

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6759

WEDNESDAY 13 NOVEMBER 2024

VOL CLV No 8

## CONTENTS

### Notices

Calendar	111
Discussion on Tuesday, 10 December 2024	111
Notice of a benefaction	111
Amending Statutes for Magdalene College	111
Statutes approved	111
Grace for submission to the Regent House under Special Ordinance A (ii) 5 (divestment from the arms industry): Notice from the Council	112
Topic of concern to the University on the future of the EJRA: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	113
Stipends of the holders of consultant clinical academic offices and payment for clinical responsibility from 1 April 2024	115
<b>Notices by the General Board</b>	
Establishment of a Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health	115
Establishment of a Professorship (Grade 11) of Molecular and Cellular Biology	115
Kettle's Yard Committee	116

### Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

Annual meetings of the Faculties	116
----------------------------------	-----

### Reports

Report of the Council on the office of Chief Financial Officer	117
--	-----

### Graces

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 13 November 2024	119
--	-----

### *End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'*

### Report of Discussion: 5 November 2024

Twenty-ninth Report of the Board of Scrutiny	121
--	-----

### College Notices

Elections	127
Vacancies	127
Events	127

### External Notices

Oxford Notices	127
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

## NOTICES

### Calendar

29 November, *Friday*. End of third quarter of Michaelmas Term.

30 November, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.

6 December, *Friday*. Full Term ends.

10 December, *Tuesday*. Discussion by videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).

#### Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

10 December

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

30 November

### Discussion on Tuesday, 10 December 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, 10 December 2024 at 2 p.m. The following item will be discussed:

1. Report of the Council on the office of Chief Financial Officer, dated 13 November 2024 (p. 117).

Those wishing to join the Discussion by videoconference should email [UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto: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](mailto:contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk), copying [ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk), by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion for reading out by the Proctors,<sup>1</sup> 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 House<sup>2</sup> 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](mailto: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/>.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.scrutiny.cam.ac.uk/> and [https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/regent\\_house\\_roll/](https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/regent_house_roll/).

### Notice of a benefaction

7 November 2024

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that she has accepted with gratitude a benefaction of £4,122,000 from the Board of Cambridge in America following a donation from Peter and Christina Dawson to endow a Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health. The General Board is proposing the establishment of the Professorship in perpetuity and an endowment fund to support the Professorship (see p. 115 and Graces 2 and 3, p. 119).

### Amending Statutes for Magdalene College

7 November 2024

The Vice-Chancellor begs leave to refer to her Notice of 11 October 2024 (*Reporter*, 6755, 2024–25, p. 45), concerning the text of a Statute to amend the Statutes of Magdalene College. She hereby gives notice that in the opinion of the Council the proposed Statute makes no alteration of any Statute which affects the University, and does not require the consent of the University; that the interests of the University are not prejudiced by it, and that the Council has resolved to take no action upon it, provided that the Council will wish to reconsider the proposed Statute if it has not been submitted to the Privy Council by 7 November 2025.

### Statutes approved

7 November 2024

The Registry has received notice from the Clerk of the Privy Council that His Majesty the King, at a Council held on 6 November 2024, was pleased to approve amendments to Statutes A I, B I and D II, which were submitted in accordance with Grace 2 of 14 February 2024.<sup>1</sup>

These changes enable membership of the University to be removed for the non-payment of fees as set out in Ordinance, remove a provision stating that resignation of University membership entails cancellation of any degree, and confirm the circumstances in which loss of membership of the University will entail loss of membership of the Senate.

<sup>1</sup> See *Reporter*, 6729, 2023–24, p. 283.

## Grace for submission to the Regent House under Special Ordinance A (ii) 5 (divestment from the arms industry): Notice from the Council

7 November 2024

The Council has received and considered a Grace initiated under Special Ordinance A (ii) 5 by 165 members of the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6751, 2023–24, p. 860). That Grace seeks support for divestment from companies involved in the defence industry by the beginning of Michaelmas Term 2025. The Grace also asks the Council to publish a Report to consider the costs and effects of that divestment and to provide a timetable for achieving that outcome. There is some cross-over between the Grace and matters relating to the University's investments raised by students taking part in a protest encampment on King's Parade over the summer. Discussions between student representatives and senior officers concluded in August 2024 with a set of agreed actions.<sup>1</sup>

The Council has decided to authorise submission of the Grace (Grace 1, p. 119). In reaching that decision, the Council notes that it has sole responsibility for decisions about investments, and therefore the Grace would not be binding on the Council if approved by the Regent House.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, the Council believes it is appropriate to examine these matters now, given that there is likely to be significant support in the Cambridge community for a considered appraisal of the University's investments and noting that many universities and other public sector bodies are examining similar issues.

The Council has agreed to set up a working group to consider the matters raised by the students and has expanded its remit to cover the additional points raised by members of the Regent House in the Grace. The terms of reference for the working group, set out in the Annex below, acknowledge the legal and regulatory framework within which the Council, as the University's trustee body, operates. Whilst the Council shares the desire of the signatories to undertake the work without delay, it notes the complex issues raised by the Grace. The Council will ask the group to aim to complete its work by the end of the academic year.

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.cam.ac.uk/notices/news/upholding-our-values-responding-to-calls-from-our-university-community>.

<sup>2</sup> See Statute F I 1(a) and Special Ordinance F (i) 1(a), as revised by Grace 2 of 8 March 2023 and approved by His Majesty in Council (*Reporter*, 6732, 2023–24, p. 405).

### ANNEX

#### Working Group on Investments in and Research Funded by Companies belonging to the Defence Industry

##### *Terms of Reference*

##### **Background**

The Council is aware that many members of the University are deeply concerned about the tragic events unfolding in many parts of the world. In the past few months, a group of students expressed their concerns in the form of an encampment on King's Parade. In addition, at the end of July 2024, members of the Regent House submitted a Grace on divestment of the defence industry for consideration by the Council.<sup>1</sup>

Following a constructive dialogue between members of the University's senior leadership team and delegates on behalf of the students protesting on King's Parade, a number of actions were agreed.<sup>2</sup> These included that relevant University bodies would review the approach to responsible investment and the guidelines that inform its research funded by companies belonging to the defence industry. It was further agreed that a working group would be established to make recommendations to the relevant University committees that oversee policies in relation to investments and research.

##### **Scope**

The Working Group will determine a suitable definition of companies to be classified as belonging to the defence industry.

The Working Group will consider two areas of enquiry, investments and research, in relation to the defence industry and make recommendations to the relevant University committees including the Council.

The Working Group will evaluate the two areas of enquiry in the wider context of the following:

- the University's role as a civic institution in the UK (including in relation to national security);
- the University's commitment to academic freedom and freedom of speech; and
- the University's obligations under charity law and other relevant legislation such as export control.

##### *Investments*

The Working Group will consider the following questions in relation to the University's investments in the Cambridge University Endowment Fund (CUEF):

- whether the Statement of Investment Responsibility<sup>3</sup> (i.e. the University's policy as an investor in the CUEF) is in line with its institutional values in relation to the defence industry;
- whether it considers that the CUEF's classification of companies belonging to the defence industry is satisfactory for the University as an investor in the CUEF;
- whether it is satisfied with the level of disclosure to the University as investor in the CUEF of any direct or indirect exposure to the defence industry in the CUEF investment portfolios; and
- what (if any) any issues arise from potential divestment from the defence industry.

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 6751, 2023–24, p. 860.

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.cam.ac.uk/notices/news/upholding-our-values-responding-to-calls-from-our-university-community>.

<sup>3</sup> *Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 45.

In assessing these questions, the Working Group will take into account:

- that the CUEF investment model is to invest via third-party fund managers;
- that distributions from the CUEF play an indispensable role in the University's finances;
- that the CUEF invests donations made to the University, its Colleges and associated charitable trusts. It is overseen by the Cambridge University Endowment Trustee Body (CUETB); and
- the Responsible Investment Principles of the CUETB.

#### *Research relationships*

The Working Group will consider:

- whether the University's guidelines/principles that inform its research funded by companies belonging to the defence industry are in line with its institutional values.

In assessing this question, the Working Group will take into account:

- that the University encourages collaborations and believes that openness is integral to its success as a world-leading research-intensive University.

#### **Consultations**

The Working Group is expected to base its assessments and recommendations on evidence. The Working Group has access to legal advice via Legal Services, who can also help facilitate external legal advice. The Working Group is encouraged to seek expert advice on any matter within its remit as it sees fit.

A number of higher education institutions and other public sector bodies are currently engaged in similar processes and discussions. The Working Group is encouraged to talk to comparable institutions about their deliberations and approaches.

#### **Membership**

The Working Group will comprise the following members:

- Chair
- Two student members of the Task Force (appointed by the Task Force)
- A student member of the Council appointed by the Council
- Two members appointed by the Council
- Two members appointed by the General Board
- One member appointed by University of Cambridge Investment Management (UCIM)

#### **Spirit of Enquiry**

The Council acknowledges that the issues to be explored by the Working Group are complex and that members of the Working Group will hold a variety of views. It expects that the members of the Working Group will treat each other with respect and conduct their business in a spirit of collaboration and transparency.

### **Topic of concern to the University on the future of the EJRA: Notice in response to Discussion remarks**

*7 November 2024*

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 8 October 2024 on the above Topic of concern concerning the future of the Employer Justified Retirement Age, or EJRA (*Reporter*, 2024–25: 6752, p. 3; 6755, p. 48). It has consulted with the General Board in preparing this reply.

The Topic of concern, raised by 16 members of the Regent House, states that 'the recent ballot<sup>1</sup> removed academic-related staff from the category of those subject to the EJRA and raised the age to 69. This means that now only a tiny proportion of the University's employees are affected and calls into question the justification it needs to be lawful'. Those members have requested a Report of the Council and the General Board on the future of the EJRA 'now that it applies to a shrinking proportion of the University's employees'. Several speakers reiterate and expand on these points, with Mr Haynes suggesting that 'we have not clearly heard any robust case for the full meaning of the 'J' in EJRA', Professor Kramer contending that 'the University has not discharged its legal burden of proof for its retention of a mandatory retirement age', and Professor Rau expressing his concern that 'the Regent House has effectively voted to implement a policy that may well be unlawful'. Others take a different stance. Dr Skittrall counsels those sharing the signatories' views to accept the outcome of the ballot and Professor Penty, Chair of the Retirement Policy and EJRA Review Group, suggests that, after lengthy consultation and debate of these issues, it is time to move on.

Regarding the numbers affected by the changes, the Council notes that just under 400 established academic-related staff were taken out of scope of the EJRA on 1 September 2024, with just under 1,800 established academic staff remaining in scope. Therefore, whilst there has been a reduction in the numbers affected, it is not a significant decrease given the overall number of academic officers remaining in scope.

<sup>1</sup> See *Reporter*, 6750, 2023–24, p. 828.

However, the number of employees who are subject to an EJRA as a fraction of the total number of employees is unlikely to be a material factor in determining whether an EJRA is objectively justifiable. What is paramount is whether the employer can objectively justify applying the EJRA to a staff category. An employer does this by demonstrating that the EJRA is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim when applied to that staff group, considering the potentially discriminatory impact on those affected. The Review Group considered that this legal test was met for established academic staff, but not for established academic-related staff, hence the recommendation to remove the latter from the scope of the EJRA. The Review Group arrived at this conclusion, having explored the issues from a range of perspectives, over the course of approximately a year.<sup>2</sup> Its work resulted in an detailed report, containing its approach, recommendations and rationale.<sup>3</sup>

Professors Baert, Evans and Kramer note the possibility of claims of age discrimination from former Cambridge staff coming before the Employment Tribunal. If there are such cases, the Council notes that it will be for the Employment Tribunal, and not the Council or indeed individual members of the Regent House, to determine whether the EJRA now in place is objectively justifiable.

Professors Baert and Baron-Cohen refer to the vacancy creation rates published in the Review Group's report, question the methodology used to determine them, and draw comparisons with the equivalent rates at Oxford, noting the adverse outcome of Employment Tribunal cases for Oxford based on those figures. Mr Haynes claims that the EJRA at Cambridge is essentially identical in all relevant respects to that at Oxford. The Council refers to its previous comments on similar arguments but notes that vacancy creation arising out of the EJRA at the University of Cambridge is significantly higher than at Oxford.<sup>4</sup>

The Council agrees with Professor Baert that there are other ways of enhancing intergenerational fairness beyond the EJRA, and that fundraising is one way of providing the University with additional resources to support its mission, albeit an unpredictable one. However, pursuing other means does not diminish the role of the EJRA in balancing the interests of younger and older cohorts.

Professor Evans draws attention to a statement in the Council's response to fly-sheets that the EJRA is an important measure for opening up opportunities for early career and fixed-term researchers 'at an institution where the number of available established posts is otherwise restricted by the availability of funding and broadly static student numbers'.<sup>5</sup> The Council stands by this statement; it does not claim that the number of University teaching offices is fixed or static, as Professor Evans implies.

The Regent House endorsed the recommendations of the Council and General Board in a ballot held in June 2024. On a very high turnout, the results of that ballot demonstrated widespread support for an EJRA (74% of the votes at first count), whether in its current form at the time of the ballot or as revised under the proposals.<sup>6</sup>

Mr Haynes suggests that voters did not have sufficient opportunity to review the case made by those in favour of abolition of the EJRA, including in a paper on the arXiv economics server authored by Linton *et al.*<sup>7</sup> The Council notes that many of the points raised in the Discussion on 8 October, including references to the findings of that paper, were addressed by the Council ahead of voting opening, and were mentioned in fly-sheets provided to voters.<sup>8</sup>

Professor Baert states that the proportion of academic-related staff and non-established academics within the membership of the Regent House has increased, and the group adversely affected by the vote (academic officers) form a minority in the Regent House. The Council notes that all academic officers are included in the membership, whereas most other University staff must hold positions at Grade 9 and above to be included. Although no analysis is available of the breakdown of the membership of the Regent House at the time of the ballot, it is likely that academic officers continued to make up a significant proportion of the electorate in this ballot.<sup>9</sup>

The Council notes Professor Baert's comments on the way in which the Grace was presented but observes that it is usual practice for a Grace to be presented as a 'package' for approval. It has concerns about Professor Baert's statement that 'academic-related and non-established academic staff were in a position to vote in a way that discriminated against established academics whilst lifting the EJRA for themselves'. Firstly, unestablished staff, whether they are academics or not, are not subject to the EJRA; this was the position prior to the ballot and has not changed since. Secondly, if the Regent House has agreed on who to include in its membership, it cannot then question the validity of a decision on the basis of the motivations of its members. The composition of the Regent House does not change depending on the matter for approval.

The Council understands that members of the Regent House will continue to hold different views on the merits of the EJRA. However, based on the remarks made, it sees no compelling arguments for reopening this matter, following such a decisive vote in favour of an EJRA. The Council will therefore not be publishing a further Report on the EJRA at this time.

Finally, Professor Penty notes the ongoing work arising from the review, to simplify the extensions process and to improve post-retirement engagement for those who want it. The Council acknowledges that this was an area of frustration with the University's retirement arrangements and looks forward to the conclusion of this important project.

<sup>2</sup> This included consideration of the 2018 analysis carried out by Dr Dan Lunn, to which Professors Baron-Cohen and Rau refer in their remarks.

<sup>3</sup> See the Review Group's report, published as part of the Joint Report presenting the Group's proposals for approval (*Reporter*, 6741, 2023–24, p. 578). The analysis of data procured from the Higher Education Statistics Agency is set out in a separate report; see 'Reviewing the Employer Justified Retirement Age (EJRA) at Cambridge' at <https://universityofcambridgecloud.sharepoint.com/sites/StaffHub/SitePages/Employer-Justified-Retirement-Age.aspx> (University account required). Due to the conditions of the University's agreement with Jisc, the HESA data report is accessible to members of University staff and members of the Regent House only.

<sup>4</sup> See in particular the section responding to comments on intergenerational fairness in the Council's Notice dated 10 June 2024 (*Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 661).

<sup>5</sup> *Reporter*, 6750, 2023–24, p. 829.

<sup>6</sup> See footnote 1.

<sup>7</sup> See <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14611>.

<sup>8</sup> *Reporter*, 2023–24: 6744, p. 637; 6745, p. 661; 6750, p. 829.

<sup>9</sup> See for example the analysis published in 2021 (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 452). This includes a breakdown of the 2020 Regent House membership and of University employees overall and compares that with modelling of membership under proposals for changes. A grade-based model with a threshold at Grade 9 and transitional arrangements was adopted, which is modelled as GG9 in the 2021 analysis. This shows academic staff continuing to be the largest University staff group within the membership. This analysis predates the introduction of an academic (teaching and scholarship) career path.



## Stipends of the holders of consultant clinical academic offices and payment for clinical responsibility from 1 April 2024

8 November 2024

Agreement has been reached on the salary arrangements for Consultant clinical academic staff with effect from 1 April 2024. There is a 6% increase at all pay points.

The values of National Clinical Excellence Awards (CEAs) and Local CEAs under the previous scheme, discretionary points and distinction awards remain unchanged.

In accordance with the principle that the remuneration of clinical academic staff in Cambridge should be broadly comparable with that of equivalent staff in other UK medical schools, the General Board has agreed to approve revised stipends and scales of stipends for clinical appointments in Cambridge.

The figures currently shown in Schedule II to the Ordinance for Stipends (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 687) are replaced with effect from 1 April 2024 and are as follows:

With effect from 1 April 2024: £105,504, £111,713, £114,893, £126,017, £139,882.

## NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD

### Establishment of a Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health

The General Board has agreed to propose the establishment in perpetuity of a Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health from 1 October 2025, assigned to the Department of Psychology and linked to a Fellowship at St Catharine's College. The salary costs of the Professorship will be fully funded by a gift of £4,122,000 as an endowment to be held on trust by the University, together with £378,000 donated as endowment to St Catharine's College to meet the costs of the associated Fellowship.

As reports of mental health issues among school and university students continue to rise globally, there is a pressing need to bolster existing support systems and ensure that Cambridge not only provides the best support to its students, but also leads the way globally in advancing the science and practice of student mental health. The Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health will greatly enhance the School of the Biological Sciences' Neuroscience, Psychology and Behaviour research theme. The officeholder will be expected to provide research and teaching leadership in young people's mental health within the Department of Psychology and across the University more broadly. It is also envisaged that the Dawson Professor will collaborate with Student Services to further improve the quality of mental health support provided for the University's students. Further, through a Fellowship at St Catharine's College, the officeholder will provide leadership for the implementation of mental health initiatives across the University and the Colleges. While it is entirely possible that the officeholder will have clinical qualifications, this will not be a requirement, and the Professorship will be open to those from a more translational science background.

The Dawson Professor is expected to play a full role in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching. In particular, the officeholder will be expected to contribute to lectures and courses in mental health at undergraduate level in the Psychological and Behavioural Sciences Tripos, with occasional additional contributions to other relevant undergraduate and postgraduate courses. A full role with graduate research students will also be expected.

The General Board has agreed, on the recommendation of the Council of the School of the Biological Sciences and the Faculty Board of Biology, that appointments shall be made by an *ad hoc* Board of Electors and that candidature shall be open without limitation or preference to all persons whose work falls within the general field of the title of the office.

The Council is submitting Graces (Graces 2 and 3, p. 119) for the approval of the establishment of the Professorship in perpetuity and regulations to govern the related endowment fund.

### Establishment of a Professorship (Grade 11) of Molecular and Cellular Biology

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Biology and the Council of the School of the Biological Sciences, has approved the establishment of a Professorship (Grade 11) of Molecular and Cellular Biology for a single tenure from 1 January 2025. The Board has agreed that the Faculty Board will assign the office to a Department within the Faculty of Biology to align with the appointee's field and experience. The office will be fully funded from existing Chest resources available to the School. The Chair of the Resource Management Committee approved the funding arrangements for the office under delegated authority on 9 October 2024.

The officeholder's research interests will be driven by new technologies using cross-disciplinary approaches – including advanced imaging, machine learning, sequencing/genomics and structural biology – allowing integration of new technologies to interrogate molecular and cellular information. An appointment in this area will promote stronger engagement across partner institutes outside of SBS (e.g. at CIMR, MRC-LMB). The recruitment of a Molecular Cell Biologist with strong interests in both the adoption and development of new technology to further advance research in this area is central to the strategic themes of many funders both in Biology and across related disciplines. This research area also fits within the remit of UKRI Physics of Life programme and the ongoing Engineering Biology funding call, and associated UKRI strategies. The officeholder will contribute to teaching, examining, and administration of existing or new undergraduate and postgraduate courses at all levels. In Part Ib of the Natural Sciences Tripos, relevant courses include Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Pathology, Cell and Developmental Biology, and Pharmacology. The appointee will also be expected to contribute to the teaching of Part II courses in Pathology, Genetics, Biochemistry or Pharmacology and to the M.Phil. Degree course in Therapeutic Sciences or the new pathways in Biomolecular science and Cell science offered as part of the M.Phil. Degree course in Biological Sciences.

It is anticipated that the officeholder will take a leadership role in the School's Molecules and Cells research theme, and there will also be an opportunity for the individual to play a key role in the development of an MRC Centre of Research Excellence.

This office is the seventh of seven new Professorships (Grade 11) to be recruited across the School's six research themes: Molecules and Cells; Reproduction, Development and Lifelong Health; Infection and Immunity; Functional and Evolutionary Genomics; Neuroscience, Psychology and Behaviour; and Organisms, Evolution and Ecology (*Reporter*, 2023–24: 6736, p. 475; 6739, p. 545; and 2024–25, 6754: p. 37 and p. 38).

## Kettle's Yard Committee

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Kettle's Yard Committee, has agreed to make changes to the membership of the Committee and the consequential amendments to General Board Regulations noted below. These changes:

- revise the Committee's membership so that there are six (instead of five) members appointed by the General Board and six (instead of five) co-opted members, with the latter to be appointed for three years and reappointable for a further three years, instead of until 31 December of the year in which they are co-opted or of the following year as the Committee shall determine at the time of their co-optation;
- make one further minor change to the membership, to update the description of the experience required of at least one of the co-opted members;
- remove the provision requiring the Registry to appoint a Secretary to the Committee, now that this appointment is made from among the staff at Kettle's Yard;
- update the titles of the 'Assistant to the Director' to the 'Assistant Director' and the 'Music Secretary' to the 'Music Associate' and the duties of the latter;
- remove the provision for an Honorary Curator, as this is no longer used;
- remove the requirement for the Appointments Committee to be a standing committee, instead enabling it to be constituted when there is a vacancy.

In the General Board Regulations for the Committee (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 657), by amending Regulations 2(b) and (g), 3, 6, 8, 11(b) and the last sentence of Regulation 9 to read as follows, removing Regulation 7 and renumbering the remaining regulations:

- [2.] (b) six members appointed by the General Board, one on the nomination of the Director of Finance and one from among the senior staff of the University's museums and collections;
- (g) not more than six persons co-opted by the Committee, at least one of whom shall have expertise within the contemporary visual arts.

3. Members in class (b) shall be appointed in the Michaelmas Term to serve for three years from 1 January following their appointment, followed by the option of reappointment for an additional three-year period. Co-opted members shall serve for three years, followed by the option of reappointment for an additional three-year period.

6. There shall be a person appointed to the post of Music Associate, who shall act as secretary of the Music Sub-committee and undertake such other duties as the Kettle's Yard Committee shall determine.

8. There shall be the University offices of Director of Kettle's Yard and Assistant Director of Kettle's Yard. The Director shall be a member of the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art.

[9.] Members in classes (c) and (d) shall be appointed when there is notice of a vacancy.

[11.] (b) to provide oversight of the Kettle's Yard accounts;

## NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.

### Annual meetings of the Faculties

#### *Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*

The Co-chairs of the Faculty Board of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies give notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held **at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, 19 November 2024**, in Rooms 8 and 9, Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, Sidgwick Avenue.

The main item of business will be the election of two members of the Faculty Board in category (e) 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 should be received by Glenn Garner ([ames-admin@ames.cam.ac.uk](mailto:ames-admin@ames.cam.ac.uk)), Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, Sidgwick Avenue, not later than Friday, 15 November 2024.

## REPORTS

**Report of the Council on the office of Chief Financial Officer**

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Report proposes changes to Ordinances to enable the offices of Director of Finance and Chief Financial Officer to merge into one new office of Chief Financial Officer.

2. In its Notice dated 23 September (*Reporter*, 6752, 2024–25, p. 4), the Council reported on plans to combine the two offices as part of a longer-term proposal to consolidate the University's financial management. The Council discussed those plans in more detail at its meeting in October. It expects to start the search for a new Chief Financial Officer in good time so that the appointee can take up office by early 2026, to align with the planned departure of Mr Odgers in December 2025. However, there is some flexibility in the dates, to allow for the possibility of an overlap for a handover from Mr Odgers to the new appointee.

3. In 2017, the Council appointed the University's first Chief Financial Officer (CFO) to oversee the University's wider operating assets and investment portfolio as well as its long-term strategic and financial plan.<sup>1</sup> The CFO currently shares financial leadership responsibilities with the Director of Finance. The proposal is now to consolidate the University's financial management in a new CFO role that incorporates the oversight responsibilities of the Director of Finance. In this new role the CFO will:

- remain a member of the University's senior leadership team, reporting to the Vice-Chancellor, and providing strategic oversight of the University's financial position;
- continue to be the main adviser to the Council on financial matters, conveying the views of the Finance Committee, which is responsible for the consideration of the financial resources available to the University and for recommending to the Council the medium-term financial strategy for the University;
- take on responsibility for leading and managing the Finance Division (250 FTE) in support of all aspects of operational financial accounting, management and control of the Academic University and its subsidiary companies; and

- become the key sponsor for the University's Finance Transformation Programme (FTP), providing unified and focused leadership during the delivery and embedding of this programme.

4. The Council fully intends this consolidation of two senior positions to result in overall savings, although they will be marginally offset by other staffing changes to ensure that the role of CFO, as revised, is manageable.

5. The Ordinances currently state that the CFO is a Council appointment, under the direction of the Council, and the Director of Finance is a senior officer heading the Finance Division and reporting to the Registry. The proposed changes to Ordinances are set out in Annex A. The amendments include:

- an explicit reference in the Ordinance for the CFO stating that the CFO reports to the Vice-Chancellor; and
- changes to the Ordinance for the Unified Administrative Service to set out that the CFO heads the Finance Division, is responsible to the Council for the performance of that Division, and is a member of relevant appointment committees.

The opportunity is also being taken to allow the Chair of the Standing Appointments Committee to approve the appointment of additional members to the membership of Appointing Committees.

6. If this Report's recommendations are approved:

- the Council will determine the date that the changes to Ordinances are to take effect, to reflect the start date of the appointee to the office of CFO, as revised; and
- the Council has agreed to make changes to the Financial Regulations and the Sites and Buildings Regulations<sup>2</sup> to replace references to the Director of Finance with references to the Chief Financial Officer, and to remove references to the Director of Finance where there are already references to the Chief Financial Officer.

**7. The Council recommends** that the changes to Ordinances as set out in Annex A be approved, to take effect on a date agreed by the Council.

13 November 2024

DEBORAH PRENTICE,  
*Vice-Chancellor*

ZOE ADAMS

SARAH ANDERSON

MADELEINE ATKINS

GAENOR BAGLEY

MILLY BODFISH

ANTHONY DAVENPORT

JOHN DIX

SHARON FLOOD

ALEX HALLIDAY

HEATHER HANCOCK

LOUISE JOY

ELLA MCPHERSON

SCOTT MANDELBROTE

SALLY MORGAN

RICHARD MORTIER

ALEX MYALL

SHARON PEACOCK

JASON SCOTT-WARREN

ALAN SHORT

ANDREW WATHEY

MICHAEL SEWELL

PIETER VAN HOUTEN

<sup>1</sup> See the Council's Annual Report for 2015–16 (*Reporter*, 6448, 2016–17, p. 202).

<sup>2</sup> Both reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 1051 and p. 1061.



## ANNEX A

The Council proposes the following changes to Ordinances:

- (a) By amending the Ordinance for the Chief Financial Officer (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 693) to read as follows:

Appointments and reappointments to the University office of Chief Financial Officer shall be made by the Council. The Chief Financial Officer is placed under the direction of the Council through the Vice-Chancellor, with such duties as the Council shall determine from time to time.

- (b) In the Ordinance for the Unified Administrative Service (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 693) by amending Regulations 2, 3, 6(c) and 7(a) to read as follows (retaining the existing footnote):

2. (a) Save as provided in Regulation 3:

- (i) under the provisions of Statute C VI, the Registry shall be the head of the Unified Administrative Service;
- (ii) the Registry, under the direction of the Council, shall manage the University Offices and their staff, budgets, space, and other resources provided to the Offices by the Council. It shall be the duty of the Registry to ensure that arrangements for the quality assurance of the services provided by the Offices are presented to the Council and are implemented as agreed by the Council;
- (iii) within each Division of the Unified Administrative Service there shall be the University office of Director (or such other title as may be determined from time to time by the Council) who shall be head of the Division and whose duties shall include the management of the Division, under the overall responsibility of the Registry.

(b) The Registry, or a University officer appointed by the Registry, shall be the Establishment Licence Holder for facilities regulated by the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986. The Registry shall make such reports on the work of the University Offices to the Council as that body may require.

3. The Chief Financial Officer shall be the head of the Finance Division and shall have the same responsibilities as the Registry under Regulation 2(a)(ii) in respect of that Division.

[6.] (c) the Registry (or a deputy appointed by the Registry) and

- (i) the Chief Financial Officer (or a deputy appointed by the Chief Financial Officer) if the appointment is to be made in the Finance Division; or
- (ii) the Director of the Division in which the appointment is to be made (except where it is the Director of the Division who is to be appointed or reappointed);

[7.] (a) (i) Appointments and reappointments to the offices of Director, Deputy Director, Assistant Director, Principal Assistant Registry, Principal Assistant Treasurer, Senior Assistant Registry, and Senior Assistant Treasurer shall be made by the Standing Appointments Committee on the recommendation of an Appointing Committee, the membership of which shall be approved by the Chair of the Standing Appointments Committee.

(ii) Subject to sub-paragraph (iii) below, the Appointing Committee shall consist of the Registry (or a deputy appointed by the Registry), the Director of the Division in which the appointment is to be made, an appropriate senior academic-related officer, a senior academic with experience and interest in what the role of the office entails, a member of the Standing Appointments Committee in class (b), and such additional members as the Chair of the Standing Appointments Committee sees fit to approve.

(iii) If the appointment is in the Finance Division, the Appointing Committee shall consist of the Chief Financial Officer (or a deputy appointed by the Chief Financial Officer), two appropriate senior academic-related officers, a senior academic with experience and interest in what the role of the office entails, a member of the Standing Appointments Committee in class (b), and such additional members as the Chair of the Standing Appointments Committee sees fit to approve.

## GRACES

**Graces submitted to the Regent House on 13 November 2024**

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, unless they are withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 112), will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 22 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.<sup>§</sup>

1. The Regent House, as the governing body of the University, requests<sup>1</sup>
  - (a) that the University disclose in aggregate form the direct and indirect exposure of its investments within and outside the Endowment Fund in companies whose business is concerned with the arms industry, as defined below;<sup>[1]</sup> and that the University commits to divest from the arms industry within the time period specified below; and
  - (b) that the Council publish a Report to the University within six months of issuance of this Grace setting out how the University will divest from the arms industry. This Report should:
    - (i) provide costed details of how the University will divest from the arms industry; and
    - (ii) consider the effects of divestment on the University's mission and function; and
    - (iii) set out a timetable for divestment which is to be completed no later than the beginning of Michaelmas Term 2025 – with the understanding that divestment from private equity funds may require further time.
  - (c) that the Council put in place measures to ascertain that divestment has been completed, and to prevent future investments of this kind. Information on this category of investments should be included in the annual report of the Cambridge University Endowment Fund henceforth.

<sup>[1]</sup> Utilising the Church of England Ethical Investment Advisory Group's recommendations, companies are classified as belonging to the arms industry if:

- (i) they are involved in the production or supply of indiscriminate weaponry (defined as nuclear weapons, anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons or biological weapons), with no turnover threshold to be applied; or
- (ii) they are involved in the production, processing, supply or storage of weapons-grade nuclear fissile materials, with no turnover threshold to be applied; or
- (iii) they are involved in the provision of strategic parts or services for anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions, chemical weapons or biological weapons, with no turnover threshold to be applied; or
- (iv) they derive more than 10% of their turnover from strategic military sales including conventional military platforms, whole military systems, weaponry or strategic military parts or services; or
- (v) further to this definition, this Grace adds: they are technological surveillance companies that derive more than 10% of their revenue from their technologies being used by states for military purposes; or they are companies associated with violations of international humanitarian conventions, laws and regulations.

2. That, on the recommendation of the General Board, a Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health be established in perpetuity from 1 October 2025, placed in the Schedule to Special Ordinance C (vii) 1, and assigned to the Department of Psychology.<sup>2</sup>

3. That a Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health Fund be established in the University, to be governed by the following regulations:<sup>2</sup>

#### DAWSON PROFESSORSHIP OF YOUNG PEOPLE'S MENTAL HEALTH FUND

1. The funds received from Cambridge in America following a donation from Peter and Christina Dawson, together with such other sums as may be received or applied for the same purpose, shall form an endowment fund called the Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health Fund to advance research in the field of young people's mental health by supporting a Dawson Professorship of Young People's Mental Health.

2. The Managers shall be responsible for the administration of the Fund and the application of its income and shall comprise the Head of the Department of Psychology, the Head of the School of the Biological Sciences and a member nominated by the Faculty Board of Biology, one of whom shall be appointed Chair by the Faculty Board.

<sup>1</sup> See the Council's Notice, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> See the Vice-Chancellor's Notice, p. 111 and the General Board's Notice, p. 115.

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

3. Subject to Regulation 4, the income of the Fund shall be applied towards the payment of the stipend, national insurance, pension contributions, and associated indirect costs of the Professorship payable by the University.

4. Any unexpended income in any financial year, including income accrued during a vacancy in the Professorship, may at the discretion of the Managers:

- (a) be applied to support the work of the Professor;
- (b) with the approval of the Council of the School of the Biological Sciences, be applied to support research in the field of young people's mental health in the University in such manner as may be recommended by the Managers; and/or
- (c) be carried forward for use as income in accordance with Regulation 3 in any one or more subsequent financial years.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

**END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'**

## REPORT OF DISCUSSION

### Tuesday, 5 November 2024

A Discussion was convened by videoconference. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Dr Michael Rands, *DAR*, was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Junior Proctor, the Senior Pro-Proctor and sixteen other persons present.

#### *Twenty-ninth Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 8 October 2024*

(*Reporter*, 6756, 2024–25, p. 65).

Dr R. V. L. DOUBLEDAY (Centre for Science and Policy, Christ's College and out-going Chair of the Board of Scrutiny):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as out-going Chair of the Board of Scrutiny I'm pleased to introduce the Board's Twenty-ninth annual report to the Regent House.

The Board of Scrutiny was established to provide independent oversight of the workings of Council and the University's leadership. The opportunity to question senior officers and follow lines of inquiry on behalf of the Regent House is a privilege. During the course of the year, I was repeatedly struck by our University's vitality. There's no doubt that this stems from the excellence and dedication of the people that work here – and the still strong sense of collegiality.

Having said that, the University faces tough challenges – not least from increasing financial pressures, regulatory demands, technological changes and societal expectations. And as the administration of the University grows in response to these challenges, our established ways of working are coming under pressure. Our culture of 'bottom up' priority setting and decision making by committee needs to be constantly reviewed and adapted.

My sense is that the University recognises this and is in the process of responding. For example, as set out in our Report, the Board has welcomed recent progress on the People Strategy, Teaching Review and on Environmental Sustainability.

However, the role of the Board is to scrutinise, and the Report highlights that more needs to be done to improve our collective capacity to make difficult decisions, stick to those decisions and focus on their efficient implementation.

In our Twenty-ninth Report, we focused on the importance of including financial considerations in planning and decision-making. The Board welcomed efforts to increase the quality of financial information through Enhanced Financial Transparency; and the budgetary discipline imposed by the announcement of 5% cuts over the next two years. And I welcome plans to consolidate the University's financial management by combining the offices of Chief Financial Officer and Director of Finance to provide leadership during the delivery of the Finance Transformation Programme.

Alongside the Finance Transformation Programme, the University has also been running transformation programmes in research services, HR and estates. For the past several years the Board has been concerned that the University may have bitten off more than it could chew, and has called for greater prioritisation, sequencing and overall operational grip.

The Board has welcomed the sense that this view is now widely shared and that there is a greater recognition of the importance of effective operational delivery. For example, by reducing duplication of roles and responsibilities between the centre, Schools, and Faculties and Departments.

Finally, I would like to thank the Vice-Chancellor and the Registry and all the other officers who gave their time to take part in the Board's discussion. I would also like to thank my fellow Board members. And finally, on behalf of the Board of Scrutiny as a whole, I would like to thank the Regent House for its engagement. I'd like to encourage members to continue to engage with the democratic self-governance of this University.

Mr R. J. HOPWOOD (Murray Edwards College and current Chair of the Board of Scrutiny):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I was a member of and secretary to the Board of Scrutiny last year and as such a contributor to its Twenty-ninth Report. This year I chair the Board of Scrutiny.

It struck me that the Vice-Chancellor's commendable address found particular resonance with many of the issues raised in the Board of Scrutiny's Twenty-ninth Report, and I wanted to echo and highlight one or two.

Firstly, I should note that the spirit in which the Board makes its Report is entirely positive. The University deserves its world-class reputation. Contributing some £30 bn to the UK economy is no mean feat and does not happen by accident. And that makes it even more important to be vigilant to the possibility of strategic drift or even decline, the onset of which, as the Vice-Chancellor noted, may be difficult to spot.

The Board found a few potential signs of this. There were worsening finances, the reasons for which, we were told, may not be fully or properly understood; worries about the coordination and expensive delivery of major projects; burgeoning administrative costs; an unwieldy, often ineffective Estate, and governance structures where more seemed somehow to deliver less.

It is undoubtedly true that the regulatory framework and funding for the HE sector have tightened in recent times. That and inflation have brought significant pressures. So, while the Board is keen to note that the overall financial position of the University remains sound, getting a firmer grip of operations and finances is, in its view, required to allow the University to make better, more agile choices, to meet the right, longer-term priorities and avoid waste. If it prevaricates or does not do so, inevitable consequences will follow.

In some ways, the Board felt the University was at an inflection point. Investment is indeed needed in a number of areas, in the right people, in the right buildings and in the right structures. This is needed to retain the University's justified position as a world-leading university.

'Salami slicing', or 'unstrategic' financial planning, as the Report notes, often leads to an ineffectual, short-term solution to a real problem, especially where structural deficits are concerned. Everyone appreciates that making decisions to discontinue or reform activity to free up resources for investment in the right priorities is never easy – but for organisations that deserve and wish to retain their global pre-eminence, it can be vital.

Mr G. P. ALLEN (Wolfson College and former Chair of the Board of Scrutiny):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, my comments concern paragraphs 52–62 of the Board's Report, which set out substantial projected deficits of the order of £45m–£60m over three years (2023–26) for the 'Academic University' and, more worryingly, the inability of the central offices to provide the Board (paragraph 59) with satisfactory explanations for the origins of these deficits. The Report also refers in paragraph 53 to the development since 2018 of Enhanced Financial Transparency (EFT) as: a means of '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 of 'attributing income where earned, with costs aligned to those income streams ... and indirect costs...'

Starting in the 1990s with what was originally known as the Disaggregation Analysis, then became the Resource Allocation Model (RAM), and supplemented by input from external consultants, the central bodies have had information for many years of the attributable income streams and costs and accordingly of which areas of the University were in surplus and those which were in deficit. The winners and losers of course fluctuated over time and the Resource Management Committee wisely resolved merely to 'have regard' to an institution's place in the RAM when considering the allocation of resources and not mechanically to follow the RAM.

It is hard to believe that it has taken the tenures of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Director of Finance, and Chief Financial Officer to develop the data in pursuit of the holy grail of EFT and meanwhile putting off the time for hard decisions about resource allocation and stopping spending; however in its Notice of 23 September 2024,<sup>1</sup> announcing the forthcoming departures of the latter officers, the Council passed the baton of EFT within the Finance Transformation Programme to their successor. The Vice-Chancellor, as Chair of the Planning and Resources Committee, is to be commended for initiating a 5% cut in Chest allocations to arrest the growing deficits. As the Board's Report makes admirably clear in paragraph 65, EFT may offer better information, but it will not generate income and 'it will not produce better decision-making unless that information is acted upon'. I hope the Council will take the recommendation in paragraph 62 seriously, set a firm timetable for reducing the annual deficits with or without EFT, and not simply kick the can down the road to the next generation of senior financial managers.

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 6752, 2024–25, p. 4.

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History), received by the Proctors:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, there is a significant omission from this Report. Among the duties of the Board of Scrutiny are to take a close look at the Council's activities and to report on them to the University. The Board of Scrutiny's members include the Proctors, who are also expected to be present at Council meetings. At the Council's meeting on 15 July the Vice-Chancellor proposed three new rules to manage 'how the confidentiality of business' is to be 'handled on the Council', limiting what its members may discuss outside its meetings and with whom.<sup>1</sup> The Council approved these rules. Why? The Council's Standing Orders already limit the confidentiality of reserved business almost entirely to the naming of names 'relating to the employment or promotion of individuals by the University' and 'the admission and academic assessment of individuals'. 'The expectation is that as little business as possible will be reserved'. The Freedom of Information Act legislation protects from disclosure at s. 36 information which may 'prejudice' the 'effective conduct of public affairs', but where should that restriction be set in the context of frankness with the University's governing body, the Regent House? A mention of Council's three intended changes would have been welcome, since they have not been put to the Regent House.

The Report is chiefly concerned with problems in the 'operation' of the University's 'silos'. The Board suggests there are 'too many', resulting in 'duplication of roles and responsibilities at the centre, Schools and Faculties/Departments', with 'not enough co-ordination' among them. It points to resulting 'siloed thinking'. There are silos within silos. The Board sees a need to improve 'operation' not only between A and B but between every pair and cluster seeking to work cooperatively amongst all these entities.

In one of the three broad areas it has chosen, the Board has duly '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'. To 'improve' that the governing bodies of the University and the Colleges would all have to work together and the Privy Council could find itself very busy approving changes of their statutes. There is, however, some room for manoeuvre in practice. As an example, the University has 'allocated postgraduate applications to colleges on the basis of a target ratio of PhDs:MPhils and automatically cut off Colleges at 30% of their minimum wish for PhD students, until all colleges had reached this level'.<sup>2</sup>

The Board's first Recommendation concerns the Teaching Review. This has two purposes: to tackle the concerns about supervisions which were prominent in the last academic year and 'also investigate the greater potential for joint appointments, especially supporting Colleges that struggle to recruit teaching fellows'.

Some operational cooperation is in evidence in connection with the first. A Joint statement<sup>3</sup> by Justice4CollegeSupervisors<sup>4</sup> and the Colleges, University and Office for Intercollegiate Services appeared in April reporting the findings of the Undergraduate Supervisor Workload Survey.<sup>5</sup> The controversy over the Colleges' role in appointing supervisors has 'exposed', says the Board, 'some of the siloed thinking in the University that saw the provision of supervisions as simply a College matter'.



On the second, the Report expresses concerns about the lack of a developed system of conjoint appointments in Cambridge. Oxford's system of conjoint appointments is long established, with academic vacancies advertised on behalf of both the University and a named College (or stated alternative Colleges) sometimes 'in association with' or simply 'and'. In Cambridge an academic may be employed both by the University and a College but not 'conjointly'. Typically 'Academic' vacancies are advertised on behalf of a Faculty or Department. College Lectureships are advertised by the relevant College and tend to be fixed-term and involve a required number of supervisions.

Cambridge's University Teaching Officers (UTOs) must give at least thirty hours' lectures a year under Special Ordinance C (ix) 5. The University preserves for these Officers (under Special Ordinance C (xi) 3), the requirement of the Oxford and Cambridge Act of 1877 s. 15 to promote the interests of the University in 'education, religion, learning, and research' (except for 'religion'). UTOs are therefore free to choose to give more time to research than to teaching.

Though UTOs are not required to supervise, Colleges regard them as desirable additions to their Fellowships. There is a helpful guide to 'the purpose of the UTO Scheme' as designed to 'enable all Colleges to operate effectively in the educational field by ensuring a reasonable distribution of University Teaching Officers (UTOs) amongst them'.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless since UTOs may choose not to belong to a College at all 'operational' reform faces quite a cliff to climb in making fundamental changes to the collaboration of University and Colleges over teaching.

The Board refers to the Annual Report of the Council for the academic year 2022–23, which 'set out five main elements' of an emerging 'People Strategy' to cover 'recruitment and offer; career progression and retention; culture and institution; pay and benefits; and diversity and inclusion'. Minute 963 of the Council at its meeting of 15 July records that this strategy was intended to 'ensure that the University could position itself as an employer of choice' but it was commented that 'it would be important that it was implemented consistently throughout the University' and there were reservations about the 'focus on talent management'.

The Board does not mention the role of the Careers Syndicate among whose responsibilities is 'to establish and organize means of communication between members of the University who are seeking employment and employers', therefore precisely to deal with the problem of the silos.<sup>7</sup> However, under 'People' and the University's 'People Strategy', it considers the 'Career Pathways'. It welcomes the introduction of a Teaching and Scholarship Pathway<sup>8</sup> and the plans to introduce more open-ended rather than fixed-term contracts for early-career researchers. Arrangements for transfer between Pathways was soon found to need a Grace.<sup>9</sup> How much such 'transfer' is happening?

The Board is less than congratulatory about 'HR processes'. It has 'received concerns that the time taken to investigate and conclude staff complaints and grievance processes were unduly lengthy'. It notes that 'the University is updating and streamlining its policy, with the aim to respond in a timely manner'. The procedure was amended as recently as May 2023, through a Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on changes to the University's Dignity at Work Policy and Grievance Policy.<sup>10</sup> Has that approved things?

The Board's Report touches only lightly upon the continuing controversy about the Employer Justified Retirement Age, mentioning it briefly in connection with 'the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)' agenda and the EJRA Review Group's estimate of 'additional salary costs if the retirement age was scrapped'. It is nevertheless a very live issue. A Topic of concern Discussion called on the Future of the EJRA was held on 8 October with the remarks made published in the *Reporter* of 16 October.<sup>11</sup> Almost all the speakers called for reform or abolition of the EJRA.

This is not the only year in which the Board of Scrutiny has expressed concerns about the operation of the University's governance, commenting that 'the need to increase understanding between the central bodies and the Regent House is a hardy perennial'. This year its heading is 'Governance needs more teeth'. It points out that 'the University governance structure is designed so that the University is run by committee, rather than individuals' and is critical that there is 'insufficient challenge evidenced in the proceedings of University committees'. There has, it says, been too much 'box-ticking'. 'Effective committees need to be critical friends' to those tasked with presenting proposals and implementing decisions.

The Board of Scrutiny is itself intent on being such a 'critical friend'. In due course the Council will publish its comments on the Report. History suggests that its recommendations may need to be repeated before they are acted on. It is to be hoped that will not be necessary this time.

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter 4: Standing Orders of the Council, The Council Handbook: <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/council-handbook/Pages/council-standing-orders.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> See Minute 833 of Sidney Sussex's College Council meeting of 22 May 2024, available at [https://www.sid.cam.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2024-05-22 Council Minutes Unreserved Business \(Approved\)\\_0.pdf#page=6](https://www.sid.cam.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2024-05-22%20Council%20Minutes%20Unreserved%20Business%20(Appealed)_0.pdf#page=6).

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ucu.cam.ac.uk/joint-statement-j4cs-and-the-colleges-university-and-office-for-intercollegiate-services-11-4>

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

<sup>5</sup> See Lent Term 2024 Undergraduate Supervisor Workload Survey Initial Report: [https://www.seniortutors.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/supervisor\\_workload\\_survey\\_report.pdf](https://www.seniortutors.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/supervisor_workload_survey_report.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.ois.cam.ac.uk/uto-scheme>

<sup>7</sup> *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 130.

<sup>8</sup> See *Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 454.

<sup>9</sup> *Reporter*, 6677, 2022–23, p. 135.

<sup>10</sup> *Reporter*, 6698, 2022–23, p. 635.

<sup>11</sup> See *Reporter*, 2024–25: 6752, p. 3 and 6755, p. 48.

Dr M. J. RUTTER (Cavendish Laboratory and Queens' College), received by the Proctors:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it is always pleasing to read the Board of Scrutiny's Annual Report, and I commend its members for the work they do on behalf of us all to ensure that the University is well-governed and learns from its successes and mistakes. Yet again I find myself wishing that I had more time to prepare these remarks, so that I might respond better to the Board's labours.

The Board expresses concern about the University's financial position. At least at the University level the overall financial position is known. My experience is that, over the past couple of decades, the amount of financial information at Departmental and Research Group level which is internally circulated, let alone discussed, has declined. Committees therefore end up considering items with clear financial implications, but with little understanding of whether costs can be met from existing resources.

As one example, I am aware that many like to blame the deficit on the increase in numbers of support staff. It is undeniable that such numbers have increased, and that staff cost money. But should I not be confident that no new post would have been created unless full funding for it had been identified? Should I not also be confident that spending money on streamlining and automating processes would have been considered alongside spending money on increasing staff headcount? And should I not be confident that the costs of poor staff retention are considered when pay and conditions are set? The costs include extra time spent on recruitment, handovers and training, and a lack of institutional memory resulting in time and resources wasted in unnecessary mistakes and in re-inventing wheels.

Financial accountability and prudence do not seem to be institutionally ingrained at all levels in this University, so perhaps it is unsurprising that there is difficulty balancing the books.

In its previous Report the Board recommended that Council publish a timetable for certain Special issues of the *Reporter*. This was done, and the Board notes its gratitude. But the Council stated that the *Officers Number, Part I* would no longer be published, stating that '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'.

I do not see how the main purpose of the *Officers Number* was ever to do with Regent House membership. The Roll of the Regent House is published separately, and there is no proposal to cease doing so. Its publication is required by Statute A III 10. One would not consult the *Officers Number* to determine whether someone else was a member of Regent House; one would consult the Roll directly. Nor would one consult the *Officers Number* to determine whether one was an Officer oneself. One would consider one's employment contract, or maybe whether one had signed 'The Book'.

But there was, and is, a purpose to the *Officers Number*. For better or worse (opinions vary), the rights, responsibilities and employment conditions of Officers and non-Officers differ. The *Statutes and Ordinances* are full of references to Officers, by which holders of an Established Office is always meant. It is therefore useful for third parties to be able to determine who is, and who is not, an Officer. And, given that the University is a public body, it could well be argued that the list of those who enjoy (and suffer) the consequences of an Established Office should be a matter of clear public record, and perhaps of historical record too. We should not have to guess which of our colleagues fall under Statute C and Ordinance XI.

Publishing an edition of the *Reporter*, when so few paper copies are now produced, should not cost much money. The production of the Officers number should be highly automated, being little more than a query on central HR records, and some formatting which too could be mostly automatic. I would question whether the Board should express gratitude for the Council's decision to cease publishing this number, and I wonder if the Council would reconsider, or, at the least, better justify, this change?

Finally, in the Recommendations of its 2022 Report, was written 'the Board recommends that the Council sets out how it will ensure proper accountability of UIS to the Regent House'. In 2023, the Board's response to the Council's comments on this point was 'the Board welcomes this, and will keep the issue under review'. This year's Report does not mention the UIS. Is all going well, or does the subheading above paragraph 75, 'governance needs more teeth', apply?

Dr W. J. ASTLE (MRC Biostatistics Unit), received by the Proctors:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Board of Scrutiny 'welcomes the introduction of a career path up to professor level for people in teaching-focused roles via the Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) Pathway and more open-ended rather than fixed-term contracts'.

In July the University extended the Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) career pathway to include clinical academics.<sup>1</sup> Minutes dated 13 June 2024 record that the HR Committee 'approved a proposal to create Clinical Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) offices and posts, including a new Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) office of Clinical Professor for established staff, and a post of Clinical Teaching Professor for unestablished staff'.<sup>2</sup> In fact, there remains a single class of office of Clinical Professor in the University, although the duties of the holders of the office, which are 'determined by the Faculty Board or other body concerned', are no longer required to include either teaching or research.<sup>3</sup>

A glance at the Report of the General Board on the outcomes of the Academic Career Pathways (Research and Teaching) and (Teaching and Scholarship) 2024 exercises indicates that promotions in the Teaching and Scholarship Pathway are made overwhelmingly into unestablished posts.<sup>4</sup> The open-ended employment contracts issued to those holding unestablished academic posts often include a 'limited funding' clause containing a warning that 'if this funding ceases then your post may be at risk of redundancy'. The high bar for redundancy set by the Schedule to Statute C does not apply to academics who do not hold University offices.<sup>5</sup> The Research Operations Office will not allow unestablished academics to apply for grants that might run beyond an end date given in a limited funding clause. (My own open-ended contract still contains a limited funding clause with an end date of 31 December 2023).

Recent disclosures by the University under the Freedom of Information Act, of papers relating to a ruling by the Vice-Chancellor a quarter of a century ago, suggest that the creation of unestablished academic posts may be unlawful. By the 1990s, the General Board had begun to make appointments to unestablished academic posts on external funds. Several of these were described as 'at the level of Professor or Reader'. They included, for example, a Northern Telecom Research Professorship of Photonics.<sup>6</sup> In 1999, the General Board decided that some general policy was needed to regulate such appointments.

On 12 May it published a Notice setting out a ‘Procedure for appointments to unestablished posts at the level of Professor or Reader’, which listed three routes to an appointment: the creation of a post due to the academic need of a Faculty, the creation of a post for a personal promotion and the creation of a post for a person in receipt of an external award.<sup>7</sup>

A request for a Discussion of the Notice as a Topic of concern to the University signed by ten members of the Regent House was received by the Registry.<sup>8</sup> In that Discussion, held on 26 October 1999, Dr (now Professor) A. W. F. Edwards explained that he had written to the Registry:

I reminded him of the sentence in Statute D, XIV [now in Special Ordinance C (vii)] ‘No Professorship shall be established in the University except by Grace of the Regent House after publication of a Report of the General Board’, and I added my view that prefixing the words ‘Research’ or ‘Unestablished’ or any other word to ‘Professorship’ did not avoid the Statute.<sup>9</sup>

Professor Edwards subsequently made a representation to the then Vice-Chancellor, Professor Sir Alec Broers, for statutory review of the practice of making appointments to unestablished posts designated ‘Research Professorships’. On 21 March 2001, the General Board announced the outcome in a Notice on ‘Appointments to unestablished posts at the level of Professor and Reader’:

In December 1999, Dr (now Professor) A. W. F. Edwards made a formal representation to the Vice-Chancellor under Statute K, 5 that the General Board’s practice of making appointments to unestablished Research Professorships was in contravention of the University’s Statutes. A legal opinion on this representation was accordingly sought, which confirmed that the practice was *ultra vires*.<sup>10</sup>

That opinion has now been disclosed by the Information Compliance Office, together with a preliminary opinion on Professor Edwards’s representation from the University’s solicitor, Gary Attle. He advised that the University cannot evade the statutory regulation of academic posts simply by labelling a post ‘unestablished’:

Unless we are instructed otherwise, it seems to be the case that a post is treated as unestablished (and outside the Statutes) if it is called unestablished and not created/established under the Statutes. We believe that this is a circular argument and likely to be regarded as an impermissible way of avoiding the Statutes in respect of Professorships.<sup>11</sup>

Counsel, Robert Jay, QC, agreed:

There is no category of ‘unestablished professor’: the phrase is, I regret to say, a contradiction in terms and the justification for the putative category entails dangerous circularity.<sup>12</sup>

It seems quite likely that analogous arguments hold for the categories of University office other than Professor.

Although the ruling arising from Professor Edwards’s representation is still in force, it is tacitly ignored. The University now employs over 300 staff in unestablished academic posts, almost 1 in 6 of its academics. Unestablished posts with the title ‘Teaching Professor’ have been created, directly contrary to the ruling of Sir Alec Broers in 2000. The review of researcher reward and progression arrangements is likely to lead to a Report proposing the reintroduction of the use of the title ‘Research Professor’ for unestablished posts, the practice that was previously ruled *ultra vires*.<sup>13</sup>

In its Twenty-seventh Report, the Board of Scrutiny noted that it awaited justification from the HR Committee of the practice of making appointments in the Teaching and Scholarship pathway to academic posts that are unestablished:

In response to remarks made in the Discussion, the Council observed that ‘there may be good reasons of business efficiency’ for needing on occasion to appoint to unestablished academic Teaching and Scholarship roles. The Board awaits the HR Committee’s explanation of what such business reasons might be.<sup>14</sup>

Did that explanation ever arrive?

Following the Board’s Twenty-seventh Report the Council agreed to a review of the increase in the use of unestablished posts in the University, a review which has been repeatedly postponed.<sup>15</sup> Meanwhile the practice of making unestablished academic appointments continues systematically, at the expense of academic freedom and of the quality of the University’s teaching and research. Consequently, I have made a representation to the Vice-Chancellor for review under Statute A IX 1.

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 6751, 2023–24, p. 882.

<sup>2</sup> Minute 2588/24, Minutes of the HR Committee, dated 13 June 2024, [https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/hr/2024-06-13/MeetingDocuments/HRC Minutes 13 June 2024 \(Unreserved\).pdf](https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/hr/2024-06-13/MeetingDocuments/HRC Minutes 13 June 2024 (Unreserved).pdf) [University account required].

<sup>3</sup> See *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 683.

<sup>4</sup> *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 685.

<sup>5</sup> *Statutes and Ordinances*, pp. 24–6.

<sup>6</sup> *Reporter*, 5528, 1992–93, p. 244.

<sup>7</sup> *Reporter*, 5773, 1998–99, p. 587.

<sup>8</sup> *Reporter*, 5779, 1998–99, p. 766 and 5787, 1999–2000, p. 62.

<sup>9</sup> *Reporter*, 5791, 1999–2000, p. 156.

<sup>10</sup> *Reporter*, 5842, 2000–01, p. 552.

<sup>11</sup> Legal advice given to the University by Gary Attle, Mills and Reeve Solicitors, dated 14 January 2000.

<sup>12</sup> Opinion of Robert Jay, QC, 39 Essex Street, dated 5 June 2000.

<sup>13</sup> Researcher reward and progression consultation document, [https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/rtp\\_consultation\\_document.docx](https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/rtp_consultation_document.docx)

<sup>14</sup> *Reporter*, 6672, 2022–23, p. 57 at p. 65.

<sup>15</sup> *Reporter*, 6714, 2023–24, p. 52.

Mr R. S. HAYNES (University Information Services), received by the Proctors:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a Senior University Computer Officer based in the University’s Information Services, a long-standing UCU<sup>1</sup> member and Union Learning Representative.

I want to add to the thanks to the Board of Scrutiny for its clarifying report and the ongoing vital role it plays in the operation of the University.

I would like to briefly highlight a few points which are in support of this vital scrutiny.

It is heartening to read the focus of concern on siloed thinking and actions, which push apart the natural collaborative harmony which distinguishes the University at its best. A more strategic, participatory, and joined-up approach serves as a community-building enabler, an antidote to an overly hierarchical approach, in line with our vision and mission.

The concern about effective governance needing more teeth, along with critical friends, raises a common concern that reporting and the sharing of the minutes from various committees is too often significantly delayed and frequently outdated (e.g. on <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/>),

making it difficult to impossible for members of the University to engage and helpfully comment on the proceedings, or contribute to the topics planned for future Discussions, or keep track of plans, decisions, and road maps meant for meaningful development. Perhaps we can review improvements to sharing some of the key details, to foster greater participation and understanding of the governance processes and intended outcomes in our community.

It was good to see supportive comments about the Justice4CollegeSupervisors<sup>2</sup> campaign, both as the kind of critical friend commended in the Report, and its impact in helping to review and improve provision of teaching.

Curiously, the mentions of the EJRA reveal in part the continuing need for critical reviews and further resolution. The concern that ‘For good governance, the costs and benefits of all proposals should be clearly spelled out to the Regent House’ (Section 80) seems too quickly to presume that a report such as from the Review Group is sufficient in providing an estimate of costs, although overall its statistical data and methods have been challenged by the critically friendly and rigorous rebuttal of the report and its conclusions: (1) ‘Is the EJRA proportionate and therefore justified? A critical review of the EJRA policy at Cambridge’ – (paper)<sup>3</sup> and (2) The Penty Report: Flaws (summary)<sup>4</sup>.

In the recent Topic of concern<sup>5</sup> the Council was asked for a report to clarify pressing and still outstanding questions on the updated EJRA, including the full case for objective justification, which as the Board points out should naturally include full costing details and the overall impact on the University Community. We await the Council’s response.

In terms of staff recruitment and retention, and the recent People Strategy, as a brief matter of concern, while commendable that there are Academic Career Pathways, we have yet to develop such career pathways for all staff, particularly ones combining continuing professional development (CPD) coupled with career progression. This is not only logical and possible, but especially so for an educational institution. The unions stand ready to further engage in helping to bring this together, as a community, and hopefully we will see more progress on this as part of developing together the People Strategy.

<sup>1</sup> University and College Union: <https://www.ucu.org.uk>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ucu.cam.ac.uk/category/justice4collegesupervisors>

<sup>3</sup> Linton *et al.* / Review rebuttal article, available at: <https://www.econ.cam.ac.uk/research/cwpe-abstracts?cwpe=2428> or <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14611>.

<sup>4</sup> See Penty Report: Flaws on the End EJRA website: <https://sites.google.com/cam.ac.uk/end-ejra/the-penty-report-flaws>

<sup>5</sup> See *Reporter*, 2024–25: 6752, p. 3 and 6755, p. 48.



## COLLEGE NOTICES

## Elections

## Darwin College

Elected to an Official Fellowship under Title A from 4 November 2024:

Karishma Jain, Ph.D., *Q*

Elected to a Professorial Fellowship under Title C from 4 November 2024:

Serafina Cuomo, Ph.D., *DAR*

## Hughes Hall

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

Jane Mann, M.A., *Oxford*, M.A., *Cambridge*, FRSA

Malgorzata Zofia Marschall, B.Sc., *Gdansk*, M.Ed., *HO*, Ph.D., *Stockholm*

Elected to a By-Fellowship from 1 September 2024:

Rachel Holmes, M.A., M.Litt., Ph.D., *St Andrews*

Anna-Maria Kypraiou, B.Sc., *Athens*, M.Phil., Ph.D., *N*

Aram Mooradian, RIBA I, RIBA II, *Architectural*

*Assoc. Sch. of Architecture*, RIBA III, *Westminster*

Sebastian Raza, B.A., *Ecuador*, M.A., *Warwick*, Ph.D., *SE*

Felix Waldmann, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D., *CAI*

## Newnham College

Elected to a Visiting Bye-Fellowship in Category H with effect from August 2024:

Rashalee Mitchell, B.Sc., M.Sc., *UWI Mona*

Elected to a Fellowship in Category C with effect from 25 October 2024:

Helen Bao, B.A., M.A., *Dongbei*, M.A., *N*,

Ph.D., *Hong Kong*

Elected to a Fellowship in Category D with effect from 25 October 2024:

Helen Taylor, M.A., *Oxford*, M.B.B.S., *London*, MRCP,

FRCR, Pg.Cert. (Med.Ed.), *Cambridge*, FHEA

Mezna Qato, B.A., M.A., *Chicago*, M.St., D.Phil., *Oxford*

Elected a Fellow Emerita in Category G with effect from 25 October 2024:

Judy Quinn, B.A., *Melbourne*, M.A., *N*, Ph.D., *Sydney*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship in Category H with effect from 25 October 2024:

Sue Jones, B.Sc., *KCL*, Ph.D., *UCL*

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship in Category H with effect from 6 November 2024:

Milena Ivanova, B.Sc., M.A., *Athens*, Ph.D., *Bristol*

## Trinity Hall

Elected into a Staff Fellowship with effect from 1 October 2024:

Edward Mair, B.A., M.A., Ph.D., *Hull*

## Vacancies

*Gonville and Caius College*: Visiting Bye-Fellowship for scholars from the Global South; open this year to scholars in the arts and humanities; tenure: twelve months from 1 October 2025 (or other agreed date); stipend: £30,000 plus research allowance; closing date: 28 February 2025 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.cai.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/visiting-bye-fellowship-for-scholars-from-the-global-south>

## Events

*Jesus College*

## China Forum Seminar series

‘What we know and what we don’t know about Zheng He’s voyages’, a virtual lecture by Dr Sally K. Church (University of Cambridge), will take place on Thursday, 14 November 2024, from 5 p.m. to 6.30 p.m.; further details: <https://www.jesus.cam.ac.uk/events/what-we-know-and-what-we-dont-know-about-zheng-hes-voyages>

## EXTERNAL NOTICES

## Oxford Notices

*Faculty of English Language and Literature and Worcester College*: Professorship of Language and Communication, endowed by News UK; tenure: from 1 September 2025 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 13 January 2025 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk>, vacancy ID: 176329

*Department of Paediatrics and Kellogg College*: Little Princess Trust Professorship of Paediatric Oncology; closing date: 10 February 2025 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk>, vacancy ID: 174451

*Department of Politics and International Relations and Nuffield College*: Postdoctoral Prize Research Fellowships in Politics (up to three posts available); tenure: three years from 1 September 2025 or as soon as possible thereafter; salary: £40,528; closing date: 5 December 2024; further details: <https://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/the-college/jobs-and-vacancies/postdoctoral-prize-research-fellowships-in-politics>

*Harris Manchester College*: Principal; tenure: from 1 October 2025 for seven years (with the possibility of renewal for a further three years); closing date: 13 December 2024; further details: <https://www.minervasearch.com/hmc>

*Merton College*: Stipendiary Lectureship in Mathematics (6 hours per week); tenure: one term from 6 January 2025 to 31 March 2025; stipend: £6,102 for the period of the appointment; closing date: 2 December 2024 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.merton.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>