

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6596

WEDNESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2020

VOL CLI No 8

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	146
Discussion on Tuesday, 24 November 2020	146
Elections to the Council	146
Election to the Board of Scrutiny	147
Report of the Council on the establishment of a Property Board: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	147

Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

Natural Sciences Tripos, Part III (Interdisciplinary Papers), 2020–21	148
Natural Sciences Tripos, Part III (Physics), and Master of Advanced Study in Physics, 2020–21	148
Bachelor of Theology for Ministry and Diploma in Theology for Ministry, 2020–21	149

Obituaries

Obituary Notice	149
-----------------	-----

Graces

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 18 November 2020	149
--	-----

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Report of Discussion: 10 November 2020

Report of the Council recommending allocations from the Chest for 2020–21	150
--	-----

College Notices

Vacancies	153
-----------	-----

Other Notices

Cambridge Endowment for Research in Finance (CERF)	153
---	-----

External Notices

Oxford Notices	153
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

- 24 November, *Tuesday*. Discussion via videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).
 28 November, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 11 a.m. (degrees in absence only).
 29 November, *Sunday*. End of third quarter of Michaelmas Term.
 4 December, *Friday*. Full Term ends.
 8 December, *Tuesday*. Discussion via videoconference at 2 p.m.
 19 December, *Saturday*. Michaelmas Term ends.

Discussion on Tuesday, 24 November 2020

The Vice-Chancellor invites those qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2019, p. 105) to a Discussion via videoconference on Tuesday, 24 November 2020 at 2 p.m., for the discussion of:

1. Report of the General Board, dated 9 November 2020, on the establishment of certain Professorships (*Reporter*, 6595, 2020–21, p. 141).
2. Report of the General Board, dated 9 November 2020, on an election to the Jacksonian Professorship of Natural Philosophy (*Reporter*, 6595, 2020–21, p. 142).

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

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 or Departmental affiliations they have.

Elections to the Council

13 November 2020

The Vice-Chancellor announces that the following candidates have been nominated in accordance with Statute A IV 2 for election to the Council, and that it has been certified to him that the candidates have consented to be nominated:

<i>Candidates</i>	<i>Nominated by</i>
Class (a): two from among the Heads of Colleges	
Professor Dame MADELEINE ATKINS, <i>LC</i>	Professor R. V. Penty, <i>SID</i> , and Professor S. Smith, <i>G</i>
Dr ANTHONY NIGEL STANLEY FREELING, <i>HH</i>	Dr P. J. Rogerson, <i>CAI</i> , and Lord Smith of Finsbury, <i>PEM</i>
Class (b): two from among the Professors and Readers	
Professor ANTHONY PETER DAVENPORT, <i>CTH</i>	Professor F. E. Karet, <i>DAR</i> , and Professor J. W. Dalley, <i>CTH</i>
Professor MARIA MANUEL GABAO LISBOA, <i>JN</i>	Dr M. G. Moreno Figueroa, <i>DOW</i> , and Professor S. R. S. Szezreter, <i>JN</i>
Dr JOHN DAVID RHODES, <i>CC</i>	Professor M. R. Laven, <i>JE</i> , and Dr E. K. Widdis, <i>T</i>
Professor EVIS SALA, <i>G</i>	Professor P. H. Maxwell, <i>T</i> , and Professor J. S. Dennis, <i>SE</i>
Professor BENJAMIN DAVID SIMONS, <i>JN</i>	Professor U. C. Goswami, <i>JN</i> , and Professor M. E. Cates, <i>T</i>
Class (c): four from among the other members of the Regent House	
Dr ZOE LOUISE ADAMS, <i>K</i>	Professor W. Burgwinkle, <i>K</i> , and Professor S. F. Deakin, <i>PET</i>
Dr ANN KAMINSKI, <i>ED</i>	Professor P. H. Maxwell, <i>T</i> , and Dr D. F. Wood, <i>ED</i>
Dr MICHAEL JOSEPH SEWELL, <i>SE</i>	Dr M. Frasca-Spada, <i>CC</i> , and Dr J. H. Keeler, <i>SE</i>
Dr NICHOLAS LUCA SIMCIK ARESE, <i>CAI</i>	Dr C. J. Goodson, <i>K</i> , and Dr P. M. Knox, <i>K</i>
Dr JOHN SUCKLING	Professor R. J. Anderson, <i>CHU</i> , and Professor P. B. Jones, <i>W</i>
Dr PIETER JACOB VAN HOUTEN, <i>CHU</i>	Dr P. J. Sloman, <i>CHU</i> , and Dr T. Tregear, <i>CAI</i>
Dr STEVEN WATSON, <i>W</i>	Mr C. F. Gilderdale, <i>JE</i> , and Dr G. Roberts, <i>T</i>
Ms JOCELYN MARGARET WYBURD, <i>CL</i>	Professor A. A. Copestake, <i>W</i> , and Professor C. J. Young, <i>PEM</i>

No other persons having been nominated, the candidates named above in class (a) are duly elected. It is necessary to hold elections in class (b) to select two from among the five candidates and in class (c) to select four from among the eight candidates. Those elected will serve for four years from 1 January 2021.

Voting will open at 10 a.m. on Friday, 27 November 2020 and close at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, 8 December 2020.

Election to the Board of Scrutiny

13 November 2020

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that he has received the following nominations, in accordance with Statute A VII 3, for election to the Board of Scrutiny to fill one vacancy in class (c)(ii) (members of the Regent House), and that it has been certified to him that the candidates have consented to be nominated:

Dr GILLIAN CLARE CARR, *CTH*, nominated by Professor Sir Mark Welland, *CTH*, and Professor M. L. S. Sorensen, *JE*

Dr ROBERT VINCENT LEVESON DOUBLEDAY, *CHR*, nominated by Dr G. L. Burgess, *ED*, and Professor R. W. Prager, *Q*

It is necessary to hold an election to select one from among the two candidates. The person elected will serve with immediate effect until 30 September 2023.

Voting will open at 10 a.m. on Friday, 27 November 2020 and close at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, 8 December 2020.

Report of the Council on the establishment of a Property Board: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

12 November 2020

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 27 October 2020 (*Reporter*, 6594, 2020–21, p. 127) on the above Report (*Reporter*, 6590, 2020–21, p. 30).

Sir Christopher Greenwood, Mr Allen, Professor Neely and others welcome the proposals as the turning of a new leaf in the oversight of the University's non-operational estate. However, some speakers query whether lessons have been learned from the management of the North West Cambridge development, as one of the largest assets in the non-operational property portfolio. With regard to the latter, Sir Christopher Greenwood, Dr de Lacey, Ms Cass and Sir Geoffrey Cass note a number of complaints made by local residents. Several of the speakers also comment on the commercial focus of the new Board and query the weighting of its membership towards those with external expertise. Mr Allen also questions how the Board will manage the tensions between its commercial objectives and the wider charitable and educational mission of the University.

As current West and North West Cambridge Estates Board member Professor Neely notes in his remarks, the changes proposed by this Report are the result of an extended process to determine the best way to provide the University with a professional property development capability. They put in place a governance structure designed to reinforce checks and controls, in line with the recommendations of the Audit Group in 2015–16. As a result, the authority granted to the new Board is, as Professor Evans notes, to be managed under a process determined by the Finance Committee annually. The more detailed terms of reference for the Board, set out in the Report's Annex B, confirm that the new Board will be expected to provide a five-year rolling business plan to the Finance Committee each year, with business cases for projects submitted for approval individually or as part of an annual business plan. Through those reports and the receipt of the minutes of the Board's meetings, the Finance Committee will be able to monitor closely the new Board's exercise of the Committee's powers. In this way, the Property Board will have autonomy to make certain decisions within a framework approved by the Finance Committee, but decisions at key milestones will remain subject to Finance Committee approval – and, where appropriate, they will continue to be subject to the approval of the Regent House.

The constitution of the new Board deliberately provides a high degree of commercial property expertise. This is to ensure the Board is equipped to assess the viability of projects and review their progress. Two internal members provide a check to maintain the Board's focus on the University's strategic objectives. Some developments will be wholly commercial, but others will be less clear-cut. The new Board will have to weigh the various factors in a feasibility assessment to reach a balanced investment decision, for scrutiny as noted above.

Professor Sanders raises a concern about the absorption of the North West Cambridge executive team within the new Property Group, and the potential for delaying Phase 2 of the North West Cambridge development. Market testing to inform the development of Phase 2 is under way and, as other speakers note, the process of consultation has started. The Director of Property Development, once appointed, will lead on the re-evaluation of the delivery strategy for Phase 2 in the light of the current market, and any necessary organisational changes to ensure that the Group has the skills and capacity to deliver a high-performance property and estates function. The Property Group will provide ongoing support for the subsidiary companies that manage services on the North West Cambridge estate.

Mr Allen asks where the responsibility lies for determining that a particular property asset is non-operational. This responsibility and the basis for its determination remain primarily in the hands of the Finance Committee, as noted in the Sites and Buildings Regulations (see Schedule 2, paragraphs 1.2 and 2.2, and Schedule 4, *Statutes and Ordinances*, 2019, p. 1061).

The Council recognises the importance of embedding sustainability targets. The new Board's objectives therefore provide for meeting property-related strategic priorities that fall outside the University's operational estate, including the University's sustainability targets (see Regulation 2(b)(ii) of the proposed Ordinance). It also understands the role of effective communication in maintaining good relationships with the local community. The Board's responsibilities thus include oversight of community relations (as noted in Regulation 2(c) of the proposed Ordinance), but the day-to-day management of those relations would be the responsibility of the Property Group. The appointment of a Director of Property Development, reporting directly to the Director of Estates, will provide better accountability for operational matters falling within the remit of the Property Group. Given the dissatisfaction with the responses to date, the Council has referred the remarks relating complaints about the management of the North West Cambridge development to the West and North West Cambridge Estates Board.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 149) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report.

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.**Natural Sciences Tripos, Part III (Interdisciplinary Papers), 2020–21**

The Committee of Management for the Natural Sciences Tripos give notice of the following additional interdisciplinary papers, which shall be included in the examination requirements of one or more subjects as shown below.

PART III

<i>Title of paper</i>	<i>Mode of assessment</i>	<i>May be offered in</i>
IDP1: Atmospheric Chemistry and Global Change	Written examination of 1.5 hours	Chemistry; Earth Sciences; Physics
IDP2: The Earth System and Climate Change	Written examination of 1.5 hours	Chemistry; Earth Sciences; Physics
IDP3: Materials, Electronics and Renewable Energy	Written examination of 1.5 hours	Chemistry; Earth Sciences; Physics

Notwithstanding the examination requirements set out in Regulation 36 of the Natural Sciences Tripos (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2019, p. 424), the following amendments shall apply to candidates offering interdisciplinary papers:

Part III: Chemistry

Candidates may offer up to two of the interdisciplinary papers listed above, without restriction. Candidates shall have less time to complete their other scheduled examination papers, such that, for each interdisciplinary paper offered:

- thirty minutes shall be taken away from the duration of Paper 1, and candidates for this paper will be required to answer one question fewer;
- forty-five minutes shall be taken away from the duration of Paper 3, and candidates will be required to answer one question fewer.

Part III: Earth Sciences

Candidates may offer one or two of the interdisciplinary papers listed above in place of the equivalent number of optional courses. Candidates will offer six optional courses in total. Examination arrangements: a two-hour examination that will include a compulsory one-hour short answer section, and a one-hour essay question, selected from a choice of three.

Part III: Physics

Candidates may offer up to three of the interdisciplinary papers listed above in place of the equivalent number of Minor Topics.

Natural Sciences Tripos, Part III (Physics), and Master of Advanced Study in Physics, 2020–21

The Head of the Department of Physics gives notice that the following Major Topics, Minor Topics, and types of further work will be available for examination in 2020–21.

Major Topics

These papers will be taken at the start of the Lent Term. Candidates are required to take a minimum of three papers. The titles of the papers are as follows:

Paper 1/AQC.	Advanced Quantum Condensed Matter Physics
Paper 1/BIO.	Biological Physics
Paper 1/RAC.	Relativistic Astrophysics and Cosmology
Paper 1/PP.	Particle Physics
Paper 1/PEP.	Physics of the Earth as a Planet
Paper 1/TQM.	Theories of Quantum Matter
Paper 1/AOP.	Atomic and Optical Physics

Candidates may replace one Major Topic with the paper ‘Quantum Field Theory’ (Paper 1/QFT) from Part III of the Mathematics Tripos (taken in June).

Minor Topics

These papers will be taken at the start of the Easter Term. Candidates who are not replacing Minor Topics by other work, as specified below, are required to take a minimum of three papers. The titles of the papers are as follows:

Paper 2/ASM.	Advanced Statistical Mechanics
Paper 2/CP.	Colloid Physics
Paper 2/EXO.	Exoplanets
Paper 2/FSU.	Formation of Structure in the Universe
Paper 2/GFT.	Gauge Field Theory
Paper 2/MP.	Medical Physics
Paper 2/PT.	Phase Transitions
Paper 2/PNS.	The Physics of Nanoelectronic Systems
Paper 2/NOQL.	Non-linear Optics and Quantum States of Light
Paper 2/QI.	Quantum Information
Paper 2/QS.	Quantum Simulation
Paper 2/SQC.	Superconductivity and Quantum Coherence

Each paper or piece of further work listed below may replace one Minor Topic:

- ‘Introduction to Technology Innovation’ (2/ITI) paper, which is examined by coursework
- ‘Advanced Quantum Field Theory’ (2/AQFT) paper from Part III of the Mathematical Tripos (examined in June)
- ‘Nuclear Power Engineering’ (2/4M16) paper from Part IIB of the Engineering Tripos (examined at the start of the Easter Term)
- The interdisciplinary papers ‘Materials, Electronics and Renewable Energy’ (2/IDP3); ‘Atmospheric Chemistry and Global Change’ (2/IDP1) and ‘Climate Change and the Carbon Cycle: An Earth History Perspective’ (2/IDP2) (all examined in the second half of the Easter Term)

Where candidates take more than three Major Topics, the examiners will use the best three results in determining the class; where candidates take more than three Minor Topics, the examiners will use the best three results in determining the class: all marks will appear on the transcript.

Bachelor of Theology for Ministry and Diploma in Theology for Ministry, 2020–21

The Faculty Board of Divinity gives notice that, with effect from the examinations to be held in 2020–21, the form of the examination for the following papers for the degree of Bachelor of Theology for Ministry and the Diploma in Theology for Ministry will be changed as follows:

For papers B.Th.11., B.Th.32., B.Th.33a., B.Th.42., B.Th.44. (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2019, p. 462) and A5, B2, B4, B6, C11 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2019, p. 434)

Instead of a three-hour examination, these papers will be examined by the submission of coursework. The work will need to be submitted in accordance with the timetable for examinations to be announced by the Faculty of Divinity later in the year.

OBITUARIES**Obituary Notice**

PAUL RIES, M.A., Ph.D., Emeritus Fellow of Darwin College, member of Gonville and Caius College, formerly University Lecturer in the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, died on 9 November 2020, aged 88 years.

GRACES**Grace submitted to the Regent House on 18 November 2020**

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*, 2019, p. 105) will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 27 November 2020.

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 9 of the Report of the Council, dated 5 October 2020, on the establishment of a Property Board (*Reporter*, 6590, 2020–21, p. 30) be approved.¹

¹ See the Council’s Notice on p. 147.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE ‘REPORTER’

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 10 November 2020

A Discussion was held by videoconference. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Mr Roger Mosey was presiding, with the Registrar's deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Senior Pro-Proctor and six other persons present.

The following Report was discussed:

Report of the Council, dated 26 October 2020, recommending allocations from the Chest for 2020–21

(*Reporter*, 6593, 2020–21, p. 96).

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I read among the remarks made in the Discussion of 27 October a dismissive mention of the 'serial rebel who wishes the University to revert to medieval modes of governance and management'. A Discussion is precisely such a 'medieval mode'. The Council merely makes recommendations when it 'begs leave to report' to the University's Governing Body, as it has done with the present Report. Discussion is the only opportunity for members of the University to put on the record concerns about 'recommendations' made to the Regent House. Here are a few.

There are departures from traditional forms and language in this year's coverage of 'allocations', to which it seems worth drawing attention. What exactly is the item in the *Reporter* of 28 October, entitled *Allocations Report and budget: Context and framework for the transition to Enhanced Financial Transparency and the budget-setting process?* This is listed under Notices, but not itself so identified. The Council merely says it is 'publishing the following contextual information as background'. Should that not have formed part of the Report we are discussing? Confusingly, the Report has its own different section headed 'Background and context'.

There have been other instances of genre-uncertainty among the items in the intermittent *Reporter* during the period of suspension of governance since March. The Ordinance governing the *Reporter* states that it 'shall contain' in its 'official' part, 'University Notices issued by authority'; also mentioned are Reports and Graces and 'other items which have appeared on the website'. Wouldn't those normally be Advance Notices? Was this a different sort of 'other item' and if so, how qualified to be published? Given the importance of the *Reporter's* status as the University's organ of historical record for the last 150 years, might it be timely to clarify the position about 'other items' and their place in that record? This adds a dimension to the problem already arising about including in the *Reporter* URLs providing links which are unlikely to work for the long-term future.

The Report itself has an oddity in the form of an Executive Summary at the beginning. I have not found a precedent for opening a Report to the University in that way, though perhaps there is one in which this innovation was explained. The numbering of paragraphs seems to run on into the main Report without the transition being entirely clear.

Then there is the expression 'Academic University', unknown to the *Statutes and Ordinances*. The preliminary 'contextual information' says 'it is critical that the Academic University takes substantial mitigating actions to achieve meaningful cost savings and incremental revenues to arrive at an operating cash flow surplus', so it seems important to be clear exactly what this 'Academic

University' consists in. The phrase also appeared in the provisional Allocations Report in the *Reporter* of 24 June, but what does it mean?

Does the 'Academic University' include or exclude Cambridge University Press and Cambridge Assessment, which are historically but anomalously 'departments' of the University? The preliminary 'contextual information' which does not form part of the Report mentions the desire to 'reduce the scale of dependency on periodic transfers from Cambridge Assessment and Cambridge University Press', so they seem to be treated as cash cows. Not part of the Academic University then, though part of the University? Chiefly a source of income? And they are now to be brought together in a single entity so how will that affect the position?

Does the 'non-Academic University' include all those commercial ventures on which the Discussion on the proposed Property Board published on 4 November expressed so many concerns? As Graham Allen stressed in that Discussion, there are 'inevitable tensions between the stated commercial objectives of the Property Board and the wider charitable and educational mission of the University'. The University's 'educational' mission is still essentially that defined in the Oxford and Cambridge Act 1877, and its 'charitable' obligations are those to be found in the recent Charities Acts of 2011 and 2016. 'Trading', a term which occurs several times in this issue of the *Reporter*, is an activity which a charity must defend and where the ground-rules are notoriously complex. So is the Property Board to be part of the 'Academic University' or not?

Other language seems to call for clearer definition. An example in the preliminary 'contextual information' is the desire for a:

sustainable Academic University operational cash flow surplus (Chest and non-Chest combined) ... to support, maintain and invest in activity across agreed strategic academic themes and initiatives.

I do not know where to read an authoritative statement of what those 'themes and initiatives' are, what makes them 'strategic' or who 'agreed' them and when that was recorded.

If the overall aim of this Report is, as it seems, to clear up the familiar untidiness of doing the sums for Chest and non-Chest income and spending which seem to result every year in their not adding up as hoped and projected, there seems to be a worrying airiness with the figures about the cost of the suspension of governance since March set out in paras. 36–38 of the Report. The 'exceptional, time-sensitive commitments' of the 'first phase' are to be 'offset at the end of the 2019–20 financial year against cost savings elsewhere'. More 'exceptional commitments' were made during the Long Vacation. 'Total exceptional expenditure related to Covid-19 is provisionally estimated at £20m, of which £10m is assumed to be Chest expenditure.' Then there is the cost of the University's Recovery Plan (the one published in the *Reporter* of 29 July in the form of a set of PowerPoint slides?). That is 'estimated at £10.5m in 2020–21' but it does not seem to be settled where that sum is to come from.

Stephen Cowley's helpful Note of Partial Dissent suggests that 'maybe the University might learn from history'. He points to:

opaque allocations to individual institutions which reward, in part, bad planning and an inability to keep to an institutional budget. Surely there has to be some accountability, or is this a rerun of North West Cambridge where, supposedly, no one was to blame for a predicted deficit of £450m (or thereabouts) in 2052?

I was reminded of an earlier period of history involving problems with the cost-benefit analysis of allocations. In his *Review of University management and governance issues arising out of the CAPSA project* (5.15),¹ Michael Shattock noted that:

In December 1998 the Committee received a briefing on CAPSA from the Management Accountant. The Note of the meeting recorded that while the Committee did not wish to ‘dampen enthusiasm for the project’ they felt there was ‘a need to caution the management team over a number of issues’.

He listed them.

¹ <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2001-02/weekly/5861/5.html>

Professor Dame MADELEINE ATKINS (University Council and President of Lucy Cavendish College), read by the Senior Pro-Procutor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the University needs a budget to be set for this financial year without further delay – already the first quarter of the financial year has passed. Overall, the allocations look reasonable, there is enhanced oversight in place for claims for additional expenditure related to the Covid-19 pandemic, and steps have been taken to address the deficit in the short and medium term.

The Allocation mechanism is widely regarded as needing a complete overhaul. Schools and Institutions should not be using Reserves to pay for core staff, thereby limiting their ability to invest in new (or existing) world-class research, or to develop their educational provision to attract the exceptional students of the future. The new academic strategies, so necessary if the University is to retain its global reputation, cannot be implemented effectively by using the historical allocation methodology with its misalignments of incentives and rewards.

This year’s budget allocation mechanism is a first step in achieving the new financial model we need. No one has claimed that it is perfect – and it is not. But it is a start on the tough journey we need to take. There is a perception that it risks increasing unfairness and inconsistency by rewarding Schools and Institutions that have been profligate (if there are any such), and by penalising those who have carefully lived within their means. Were that to happen it would indeed send precisely the wrong signal. No evidence has been presented, however, that that is an inevitable, long-term, or self-perpetuating outcome. Rather, it has been presented as a more accurate and transparent baseline of actual expenditure which has to be understood – and, yes, sharply interrogated – before sensible decisions on future investment in our academic endeavours can be made, especially in relation to attracting and retaining the best academic staff at all levels, and especially for those Schools and Institutions most dependent on the Chest.

Like other speakers at Council, I would much prefer to see the journey to a new financial model and allocation methodology completed in under three years. However, the bandwidth available to accelerate this programme has inevitably narrowed as we all deal with the immediate financial and administrative consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic, and this must be recognised.

Professor D. A. CARDWELL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategy and Planning, and Fitzwilliam College), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, this Report, which I commend to the Regent House, is the outcome of significant work over the last several months to introduce a new approach to determining a Chest budget. Fundamental to this approach is a move away from a budget based on historic allocations to one based on committed expenditure and approved business plans.

The deficit reported in successive Allocations Reports has informed the perception that actual costs met from the Chest have grown faster than Chest income. As the Finance Committee has recognised, however, a plan to remedy that position over the next several years must have a solid foundation, and it is clear that the historic focus on Chest allocations as if they were identical to actual Chest expenditure in Schools and institutions does not provide that foundation.

Chest allocations are informed by historic baselines and have not kept pace with the cumulative impact of pay rises and promotions, the latter only partially offset by turnover of academic posts. Across the University, Schools and institutions are using reserves to supplement Chest allocations and meet ongoing Chest expenditure commitments, which are principally staff costs. Some parts of the University have had the diversity of funding sources to enable them to exercise firmer budgetary control than others; stronger and more regular monitoring of expenditure via the Resource Management Committee is also fundamental to implementing the new approach. This can only be achieved, however, if we have a comprehensive understanding of committed expenditure. This would not be possible if the focus remained solely on allocations and ignored expenditure from reserves.

Acknowledging this position, and recognising commitments already made, is not a decision about whether those costs and commitments should remain in the long-term. The University must be prepared to look hard at its financial sustainability, given the continuing risks as a result of Covid-19 and the end of the transition period following the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union. As pay costs are the biggest proportion of University expenditure, this raises difficult questions about future staffing levels and restrictions on staff growth if income cannot be increased. I reiterate that there must also be firm budgetary control, with institutions taking greater responsibility for, and living with the consequences of, the financial impact of their decisions. This is a core principle of the project underway to deliver enhanced financial transparency and reform the University’s approach to planning and budgeting over the next two to three years.

In the immediate future, the University can take positive steps towards financial sustainability if it can prioritise a manageable number of key initiatives – those within scope of the Council’s Recovery Plan, and the complementary proposals identified by Schools and institutions – which have been designed to enhance the University’s academic activity and its supporting professional services, and make early, significant progress towards the target of a sustainable operating surplus. That is my priority and I am confident that this desire is shared by my colleagues in Schools and institutions and on the central committees, the process of whom have contributed constructively to the project that has culminated in this Report.

Dr S. J. COWLEY (University Council, Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, and Emmanuel College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the Council but I speak in a personal capacity. I am the author of the Note of Partial Dissent where I stated, *inter alia*, that while I am content with the overall level of expenditure (since the University needs a budget) ‘I cannot support the opaque allocations to individual institutions that reward in part bad planning and an inability to keep to an institutional budget’.

This millennium I have served four years on the Board of Scrutiny and at the end of December I will have served twelve years on the Council. Throughout these periods of service one of my prime interests has been the University’s finances. Indeed to quote from my 2016 election statement:

In such a landscape, the Council needs to ensure that, as a prerequisite, the University’s finances are in good order. This may mean that difficult choices are necessary, as illustrated by the recent request to Schools as to how they might cope with a 10% reduction in Chest allocation. However, any such choices need to ensure that the defining characteristics of the University are maintained, including its broad subject base, its accessibility for the best qualified, its collegiate structure (including the supervision system), and support for staff to pursue their own lines of research.

Unfortunately, the time for difficult choices has arrived and the need to protect support for research should be at the forefront.

I have found that serving on Council has been frustrating at times and no doubt some of the senior officers in the University have found my presence frustrating – or maybe that should be ‘infuriating’. Indeed one of my infuriating characteristics is telling people that ‘I told you so’. In one week during the first lockdown I managed to ‘annoy’ the Vice-Chancellor, my Head of Department and my wife by uttering that phrase (although I was only worried about my wife). However, it really would be nice to be listened to occasionally.

For example, over the last few years while the University has been slipping down the QS World-Ranking Tables, I have raised this matter at Council but to no apparent effect. However, this year I gather someone else raised the issue and now it is being looked into. While I may not be that great at research, I understand that research is the life-blood of this University and if the University drops out of the top ten of the QS Rankings it will do us damage (whatever we may think of such rankings). The University is seventh this year having been second in 2013. So where are the University’s priorities as regards funding? Is it research?

In the five years since 2015, total Schools expenditure has increased by 15.5%, and it is the Schools where teaching and research takes place. Compare this with the 37.9% increase for ‘Academic Institutions and Services’ (including a 49.4% increase for the University Information Services in four years), and a 57.6% increase for the Unified Administrative Service (including a 64% increase for the Finance Division in four years), where the raw numbers were kindly provided by the Finance Division, while the percentages are mine.

If that does not concern you, then compare staff numbers. From 2010 to 2019, technical assistant staff increased by 4%, academic staff by 8%, research staff by 43% and academic-related and assistant staff by 49%, where the numbers come from a July paper to the HR Committee.

One of the problems with this cash budget is that it bakes in the above increases, partly caused by expenditure of reserves that are now being exhausted. At this point, may I make the point that nobody should be spending

reserves on core expenditure. You spend reserves on finite-time expenditure and if a Department or an Institution has been spending its reserves on core expenditure then that just reinforces the point I made in my Note of Partial Dissent that the planning system is broken.

Further, as I noted in my Note of Partial Dissent, ‘despite my best efforts there is still an extra £7.5m (and possibly more) in apparently unaccounted increased expenditure’ in the proposed allocations. From the increases I have referenced above, one can probably guess where this excess of expenditure is occurring.

During my time on the Council I have served on the Resource Management Committee for eight years, the Planning and Resources Committee for four years and, most recently, the Finance Committee for nearly four years. My judgment, which I accept may be incorrect, is that the structural deficit is not going to be eliminated by increased revenue (in support, I note the slow take-off of the Surplus Improvement Fund); I wish that it was. The staff numbers which have gone up are going to have to come down (which some will admit privately but not publicly). Moreover, the numbers should come down in such a way that research is prioritised, otherwise the University is very likely to drop out of the QS top ten. As a member of the University and College Union for nearly forty years, my deep desire is that this reduction is by natural wastage rather than by redundancy. To that end, the reductions need to start now and the baked-in increases need to be unbaked (and if so, it might be possible to reverse some of the pay freeze, as I gather King’s College London has so done).

I write this having just come out of a meeting discussing the University’s accounts for the last year. Much focus was on how much the University was worth; something in which I presume accountants are interested but I am not, since the University is not going to be bought out by a bid from Oxford or elsewhere. Moreover, there are so many moving parts in the accounts, including the CUEF, Cambridge Assessment, Cambridge University Press, the pension deficit (which can swing by hundreds of millions of pounds in a year), donations, etc., that working out how much money the University has to spend each year is difficult (notwithstanding the forthcoming Appendix 1, which I commend to the Regent House).

The very real advantage of the Chest was it gave you a sum that was likely to be there year-on-year and on which you could base core expenditure. The move to a cash budget I view as vandalism. Allocations from the Chest allowed prudent institutions to build up reserves which then facilitated bottom-up initiatives; indeed, it is arguable that one of the major reasons for the success of the University has been the fact that it is bottom-up.

Maybe a cash budget will be more transparent, although the process this year has been far more opaque than previously. However, even if it is more transparent, and maybe helps those who cannot control their spending of reserves (if they cannot distinguish between core and non-core), the bottom line is that it will not increase the amount of money available to spend. There will still be cuts. The past planning procedure was rooted in the idea that as a University there was a need for cross-subsidy between academic institutions, something I strongly believe in (indeed Mathematics has often been the largest net contributor to the pot for many years). I have asked repeatedly how this cross-subsidy will be implemented in the new cash budget but I have not received an answer. My answer is: make sure you are a member of one of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences or the School of Technology or best of all the Administration.

COLLEGE NOTICES**Vacancies**

Hughes Hall: Research Associate Competition, 2021 (15 posts available); tenure: three to five years from 1 March 2021; closing date: 10 January 2021 at 12 midnight; open evening Q&A: 7 December 2020 at 6.30 p.m.; further details: <https://www.hughes.cam.ac.uk/about-us/jobs-at-hughes/>

OTHER NOTICES**Cambridge Endowment for Research in Finance (CERF)**

CERF is offering a studentship scheme for doctoral funding starting in October 2021. Funding is for three years and includes University and College fees and an allowance for accommodation and living expenses.

The scheme is open to Ph.D. students who do research into aspects of finance, financial institutions and financial markets, and their relationship with the performance of the economy. Incoming doctoral students or students who are in the first year of their Ph.D. can apply for funding.

The closing date for applications is 9 February 2021 and further information, including details on how to apply, is available at <https://www.cerf.cam.ac.uk/people/studentship/cerf-scholarship-competition-2021-now-open>

EXTERNAL NOTICES**Oxford Notices**

University of Oxford

Hanseatic Scholarships for study or research in Germany

Applications are currently open for the Hanseatic scholarships available to Oxford or Cambridge final year undergraduates and postgraduate students wishing to undertake research or study for one or two years in Germany. Applications close on Friday, 29 January 2021. More information on how to apply and eligibility can be found on the Hanseatic Scholarships website: <https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/fees-funding/international/scholarships-exchanges/german/hanseatic>

New College: the following Junior Research Fellowships are open for application:

Stipendiary at £23,754 a year plus allowances:

Esmée Fairbairn JRF in Mathematics
(closing date: 10 December 2020);

Herbert Nicholas JRF in Politics
(closing date: 14 December 2020);

Juliana Cuyler Matthews JRF in Modern Languages
(closing date: 11 January 2021);

Todd-Bird JRF in Medicine or Biochemistry
(closing date: 10 December 2020).

Non-Stipendiary:

Todd-Bird JRF in Clinical Medicine
(closing date: 10 December 2020).

All posts are tenable for three years from 1 October 2021 and further details are available at https://isw.changeworknow.co.uk/new_college_oxford/vms/e/careers/search/new

The Queen's College: Associate Professorship (or Professorship) in Black British History, c.1900–present; tenure: from 1 October 2021 or as soon as possible thereafter; salary: £48,114–£64,605 plus additional benefits; closing date: 14 December 2020 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.queens.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

© 2020 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

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

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

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

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

Notices for publication in the *Reporter*, or queries concerning content, should be sent by email to reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk; messages may also be left by telephone to 01223 332298

Advice and information is available on the *Reporter* website at <https://www.reporter.admin.cam.ac.uk/>.

Copy should be sent as early as possible in the week before publication; short notices will be accepted up to **4 p.m. on Friday** for publication the following Wednesday. Inclusion of notices is at the discretion of the Editor.