For instance, a senior officer suggested to the Board that there is a lack of clarity about roles at the moment, which leads to hiring more people.

²³ *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 670.

64. In its meetings with staff during the year, a recurring theme has been the need for the University to consider what current activities it can ‘stop’ to reduce costs, rather than simply trying to do more with less money. There would appear to be a level of duplication between the work of the UAS Divisions, Schools and Departments. Partly, this seems to stem from a lack of understanding and delineation of the roles and responsibilities of each, but also partly this reflects a lack of trust between parts of the administration. Reducing duplication and ‘siloeing’ (see below), and increasing trust, should be a priority for implementing the 5% cuts over the coming two years.

65. There is clearly an urgent need to improve planning and financial control. The impression gained by the Board is that it was a mistake not to continue to run the former planning process, together with the RAM, until the Finance Transformation Programme, and in particular the EFT project, was fully functional. For too long, the EFT project has offered ‘jam tomorrow’, and even when the project comes to fruition, all EFT can do is offer better information (assuming that the correct information is fed into it). In itself it will not generate income, and it will not produce better decision-making unless that information is acted upon. To that end, the key committees (e.g. the Resource Management Committee) need to be effective and not fall into the trap of being tick-box exercises (see below).

66. Another recurring theme in our meetings was that, while the University’s systems and processes need modernising, the University embarked on too many major transformation programmes at the same time, namely, Finance, HR, Estates and Research. While the University subsequently recognised this over-stretch, e.g. in establishing a Change and Programme Management Board,²⁴ the task in hand that the University faces is how to extricate itself from a sub-optimal position without sacrificing the gains which these change programmes can bring.

67. A difficulty that the Board has pinpointed from repeated comments, is that aspects of operations (and not just those associated with the change programmes) are far too siloed. Examples of such siloeing include the failure to fully recognise potential synergies with the new Finance and HR systems, a failure to fully cost the new reporting system for HR, and the embarkation on an ambitious Estates Plan based on an annual capital expenditure budget of £100m (the indicative figure notified to the Board by the Estates Division as being used in the Estates plan) which seems unrealistic given the state of the University’s finances and the level of savings that are going to be required. If the financial and related issues facing the University are to be addressed, cooperation within the University needs to improve.

68. The Board recognises that it is not easy to break down these silos, but some degree of overall operational co-ordination is required to ensure that the disparate parts of the University operate as seamlessly as possible (preferably without the creation of further co-ordination committees). The Board is reluctant to suggest the establishment of a Syndicate to review the University’s constitutional and administrative arrangements, say, along the lines of the Wass Syndicate.²⁵ However, over three decades on from those reforms, a relatively wide-ranging review of administrative arrangements might be in order.

69. Since the first draft of this Report, there are indications that it is recognised that changes are required. The Board notes the posts of Director of Finance and Chief Financial Officer are to be consolidated with the post presumably placed under the direction of the Council (as is the case of the CFO at present).²⁶ The Board also presumes that the opportunity will be taken so that henceforth the Finance Division will report to the consolidated post rather than the Registry. On a more radical front, has the administration now grown so large that a substantive post of Chief Operating Officer should be established, with the policy and operations administrative support being separated? For instance, in the case of the University Research Office²⁷ this would appear to be relatively straightforward given that there are already two separate ‘offices’, namely the Research Strategy Office and the Research Operations Office.²⁸ Further, given that the Pro-Vice-Chancellors are predominantly concerned with policy, such a reform might provide an opportunity to review their administrative support.

70. Given the pressing challenges the University is facing, the Board is of the view that business as usual is not a feasible option.

71. The Board recommends that structures and reporting lines in financial and administrative leadership be reviewed, with consideration particularly given to the costs and benefits of establishing a post of Chief Operating Officer.

²⁴ Although, at the time of writing, no Minutes were available on the CPMB website at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/cpmb/Pages/minutes-archive.aspx> (University account required).

²⁵ <https://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/university-archives/glossary/wass-syndicate>

²⁶ The office of Treasurer, to whom the Finance Division used to report, was abolished as part of the Wass reforms. The establishment of the post and then office of Chief Financial Officer to some extent undid that reform, but the underlying administrative arrangements were not addressed when the post was established. Under the Ordinance for the UAS (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 693), the Director of Finance, as the head of a UAS Division, reports to the Registry, although there is an arrangement whereby he also informally reports to the Chief Financial Officer.

²⁷ <https://www.academic.admin.cam.ac.uk/university-research-office>

²⁸ <https://www.research-strategy.admin.cam.ac.uk> and <https://www.research-operations.admin.cam.ac.uk>

Automated systems and decision-making

72. The Board received expressions of concern about the introduction of automated systems, which, while standardising and rationalising effort and decision-making, did not, in the view of some, lead to sufficiently nuanced consideration of issues and outcomes. This became apparent, for example, with the introduction of a travel risk management system (Peregrine Foresight) which is involved in reaching important decisions for staff undertaking work or research abroad.

73. Given the decisions had the potential to affect the work and thus the careers and research of academics, greater human input into risk management decisions seemed appropriate. However, this was disincentivised since any individual overruling the outcome indicated by the system introduced risk for the individuals so doing and, the Board was informed, raised questions regarding the validity of insurance cover.

74. While the Board recognises resolving the two-way tension arising in such risk management decisions can be no easy task, care is needed in rolling out such systems generally given the significant and unintended consequences they can give rise to. The Board is of the view that a careful review of the role and limitations of the travel risk management system in particular, before it was rolled out more widely would have been worthwhile. The Board would also like to emphasise the care that is needed in the use of such systems in general.

Governance needs more teeth

75. The Board is somewhat concerned that there is insufficient challenge evidenced in the proceedings of University committees. In particular, during the year it was observed to the Board that a key committee seemed to have lost its centre of gravity, and appeared at times to be little more than box-ticking. The Board gathers that the situation regarding that particular committee has significantly improved, but that such a concern could have been raised at all indicated a potential failure of governance.

76. The University governance structure is designed so that the University is run by committee, rather than individuals. The University does not have a Chief Executive Officer; instead, the Vice-Chancellor chairs the Council, which is the principal executive and policy-making body of the University. Similarly, the Vice-Chancellor or the Pro-Vice-Chancellors chair the other key committees of the University, and it is those committees that make the decisions. This means that if there is to be effective decision-making, there has to be informed and in-depth discussions at committee level, the committee papers need to clearly present options in digestible form, and there should be constructive challenge. Effective committees need to be critical friends to those tasked with presenting proposals and implementing decisions. Committees that are box-ticking exercises, and whose teeth have become blunted, are at best pointless and at worst damaging.

77. The Board is left wondering whether one of the underlying reasons for the University's financial position is because key committees, such as the Resource Management Committee (RMC) and/or the Planning and Resource Committee (PRC), had drifted over a number of years into too much of a box-ticking exercise.²⁹ The Board gathers that processes have improved, but the culture needs to return to one where challenge, where appropriate, is seen as a duty by members of committees.

78. However, it may not just be committees where there may not be sufficient challenge. Unfortunately, more than once, the Board met with staff reticence when revealing concerns, for fear of negative consequences for them personally. The University functions best when there is an open culture where staff (of whatever level) should feel able to tell more senior staff difficult home truths, e.g. such as the real costs and timelines for a project. One of the reasons that the CAPSA project was such a debacle was that middle-ranking computer officers knew that it was not going to work, but could not get traction with more senior staff.³⁰ Appropriate challenge should be rewarded.

²⁹ In the case of the RMC, it is a little hard for a member of the Regent House to check, since at the time of writing the Minutes available on the RMC website at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/RMC/Pages/minutes-archive.aspx> (University account required) are patchy, with only three sets of Minutes available for meetings since November 2021 (i.e. June 2022, November 2022 and February 2024).

³⁰ It is also true that the Board's Fifth Report, the publication of which was delayed, also failed to obtain traction with the University's leadership. In the light of the issues with the current change programmes, it is possibly worth quoting that Report's view on CAPSA before go-live, since there appear to be similarities with the difficulties faced by some of the current projects:

The project to develop a University-wide commitment accounting software system, now known as CAPSA, has been a matter of interest and concern to us for more than two years now. In May 1998 we wrote that 'the slow pace of progress to date arises almost certainly from an initial underestimate of both the complexity of the project and the number of staff required to support it, compounded by the worrying failure to consult the end-users from the outset' (*Reporter*, 5742, 1997–98, p. 818). The University then called in an external consultant, who reviewed all the work that had been done on the project, organized widespread consultation resulting in the production of a specification for the system, and then recommended an entirely new accounting system. In May 1999 the Council approved the installation of a system supplied by Oracle at a cost of £4.7m (*Allocations*, paragraph 28). A year later, the cost has risen to £8.0m, we are now within a few weeks of the intended start date, and many users are only just discovering that the system will not do what they had thought it would: the research grants module does not deal with salary costs; there are difficulties with running the software on operating systems other than Windows; and the requirement for a simple-to-use interface for casual users has been dropped for the time being. This final, and apparently last-minute, change has implications for the time needed for user training and has security implications which we can only presume have been fully addressed by the implementation team. Whether or not the system becomes fully operational on 1 August 2000, it will be important for the Council to report on the cost of the project so far, the expected further costs, and whether the implementation has been managed successfully. In this context we welcome the assurance we have received that the University will not embark on a major student database project until the lessons of CAPSA have been learnt. (*Reporter*, 5820, 2000–01, p. 25 at p. 28).

79. The need to increase understanding between the central bodies and the Regent House is a hardy perennial. However, the defeat in Lent Term 2024 of the proposal for a new Pro-Vice-Chancellor for sustainability, partly because of a lack of transparency of the funding model, illustrates the point. As a further example, for the vote on changes to the Employer Justified Retirement Age, the *Reporter* commendably listed the Review Group's estimate of 'approximately £7.4m a year' in additional salary costs if the retirement age was scrapped, 'compared to £2.2m if the EJRA is increased to 69'.³¹ However, the statement that the Finance Committee and the General Board would 'as part of the normal budgetary process each year, examine how the consequential financial implications [of an amendment proposing the abolition of the EJRA] can be managed' was insufficient (particularly since the key committees that would have had to grapple with the increased expenditure would be the RMC and the PRC), and seems to underscore the belief that money can be found for any activity without consequence.

80. For good governance, the costs and benefits of all proposals should be clearly spelled out to the Regent House. Long term it would be hoped that an emphasis on identifying the source of funds for any proposals would gradually achieve a change in mindset such that there is more focus on the need for financially robust proposals through University decision-making and that there is no separate fund which can be magicked into existence. This will encourage a firmer hand in terms of setting a budget and remaining within it and hard financial limits on spending.

81. The Board recommends that all proposals put to the Regent House (or other bodies) should be fully costed, with clarity as to where resources will come from, together with the value of benefits (and the implications of not accepting the proposal), the long-term aim being to embed a culture of financial control across the University.

³¹ *Reporter*, 6748, 2023–24, p. 727.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Board recommends that the Review of Teaching ensures that the new education strategy outlines concrete actions and structural reforms where necessary rather than simply warm words. Furthermore, the Review of Teaching should consider methods of increasing the supply of supervisions rather than, as at present, seeing this in terms of limiting the demand for supervisors by increasing the average number of students in each supervision. The latter should be avoided as much as possible given that the University's reputation for education is based on the strength of its small-group supervision system, which should be protected and defended as much as possible.
2. The Board recommends better assessments of policy changes from educational services on (a) staff time across the University and (b) equality, diversity and inclusion impact assessments. This is needed given the level of transformation in education services in the University, as there is a risk that these reforms occur in a piecemeal or siloed way without full assessment or mitigation of the consequences on other stakeholders in the University.
3. The Board recommends that the University and the Colleges work to improve co-ordination of admissions processes and widening-participation schemes. The Board is particularly concerned about the lack of co-ordination between Colleges on admissions policies. The Board recommends that the University should do everything in its power to encourage agreement on admissions governance reform and then to swiftly implement it. In the medium term, the Board recommends that the University should promote the use of Bridging Courses and Preparation Weeks and encourage greater co-ordination between Colleges and Faculties/Departments over their delivery to maximise economies of scale.
4. The Board recommends the University should collect more and better EDI data relating to recruitment, including socio-economic background, to guide further development of strategy and policy in this area.
5. The Board recommends that the University accepts the recommendations made to RPC for a bold climate and environmental research strategy, and that appropriate resources are committed to support the strategy and associated fundraising effort.
6. The Board recommends that long-term leadership is needed on operational environmental sustainability. The Board calls on the Council to clarify to relevant committees the Council's expectations on each for delivering against its commitments on environmental sustainability, including its carbon reduction target, so that progress is not slowed whilst the assessment of operational environmental sustainability and development of a new strategy is undertaken.
7. The Board recommends that the Council publishes a comprehensive update to the Regent House by July 2025 on progress towards the University's environmental sustainability commitments, covering both academic and operational activities. The Board also recommends that key committees such as the Estates Committee, Environmental Sustainability Strategy Committee, and Research Policy Committee are required to report to the Council on the progress they are making in supporting delivery towards the University's commitments.
8. The Board recommends, as a matter of urgency, that the University should better understand where there has been increased expenditure in the last decade, and why and having done so, closely consider a more strategic approach to implementing the interim 5% cut than 'salami slicing'.
9. The Board recommends that structures and reporting lines in financial and administrative leadership be reviewed, with consideration particularly given to the costs and benefits of establishing a post of Chief Operating Officer.
10. The Board recommends that all proposals put to the Regent House (or other bodies) should be fully costed, with clarity as to where resources will come from, together with the value of benefits (and the implications of not accepting the proposal), the long-term aim being to embed a culture of financial control across the University.

8 October 2024

ROB DOUBLEDAY, *Chair*
 ROB HOPWOOD, *Secretary*
 STEPHEN COWLEY
 MARKUS GEHRING

NAZIA HABIB
 ANDREW HAMMOND
 RICHARD LLOYD
 FRAZ MIR

JUDITH PLUMMER BRAECKMAN
 ORSOLA RATH SPIVACK
 CHARLES READ

ANNEX

**Twenty-eighth Report of the Board of Scrutiny (2023):
Summary of recommendations, the Council's responses, and the Board's commentary on these**

1. The Board recommends that the University establish a review, with representation from the Colleges' Standing Committee, to produce a strategy for facilitating the Colleges' task of arranging supervisions. The review should examine how staff on permanent and temporary contracts within the University could be incentivised to deliver more supervisions, to create a more equitable and effective distribution of teaching load within the University. The details for the contractual and remuneration arrangements for this teaching would remain solely at Colleges' discretion. The review should also investigate the greater potential for joint appointments, especially supporting Colleges that struggle to recruit teaching fellows.

A review of undergraduate teaching has been launched by the General Board and the Colleges' Committee (*Reporter*, 6722, 2023–24, p. 197). The review has been commissioned at the Council's request to address the institutional culture of overwork which is claimed to be contributing to poor mental health and wellbeing amongst the student population. It will also seek to address the related issue of the sustainability of the supervision system (in particular, the available resources for supervision, both personnel and financial, and the risks of low availability of supervisors affecting the quality of the education).

In making its recommendations, the group tasked with the review will also take account of staff workload, and any recommendations will be assessed to ensure that they do not increase staff load in the longer term, and ideally will reduce it.

This review sits alongside related work by the Colleges through the Office of Intercollegiate Services in response to demands from the Justice for Supervisors campaign. Work is being coordinated to ensure that efforts are not duplicated, and actions are complementary.

Board commentary: The Board is grateful for the Council's response and refers the Council to remarks in its Twenty-ninth Report concerning the supply of supervisors and how the supervision system helps underpin the distinctiveness and high reputation of the University.

2. The Board recommends that the General Board's Education Committee (GBEC) establish a regular review of all part-time accredited and non-accredited courses offered by the University or its subsidiaries, focusing especially on online courses, to ensure that there is both outward-facing clear differentiation between providers and the elimination of the risk of counterproductive internal competition. This review should also have the aim of assuring the Regent House that new providers consistently meet the aims of the University, are of high educational quality, and are robustly governed.

Part-time accredited programmes, including accredited online courses, are included as part of the Education Committee's Education and Monitoring and Review process (EMR).¹ This quality assurance process aims to monitor and review the University's courses. It replaces the previous six-yearly Learning and Teaching Review (LTR) process, and the Annual Programme Review (APR) process. It applies to any Department, Faculty or institution offering award-bearing courses, including all Triposes, all Master's programmes and doctoral courses, all courses listed as 'non-member awards' in *Statutes and Ordinances*, and the Language Centre CULP awards.

The purpose of EMR is to provide evidence-based, regular review of courses for quality monitoring and enhancement. A pilot took place in 2022, and is now being rolled out across the University.

Non-accredited professional and executive education and other non-accredited programmes are not currently formally regulated, although providers of such programmes have until recently been approved by the Board of Executive and Professional Education (BEPE). The General Board agreed to dissolve BEPE in Michaelmas Term 2023, as it was not able to fulfil its function owing to a lack of resource and official authority. The process of endorsement of providers was not sufficiently robust. The executive, professional and digital landscape has evolved significantly since BEPE was established in 2011, and facility to support strategic decision-making by the General Board is now required. Subject to identification of resource to support this work, terms of reference for a strategic review of non-traditional forms of education, including EPE and online courses, will be developed for 2024–25. Until this review is completed, new providers wishing to offer non-accredited programmes will be subject to light-touch consideration by the General Board's Education Committee.

Board commentary: The Board notes the response of the Council.

¹ <https://www.educationalpolicy.admin.cam.ac.uk/ensuring-quality/quality-processes/emr>

3. The Board recommends that the Council and the General Board should take an active role in sponsoring conversations about research strategy: asking what the University as a whole is seeking to achieve over the medium to long term and how we measure our success, and noting the obvious interconnections between research, research funding, and the overall financial health of the University.

The Council welcomes the Board's recommendation that the Council and the General Board should take an active role in sponsoring conversations about research strategy.

Academic freedom and the enabling of researchers to drive their research agendas within and between the six Schools via their academic visions, departmental strategic plans, interdisciplinary strategic research initiatives and research centres at multiple scales around key research priorities is core to the University's mission and a key part of its historic success.

While it is essential that the University maintains this ethos, the Council agrees that more and wider conversations regarding research strategy have been beneficial in working towards the future success of Cambridge as a world-leader in research. The Council provided input into an Enabling Framework for Research, a proposed set of strategic principles, priorities and actions designed to facilitate the development and implementation of research strategy across the University. After wider consultation, the final report on the Framework is due for completion at the end of the academic year.

One of the aims of the Framework will be to facilitate the identification and support of key strategic priorities. This will build on recent experience of developing strategic priorities in the areas of Artificial Intelligence and Climate and Environmental Sustainability. In response to shared School strategic priorities in artificial intelligence, and after approval by the Research Policy Committee, the Planning and Resources Committee and the General Board, the University has launched a new institutional collective, AI@Cam.² Now in its second year, this initiative has harnessed the University's capabilities in training, policy, research and societal engagement to foster an inclusive strategic programme in this area.

The Research Policy Committee has identified climate and environmental sustainability research as a priority area for the development of a strategic approach and has recently established a working group to consult with the wider University community on the articulation and implementation of a strategy in this area. This activity will draw on and be aligned with the recommendations of the Topping Study.³ The Council and the General Board will be consulted throughout this process. This model of strategy development, via researcher-driven, consultative processes and inclusive engagement with the University's governance structures, may offer a model for developing strategies for other research priority areas.

Strategic alignment with major infrastructure developments also underpins advances in research and innovation. This includes for example the completion in 2024 of the Ray Dolby Centre and the new National Facility for Physics at West Cambridge, as well as the new Heart and Lung Research Institute which opened last summer adjacent to the Royal Papworth Hospital on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Renewing and revitalising the University's estate is essential for maintaining and enhancing both competitive and collaborative research output. The University is also working to ensure alignment between strategic approaches to international collaboration and research. In particular, the University continues to build on existing international strategic partnerships such as the Cambridge Centre for Advanced Research and Education in Singapore (CARES) that celebrated its tenth anniversary this year by increasing the breadth of research programmes to deliver new cross-disciplinary initiatives linked to lifelong health and education. Similarly, research strategy is dependent on a successful strategy to support and attract staff and students. While the University remains attractive to early career researchers, especially through the UK Future Leaders Fellowship and ERC funding programmes, the work of the recently established Research Culture Steering Committee and projects such as Eddington will be vital to ensuring that we remain able to attract the best to work at Cambridge. New initiatives such as the Mastercard Foundation Scholars Program will similarly help to attract talented students from across the globe to the University.

The Council also notes the Board's focus on the importance of research funding to the financial health of the University. Brexit and the uncertainty around association with the Horizon Europe framework had negatively influenced research grant income. It is anticipated that association commencing in January 2024 will go some way towards reversing that trend. Furthermore, evidence indicates that the large grants contributions fund implemented in October 2021 is incentivising Cambridge researchers across all disciplines to successfully respond to large strategic collaborative grant calls.

The Council welcomes the Board's comments regarding the work that has been undertaken to address capacity issues in the central Research Operations Office and will continue to encourage discussions regarding capacity centrally and in Schools and Departments.

Board commentary: The Board is grateful for the Council's response. The Board has kept a number of issues mentioned here under review and notes several are pertinent to its Twenty-ninth Report.

² <https://www.cam.ac.uk/research/aicam>

³ See *Reporter*, 6722, 2023–24, p. 195.

4. The Board recommends that the Council: (a) publish a statement of the governance of the CMAF and report on its holdings and investment performance annually in the Financial Statements and Accounts; and (b) clarify the distinction between an allocation for a specific purpose and a Fund, e.g. the Investment Fund, propose Ordinances for any new Funds and – by analogy with the Strategic Planning Reserve Fund – publish an annual list of allocations from such Funds in its Annual Report.

The Cambridge Multi-Asset Fund (CMAF) is a managed investment account with Legal & General Investment Management, established for the University to provide an investment vehicle for funds likely to be needed for operational purposes in a 3–5-year period, i.e. money not needed in cash in the short term nor intended for long-term investment in the University's Endowment Fund (CUEF). As a matter of governance CMAF falls within the responsibilities of the Council under Statute A IV 1(a), acting through the Finance Committee, in the exercise of general supervision over the finances of the University including all its investments. As such, the details of the CMAF holdings, including asset allocations and fund performance, are regularly reviewed by the Finance Committee. Reporting on CMAF in the Financial Statements is as required by applicable reporting standards. In addition the Council will in future publish information annually on the performance of CMAF in the *Reporter* as part of the Financial Management Information (FMI).

CUEF and CMAF are dedicated investment vehicles. Internal 'Funds' (such as the Strategic Planning Reserve Fund) are internal allocations of available University resources ring-fenced from time to time for specific purposes. As allocations of internal resources, these are overseen by the Planning and Resources Committee. The Regent House has sight of the use of these internal 'Funds' through the information published in the University's annual Budget/Allocations Report and FMI pack.⁴

Board commentary: The Board is grateful for the Council's response and notes the oversight mechanisms for these funds.

5. The Board recommends that the Council: (a) in the course of 2023–24, agree and publish a plan for cost reductions/income growth to return the Chest budget to balance; and (b) review the format and content of the Allocations Report with a view to providing better information (as was the case until 2019) to improve transparency and enable the Regent House to understand trends in allocations, particularly between academic and non-academic activities.

The Council acknowledges the need for renewed urgency and traction in delivering its income growth and cost efficiency objectives in relation to the estate, procurement and professional services systems and processes. As Chest income and expenditure has evolved over time to a position where this represents the minority of the Academic University's finances, the issue of deficits needs to be addressed at the total Academic University level and not just at the somewhat arbitrary 'Chest' split. A better understanding of the Academic University's finances will come from the allocation of all income and costs through the programme of Enhanced Financial Transparency (EFT) and it is in the delivery of EFT that resources are being concentrated.

Professor Anderson and Dr Szuba call for greater scrutiny of the funding allocated to the UAS and the UIS and Professor Mortier asks about progress on identifying the savings and efficiencies expected to be delivered by the transformation programmes. The Council and the General Board will discuss options to bring the overall Academic University finances back into balance at an away day in March 2024.

The Council will review the content of the Budget/Allocations Report and other information provided to the Regent House, in particular using the data set as it develops from the EFT programme. The Council notes that additional information was subsequently provided to the Regent House to match the level provided in the 2019 Report, and it will ensure that this level of information continues to be reported.

Board commentary: This area has featured heavily in the Board's deliberations and activity during 2023–24 and the Board refers the Council to the Board's further observations and recommendations.

6. The Board recommends that the Estates Division expedite the gathering of robust space utilisation data so that informed decisions can be made on the size and shape of the estate.

The Council welcomes the Board's recommendation to expedite the gathering of robust space utilisation data to inform decisions on the size and shape of the estate.

Space utilisation surveys started in the Michaelmas Term 2023 as a part of the evidence-gathering for the Reshaping our Estate programme. The programme aims to establish facts and present opportunities to make the estate more efficient, effective, sustainable, and fit-for-purpose. To measure space utilisation, a survey team is recording usage of an identified space on multiple occasions throughout each day over a full week. Once all surveys are complete, the team will have surveyed approximately one-third of the estate (approximately 200,000 sq m) on city centre sites and in West Cambridge.

Analysis of the data will be completed during the Lent Term 2024 and for each surveyed space the results will include average use, peak use, frequency of use, and total occupancy when in use. The outcomes will be reported to the Estates Committee in support of the Committee's consideration of opportunities for providing higher quality and better used spaces within the Reshaping our Estate programme. The Estates Committee will subsequently make recommendations to the General Board and the Council. The Council will seek the approval of the Regent House where those recommendations touch on matters requiring that approval.

Board commentary: The Board received confirmation that the space utilisation audit had been completed during the year and its results reviewed.

⁴ Links to the published Allocations Reports and FMI reports are provided at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/finance-committee/Pages/budget.aspx> and <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/finance-committee/Pages/fmi.aspx> respectively.

7. The Board recommends that the Council set out deliverable projects for the estate, in order to provide greater impetus towards the University's declared decarbonisation and sustainability goals within an affordable and risk-contained framework.

The recommendation from the Board of Scrutiny refers to the University's sustainability goals. This response relates only to the University's environmental sustainability commitments pertaining to the operational estate. However, the University is in the process of developing an institutional strategy on climate and environmental sustainability that will communicate commitments and priorities in relation to sustainability beyond the operational estate (see *Reporter*, 6722, 2023–24, p. 195). The Council hopes that the creation of an additional Pro-Vice-Chancellorship, to be funded on a cost-neutral basis, will provide impetus for progress on the University's wider sustainability goals.

The University's carbon reduction target requires energy-related emissions from the operational estate to be reduced by 75% by 2030–31 (against 2015–16 levels) and to absolute zero by 2048. Achieving both the mid-term and longer-term targets requires the University to significantly reduce its use of gas, as emissions from gas now make up the majority of the estate's energy-related emissions.

With a focus on the mid-term target, the Estates Division has a number of carbon reduction projects in delivery; see Table 1 at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6726/Estates-carbon-reduction-projects.pdf> (University account required) for examples. The projects on Table 1 include a combination of:

- opportunities that are being taken to decarbonise a building or site as part of/alongside other work the University is already doing (Whittle Laboratory, Cavendish II and Mill Lane site);
- opportunities to secure government funding for projects that are eligible for the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS) (Keynes House and Donald McIntyre Building);
- site-wide heat networks (Sidgwick and West Cambridge sites), which the Division knows from previous work are the most technically and economically viable solution for decarbonising the University's key sites.

These considerations collectively help to reduce overall costs to the University and the risk of 'regret spend'.

In parallel, the Estates Division is developing a longer-term programme of heat decarbonisation (degasification) projects. This includes establishing cost- and carbon-reduction estimates for the potential projects, which will inform prioritisation of projects within the programme. Crucially, the scheduling and prioritisation of projects will also take account of the University's programme of major refurbishments, and specific proposals emerging from the Reshaping our Estate programme; wherever possible, decarbonisation will be delivered through or as part of projects (or, in the case of the programme, disposals) that the University is planning to carry out anyway, as this will be key to reducing cost, disruption and risk.

The Council will receive an updated heat decarbonisation programme in Lent Term 2024, with the expectation of publishing details in the *Reporter* once finalised. It should be noted that the programme will not be static – it will continue to change and develop to reflect changes to the Reshaping our Estate programme and the major refurbishment programme.

Besides carbon reduction, the University has also set out a number of other environmental sustainability commitments for its estate in its Biodiversity Action Plan and Transport Strategy. Programmes of work are underway to deliver against these; progress is reported annually in the University's Environmental Sustainability Report.

Board commentary: The Board is grateful for the Council's response. The Board refers the Council to the Board's Twenty-ninth Report, specifically its comments on sustainability and the difficulties noted in siloed behaviours and differing understandings of the resources available to deliver a co-ordinated and affordable plan.

8. The Board recommends that the Council direct the Registry to propose the terms of reference for a review of the HR Division, possibly as the first in a rolling programme of reviews of UAS Divisions.

A review of HR was carried out in Michaelmas Term 2020 by an external consultant, whose report was shared with the HR Committee. It recommended strengthening capacity. In response, the Division has established an organisational development team and an investigations team, and is in the process of establishing a case management team. In addition, the HR Division recently commissioned targeted reviews of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and the Learning and Development teams to address concerns regarding capacity in those areas.

It should also be noted that Reimagining Professional Services (RPS) is looking precisely at the issue the Board is concerned about: the distribution of functions and expertise between the centre and that devolved to institutions, to ensure consistent service delivery across the University. RPS will be looking at this not just within HR but across all professional services functions, focusing on how the functions interact with Schools, Faculties and Departments, and the equivalent in Non-School Institutions. As a result, the services provided across the University should become more connected, effective and efficient. To layer a series of UAS reviews on top of the work already under way would cut across RPS and the other change programmes which are already established; it would distract colleagues from successfully delivering those change programmes, the scale of which should not be underestimated; and could lead to confusion.

On a related note, one of the two examples given as reasons for instigating a review of the HR Division (delays in the payment of Examiners in summer 2022) did not in fact fall within the remit of the HR Division. The Council commends the Division for the significant body of work it has successfully completed in 2022–23 not mentioned in the Report, for example, the delivery of the Hybrid Working Policy, a revised Dignity at Work Policy and an International Working Policy, and numerous other activities in response to the challenges in recruitment and retention post-pandemic.

Board commentary: The Board is glad that RPS, and professional services more widely, is looking at the issues it is concerned about. The Board refers the Council also to remarks made in its Twenty-ninth Report concerning People and Finance.

9. The Board recommends that the Council publish a timetable for the regular publication of special issues and certain Reports, to include the Financial Statements, Financial Management Information, Officers numbers, the Allocations Report, and the Annual Reports of the Council and the General Board.

The Council agrees with the Board that, now that the team responsible for publication of the *Reporter* is back to a full complement of staff, it would be helpful to have more certainty about the timing of publication for certain regular Reports and for the special issues of the *Reporter*. It therefore proposes that each year the Annual Reports of the Council and the General Board be published in November/December, the list of Fellows in December, the Financial Statements in January/February, the Financial Management Information in February/March, the Budget/Allocations Report in June/July, and the membership of University bodies (what was the Officers number Part II special issue) also in June/July. The Officers number Part I special issue includes a list of officers by institution. Regent House membership for University staff is no longer predicated, for the majority, on holding an office, so the main purpose of publishing that list has been removed, and therefore it will no longer be published. The list of Professors, Clinical Professors, Professors (Grade 11), and Readers, who are eligible for appointment to the Council in class (b), and the remaining parts of the Officers number Part I special issue will continue to be published in the special issue providing the membership of University bodies in June/July.

Board commentary: The Board is grateful for the Council's response.

GRACES

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 23 October 2024

The Council submits the following Grace to the Regent House. This Grace, unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 112), will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 1 November 2024. 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: (i) the stipends for all non-clinical University staff whose stipends are spine points on the Cambridge general stipend and salary scale be increased as set out in the Schedule to the Council's Notice (p. 58); and (ii) the stipends for non-clinical officers whose stipends are not spine points on the general scale, except the stipend of the Deputy High Steward, be increased from the 1 August 2023 values by £900 with effect from 1 August 2024, and by a percentage to bring the total award to 2.5% with effect from 1 March 2025, until further notice.

[§] 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 25 October 2024

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on 25 October 2024:

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

1. FARBOD AKHLAGHI-GHAFFAROKH, Fellow of Christ's College, and Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Oxford (2022).

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

2. KATHARINE ELIZABETH BAILEY, Managing Director, Cambridge Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring, in the Press and Assessment Department.
3. ADRIAN SPENCER CLARK, Director, Group Finance, in the Press and Assessment Department.
4. BENJAMIN RICHARD DENNE, Director of Publishing, Academic Books, in the Press and Assessment Department.
5. HELEN RACHEL EXWORTH, Head of Business Partnering, Shared Services and Academic, in the Press and Assessment Department.
6. ELENA FILIMONOVA, Fellow of Selwyn College.
7. AÍDA GARCÍA MIEZA, Director, Iberia, in the Press and Assessment Department.
8. STEFAN MATTHIAS GOETZ, University Lecturer in the Department of Engineering.
9. SAID REZA HUSEINI, Fellow of King's College.
10. ALICE JILL HUTCHINGS, Fellow of King's College.
11. MICHAEL TADAO INOUE, Professor of Systems Genomics and Population Health in the Department of Public Health and Primary Care.
12. OLEG IVANOVICH KITOV, Fellow of Selwyn College.
13. ROBERT MARK LAING, Managing Director, South Africa, in the Press and Assessment Department.
14. CHRISTINE ANNE ÖZDEN, Global Director, Climate Education, in the Press and Assessment Department.
15. QUN PAN, Asia Director, Academic Publishing, in the Press and Assessment Department.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 26 October 2024

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on 26 October 2024.

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

1. TAMSIN JOY SAMUELS, Fellow of Darwin College, and Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Oxford (2019).

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

2. NATHANIEL ANDERSON, Fellow of Darwin College.
3. MICHELLE ANGELA LINTERMAN, Fellow of Churchill College.
4. SANDRA PETRUS-REURER, Fellow of Darwin College.
5. SUZANNE MARIE TONKIN, Fellow of Lucy Cavendish College.
6. STEPHEN THOMAS WILFORD, Fellow of Wolfson College.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Fitzwilliam College

Elected to a Fellowship in Class C, with effect from 1 October 2024:

David Hardman, M.A., M.Eng., *CC*
Rebecca Heath, B.A., *K*, M.Phil., *CHU*

Elected to a Fellowship in Class A from 1 October 2024:

Natalie Morningstar, B.A., *Yale*, M.Phil., Ph.D., *TH*

Elected to a Fellowship in Class B from 1 October 2024:

Kasia Boddy, M.A., *Edinburgh*, Ph.D., *K*

Wolfson College

Elected to an Honorary Fellowship with effect from 9 October 2024:

Professor Jane Clarke, FMedSci, FRS

Elected to a Bredon Fellowship:

Wei Wang, B.A., *Shanghai University of Finance and Economics*

Elected to a College Official Fellowship (Title C) with effect from 1 October 2024:

Salim Al-Gailani, B.A., *UCL*, M.Phil., Ph.D., *DAR*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship (Title G) with effect from 1 October 2024:

Nikhil Bassi, M.Pharm., *Bath*, M.B., B.Chir., *W*
Gareth Bird, M.Phys., *Oxford*, Ph.D., *Birmingham*
David Bulmer, B.Sc., *Manchester*, Ph.D., *UCL*
Riccardo Masina, B.Sc., *Imperial*, M.B., B.Chir., *W*,
FHEA
José Paiva Miranda de Siqueira, B.A., *Brasília*,
M.A.St., Ph.D., *CHR*

Vacancies

Christ's College: College Lectureship and Post-Doctoral Fellowship in Economics (fixed term); tenure: from 1 September 2025 to 31 August 2029, or for a similar period with dates to be agreed (not renewable); stipend: £40,311–£46,735; closing date: 6 December 2024 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/vacancies-christs-college>

Clare Hall: Research Fellowship Competitions (up to seven posts available: four in the Sciences, three in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences); non-stipendiary; tenure: three years from 1 October 2025; closing date: 10 November 2024; further details: <https://www.clarehall.cam.ac.uk/rf/>

Events

Hughes Hall

Black History Month Seminar Event

This panel discussion as part of Black History Month will take place on 28 October 2024, from 6–7.30 p.m., in the Pavilion Room, Hughes Hall; further details and booking: <https://www.hughes.cam.ac.uk/about/events/black-history-month-seminar/>

Awards

Girton College

William Dusinberre Prize 2025

Girton College has established a new prize to support and recognise student research and engagement with the legacies and practices of enslavement; the prize, of £500, will be open to all students registered during the academic years 2023–24 and 2024–25; competition opens: Lent Term 2025; submission deadline: 30 April 2025; further details and application criteria: <https://www.girton.cam.ac.uk/news/girton-college-william-dusinberre-prize-2025>

SOCIETIES, ETC.

Cambridge Philosophical Society

The Society's second talk of the Michaelmas Term, 'Surging cylinders, flapping wings and gust encounters: Force production in unsteady flows', by Professor Holger Babinsky (Department of Engineering), will take place on Monday, 28 October 2024 at 6 p.m., in person at the Bristol-Myers Squibb Lecture Theatre, Department of Chemistry, Lensfield Road; free and open to all; further details and booking: <https://www.cambridgephilosophicalsociety.org/events/event/holger-babinsky>