

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6750

WEDNESDAY 24 JULY 2024

VOL CLIV No 40

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	800
Discussion on Tuesday, 8 October 2024	800
Notice of a benefaction	800
Grace 2 of 17 July 2024: Correction	800
Election to the Board of Scrutiny in class (c)(ii)	801
Dates of Congregations, 2024–25, 2025–26 and 2026–27	801
Report of the General Board on the introduction of Clinical Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) offices and posts: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	802
Making decisions during crises	803
Grants from the Colleges Fund	803
Leadership of environmental sustainability	804
Predictable Working Policy	804
Extension to the pilot of the Email Address Allocation and Retention Policy	805
Lord's Bridge, Cambridge Road	805

Vacancies, appointments, etc.

Appointments	805
Vacancies in the University	806

Awards, etc.

Seatonian Prize	806
-----------------	-----

Reports

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the review of examination regulations following the marking and assessment boycott	806
--	-----

Obituaries

Obituary Notices	812
------------------	-----

Graces

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 24 July 2024	812
---	-----

Acta

Congregations of the Regent House:	
Thursday, 18 July 2024	813
Friday, 19 July 2024	818
Saturday, 20 July 2024	823
Result of ballot on Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (EJRA) and an amendment	828

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Fly-sheets reprinted

Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (EJRA)	829
--	-----

Report of Discussion: 16 July 2024

First-stage Report of the Council on the alteration and refurbishment of the Stirling Building on the Sidgwick site	845
First-stage Report of the Council on a new temporary facility for the Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus	846

College Notices

Elections	852
Vacancies	852

External Notices

Oxford Notices	852
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

31 July, *Wednesday*. Last ordinary issue of the *Reporter* in the 2023–24 academic year.

25 September, *Wednesday*. First ordinary issue of the *Reporter* in the 2024–25 academic year.

1 October, *Tuesday*. Michaelmas Term begins. Congregation of the Regent House at 9.55 a.m.: Election and admission of the Proctors. Annual address by the Vice-Chancellor.

8 October, *Tuesday*. Full Term begins. Discussion by videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).

Discussion on Tuesday, 8 October 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, 8 October 2024 at 2 p.m. The following item will be discussed:

1. Joint Report of the Council and the General Board, dated 18 July 2024, on the review of examination regulations following the marking and assessment boycott (p. 806).

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

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

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

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

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

Notice of a benefaction

18 July 2024

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that she has accepted with gratitude a benefaction of approximately £4.7m from the trustees of a discretionary trust fund established under the will of Dr John Brian Dodsworth. In a letter of wishes dated 18 September 2018, Dr Dodsworth requested that the trust fund be used to ‘support the study, teaching of and research in Icelandic studies in the University; and support the purchase of material relevant to Icelandic studies by the University Library’. The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 2, p. 812) to establish an endowment fund reflecting that wish, to be called the Brian Dodsworth Fund.

Grace 2 of 17 July 2024: Correction

22 July 2024

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice of a correction to Grace 2 of 17 July 2024, made under Regulation 15 of the Ordinance for Graces and Congregations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 112). The wording of the Grace has been amended to read as follows (inserted wording shown in bold):

2. That the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Report of the Council, dated 4 June 2024, on the term of office of the Chancellor and the High Steward (*Reporter*, 6744, 2023–24, p. 634), **as amended by the Council’s Notice dated 11 July 2024**, be approved.¹

¹ See the Council’s Notice, p. 778.

Election to the Board of Scrutiny in class (c)(ii)

23 July 2024

The Vice-Chancellor announces that the following person has been elected to serve as a member of the Board of Scrutiny in class (c)(ii) with immediate effect until 30 September 2027:

Class (c)(ii) (a member of the Regent House): Professor NEIL WYN EVANS

The results of the voting are as follows:

Number of valid votes cast: 1,984 (no invalid votes) (Quota: 992)

Professor NEIL WYN EVANS	1,345	ELECTED
Ms MARÍA MATILDE GOODALL	639	
TOTAL	1,984	

Dates of Congregations, 2024–25, 2025–26 and 2026–27

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice, in accordance with Special Ordinance A (ii) 2, and the regulations for General Admission to Degrees, that Congregations will be held on the following days in the academic years 2024–25, 2025–26 and 2026–27.

CONGREGATIONS OF THE REGENT HOUSE (on Saturdays unless otherwise stated)

2024–25

MICHAELMAS TERM 2024 <i>Full Term:</i> 8 October – 6 December	LENT TERM 2025 <i>Full Term:</i> 21 January – 21 March	EASTER TERM AND LONG VACATION 2025 <i>Full Term:</i> 29 April – 20 June
1 October (Tuesday), 9.55 a.m. ¹ 25 October (Friday), 10 a.m. 26 October, 10 a.m. 30 November, 10 a.m.	31 January (Friday), 2 p.m. <i>(for degrees in absence only)</i> 1 March, 10 a.m. 29 March, 10 a.m. 5 April, 10 a.m.	3 May, 10 a.m. 23 May, (Friday) 10 a.m. 24 May, 10 a.m. <i>Honorary Degrees:</i> 25 June (Wednesday), 2.45 p.m. <i>General Admission:</i> 2 July (Wednesday), 10 a.m. ² 3 July (Thursday), 10 a.m. ² 4 July (Friday), 10 a.m. ² 5 July, 10 a.m. ² 24 July (Thursday), 10 a.m. 25 July (Friday), 10 a.m. 26 July, 10 a.m.

2025–26

MICHAELMAS TERM 2025 <i>Full Term:</i> 7 October – 5 December	LENT TERM 2026 <i>Full Term:</i> 20 January – 20 March	EASTER TERM AND LONG VACATION 2026 <i>Full Term:</i> 28 April – 19 June
1 October (Wednesday), 9.55 a.m. ¹ 24 October (Friday), 10 a.m. 25 October, 10 a.m. 29 November, 10 a.m.	30 January (Friday), 2 p.m. <i>(for degrees in absence only)</i> 28 February, 10 a.m. 28 March, 10 a.m. 11 April, 10 a.m.	2 May, 10 a.m. 22 May, (Friday) 10 a.m. 23 May, 10 a.m. <i>Honorary Degrees:</i> 24 June (Wednesday), 2.45 p.m. TBC. <i>General Admission:</i> 1 July (Wednesday), 10 a.m. ² 2 July (Thursday), 10 a.m. ² 3 July (Friday), 10 a.m. ² 4 July, 10 a.m. ² 23 July (Thursday), 10 a.m. 24 July (Friday), 10 a.m. 25 July, 10 a.m.

¹ Election and admission of the Proctors.

² General Admission (M.Eng., M.Math., M.Sci., Vet.M.B., B.A., and B.Th. Degrees only).

2026–27

MICHAELMAS TERM 2026 <i>Full Term:</i> 6 October – 4 December	LENT TERM 2027 <i>Full Term:</i> 19 January – 19 March	EASTER TERM AND LONG VACATION 2027 <i>Full Term:</i> 27 April – 18 June
1 October (Thursday), 9.55 a.m. ¹ 23 October (Friday), 10 a.m. 24 October, 10 a.m. 28 November, 10 a.m.	29 January (Friday), 2 p.m. (for degrees in absence only) 27 February, 10 a.m. 3 April, 10 a.m. 10 April, 10 a.m.	1 May, 10 a.m. 21 May, (Friday) 10 a.m. 22 May, 10 a.m. <i>Honorary Degrees:</i> 23 June (Wednesday), 2.45 p.m. TBC. <i>General Admission:</i> 30 June (Wednesday), 10 a.m. ² 1 July (Thursday), 10 a.m. ² 2 July (Friday), 10 a.m. ² 3 July, 10 a.m. ² 22 July (Thursday), 10 a.m. 23 July (Friday), 10 a.m. 24 July, 10 a.m.

¹ Election and admission of the Proctors.

² General Admission (M.Eng., M.Math., M.Sci., Vet.M.B., B.A., and B.Th. Degrees only).

Report of the General Board on the introduction of Clinical Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) offices and posts: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

18 July 2024

The Council has received the remarks made at the Discussion on 25 June 2024 concerning the above Report (*Reporter*, 2023–24: 6745, p. 683; 6748, p. 776).

The General Board's Report is the first step in enabling teaching-focused clinical academics to seek promotion under the Academic Career Pathway (Teaching and Scholarship) (ACP (T&S)) scheme. It recommends permitting promotion of clinical academics to existing offices and posts on the T&S track, and also to the office of Clinical Professor, which is currently only available on the Research and Teaching track. This will create a clear promotions pathway through different levels of office and post for teaching-focused clinical academic staff. If the Report's recommendations are approved, the ACP (T&S) scheme guidance¹ will be updated to cover clinical academic (T&S) roles. The changes to the existing scheme guidance are expected to be minimal, with the single most substantive change being an additional requirement that clinical academics must be clinically active. Those seeking promotion as clinical academics will therefore need to meet the existing criteria and also hold an honorary consultant contract from an NHS body.²

Dr Astle draws attention to discussion of the office of Clinical Professor, including the contents of the 2022 Report that proposed the new office. He quotes from the Report, which noted that for clinical academics, whose pay is determined according to NHS seniority, 'the purpose of applying for promotion under the University's academic promotions scheme is solely to achieve a change in title, with their pay remaining the same'.³ This remains the main reason for including only one office of Clinical Professor in the table in paragraph 14 of this Report, equivalent to the office of Professor at Grade 12 for non-clinical academics, rather than having two offices, one at Grade 11 and another at Grade 12.

The General Board has confirmed that the criteria for promotion to a Clinical Professorship through the ACP (T&S) Pathway are to be equivalent to those for promotion to the office of Professor at Grade 12 rather than the office of Professor (Grade 11). Although the Report notes transitional arrangements for clinical academics who currently hold the offices of Reader and Professor (Grade 11), there are in fact no current holders of those offices in either the School of Clinical Medicine or the School of the Biological Sciences and therefore no transfers are anticipated.

Professor Evans is correct that the honorary consultant contract does not of itself guarantee expertise in teaching and therefore the relevant assessment of teaching ability would be on appointment and as part of the promotions process. However, as noted above, it is a core criterion for clinical academics that they must hold an honorary consultant contract, therefore any person seeking to transfer or be appointed or promoted to any clinical academic role, including T&S roles, must hold such a contract. This is because holding an honorary consultant contract indemnifies those academics when they carry out clinical work associated with their contract of employment with the University. It also confirms their status as individuals who can carry out clinical work in an NHS setting, are registered with a relevant professional body (such as the General Medical Council) and are on the Specialist register. Administratively, it also confirms that they are eligible to be paid on the clinical pay scales, given that all clinical academics are paid according to those pay scales.

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 812) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report.

¹ See the existing guidance on the HR Division's website at: <https://www.acptands.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/>.

² An honorary consultant contract signifies that the holder is registered with the General Medical Council, the Nursing and Midwifery Council or the Health and Care Professions Council.

³ *Reporter*, 6646, 2021–22, p. 256.

Making decisions during crises

18 July 2024

In July 2020, at the end of the first lockdown of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Council acknowledged that it needed to provide greater clarity on how it expected the University to make decisions in a future crisis. It invited members of the Regent House to provide their feedback on the management of the pandemic since March 2020 by calling a Discussion on a Topic of concern. In its response to remarks made at that Discussion, the Council noted that it would devise a scheme to govern strategic decision-making in a crisis ‘to bridge the gap between the highlighted concerns about transparency of decision-making and accountability to the Regent House and the Council’s need for a more agile decision-making process that is capable of providing an authoritative response within a short timeframe’.¹

In its response to the Board of Scrutiny’s 28th Report in January 2024, the Council noted its regret for the delay in providing its proposals on the management of future crises – other work had taken priority – and its expectation that it would publish a Report by the end of this academic year.²

At its meeting on 15 July, the Council agreed that it wished to clarify and strengthen the delegation of decision-making powers to sub-committees and individuals to enable quick decision-making in a crisis. The Council noted its two Notices in June 2020 recording decisions made during the initial phase of the pandemic between 16 March and 31 May 2020.³ It agreed that in the small number of cases where there was a breach of regulations, a different decision would be made now⁴ or changes have since been made to Ordinances to revise arrangements which were difficult to meet or unclear or are the subject of ongoing review. It also noted that some of the earliest and most consequential decisions during that phase concerned delegations of decision-making authority by the Council and the General Board. In March 2020, the Council agreed to delegate its authority to the Vice-Chancellor should significant, rapid and unexpected changes relating to the Covid-19 crisis require urgent decisions concerning the University’s business. The Council also delegated authority to the chairs of the Council’s committees to take such decisions as they consider necessary. The General Board gave similar delegations to the Vice-Chancellor and the chairs of its committees.

The Council will therefore consider proposed amendments to the provisions for delegation currently set out in Special Ordinance A (viii) 4, with a view to publishing a Report in Michaelmas Term 2024. It will also receive for review a draft scheme of delegation to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the University’s committee-based decision-making processes, which will in turn facilitate more effective management of a crisis.

¹ *Reporter*, 6627, 2020–21, p. 768.

² *Reporter*, 6726, 2023–24, p. 237.

³ *Reporter*, 2019–20, 6585, p. 454; 6586, p. 472.

⁴ For example, the *Reporter* would continue to be published weekly during term, even if a pause in normal committee business resulted in lighter issues.

Grants from the Colleges Fund

18 July 2024

The Council has received the following report from the Colleges Fund Committee, which it now publishes to the University in accordance with Regulation 4 for the Fund (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 1082).

1. The amount available in the Fund for distribution in 2023–24 is £5.815m.
2. The Colleges Fund Committee has approved the following grants to be paid in 2023–24:

	<i>Total Grant</i>
	£’000
St Edmund’s College	1,246
Lucy Cavendish College	1,246
Hughes Hall	613
Wolfson College	928
Fitzwilliam College	615
Darwin College	848
Clare Hall	319

3. The allocation is calculated by taking account of the model of a ‘standard’ College with a basic requirement for endowment. The figures take account of the endowment requirements of the relevant Applicant College as estimated by the Committee’s model having reference to numbers of undergraduate students, full-time equivalent postgraduate students, Fellows, and College Teaching Officers.

4. The Colleges Fund Committee has not approved any exceptional grants in addition to the endowment-based grants listed above.

Leadership of environmental sustainability

18 July 2024

The Council wishes to update the Regent House on leadership of environmental sustainability. At its meeting on 15 July, the Council approved two related proposals to provide leadership for environmental sustainability, one focused on academic leadership, the other to provide operational leadership.

Academic leadership for environmental sustainability

Mirroring a suggestion from Regent House members as part of comments on the proposal for a sixth Pro-Vice-Chancellor with responsibility for environmental sustainability, academic leadership will be provided by an existing Pro-Vice-Chancellor (PVC). ‘Environmental Sustainability’ will be added to the portfolio of the current PVC (Education) so that it becomes the PVC (Education and Environmental Sustainability). This change will take effect from 1 September 2024. This portfolio will be reviewed on any subsequent new appointment or reappointment to this particular office.

The brief for the environmental sustainability portfolio will be to develop an academic strategy that will integrate and enhance the University’s interdisciplinary research strengths, capabilities and ambitions and will encompass its educational offerings and outreach activities. The PVC will also support and champion the University’s climate and sustainability initiatives across the collegiate University, including Cambridge Zero, the Cambridge Conservation Initiative and the Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership.

Operational leadership for environmental sustainability

The aim is for the University to have, by the end of the calendar year 2025 at the latest, an agreed approach to environmental sustainability which is sector-leading. This will include an ambitious strategy to achieve operational environmental sustainability, accompanied by a plan for delivery with firm, costed targets and clear KPIs against which progress can be measured; a clarified and strengthened governance structure to oversee progress; and a clear articulation of who, operationally, is responsible for delivering which aspects of the plan. Initially, the focus of this activity will be on climate and environmental sustainability but, over time and depending on progress, the scope may be broadened to cover social and other sustainability issues.

This ambition will be approached in two stages. Stage 1 will involve an assessment of the work done to date across the University in the five main areas of environmental sustainability – waste, water, carbon, biodiversity and transport. The assessment, which should be completed by the end of 2024, will provide recommendations for improvement, both operationally and in terms of the University’s governance in this area, and identify early wins. It will also offer a broad strategic framework that could be developed in Stage 2.

Stage 2 will require the recruitment of an individual who has expertise in delivering stretching environmental sustainability objectives in complex organisations. Building on the assessment carried out in Stage 1, the individual will be responsible for developing and leading the implementation of the University’s operational environmental sustainability strategy and plan. The person appointed will also be responsible for implementing the recommendations of the Stage 1 assessment (if approved by the Council), including embedding any governance changes. The position will be fixed term and the individual will report to the Vice-Chancellor.

Predictable Working Policy

18 July 2024

The Council and the General Board have approved a Predictable Working Policy, to ensure compliance with new government legislation due to come into effect this autumn. The Workers (Predictable Terms and Conditions) Act received royal assent on 16 October 2023 and aims to redress the balance of one-sided flexibility by providing employees, workers and agency workers with a statutory right to request more predictable terms and conditions if their existing working pattern lacks consistency. A ‘work pattern’ includes the number of hours, the days of the week and the times, or the duration, an individual is required to work. Subject to eligibility, those engaged on a fixed-term contract of 12 months or less can seek a longer term or an open-ended contract. A statutory request including any appeal must be concluded within one month of the application. The legislation is process-based and the Policy incorporates the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service guidance.

The Policy will be launched on the date the legislation comes into effect. The approved text of the Policy is available on the *Reporter* website at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6750/PredictableWorkingPolicy.pdf> (University account required).

Extension to the pilot of the Email Address Allocation and Retention Policy

18 July 2024

Further to the Notice published on 26 July 2023 (*Reporter*, 6710, 2022–23, p. 885), the General Board and the Council have approved a six-month extension to the pilot¹ of the Email Address Allocation and Retention Policy,² and a delay to the wider rollout of the policy from 1 September 2024 to 1 March 2025. To allow time for a period of preparation, communications to affected individuals did not commence until the end of January 2024. That preparation included agreeing draft communications, and ascertaining an approach to implementation with the three participating volunteer institutions. An extension will allow for the collection of sufficient data to assess whether and how the policy can be refined further, as well as ensure adequate time to put processes in place to enable a smooth rollout across the wider University. Any recommended changes to the policy resulting from the pilot will be considered by the General Board and the Council prior to the wider rollout.

The Email Address Allocation and Retention Policy sets out options for email address retention for email address users leaving the University who would not be eligible to retain their address under existing standard retention procedures. In the first three months of the pilot's operation, 326 email address users leaving the University were contacted by UIS to advise them of the options for email address retention. Only two of these users requested one of the forms of retention set out in the policy, and subsequently both were found to be eligible to retain their email addresses under existing procedures.

¹ See <https://help.uis.cam.ac.uk/service/email/address-allocation-policy/email-address-allocation-and-retention-policy-pilot>.

² See <https://help.uis.cam.ac.uk/service/email/address-allocation-policy>.

Lord's Bridge, Cambridge Road

Further to the Council's First-stage Report of 29 July 2020¹ and subsequent planning permission granted by South Cambridgeshire District Council in 2023, the Estates Committee has taken the decision not to pursue the proposed development of a solar farm at Lord's Bridge, Cambridge Road, Barton. Further work on the project has led to the conclusion that the construction and operation of the planned solar farm would have a sufficiently detrimental impact on the research undertaken at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory that the simultaneous land uses at Lord's Bridge are incompatible.

¹ *Reporter*, 6587, 2019–20, p. 551; 6593, 2020–21, p. 105.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Appointments

The following appointments have been made:

University Associate Professor (Grade 10)

Psychology. Dr Stephanie Anne Archer, B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D., *Derby*, appointed from 1 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

University Associate Professor (Grade 9)

Archaeology. Dr Liliana Janik, M.Phil., *Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń*, Ph.D., *MUR*, appointed from 4 June 2024 until the retiring age.

University Assistant Professors

Architecture. Dr Fiona Muriel Smyth, B.Sc.Arch., B.Arch., Ph.D., *University College Dublin*, appointed from 1 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years. Dr Karolina Vasilikou, B.A.Arch., M.A.Arch., *National Technical University of Athens*, M.Sc., *Bath*, Ph.D., *Kent*, appointed from 1 October 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics. Dr Dominique Françoise Maldague, B.A., Ph.D., *UC Berkeley*, appointed from 18 June 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of three years.

Departmental Secretary

Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics. Mr Benjamin James Daft, B.A., *Leicester*, appointed from 24 June 2024 until the retiring age.

Senior Assistant Secretaries

University offices (Academic Division). Ms Wing-Ying Lee, B.A., Pg.Dip., *The Hong Kong Polytechnic University*, M.A., *City University of Hong Kong*, appointed from 24 June 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of six months. Ms Alice Eleanor Barington Wood, B.A., *Open*, appointed from 5 September 2024 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of six months.

Vacancies in the University

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

Professorship of Politics in the Department of Politics and International Studies; tenure: from 1 September 2025 or as soon as possible thereafter; informal enquiries: Professor Jude Browne, Head of the Department of Politics and International Studies and Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: jmb63@cam.ac.uk); closing date: 15 September 2024; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/47365/>; quote reference: UE42442

Assistant Teaching Professorship in Nuclear Engineering in the Department of Engineering (part-time); tenure: until 31 August 2026; salary: £45,585–£57,696, *pro rata*; closing date: 5 August 2024; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/47080/>; quote reference: NM42183

Evaluation Specialist – Environment and Sustainability in the Academic Division of the University offices; tenure: until 31 July 2025; salary: £36,024–£44,263; closing date: 15 August 2024; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/47383/>; quote reference: AK42460

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

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

AWARDS, ETC.

Seatonian Prize

The Examiners of the Seatonian Prize for the best English poem on a sacred subject give notice that the subject for 2024 is:

‘The same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened’
(Genesis 7.11)

Further details can be found at: <https://www.divinity.cam.ac.uk/seatonian-prize>.

The winner for 2023 was Mr Steven Toussaint of Emmanuel College.

REPORTS

Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the review of examination regulations following the marking and assessment boycott

The COUNCIL and the GENERAL BOARD beg leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Report aims to provide a clear explanation of the actions the General Board may choose to take, under its existing authority, to minimise the impact on students of serious disruption to the examining process, including as a result of a marking and assessment boycott, whilst making sure academic standards continue to be maintained (Annex A). It also proposes changes to Ordinances to extend those actions to include three new measures (Annex B). This Report reflects the experiences during, and the lessons learned following, the marking and assessment boycott that took place in 2022–23 and adopts the recommendations of a group set up by the Council to review examination regulations.

Background

2. In March 2023, in anticipation of industrial action during the summer examination season, the Council published Graces relating to several measures to mitigate the impact of that action on students. The Council received an amendment from members of the Regent House, which sought to remove most of those measures on the basis that there were concerns about the maintenance of academic standards. In votes, the measures as amended¹ were approved, rejecting all but two of the mitigating actions that had been proposed. In line with regulatory obligations, the Acting Vice-Chancellor reported the votes as a potential breach of registration condition E2 (concerning good

governance) to the Office for Students. The commentary on the University’s response to this reportable event noted that there would be a review of the governance arrangements for examination regulations.

3. A task and finish group was set up early in Michaelmas Term 2023 to carry out the review (its terms of reference and membership are set out in Annex C). The review is divided into two phases. Phase 1 looked specifically at what measures are and/or should be available in the event of major disruption to examinations, including in response to a marking and assessment boycott or other industrial action. Phase 2 is a wider review of Chapter III of Ordinances on the examination of taught programmes and is ongoing.

4. The Council and the General Board endorse the two general principles guiding the review, as agreed by the group:

- (a) student interests should be protected; and
- (b) academic standards must be maintained. This includes having appropriately qualified examiners and assessors to undertake marking, not approving results or the graduation of students for which insufficient marks are available, and not allowing Examination Boards to operate unless they are satisfied that they have sufficient expertise.

¹ *Reporter*, 6700, 2022–23, p. 667.

Review recommendations

5. This Report takes forward the recommendations of Phase 1 of the review:

- (a) to articulate clearly the existing powers of the General Board to mitigate the impact of serious disruption of the examination process on students whilst upholding academic standards (see the commentary in Annex A); and
- (b) to revise Ordinances (as set out in Annex B):
- (i) to include three new measures to extend the General Board's authority where the two guiding principles are upheld:
- to allow lists of candidates for examination, and class-lists and other lists of candidates approved for degrees and other awards, to be accepted later than the dates set out in Ordinance;
 - to permit examinations to start later than the dates set out in Ordinance;
 - to enable Examiners to include candidates declared to have deserved honours on the class-list, to be classed later.
- (ii) to make additional changes:
- to confirm the circumstances in which a final meeting of Examiners may proceed if any Examiner fails to attend the meeting without notice;
 - to remove outdated references requiring two printed class-lists.

6. The Council and the General Board agree with the group's view that the Board should have the ability to revise dates in Ordinance during industrial action or other disruption, as set out in paragraph 5(b)(i) and (ii), provided that the two guiding principles are upheld. These mitigating actions were approved by the votes in March 2023.¹ The General Board has agreed to make similar provision in the General Board Regulations for certain postgraduate taught courses, with effect from the same date as the changes to Ordinance that this Report proposes (see Annex D).

7. The group carefully considered the impact on students who were not able to graduate with their cohort in the summer of 2023 and the different scenarios that the General Board had encountered as a result of all marks not being available for the whole cohort to the normal timetable. Based on reflection and feedback, the group

considers that in similar circumstances and in line with the principles agreed, candidates who have completed all of the requirements of assessment but have outstanding information due to marking not being completed, should be eligible to graduate as normal (provided the Examiners are satisfied that they have met the required standard), with their final classification and any marks of distinction added at a later point. The Examiners' decision to pass individual students, or declare them to have received honours, would be based on a clear demonstration, through the marks available for those students, that it is beyond doubt that they have reached the required standard. The General Board would consider a request from the Chair of Examiners to take this action on receipt of confirmation that these conditions had been met. The Council and the General Board support the proposal in paragraph 5(b)(i) – to enable Examiners to include candidates declared to have deserved honours on the class-list, to be classed later – as an appropriate mitigation.

8. The group acknowledged that there may be situations which would not be mitigated by the proposed changes to marking and classing. These include not being able to approve results or allow the graduation of students for whom there were an insufficient number of marks available (i.e., when missing marks mean it is not beyond doubt that they will pass), or when there is felt to be a lack of expertise amongst the Examiners at the final meeting of the Examination Board. This is, however, unavoidable given the guiding principle of maintaining academic standards.

9. During the period in which the Phase 1 review was taking place, the Acting Commissary received a representation from a member of the Regent House under Statute A IX 1(b) concerning the General Board's decision-making during the 2023 marking and assessment boycott. The General Board, on the recommendation of the Registry, has agreed to make an amendment to the General Regulations for the M.Phil. Degree by Advanced Study, to take account of a point made by the Acting Commissary in his decision on that application. The amendment requires the permission of the General Board to be sought to allow Examiners to be excused from their obligation to attend the final meeting of Examiners. This amendment will enable the General Board to continue to monitor attendance at such meetings, as part of its role in ensuring that academic standards are maintained.

10. The Council and the General Board recommend that the changes to Ordinance set out in Annex B be approved, to take effect on approval or such later date as determined by the General Board.

18 July 2024

DEBORAH PRENTICE,
Vice-Chancellor

ZOE ADAMS

SARAH ANDERSON

MADELEINE ATKINS

ANTHONY DAVENPORT

JOHN DIX

SHARON FLOOD

HEATHER HANCOCK

LOUISE JOY

ELLA MCPHERSON

SCOTT MANDELBROTE

SALLY MORGAN

ALEX MYALL

SHARON PEACOCK

JASON SCOTT-WARREN

ANDREW WATHEY

MICHAEL SEWELL

PIETER VAN HOUTEN

18 July 2024

DEBORAH PRENTICE,
Vice-Chancellor

MADELEINE ATKINS

TIM HARPER

NEELA MAADHUREE

ELLA MCPHERSON

PATRICK MAXWELL

NIGEL PEAKE

RICHARD PENTY

ANNA PHILPOTT

EMILY SO

PIETER VAN HOUTEN

BHASKAR VIRA

CHRIS YOUNG

¹ *Reporter*, 6700, 2022–23, p. 667.

ANNEX A

Summary of the General Board’s existing authority to allow alternative arrangements for examinations to mitigate the impact on students of serious disruption

Under Statute A V 1 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 7), the General Board is responsible for setting and maintaining the academic and educational policy of the University and for the management of the University’s academic and educational affairs. It is therefore inherent in the duties of the General Board that it must maintain academic standards.

The Statute also notes that the General Board has authority to make regulations about any matters within its responsibility. All regulations governing the arrangements for specific degrees and other awards are in General Board Regulations, set out in Chapter IV and Chapter VII of Ordinances. They are made or amended by the General Board (or the Education Committee or the Education Committee’s Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee under delegated authority) on publication of a Notice in the *Reporter*.

The Ordinances in Chapter III already give the General Board and certain officers the authority to take action in particular circumstances. The following table provides information on those actions.

<i>Summary of action</i>	<i>Authority in Chapter III of Ordinances</i>	<i>Body/Officer with decision-making authority</i>	<i>Details</i>
Release provisional marks to students and others	Regulations 2 and 4, Ordinance for the Disclosure of Examination Marks (<i>Statutes and Ordinances</i> , p. 258)	Council	Regulation 2 requires the Examiners for each of the examinations specified in Regulation 1 to ‘communicate to the Registry and to Tutors or other designated College officers... for transmission to their pupils, <u>the marks of their pupils and such other information as may be considered advisable</u> ; provided that, in the case of examinations leading to the degrees of <i>M.B.</i> , <i>B.Chir.</i> , and <i>Vet.M.B.</i> , such communication shall be in accordance with the regulations for <i>those degrees</i> ’ [emphasis added]. Regulation 4 allows marks and other information to be provided ‘in a statement of verification by the <u>Registry</u> , on evidence supplied by the Examiners, to examining bodies external to the University, for the purpose of exemption from their examinations’
Allow the final meeting of Examiners to take place without all Examiners present	Regulation 1, Ordinance for the Approval of Class-Lists (<i>Statutes and Ordinances</i> , p. 258)	General Board	Under the ‘Save in so far as the General Board shall allow otherwise’ clause, the Board has agreed to consider requests by the Chair of Examiners to excuse the attendance of a specified number of Examiners who will not be in attendance. In making such a request, the Chair of Examiners must be able to confirm that academic standards would be maintained notwithstanding the absence of these Examiners – that is that the remaining Examiners are confident that they can reach robust and reliable academic judgements and that the students to be classed must have a full set of marks. The External Examiner would be required to be present unless, exceptionally and based on circumstances outside the control of the External Examiner, permission for them not to attend has been granted under the Vice-Chancellor’s powers to excuse attendance for grave cause under the same regulation.
Class part of a cohort	Regulation 3, Ordinance for the Approval of Class-Lists (<i>Statutes and Ordinances</i> , p. 258)	General Board	Where a minority of students in a cohort have marks missing for whatever reason, it is custom and practice that Examiners have the option to class those students for whom complete marks are available. In exercising their academic judgement whether it is reasonable to class some of the cohort, academic custom and practice for classing must be maintained to assure reliability of the results and thereby maintenance of academic standards. [Amendments to reflect and record the current practice are set out in the revised wording of Regulation 6 of the Ordinance for the Approval of Class-lists in Annex B.]
Appoint further Examiners, Assessors, and Deputy Chairs	Regulation 4, General Regulations for Examiners and Assessors (<i>Statutes and Ordinances</i> , p. 259)	Chair of Examiners	The Chair of Examiners may request appointment of additional Examiners if the Chair reasonably believes that additional Examiners are needed. The regulations allow for the appointment to be approved outside the normal schedule by the General Board or a delegate.

ANNEX B**Proposed changes to Ordinances**

A. In the Ordinance for the Approval of Class-Lists (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 258):

(a) In Regulation 1 by inserting the phrase ‘(either before or after the meeting in question)’ after the words ‘Save in so far as the General Board shall’.

(b) By replacing existing Regulations 3–6 with the following new Regulations 3–7:

3. At the final meeting of the Examiners held under Regulation 1(b), or at the meeting of the Chair and the Senior Examiners held under Regulation 2, the class-list, as finally approved, shall be signed by all those present. The duly signed class-list shall be sent without delay to the Registry by the Chair of Examiners. That signed printed copy of the class-list, or if the Examiners’ agreement to sign is verified in another way, a printed copy subsequently signed by the Chair of Examiners, shall be preserved in the Registry as the authoritative list.

4. Where any Examiner fails to attend a meeting referred to in Regulation 1(a) or 1(b) without such absence being excused in advance by either the General Board or the Vice-Chancellor under Regulation 1, those present may, if they consider it appropriate to do so, proceed with the meeting, but the Chair of Examiners must immediately thereafter seek the General Board’s approval to the absence under Regulation 1.

5. In deciding whether to exercise its discretion under Regulation 1, the General Board must be satisfied that it is in the interests of students to do so and that academic standards have been and will be fully maintained. In determining whether academic standards have been (or will be) fully maintained, the General Board must have regard to whether there was or would be sufficient expertise among the Examiners who were or would be present at the meeting (and in doing so may consult with the Chair of Examiners).

6. Where the Chair of Examiners considers it necessary to protect the interests of students and is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained, any meeting referred to in this Ordinance may consider the marks of only some of the candidates for an examination, provided that for those candidates sufficient marks are available to enable a class to be awarded, with the marks of the remaining candidates for that examination to be considered at a separate meeting.

7. The General Board may, in circumstances other than those described in Regulation 3 of the Ordinance for Allowances to Candidates for Examinations and Regulation 1 of the Ordinance for the degree of Bachelor of Arts by Honours^[1], approve candidates for inclusion on a class-list for any examination under the heading ‘Declared to have deserved honours’ or on a list of successful candidates, at the request of the Chair of Examiners where the regulations for the course require this, provided that the Board is satisfied that to do so is in the interests of students and that academic standards continue to be maintained.

^[1] [Cross-references to the Ordinances to be added, *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 249 and p. 438].

B. By inserting the following new regulations in Ordinance, and renumbering any remaining regulations:

(a) Regulation 6, Ordinance for the Dates of Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 254):

6. Notwithstanding the above regulations, the General Board may start any examination later than as prescribed, if the General Board considers it necessary to take this action to protect the interests of students and is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained.

(b) Regulation 19, Ordinance for the Entries and Lists of Candidates for Examinations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 253):

19. Notwithstanding the above regulations or the Ordinance for the Dates of Examinations, the General Board may accept a list of candidates or a class-list or a list of candidates approved for a degree or other award later than the latest day or time prescribed, if the General Board considers it necessary to take this action to protect the interests of students and is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained.

ANNEX C

Terms of reference and membership of the task and finish group*Review of examination regulations post Marking and Assessment Boycott*

In May 2023, the Regent House rejected the Council’s proposal for emergency powers to mitigate the impact of the Marking and Assessment Boycott (MAB) on students. Following this decision, the Chair of the Council notified the Office for Students (OfS) of a breach of condition of registration E2 (good governance). In that report, the Chair of the Council noted that the University would undertake a review of its exam regulations.

This paper sets out proposed composition of a Task and Finish Group to oversee this review together with proposed terms of reference for the work.

The overall aim of the review is to consider how examinations should be regulated whilst ensuring that academic standards are upheld, and student interests are protected. The review will be divided into two phases completed over different time scales.

Phase 1 will look specifically at what measures should be available in the event of major disruption to examinations, including in response to a marking and assessment boycott or strike action, with due regard to proposed emergency provisions for matters governed by Ordinance or Order as they are developed by the Governance and Compliance Division. Phase I will be completed by Lent Term 2024 for implementation in Easter Term 2024.

Phase 2 will be a wider review of Chapter III of *Statutes and Ordinances* on examination of taught programmes to determine whether regulations should remain as Ordinances subject to Regent House approval, or would more appropriately be located as regulations under control of the General Board; and to clarify and simplify regulations. Phase 2 has a proposed completion date of Michaelmas Term 2024, in preparation for implementation in Michaelmas Term 2025.

(1) Membership of the Task and Finish Group

<i>Description</i>	<i>Member</i>
Chair	Dr Pieter van Houten
Member of Council Business Committee	Dr Zoe Adams
A Senior Tutor from a College	Professor Tom Monie (Christ’s College)
Two members of the General Board’s Education Committee	Professor Richard Rex Dr Ella McPherson
Three academics with experience as a Chair of Examiners (to include a spread of subject areas and undergraduate and postgraduate examining)	Professor Mark Elliott (Law) Professor Harriet Allen (Geography) Professor James Keeler (Chemistry)
A representative from the Cambridge Students’ Union	Fergus Kirman
Head of Education Services	Alice Benton

In attendance:

<i>Description</i>	<i>Member</i>
Head of Education Quality and Policy Office	Jane Clare
University Draftsman	Ceri Benton
Head of Exam Operations and Mitigating Circumstances	Jenny Green

(2) Terms of Reference*Phase 1*

- (i) To consider what measures should be available in the event of major disruption to examinations, including in response to a marking and assessment boycott or strike action and how best these should be articulated and published;
- (ii) To ensure that any proposals are aligned with the proposal on emergency provisions for matters governed by Ordinance or Order as it is developed by the Governance and Compliance Division.

Phase 2

- (i) To consider whether some or all of the regulations should remain as Ordinances subject to Regent House approval, or would more appropriately be located as regulations under control of the General Board;
- (ii) To consider if other wider reforms as part of the re-writing of Chapter III would be advantageous including devolving responsibility for the appointment of examiners to Faculty Boards and Degree Committees;
- (iii) To consider simplification and clarification of Ordinances in Chapter III, including whether some operational details should be removed and published in a different way;
- (iv) To review regulations in the light of experience gained during the course of the marking and assessment boycott to ensure that regulations are clear. In particular, to achieve clarity around appointment of examiners, approval and signing of class lists, requirements for attendance at meetings, and arrangements in the case of examiners being unable to attend;
- (v) To consider what additional advice and guidance should be issued to Faculty Boards and Degree Committees, and to Chairs/Senior Examiners on roles and responsibilities.

ANNEX D

Changes to General Board Regulations

The General Board has approved the following new regulations, to take effect from the same date as the changes set out in the Report unless the General Board determines otherwise.

- (a) By inserting the following new regulation in Chapter VII:

GENERAL REGULATION FOR POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT COURSES

Notwithstanding the regulations in this Chapter governing examinations, the General Board may grant permission for examinations to be scheduled after the end of a programme or on dates later than those previously agreed, if the General Board considers that those examinations could not otherwise be delivered and it is necessary to take this action to protect the interests of students, provided that the General Board is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained.

- (b) By inserting new Regulation 30 at the end of the Regulations for the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 470), to read as follows:

30. Notwithstanding the above regulations, the General Board may grant permission for examinations to be scheduled later than the timetable published in accordance with Regulations 11 and 15, if the General Board considers that those examinations could not otherwise be delivered and it is necessary to take this action to protect the interests of students, provided that the General Board is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained.

- (c) By amending Regulation 16 and inserting new Regulation 19 at the end of the General Regulations for the degree of Master of Philosophy by Advanced Study (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 504), to read as follows:

16. Save in so far as the General Board shall allow otherwise, every Examiner who has taken part in the examination shall be present, unless prevented by grave cause approved before the meeting by the Vice-Chancellor, at the final meeting of the Examiners at which the marks of candidates are approved and a provisional pass-list signed.

19. Notwithstanding the above regulations, the General Board may grant permission for examinations to be scheduled after the end of the programme, if the General Board considers that those examinations could not otherwise be delivered and it is necessary to take this action to protect the interests of students, provided that the General Board is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained.

- (d) By inserting new Regulation 14 at the end of the General Regulations for the degree of Master of Research (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 541), to read as follows:

14. Notwithstanding the above regulations, the General Board may grant permission for examinations to be scheduled after the end of the programme, if the General Board considers that those examinations could not otherwise be delivered and it is necessary to take this action to protect the interests of students, provided that the General Board is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained.

- (e) By inserting new Regulation 25 at the end of the Regulations for the degree of Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 564), to read as follows:

25. Notwithstanding the above regulations, the General Board may grant permission for examinations to be scheduled later than the dates determined in accordance with Regulations 8 and 13, if the General Board considers that those examinations could not otherwise be delivered and it is necessary to take this action to protect the interests of students, provided that the General Board is satisfied that academic standards will be maintained.

OBITUARIES

Obituary Notices

MICHAEL DONALD INGLIS CHISHOLM, M.A., Sc.D., FSA, FBA, Emeritus Fellow of St Catharine's College, Emeritus Professor of Geography, Gill Memorial Prizewinner, died on 9 July 2024, aged 93 years.

PETER ROWLAND GLAZEBROOK, M.A., Emeritus Fellow and formerly Vice-Master, President, Graduate Tutor, Director of Studies in Law, and Keeper of the Old Library of Jesus College, sometime University Lecturer in the Faculty of Law, died on 12 July 2024, aged 88 years.

GRACES

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 24 July 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, 2 August 2024**. Further information on requests for a ballot or the amendment of Graces is available to members of the Regent House on the Regent House Petitions site.[§]

1. That the recommendations in paragraph 17 of the Report of the General Board, dated 7 June 2024, on the introduction of Clinical Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) offices and posts (*Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 683) be approved.¹
2. That a Brian Dodsworth Fund be established in the University, to be governed by the following regulations:²

BRIAN DODSWORTH FUND

1. The bequest received from the Trust Fund created by Dr John Brian Dodsworth in his will, together with such other sums as may be received or applied for the same purpose, shall form an endowment fund called the Brian Dodsworth Fund to support the study, teaching of and research in Icelandic studies in the University, the purchase of material relevant to Icelandic studies by the University Library and the affiliated libraries, and to provide studentships in Icelandic studies in accordance with Regulation 3.
2. The Managers of the Scandinavian Studies Fund shall be responsible for the administration of the Fund and the application of its income.
3. Subject to Regulation 4, the income of the Fund shall be used, at the discretion of the Managers:
 - (a) to support the study, teaching of and research in Icelandic studies in such manner as the Managers shall determine, including through the purchase of material by the University Library and the affiliated libraries and the payment of the stipend, national insurance, and pension contributions of offices or posts;
 - (b) to provide awards, which shall be called the Brian Dodsworth Studentships, to students of Icelandic studies. Arrangements for awards, including the number, tenure and conditions of Studentships to be awarded in any given year, the expenses to be covered by an award, and the form of the application and selection processes, shall be at the discretion of the Managers and may provide for applications by persons who are not yet members of the University and for the financial circumstances of candidates to be taken into consideration.
4. Any unexpended income in any financial year may, at the discretion of the Managers:
 - (a) be awarded as Studentships in support of Scandinavian studies under such criteria as the Managers see fit;
 - (b) be carried forward for use as income in accordance with Regulation 3 in any one or more subsequent financial years;
 - (c) with the approval of the General Board, be applied to support research in the field of Scandinavian studies in the University in such manner as may be recommended by the Managers.

¹ See the Council's Notice, p. 802.

² See the Vice-Chancellor's Notice, p. 800.

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

ACTA

Congregation of the Regent House on Thursday, 18 July 2024

A Congregation was held at 9.30 a.m. The Graces submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6749, 2023–24, p. 789) and the supplicat for degrees to be conferred in absence were approved and the Congregation dissolved. Ceremonies to mark the conferral of these degrees then took place.

This content and pages 814-817 have been removed as they contain personal information.

Congregation of the Regent House on Friday, 19 July 2024

A Congregation was held at 9.30 a.m. The Grace submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6749, 2023–24, p. 790) and the supplicat for degrees to be conferred in absence were approved and the Congregation dissolved. Ceremonies to mark the conferral of these degrees then took place.

This content and pages 819-822 have been removed as they contain personal information.

Congregation of the Regent House on Saturday, 20 July 2024

A Congregation was held at 9.30 a.m. The Graces submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6749, 2023–24, p. 790) and the supplicat for degrees to be conferred in absence were approved and the Congregation dissolved. Ceremonies to mark the conferral of these degrees then took place.

This content and pages 824-827 have been removed as they contain personal information.

Result of ballot on Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (EJRA) and an amendment

23 July 2024

The Registry gives notice that, as a result of the ballot held between 10 and 22 July 2024, Grace 2 of 12 June 2024, recommending the retention of the of the Employer Justified Retirement Age (EJRA) but with changes to its scope and other revisions to the University's Retirement Policy, was **approved**.

The Council had already called a vote on the Grace's proposals. Following the receipt of an amendment proposing the abolition of the EJRA for all officers, the Council agreed on 28 June to add the amendment to the ballot paper with some minor changes to the drafting (*Reporter*, 6748, 2023–24, p. 727). The 28 June Notice also confirmed the options on the ballot paper as follows:

- (A) In favour of the Grace in its original form
 - The EJRA only applies to academic officers, the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellors
 - The EJRA takes effect at the end of the academic year those officers reach 69
 - The changes to the Retirement Policy and Ordinances are made with effect from 1 September 2024, as set out in the Report
- (B) In favour of the Grace as amended
 - The EJRA is abolished for all officers, both academic and academic-related, with immediate effect
- (C) Against the Grace, whether in its original or amended form
 - The EJRA is retained for all officers, both academic and academic-related, as it currently stands, retiring at the end of the academic year in which they reach 67

The results of the voting, conducted under the Single Transferable Vote regulations (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 121), are shown below.

Number of valid votes cast: 3,498 (no invalid votes) (Quota: 1,749)

	<i>First count</i>	<i>Transfer of option (C) votes</i>	<i>Second count</i>	<i>RESULT</i>
(A) EJRA of 69 for academic officers, Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellors only	1,699	570	2,269	APPROVED
(B) Abolition of the EJRA for all officers	900	+30	930	
(C) No change: EJRA of 67 for all officers	899	-899	–	
<i>Non-transferable</i>		299	299	
TOTAL	3,498		3,498	

Eleven fly-sheets signed by members of the Regent House, two fly-sheets signed by members of the Regent House and University employees, and one fly-sheet signed by registered students and sabbatical officers of the University of Cambridge Students' Union were received in relation to this ballot. The Council also issued a statement in response. In accordance with the Council's Notice on Discussions and Fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 116), the thirteen fly-sheets signed by members of the Regent House (including the two mixed fly-sheets) and the Council statement are reprinted below (from p. 829); the student fly-sheet is not reproduced.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registry*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

FLY-SHEETS REPRINTED**Fly-sheets relating to the ballot on Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (EJRA)**

In accordance with the Council's Notice on Discussions and Fly-sheets (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 116), the thirteen fly-sheets signed by members of the Regent House and the Council statement in response received for the ballot on Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (EJRA) are reprinted below. Fly-sheets are reprinted in the order in which they appeared in the ballot booklet, which was random. For the result of the ballot see p. 828.

Fly-sheet in support of Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (EJRA)

We would like to express our strong support for the recommendations put forward by the EJRA Review Group, and urge you to vote in favour of the recommendations. In particular, **we oppose a blanket removal of the EJRA for academic University officers, unless a clear transition plan is put in place to (1) minimise the impact on academic career progression, and (2) ensure continuation of the positive changes in research culture, diversity and equality.**

As the comprehensive analysis by the Review Group highlights, abolishing the EJRA for academics is predicted to result in ~40% decrease in new vacancies over the next decade. This will severely impact career prospects for early-career academics in non-established posts, who lead ambitious, innovative and creative research programmes, and contribute substantially to teaching, outreach, grant income, and many aspects of University life and culture.

Although most other Russell Group institutions do not apply an EJRA, with the exception of Oxford, a key difference is that 53% of Cambridge academics stay at the University until retirement, in contrast to 22% elsewhere. Whilst this highlights the exceptional academic and professional environment at the University, it also advocates the need for other solutions to sustain a diverse and dynamic academic environment, and provide opportunities for academics starting their independent careers. In the absence of alternative, better approaches, we currently favour maintaining an EJRA within the University.

We highly appreciate and respect our established colleagues and mentors, some of them nearing or past the retirement age, who continue to lead world-class research programmes. They provide invaluable guidance, inspiration, and collaborative opportunities at the onset of our independent careers. One day, we hope to be in a similar position, feeling similarly valued, and keen to carry on our jobs and research. However, we believe that the proposed revisions to the extension process ensure sufficient flexibility for continued academic engagement beyond the retirement age.

Finally, the recommendation of the Report is to increase the EJRA to the age of 69. This will still result in a ~10% reduction of vacancies over the next 10 years, without clear prospects of new positions being created. The signatories would be grateful for the University to consider how to mitigate this. Together with the Mid-Career Fellows and Early PI Networks that many of us are members of, we are keen to help develop a strategy for ongoing fair, diverse and innovative career opportunities.

Please vote in favour of the Report's recommendations [Option (A)].

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

J. W. J. AKROYD	I. HARDEGE	A. PHILPOTT
N. S. BAYIN	M. W. HOARE	E. RAFFAN
S. J. BRAY	M. A. HOLMES	T. E. RATNAIKE
S. S. G. BROWN	N. J. HOLMES	T. J. V. ROULET
H. J. C. J. BULSTRODE	C. J. HOULDCROFT	S. RUSSELL
D. A. CARDWELL	M. IMBEAULT	J. S. SIMONS
S. T. CARPENTER	A. JHA	N. SINGAL
J. CHOI	L. M. JOY	U. M. H. SOVIO
E. A. CLARK	F. A. KARAM TEIXEIRA	B. J. STEVENTON
W. H. COLLEDGE	J. R. KUMITA	M. A. STORER
S. J. COLVIN	M. E. DE L. LAMB	J. VAN DEN AMEELE
L. A. DEARDEN	M. LANDGRAF	E. M. WEIR
M. A. DUQUE CORREA	R. G. McMAHON	J. M. WHITEHEAD
A. C. FERGUSON-SMITH	T. G. MICKLEM	C. D. WHITEWOODS
A. M. FRANKELL	L.-M. E. NEEDHAM	F. XIONG
C. B. J. GODLEE	K. K. NIAKAN	

Also signed by ten University employees who are not members of the Regent House or registered students.

Fly-sheet in favour of abolishing the EJRA

As a British employer seeking to retain a mandatory retirement age for its academic members of staff, Cambridge University is legally obligated to provide an adequate rationale for doing so. Legally as well as morally, the burden of proof lies on the University to justify its age-based discrimination. Through the Review Group chaired by Richard Penty, the University has sought to discharge its burden of proof by contending that the abolition of its mandatory retirement age would significantly reduce the number of vacancies each year for entry-level academics. However, as is shown in a sustained rejoinder by Oliver Linton and Raghavendra Rau and others to the report issued by Penty's Review Group, the efforts of the Review Group to supply a justification for the University's mandatory retirement age are fatally undone by errors and inconsistencies and unsubstantiated pronouncements in the Group's statistical analyses.¹

As is recounted in the Linton/Rau document, some apt modelling of the likely effects of the abolition of the University's mandatory retirement age indicates that any reduction in vacancies for entry-level academics will in fact be trivial (between 1% and 4%). As five employment tribunals have held in five consecutive successful lawsuits against Oxford University² – the only other English university to retain a mandatory retirement age since 2011 – such a negligible reduction in entry-level vacancies is far too small to be a legally recognizable justifying factor. It cannot render lawful the age-based discrimination in which the University is engaging through its retention of a mandatory retirement age.

Members of Penty's Review Group have also invoked a few ancillary rationales for the retention of a mandatory retirement age. Each of those additional rationales is rebutted both in the Linton/Rau document and on the 'Abolish EJRA at Cambridge University' website.³ One of those ancillary justifications should receive some brief attention here. Supporters of a mandatory retirement age suggest that, if it is eliminated, it will have to be replaced by the University with a system of performance management. Three responses to such a concern are warranted here. First, as has been stated by successive employment tribunals and by a parliamentary position paper that accompanied the 2011 Repeal of Retirement Age Amendment to the 2010 Equality Act,⁴ the use of a mandatory retirement age as a substitute for an adequate system of performance management is unlawful. Second, most if not all of the components of a satisfactory system of performance management are already routinely operative within the workings of the University: probationary-period assessments, course evaluations, promotions assessments, REF inclusion or exclusion, professorial pay-grade reviews. Indeed, those components generate more fine-grained appraisals than will be necessary in any adequate system of performance management. Third, any additional measure that would involve an amendment to Statute C of the University cannot be introduced without the approval of the Regent House.

In short, the justifications for a mandatory retirement age propounded by the University through the Penty Review Group are untenable. Hence, the University has not discharged its legal burden of proof for its retention of a mandatory retirement age. **Members of the Regent House should vote to abolish that discriminatory policy, which currently leaves the University vulnerable to spates of successful lawsuits [Option (B)].**

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

D. S. H. ABULAFIA	R. GARCIA MAYORAL	E. M. NUGENT
MICHAEL ANDERSON	N. J. GAY	W. O'NEILL
S. M. ANSARI	G. F. GILMORE	S. M. OOSTHUIZEN
W. J. ASTLE	M. A. GOLDIE	M. PEPPER
P. J. N. BAERT	D. J. GOODE	F. QUEVEDO
S. BARON-COHEN	U. C. GOSWAMI	D. RALPH
P. L. BOSSAERTS	M. W. GROSS	L. RAMAKRISHNAN
R. E. BOURKE	T. C. GROSSER	R. RAU
PIETE BROOKS	R. HAYNES	D. M. REINER
T. A. CARPENTER	D. A. HODELL	T. W. ROBBINS
G. C. CARR	C. J. HUMPHREYS	I. G. ROBERTS
P. A. CHAUFFAILLE SAFFI	H. E. HUPPERT	H. SABOURIAN
T. W. CLYNE	M. JAMNIK	L. SARNO
F. COLUCCI	P. A. KATTUMAN	S. SCHOLTES
J. A. CROWCROFT	Y. J. KIM	W. SCHULTZ
M. A. CROWLEY	ROSS D. KING	R. J. SMITH
E. DIMSON	M. H. KRAMER	E. J. SOILLEUX
R. J. DOWLING	P. O. KRISTENSSON	C. A. TOUT
M. P. EISNER	N. D. A. LANE	L. R. VINX
C. H. EK	D. LIANG	B. A. WINDEATT
G. R. EVANS	O. B. LINTON	L. A. ZAIBERT
N. W. EVANS	A. W. MOORE	
R. A. FOLEY	F. MOSCOSO DEL PRADO MARTÍN	

¹ See <https://www.econ.cam.ac.uk/research-files/repec/cam/pdf/cwpe2428.pdf>.

² The first of those five lawsuits was appealed by Oxford, and the employment tribunal's judgment was upheld by the Employment Appeal Tribunal. Thus, six consecutive legal decisions have gone against Oxford on the ground that the effect of its mandatory retirement age in increasing entry-level vacancies is trivially small. In addition, in three consecutive proceedings against Oxford prior to the employment-tribunal litigation, Oxford's Internal Appeal Court staffed by senior independent judges held that the university's mandatory retirement age is unjustified (though the trivial smallness of the increase in entry-level vacancies was not an issue in those proceedings).

³ See <https://sites.google.com/cam.ac.uk/end-ejra>.

⁴ See p. 3 of <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78b3a240f0b62b22cbc19e/11-536-phasing-out-default-retirement-age-government-response.pdf>.

**Recommendations of the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the
University's Retirement Policy and Employer Justified Retirement Age – *Placet* fly-sheet**

As retired members of the University, we are reluctant to meddle in its governance. But we can perhaps claim a legitimate voice on this issue. We appreciate the anxieties that members of the Regent House may feel about a fixed retirement age. But many of those anxieties are faced in these proposals (including the raising of the retirement age to 69, the modification to the rules for 'extensions' and the planned review of the contribution of retired academics to the University). For us inter-generational fairness, and the hopes and aspirations of early career scholars take precedence. **So we urge you to vote placet, in favour of the Grace [*Option (A)*].**

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

J. W. AJIOKA
T. R. S. ALLAN
C. Y. BARLOW
W. M. BEARD
B. J. BURCHELL
D. A. CARDWELL
P. A. CARTLEDGE
A. N. CHESTER
N. COLLINGS
S. J. COLVIN
A. COOKE
N. R. M. DE LANGE
J. DIGGLE
A. M. DONALD
A. EATON
J. A. ELLIOTT
D. J. FELDMAN
D. F. FORD
S. C. FRANKLIN

G. L. GERSTLE
H. J. GLEN
C. D. GRAY
B. J. HEAL
D. W. HOLTON
G. C. HORROCKS
C. HUMPHREY
H. R. HURST
I. M. HUTCHINGS
J. M. E. HYLAND
J. A. JACKSON
M. K. JONES
J. M. LIEU
M. J. MILLETT
P. C. MILLETT
A. C. MINSON
M. G. MORENO FIGUEROA
C. T. MORLEY
D. O'BRIEN

N. M. PADFIELD
A. D. B. POOLE
S. K. RANKIN
J. C. ROBERTSON
S. RUSSELL
J. K. M. SANDERS
M. SCHOFIELD
N. SINGAL
D. J. SPIEGELHALTER
F. M. STAJANO
L. C. TAUB
A. E. TRAUB
M. E. WELLAND
J. WHALEY
J. M. WHITEHEAD
J. WOODHOUSE
S. E. WORTHINGTON

Fly-sheet in favour of recommendations regarding the EJRA

The case for retaining a mandatory retirement age for academic Officers is a straightforward one. The majority of academic posts in Cambridge become vacant on the retirement of the holder – not many leave for other universities in mid-career. If the retirement age were abolished for academic officers and a significant number were to retire later, then the University would be unable to maintain even the present low rate of new appointments. The greater unpredictability in the timing of retirements would also make planning for recruitment for the replacement of retirees by Faculties and Departments more difficult.

New academic staff, mostly younger in truth, bring new ideas, new approaches and new research areas. Turnover in academic officers at Cambridge is already low and to refresh our research portfolio we need more turnover, not less. This of course is not about the capability of staff near retirement age but rather an acknowledgement that each new vacancy provides a way of opening up a new research area. Recruitment of new staff also serves to improve diversity amongst our established academic cohort.

Retirement from office should not mean the end of academic life: we all have colleagues who continue to contribute to the University via teaching, research and in many other ways after formal retirement. This post-retirement engagement can be made easier, and here the EJRA Review proposes that extensions beyond the retirement age in an unestablished capacity should be made simpler and more than one application allowed. There is also a recognition that more needs to be done to assist emeritus staff to continue to contribute where they wish to do so and the University has committed to make sure this happens. This is very much in line with trends at many other research intensive institutions on both sides of the Atlantic.

We recognise that the EJRA is an emotive subject for many, but there is no one perfect solution to the issue. The Review's recommendations, which include the proposal to raise the retirement age from 67 to 69 for academic officers, are an attempt to mitigate the issues facing those approaching retirement whilst providing opportunities for early career researchers and for the University to refresh its research base. The combination of new recruitment with mechanisms for retaining exceptional researchers and scholars beyond the retirement age promotes fairness across the generations. We believe that the recommendations achieve a sensible balance between these competing drivers.

Hence we are certain that the proposals are in the best interests of the University. **We therefore urge you to vote in favour of the recommendations on the EJRA in Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 and to reject any amendments [Option (A)].**

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

O. B. AKAN	A. EATON	L. M. JOY
J. W. J. AKROYD	C. J. EDMONDS	H. J. JOYCE
G. P. ALLEN	S. J. EGLIN	C. F. KAMINSKI
K.-A. ALLEN	J. A. ELLIOTT	G. S. KAMINSKI SCHIERLE
M. ATATURE	A. C. FERGUSON-SMITH	F. A. KARAM TEIXEIRA
M. ATKINS	R. C. FITZGERALD	J. H. KEELER
H. BABINSKY	A. J. D. FLETT	K. L. KENNEDY
N. BAMPOS	A. J. FLEWITT	M. KRAFT
C. Y. BARLOW	P. D. FLYNN	S. T. LAM
J. J. BAUMBERG	R. H. FRIEND	M. LANDGRAF
M. M. BEBER	J. P. GARDNER	A. A. LAPKIN
A. M. BENTON	G. L. GERSTLE	I. C. LESTAS
M. D. BOLTON	E. GILBY	T. LI
S. J. BRAY	M. R. W. GLOVER	J. R. LISTER
D. A. CARDWELL	A. GONZALEZ CABRERA HONORIO SERRENHO	M. V. LUCAS-SMITH
T. K. CARNE	A. GURRIA	D. J. T. MCKAY
S. T. CARPENTER	J. A. GUY	R. G. McMAHON
M. D. CASTLE	S. E. HAKENBECK	F. A. McROBIE
H. A. CHASE	J. D. HALL	A. E. MARKAKI
Y. R. CHEN	H. J. HANCOCK	J. M. R. MATHESON
Q. CHENG	L. E. HARGREAVES	P. H. MAXWELL
E. A. CLARK	T. N. HARPER	T. G. MICKLEM
J. CLARKE	T. HASAN	G. D. MOGGRIDGE
W. H. COLLEDGE	C. J. HILL	M. G. MORENO FIGUEROA
S. J. COLVIN	M. HOCKADAY	A. J. MURRAY
M. J. CRISP	M. A. HOLMES	A. D. NEELY
A. M. DONALD	N. J. HOLMES	T. C. O'CONNELL
A. P. DOWLING	H. E. M. HUNT	C. J. O'KANE
A. DOWNIE	S. IYER	O. ONER
C. DURKAN	MARTIN H. JOHNSON	N. A. OVENDEN
J. H. DURRELL		R. M. OWENS

J. E. PAGE
G. T. PARKS
A. K. N. PARLIKAD
N. PEAKE
R. V. PENTY
A. PHILPOTT
M. R. E. PROCTOR
R. T. RANASINGHE
M. R. W. RANDES
E. L. RAWLINS
R. RHODES
P. J. ROGERSON
T. J. V. ROULET
F. J. RUSSELL

S. RUSSELL
A. SANCHEZ
J. K. M. SANDERS
J. S. SIMONS
N. SINGAL
R. J. SIPPY
M. T. SKIPPER
F. M. STAJANO
P. STANLEY-MARBELL
B. J. STEVENTON
N. SWAMINATHAN
J. M. TILEY
J. J. TOMASIK
A. E. TRAUB

P. S. TZOKOVA
J. VAN DEN AMEELE
P. J. VAN HOUTEN
C. K. VELU
R. VENKATARAMANAN
A. J. WEBBER
L. A. WEINERT
M. E. WELLAND
J. M. WHITEHEAD
C. D. WHITEWOODS
J. M. WYBURD
A. D. YATES

Fly-sheet in support of Grace 2 of 12 June 2024

In this fly-sheet we highlight something that is of crucial importance to the hundreds, if not thousands of us who have worked over the years to make Cambridge a better and fairer university. The Employer Justified Retirement Age (EJRA) policy at the University of Cambridge plays a critical role in maintaining the institution's tradition of academic excellence and innovation and has a positive impact on diversity, equality and inclusion. While intergenerational fairness is an aim of EJRA, diversity is a vital part of that fairness. Frankly, we think improvement in EDI indicators needs to be an EJRA aim and are disappointed that it was dropped from the list. Nevertheless, it remains crucially important to all the signatories of this fly-sheet.

Over the past 10 years, the University has increasingly become more diverse, equal and inclusive. This has led to more creative thinking and innovation, the introduction of new perspectives, greater motivation and aspiration for all staff groups, and immeasurable enrichment of university life for everyone. We would like to remind everyone that this wasn't always the case and diversity is not uniformly distributed.

The vast majority of white and BAME women working for the University for instance are still stuck in lower paid jobs. While almost half of all associate and assistant professors at grade 9 are women (45% in 2023), only a quarter of professors at grade 12 are female (25% in 2023). Similarly, BAME colleagues still constitute a small minority in high level decision-making bodies in the University.

The University is recruiting more diverse staff as positions become available. Over the past 10 years, 86% to 90% of retirees were white, with a vast majority of them male, indicating clearly how the University is changing. In the same period, while the proportion of women at grade 12 is still low (26.0% of all staff in 2023), it has risen by almost 10% (16.6% of all staff in 2014). The overall percentage of BAME employees at the University has also increased steadily from 11.1% in 2014 to 18.6% in 2023 (of those who declared their ethnicity).

Having a more diverse university is good for everyone, and it wouldn't be possible if no positions came up to be filled. The EJRA review finds that the majority of academic posts in Cambridge are created only when the position-holder retires. If people did not retire, Cambridge would not have become more diverse.

Remember, while other universities have been able to grow, our peculiar collegiate system precludes significantly increasing student numbers and therefore the creation of new positions. Before other universities abolished retirement age, Cambridge had the lowest job creation rate in the Russell Group. As a result of abolition, many Russell Group universities now have an even lower new position creation rate, despite their growth. EJRA is how we have been able to become more diverse, and we need to maintain it. The proposed policy is in the best interests of the University.

Let's vote in favour of Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (*placet*) and reject any amendments [*Option (A)*].

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

B. J. BURCHELL	E. A. HIDE	R. T. RANASINGHE
D. A. CARDWELL	S. IYER	T. J. V. ROULET
S. J. COLVIN	L. M. JOY	A. SANCHEZ
M. S. DESAI	P. M. KNOX	J. K. M. SANDERS
J. A. ELLIOTT	M. V. LUCAS-SMITH	J. E. SCOTT-WARREN
S. B. FRANKLIN	R. G. MCMAHON	J. S. SIMONS
J. P. GARDNER	M. G. MORENO FIGUEROA	F. M. STAJANO
M. R. W. GLOVER	Y. NAVARO	A. E. TRAUB
S. E. HAKENBECK	T. C. O'CONNELL	J. VAN DEN AMEELE
H. J. HANCOCK	R. M. OWENS	A. J. WEBBER
C. M. HICKS	R. V. PENTY	J. M. WHITEHEAD

Postdoc fly-sheet in favour of the recommendations on the EJRA

The University's retirement age is a logical and important trade-off to the unique independence and academic freedom offered by Cambridge's established academic posts, as it guarantees Cambridge's established researchers and academics to be at the forefront of innovation and knowledge creation without having to fear how their ideas and advances might be interpreted by performance managers. This extraordinary flexibility and protection are a key asset for Cambridge's innovation potential, and essential for its future success.

However, unsurprisingly, having such a unique post is not only highly sought after by many within the local postdoctoral and earlier career communities but even PIs well beyond Cambridge. It is therefore understandable that most established Cambridge academics prefer to remain within their positions until they need to be vacated and, accordingly, the EJRA plays a major role in Cambridge's job creation rate.

The data presented by the EJRA working group has impressively demonstrated that abolishing the retirement age could lead to 672 fewer vacancies for earlier career academics over the next 40 years, which would not only fuel the precarities already experienced by many but also significantly damage Cambridge's aim to support intergenerational fairness by hindering career opportunities and progression for large numbers of the early and mid-career academic communities.

Hence, the postdocs, early, and mid-career researchers and academics signing this fly-sheet appeal to everyone that is permitted to participate in the ballot to **protect the retirement age and intergenerational fairness by accepting the recommendations on the EJRA in Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 [Option (A)] while rejecting potential amendments.**

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

D. A. CARDWELL
M. J. CRISP
A. EATON
M. R. W. GLOVER
J. D. HALL
S. IYER
L. M. JOY

G. S. KAMINSKI SCHIERLE
D. J. T. MCKAY
R. G. MCMAHON
M. G. MORENO FIGUEROA
T. C. O'CONNELL
R. M. OWENS
R. V. PENTY

N. RICHMAN
S. RUSSELL
J. S. SIMONS
J. J. TOMASIK
P. S. TZOKOVA
J. VAN DEN AMEELE
J. M. WHITEHEAD

Also signed by twenty-four University employees who are not members of the Regent House or registered students.

Fly-sheet for Regent House ballot on Grace 2 of 12 June 2024

There are some key issues which Regents should bear in mind when deciding how to vote.

47% of academic officers retire on the last day they currently can. This is despite some staff choosing to move to other institutions to avoid retirement. The Review looked for such staff but the numbers were too low to be visible in the data. Late career ‘brain drain’ is not a significant phenomenon overall, though there may be some subject exceptions.

Cambridge had the lowest job creation rate of any Russell Group University before the abolition of mandatory retirement. We have maintained our rate, most probably because of our Employer Justified Retirement Age (EJRA), but we are no longer the lowest. We are still below the average of the 22 Russell Group higher education providers (HEPs) which don’t have an EJRA but the gap between us and them pre-2012 was such that it would have required almost no one to retire from those HEPs in the past 10 years to reduce their raw rate to below ours.

No one can predict, with certainty, what would happen if we ended mandatory retirement. The Review’s detailed modelling yielded estimates for the reduction in vacancies of 28–40% (in first 10 years) and 12–19% in long-term. Others claim the Review’s methodology is flawed and that the long-term figure is 2.75% (or 1–4%), obtained by estimating average length of tenure, and average extension to that, if there is no mandatory retirement, yielding a plausible figure of 11% for long-term reduction but then dividing it by 2 twice; both divisions are inappropriate. The first was to adjust for only c. 50% of departures being retirements, but this is accounted for in the figure for average tenure. The second division is due to estimating 50% would still retire at 67 without an EJRA, but again this is already part of the calculation of the increase in tenure due to staff retiring later than now. Both these are double counting and invalid.

The EJRA does discriminate on age, but age discrimination is legal in the right circumstances, e.g. you can’t vote until 18 and can’t serve on a jury after 75. Without an EJRA, our progress in addressing historic discrimination in recruitment by gender and ethnicity will be slower.

We believe that accepting the hurdle – that we must present a convincing case for staying on after 69 – is an acceptable compromise to retain our stringent protection from influence or interference in our intellectual freedom. Others may believe we can have our cake and eat it, but we expect that abolition of mandatory retirement will create a necessity for greater management of academics, including easier dismissal for perceived weak performance. Yes, this will require Regent House approval, but Regents are duty bound to accept measures which have a compelling case.

We urge you to put the interests of the University first, above any personal considerations, and **vote to approve Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 unamended** [*Option (A)*].

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

D. A. CARDWELL	S. C. GRAHAM	N. PEAKE
D. M. CARRINGTON	S. E. HAKENBECK	A. PHILPOTT
Y. R. CHEN	H. J. HANCOCK	E. L. POOLE
Y.-W. B. CHUNG	T. N. HARPER	P. J. ROGERSON
A. COOKE	N. J. HOLMES	T. J. V. ROULET
H. J. CREMIN	S. IYER	S. RUSSELL
M. J. CRISP	L. M. JOY	A. SANCHEZ
C. M. CRUMP	J. H. KEELER	J. K. M. SANDERS
J. E. DEANE	A. LISTON	F. M. STAJANO
J. L. DOOLEY	N. MCGOVERN	M. P. F. SUTCLIFFE
J. H. DURRELL	R. G. MCMAHON	S. R. S. SZRETER
J. A. ELLIOTT	P. MASTROENI	L. S. TILEY
A. E. FIRTH	C. J. MERRICK	A. E. TRAUB
G. M. FRASER	T. G. MICKLEM	J. M. TURNER
A. GANNON	M. G. MORENO FIGUEROA	S. D. TURNER
J. P. GARDNER	M. J. MURRAY	J. VAN DEN AMEELE
M. R. W. GLOVER	T. C. O’CONNELL	M. WALLBERG
I. G. P. GOODFELLOW	K. OKKENHAUG	J. M. WHITEHEAD

You have nothing to lose as a result of voting for Abolition of the EJRA

The ballot on the amended EJRA Grace offers several choices:

- to vote for the status quo, or not to vote, which would have the same effect
- to vote to abolish the EJRA for academic-related Officers and to raise the age of dismissal for University Teaching Officers from 67 to 69
- to vote to abolish the EJRA altogether.

Single transferable voting means that any academic Officer who puts ‘abolition’ [*Option (B)*] first and the proposal to raise the age of dismissal from 67 to 69 [*Option (A)*] second will not be denied the extra two years as a result of voting for abolition if that option succeeds in gaining a majority.

Voting for abolition of the EJRA does not automatically benefit Cambridge’s younger UTOS. Vacated UTO posts are advertised globally, and are commonly taken by applicants from outside the University.

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

D. S. H. ABULAFIA	N. J. GAY	F. MOSCOSO DEL PRADO MARTÍN
MICHAEL ANDERSON	M. A. GIROLAMI	S. M. OOSTHUIZEN
S. M. ANSARI	M. W. GROSS	D. RALPH
W. J. ASTLE	T. C. GROSSER	L. RAMAKRISHNAN
P. J. N. BAERT	R. HAYNES	R. RAU
S. BARON-COHEN	D. A. HODELL	T. W. ROBBINS
P. L. BOSSAERTS	C. J. HUMPHREYS	I. G. ROBERTS
PIETE BROOKS	H. E. HUPPERT	H. SABOURIAN
P. A. CHAUFFAILLE SAFFI	F. IIDA	S. SCHOLTES
C. M. CLARK	M. JAMNIK	W. SCHULTZ
T. W. CLYNE	P. A. KATTUMAN	R. J. SMITH
J. A. CROWCROFT	M. H. KRAMER	E. J. SOILLEUX
E. DIMSON	N. D. A. LANE	C. A. TOUT
M. P. EISNER	D. F. LAUGA	L. R. VINX
G. R. EVANS	R. L. MARTIN	
R. A. FOLEY	A. W. MOORE	

Fly-sheet in support of Grace 2 of 12 June 2024 (EJRA)

The subject of retirement is one that academics in the University feel strongly about. The University as an institution is not its buildings, committees, departments or other structures – it is people who make the place: students, professional services staff, technicians, cleaners, gardeners, academics and those in the multitude of other roles that make the University work. To very many of us, the relationship that we have with the University is not purely transactional. It is as though we give a piece of our very souls to this place. Many staff in a diversity of roles share this feeling of course, but in the context of the EJRA, there is a particular impact on academics.

The single most important reason for having an EJRA for academics is the consequence for academic freedom. There is no other university worldwide that surpasses the academic freedom that we benefit from here. Fundamentally it is for each academic to decide for themselves what to research without fear for our positions. This allows us all to be risk-takers; to test out ideas that are radical, unpopular, untried or beyond the edge of what might usually be considered ‘our fields’. But it is exactly in this type of space that some of the most outstanding research takes place, and Cambridge has had a far greater impact on the world than its physical size would suggest because of this freedom.

Nothing, however, is without a price, and the necessary consequence of the absence of a performance review that could lead to the end of employment (something that would greatly diminish that academic freedom) is the fixed retirement age for academics in tenured posts. We therefore support the recommendation to retain the EJRA and increase it to 69.

However retirement should not be the end of an academic’s relationship with the University: someone’s ability to contribute to learning and research does not depend on age. The University has not had a good track record in recent years of recognising this and has largely ignored the consequence of retirement on academics; they suddenly find themselves practically excluded from the University that they have given themselves to, and to which they may have so much more to offer. It is perhaps the Colleges who have been much better at valuing Emeritus Fellows in their academic communities.

Hence the review recommendation that an academic can continue to be indefinitely employed on research grants to which they contribute is one positive step. But there is much more to do to improve the current situation, and the final recommendation that the University should review its post-retirement engagement with academic staff is critical. The University could do so much more, at relatively little cost, to allow academics to contribute to the intellectual life of the University, whether or not they continue with formal employment, and it is important that Council has said that it will implement this recommendation should the Grace be passed in its original form.

If we get this right, retirement from tenure should not be something to be feared. Rather, it should provide an opportunity to each of us as we pass through retirement to find new, exciting and fulfilling ways to participate actively in the life of this University, and in doing so enhance its ongoing mission to contribute to society through learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

We urge you to vote in favour of the recommendations of Grace 2 of 12 June in its original form [*Option (A)*] and to reject any amendment that would lead to the removal of the EJRA.

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

O. B. AKAN	S. D. GUEST	T. C. O’CONNELL
K.-A. ALLEN	T. HASAN	G. T. PARKS
D. A. CARDWELL	N. J. HOLMES	R. V. PENTY
Q. CHENG	I. M. HUTCHINGS	T. J. V. ROULET
M. J. CRISP	S. IYER	S. RUSSELL
J. H. DURRELL	L. M. JOY	F. M. STAJANO
J. A. ELLIOTT	H. J. JOYCE	P. STANLEY-MARBELL
A. J. FLEWITT	M. KIM	M. P. F. SUTCLIFFE
J. P. GARDNER	M. V. LUCAS-SMITH	A. E. TRAUB
A. GONZALEZ CABRERA HONORIO SERRENHO	R. G. MCMAHON	C. K. VELU
	T. H. W. MINSHALL	

Fly-sheet against the abolition of EJRA and for the recommendations of the EJRA Review Group

The EJRA Review Group has produced a range of analyses – in many ways more robust than evidence provided by Oxford to defend its retirement age – showing how many more Cambridge academics, compared to other Russell Group universities, retire at the cut-off age of 67 instead of retiring before their mid-60s. Simulations based on HESA data show that abolishing the retirement age would cost us 12 to 26 new job opportunities annually. The Review Group had legal counsel and is confident those arguments will stand in court.

Esteemed colleagues have produced a rebuttal paper critiquing the Review Group’s assumptions and methods. This would make for a great review in a top econometric journal, but it does not provide evidence or analysis of its own. The analyses provided by the EJRA Review Group were reviewed by other statistical experts who maybe did not have the conflict of interest of being close to their retirement age. Another fly-sheet points out one important problem in this rebuttal paper.

Importantly, Linton, Rau and their co-authors conclude that the EJRA should be abolished altogether without providing evidence that this is the right course of action. While the Review Group does not claim the evidence provided by the Review is perfect (at least it provides evidence to support its conclusions), it does not take a team of advanced econometricians to know that in a university like Cambridge that does not grow in the number of its students, allowing people to retire whenever they decide (meaning staying on way after 67 as our data would suggest), would have a disastrous impact on the creation of new academic posts. On page 3, the Linton/Rau paper simply misunderstands how our University works and make the assertion that ‘the creation of new professorships is contingent on funding availability and academic interest, not vacancy generation through retirement.’ This is incorrect: there is no open-ended process to recruit new people at Cambridge. The Chest income for each institution is tightly defined and this controls the number of academic positions. The kind of expansive university they imagine simply does not exist here. Comparing Cambridge with other Russell Group universities with regards to the job creation rate is misleading considering how those universities have grown their student numbers, while we have not.

Do we really want a university where people can retire whenever they wish whatever their contribution to our institution? The temptation for many would be to stay on *ad vitam aeternam*. We need to retain flexibility to create new academic posts through retirement, while offering opportunities for certain individuals to stay on, in a transparent and fair manner.

A fly-sheet states that ‘the use of a mandatory retirement age as a substitute for an adequate system of performance management is unlawful.’ The reference provided merely says that the Government does not believe that it should be so used. By contrast, in the case of *Seldon v Clarkson Wright and Jakes (a partnership)* [2012] UKSC 16, the Supreme Court found that ‘The third [aim] was limiting the need to expel partners by way of performance management, which is directly related to the ‘dignity’ aims accepted in *Rosenblatt and Fuchs*. It is also clear that the aims can be related to the particular circumstances of the type of business concerned (such as university teaching, as in *Georgiev*). I [Lady Hale] would therefore accept that the identified aims were legitimate.’ Abolishing the EJRA would implicitly be an agreement for performance management which would impact academic freedom especially for most senior colleagues who are not subject to probation.

The recommendation of the EJRA Review Group – to maintain the retirement age but shift it to 69 – is fair and well-needed to maintain equity across generations through necessary turnover. By contrast, the idea of abolishing the EJRA altogether would throw our university into chaos. **We encourage colleagues to consider the risks associated with the abolition of the retirement age and vote in favour of the conclusions of the EJRA Review Group [Option (A)].**

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

B. J. BURCHELL
D. A. CARDWELL
Y. R. CHEN
S. J. COLVIN
M. J. CRISP
M. S. DESAI
J. A. ELLIOTT

J. P. GARDNER
M. R. W. GLOVER
N. J. HOLMES
L. M. JOY
P. M. KNOX
D. J. T. MCKAY
R. G. McMAHON

M. G. MORENO FIGUEROA
D. O’BRIEN
A. SANCHEZ
A. E. TRAUB
C. D. WHITEWOODS

Fly-sheet against the notion that the EJRA improves the diversity of the University's academic staff

Some supporters of the retention of an EJRA contend that age-based discrimination by the University enhances the diversity of the academic staff. This fly-sheet briefly presents several considerations that tell against such a rationale for the retention of an EJRA.

First, given that the abolition of the EJRA will affect the number of entry-level vacancies only trivially,¹ any enhancement of diversity through entry-level appointments will likewise be affected only trivially by the abolition of the EJRA.

Second, the report of the Penty Review Group explicitly refrains from invoking the improvement of diversity as one of the considerations telling in favor of the retention of an EJRA. The report concedes: 'The simulation based on HESA data did not reveal clear evidence that the EJRA impacts on diversity directly (there is no significant difference between the University and other Russell Group universities in this regard).' Indeed, since the elimination of the EJRA at other Russell Group universities, both Cambridge and Oxford have been persistently behind those other universities with regard to the proportion of women in academic posts.

Third, as has been remarked by one of the employment tribunals that found Oxford University's EJRA to be unlawful, there are numerous non-discriminatory steps that can be taken to improve the diversity of the University's academic staff.

Fourth, when invoked as a rationale for involuntarily removing members of the academic staff from their positions, a diversity-focused justification is of dubious legality. It would very likely be in contravention of the 2010 Equality Act and the 1998 Human Rights Act, since it consists in the proposition that certain members of the academic staff should be involuntarily removed from their posts on the basis of their skin color and gender.

Fifth, the retention of an EJRA can detract from the diversity of the University's academic staff at senior levels. Cambridge University as a world-class institution of higher education should be able to attract eminent academics from the United States to fill chairs and other senior posts. At present, the operativeness of an EJRA in Cambridge is a major hindrance to attracting such academics. As such a hindrance, the EJRA can also be an obstacle to improving the diversity of the University's academic staff at senior levels. For example, one of the University's scientific departments has currently extended an offer to a distinguished African-American scientist for a position in Cambridge. That scientist is waiting to see whether the EJRA will be retained or abolished. If the EJRA is retained, the African-American scientist will decline to accept the offer from Cambridge.

In light of the considerations adduced here, we conclude that there is no diversity-centred rationale for retaining an EJRA. **We therefore encourage the members of the Regent House to vote to abolish the EJRA** [*Option (B)*].

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

MICHAEL ANDERSON	M. A. GOLDIE	M. PEPPER
S. M. ANSARI	M. W. GROSS	F. QUEVEDO
W. J. ASTLE	R. HAYNES	R. RAU
P. J. N. BAERT	D. A. HODELL	T. W. ROBBINS
S. BARON-COHEN	J. M. HOWE	L. SARNO
R. E. BOURKE	C. J. HUMPHREYS	S. SCHOLTES
PIETE BROOKS	P. A. KATTUMAN	W. SCHULTZ
J. A. CROWCROFT	M. H. KRAMER	R. J. SMITH
E. DIMSON	D. LIANG	E. J. SOILLEUX
M. P. EISNER	O. B. LINTON	C. A. TOUT
G. R. EVANS	A. W. MOORE	L. R. VINX
R. A. FOLEY	F. MOSCOSO DEL PRADO MARTÍN	B. A. WINDEATT
N. J. GAY	S. M. OOSTHUIZEN	L. A. ZAIBERT

¹ See Fly-sheet in favour of abolishing the EJRA on p. 830.

Fly-sheet in favour of abolishing the EJRA

It is an embarrassing fact that the University of Cambridge has a poor record when it comes to discrimination. Cambridge University refused to grant degrees to women until the late 1940s – the last British University to do so. We now look back and wonder how members of this university could have been so bigoted and determined to maintain gender discrimination for so long whilst other institutions had embraced this form of gender equality decades earlier. Yet now, in relation to age discrimination, the University is again refusing to move with the times, more than a decade after nearly all other British universities have accepted the 2011 Repeal of Retirement Age Amendment to the 2010 Equality Act and abolished compulsory retirement.

The report of the Retirement Policy and EJRA Review Group (the Penty report) has been shown to be seriously flawed. A recent research paper by Linton and Rau (see Linton *et al.* 2024 Cambridge Working Papers in Economics, CWPE2428) has demonstrated convincingly that, contra the Penty report, the effects of the EJRA for the creation of vacancies and opportunities for early career academics are negligible, even in the short term, and these effects become even more negligible when one considers that, as the Penty report itself acknowledges, most vacancies are filled by external candidates.

Moreover, Cambridge's attempt to hold onto the EJRA puts an additional burden on the USS as a whole, and it therefore puts more financial pressure on other UK Higher Education institutions, further undermining their financial viability and their ability to create new posts. In other words, within the broader picture, if there is any effect, the EJRA is likely to undermine intergenerational progression within the broader university sector.

Furthermore, as explained in various contributions to the Discussion on 28 May (published in the *Reporter* on 5 June 2024), the Penty report is fallacious in a variety of ways, presenting data in an incomplete and misleading fashion, and with the evidence presented sometimes contradicting its own conclusions. It is alarming that a report of such poor quality would be used as the main basis to promote the retention of the EJRA for academics, affecting the lives of thousands of people.

The Penty report recommends abolishing compulsory retirement for administrative staff ('academic-related' is the lingo). When considered in isolation, this is obviously a positive step, but most astonishingly the Penty report wants to retain the EJRA for academics. Indeed, the recommendation from Penty *et al.* is to have age-related discrimination targeted at academics only! Interestingly, in the survey conducted by the Review Group, more staff wanted to abolish rather than retain the EJRA for academic University officers, whilst more staff wanted to retain rather than abolish the EJRA for academic-related staff (p. 25 in the Penty report) – precisely the opposite of the Penty report's recommendation.

Some arguments have been raised about diversity, and they have been addressed in another fly-sheet.¹ Whilst diversity cannot be used to justify age discrimination, it is undoubtedly an important consideration which is valued by most of us. That is why it is so important to look at the financial implications of the EJRA for different categories of people. There is a widespread perception that Cambridge academics are a group of highly privileged people, but a sizable proportion of them struggle financially, and their accrued pensions do not go nearly far enough. Academics with truncated careers, for instance, would benefit from a few extra years; we know several academics (most of them women) who had to take time out to look after children and whose retirement funds are not nearly sufficient. Then there are people whose international careers have taken them to different countries with different pension arrangements (and often without the equity to purchase houses at the exorbitant Cambridge prices); again, they are disadvantaged. The EJRA is not only unfair for those financially more vulnerable within the University; it also makes it extremely difficult to recruit and retain people who have no independent financial means.

The EJRA is most unfair for the numerous successful research groups within the University that create opportunities for researchers at various stages of their career. Some of these groups have painstakingly been built up over decades. Data from the UKRI shows that 17% of the sum total of awards went to PIs aged 60 or above; these were also the largest awards. We cannot be complacent and expect Cambridge's success story to continue if the EJRA remains in place. Accomplished PIs are not going to wait around, begging for an extension with all the uncertainties, patronage and casualisation that involves. In an increasingly competitive climate (as we all know, Cambridge is one of the least affordable places to live in the UK, academic salaries at the University are low by international standards, and USS pension arrangements have become less attractive), the more successful academics amongst us will undoubtedly leave, some of them well before retirement age. It is already becoming increasingly difficult to hire senior academics. If we may be allowed a footballing metaphor, since the Euros are currently taking place, we are seriously at risk of becoming a mere feeder-club to other institutions.

One last thing: the way in which the Penty report has been communicated to members of the University is disturbing. The various bullet points in the emails that were sent out mistakenly suggest that these are indisputable facts; the rebuttal research paper by Linton and Rau has shown how problematic these 'facts' are. Most contributions in favour of the EJRA (in the Discussion and in the fly-sheets) are written by members of the Review Group, commenting on their own report. They have used School and Departmental channels to promote their stance. It is also interesting to see the concerted effort on behalf of the University to appeal to early career academics by wrongly implying that their interests are different to those with established positions. It is important for the academic community within this University not to fall into this trap. The academics should stand united and refuse to be treated as second-class citizens within their own institution.

For the record, we welcome the Penty recommendation to abolish the EJRA for academic-related staff. **However, the EJRA should be abolished for both academic and academic-related University officers [Option (B)].**

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

MICHAEL ANDERSON
S. M. ANSARI
S. BARON-COHEN
R. E. BOURKE
PIETE BROOKS
J. A. CROWCROFT
E. DIMSON
G. R. EVANS
R. A. FOLEY
N. GANANY
N. J. GAY
M. A. GOLDIE
M. W. GROSS

R. HAYNES
P. A. KATTUMAN
ROSS D. KING
M. H. KRAMER
O. B. LINTON
A. W. MOORE
F. MOSCOSO DEL PRADO MARTÍN
S. M. OOSTHUIZEN
M. PEPPER
L. RAMAKRISHNAN
R. RAU
T. W. ROBBINS
H. SABOURIAN

L. SARNO
S. SCHOLTES
W. SCHULTZ
R. J. SMITH
E. J. SOILLEUX
C. A. TOUT
P. TUCKER
L. R. VINX
G. H. WALKER
D. T. WEINBERG
B. A. WINDEATT

¹ See Fly-sheet against the notion that the EJRA improves the diversity of the University's academic staff on p. 840.

Fly-sheet against notion that the EJRA improves the job prospects of early career scholars

Some supporters of the retention of an EJRA contend that age-based discrimination by the University enhances the prospects of early career scholars. This fly-sheet presents several considerations that tell against such a rationale for the retention of an EJRA.

1. More than two-thirds of researchers at the University are employed on a fixed-term basis. They are rightly unhappy with job insecurity, modest pay rises and uncertain career prospects. They are often (but not always) early career researchers. The University has repeatedly failed to do even small things to improve the lot of these researchers. For example, if unestablished staff give a lecture, then the University pays £87.85 per lecture. Let us say it takes one 8-hour working day to create a new one-hour lecture from scratch. This works out at £9.76/hr, whilst the 2024 national living wage is £11.44/hr.

2. The University has failed to take advantage of existing opportunities to advance prospects of its early career or fixed-term researchers. When the UKRI launched its Future Leaders Fellowship scheme, most departments did not allow prospective candidates to use it, even ones already on so-called (fixed-term) ‘Early Career Lectureships’. The UKRI scheme offers generous funding for up to 7 years for untenured staff, but requires a commitment from the host university to provide a permanent position upon completion of the fellowship. The scheme has a focus on diversity, and other Russell Group universities used it to broaden the backgrounds and ages of their staff. Over 500 new jobs have been created at UK universities with the scheme, but none at Cambridge. (Some departments allowed those with existing offers of permanent positions to apply to the Future Leaders Fellowship, a policy which actually prevented new permanent roles being created elsewhere.)

3. The University’s record on academic vacancies is amongst the worst in the Russell Group, even though the creation of such vacancies is one of the stated aims of the EJRA. The University consistently has had lower levels of vacancies for established academic posts compared to other Russell Group universities, both before and after the elimination of mandatory retirement at those other universities in 2011 (see Linton *et al* 2024, arXiv 2405.14611v2). The University urgently needs to create new academic positions to maintain its high international standing in teaching and research. Over the last decade, the University has found it much easier to create fresh managerial and administrative positions than academic jobs.

4. The use of inflexible and blanket organisational employment policies (EJRA, UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship applications, proliferation of temporary employment practices) is dangerous. The unlawfulness of the similar EJRA at Oxford has already been shown in a succession of lost lawsuits. This is a persistent drain on resources which could be used more profitably elsewhere, amongst other things, to create new positions. Employment processes cannot be automated by using blanket policies such as a mandatory retirement age without severe legal risks.

5. Discrimination is still discrimination. Polluting the academic system with institutional age discrimination demeans everyone. The University should be creating fresh academic jobs for younger researchers as well as facilitating productive academic careers for its established members of staff. The University should be aiming for higher levels of organisational care for all its employees, whether young, mid-term or old.

In light of these considerations, we conclude that there are better methods for supporting early career researchers than a discriminatory EJRA which as operated in Cambridge is ineffective in increasing the levels of academic vacancies.

We therefore encourage the members of the Regent House to vote to abolish the EJRA [Option (B)].

Signed by the following members of the Regent House:

MICHAEL ANDERSON
S. M. ANSARI
W. J. ASTLE
P. J. N. BAERT
S. BARON-COHEN
R. M. BOURKE
PIETE BROOKS
T. W. CLYNE
E. DIMSON
M. P. EISNER
G. R. EVANS
N. W. EVANS
R. A. FOLEY

N. J. GAY
G. F. GILMORE
M. W. GROSS
R. HAYNES
D. A. HODELL
J. M. HOWE
C. J. HUMPHREYS
P. A. KATTUMAN
M. H. KRAMER
P. O. KRISTENSSON
O. B. LINTON
A. W. MOORE
F. MOSCOSO DEL PRADO MARTÍN

E. M. NUGENT
S. M. OOSTHUIZEN
M. PEPPER
L. RAMAKRISHNAN
R. RAU
T. W. ROBBINS
S. SCHOLTES
W. SCHULTZ
R. J. SMITH
E. J. SOILLEUX
C. A. TOUT

Statement by the Council

1 July 2024

The Council (or any other body whose proposal is to be voted on) may choose to publish a statement, for inclusion with materials provided to voters, when it considers it necessary to correct factual errors or address any misunderstandings contained in fly-sheets provided by members of the Regent House and others. The Council has approved this statement in response to the fly-sheets concerning Grace 2 of 12 June 2024, to draw attention to the following points:

1. Where a member continues after the normal retirement age (NRA) in USS, currently aged 66, both they and the employer will continue to pay contributions in respect of the additional benefits earned. Although a late retirement factor will be applied to the benefits accruing after the NRA, this is calculated by the scheme actuary to be cost-neutral (on the basis that it is anticipated that benefits will be paid for a shorter duration).
2. The University's Retirement Policy does not claim to justify the EJRA by reference to diversity (it is not an Aim of the Policy), a point which was clarified in the Review Group's report.¹ Nevertheless, the Group considered the impact on diversity at the request of the Council because it is a matter of importance to the University. While the EJRA is not a direct means for introducing greater diversity, it creates opportunities for greater diversity because it opens up vacancies that would otherwise not be available. It was notable that those retiring are considerably less diverse than those being recruited.
3. The EJRA is certainly not the only way of opening up opportunities for early career and fixed-term researchers, but it is an important one at an institution where the number of available established posts is otherwise restricted by the availability of funding and broadly static student numbers.
4. For the reasons already noted in the response to Discussion remarks on the EJRA proposals,² considerable caution should be exercised when drawing comparisons with the EJRA arrangements at the University of Oxford.

¹ See sections 4.9.1 and 5.1.5 of the Review Group's report.

² See *Reporter*, 6745, 2023–24, p. 661.

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 16 July 2024

A Discussion was convened by videoconference. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Ms Sonita Alleyne, *JE*, was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Senior Pro-Proctor, the Junior Pro-Proctor and sixteen other persons present.

Due to time limitations, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor ruled that the seven sets of remarks received by the Proctors ahead of the Discussion be included in the formal record without being read out. Contributions to the Discussion were made as follows:

First-stage Report of the Council, dated 2 July 2024, on the alteration and refurbishment of the Stirling Building on the Sidgwick site

(Reporter, 6748, 2023–24, p. 729).

Dr J. P. GARDNER (University Librarian and Selwyn College), received by the Proctors:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as University Librarian, I am one of the Sponsors of the project to refurbish the Stirling Building, along with Professor Tim Harper (Head of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences). I am also Chair of the Stirling Building Programme Board. My remarks reflect my commitments as Sponsor and Chair.

The Stirling Building refurbishment project has been in development since June 2022, and the business case for investment has been meticulously built up and scrutinised at each stage through the University's governance, including the Programme Board, Estates Investment Advisory Sub-Committee, Estates Technical Sub-Committee, Estates Committee, as well as the General Board and the Planning and Resources Committee.

Those who know the site well will be acutely aware that intensive intervention is essential to make the building safe and fit for future use for its core academic purpose as a learning and research space, popular Seeley Library, and History Faculty home. The project has taken every opportunity to ensure its redesign provides benefit back to as many staff and students on the Sidgwick Site as possible, as well as making the building function as it must for future generations of historians.

Completed in 1968, the Grade II* listed building was designed by the pre-eminent British architect James Stirling – the annual RIBA Stirling Prize for Architecture is named in his honour. It is one of three Red Trilogy buildings along with the Engineering Building at the University of Leicester and the Florey Building at Queen's College, Oxford. The Project Team fully acknowledges that some people intensively dislike the Stirling Building, but it is also true that generations of students and staff hold it in great affection. Like it or dislike it, Grade II* is equivalent in all essential aspects to Grade I status and this brings considerable responsibility for the University.

While the building is an architectural icon and inseparable from the identity of the History Faculty and Seeley Library, there are growing usability and safety issues that increasingly diminish the building's ability to provide an environment where our academics and students can thrive. As well as safety issues and regular water ingress, the top floor is completely unusable in warm months due to the thermal gain.

The building is failing, and significant renovation is required. The costs will be continually scrutinised, and the team will explore value for money opportunities as the

project develops through RIBA Stage 4, along with market testing with the contractor. The Estates Technical Sub-Committee will aid this process, and robustly challenge and test the technical solutions and design.

The building requires complete replacement of the glazed façade and building services systems, as well as decarbonisation. This is required to ensure a comfortable and sustainable internal environment and to meet the University decarbonisation and zero gas policies.

The approval to move to RIBA Stage 4 project is predicated on the understanding that this represents a once in a generation opportunity to provide a new range of enhanced learning and working environments at the centre of the University's Sidgwick site, while improving the building's accessibility, safety and comfort, and provide a new range of learning and working environments at the heart of the University's Sidgwick site.

The comprehensive refurbishment will safeguard the use and enjoyment of the building; repairing and upgrading building fabric, replacing services to improve thermal comfort, and introducing a range of carbon saving and climate resilient measures.

The project has followed a meticulous conservation-led approach that embraces the value, significance and distinctive character of the building while recognising the need for change to meet contemporary requirements. After considering the multiple adaptations to the building, careful judgements have been made about the recovery and reinstatement of materials and details. In conjunction with an approach to new and repaired fabric, this project will breathe new life into the building, making its architectural value more tangible.

A key driver for the project is to meet access and inclusion goals. Critically, the project will significantly improve step-free access throughout the building, including external terraces, to ensure equitable entry and circulation for all users. Internal treatments will also provide a more comfortable range of environments, recognising the different learning, working, and research needs of those who will use it.

Environmental sustainability is another major focus, with innovative technologies and materials being employed to enhance the building's performance. 'Fabric-first' and passive upgrades, in conjunction with renewable energy sources and efficient systems and controls, will reduce energy consumption. The project targets BREEAM Excellent certification and a zero-gas approach will be employed to help the University reach its own absolute zero targets. Incorporation of the WELL Standard ensures wellbeing of occupants is addressed from the outset and a pre-refurbishment audit has been undertaken to identify potential reuse or recycle opportunities and minimise waste.

Extending the building also forms part of the proposals, with two new pavilions proposed to provide additional library and reading spaces while supporting improved accessibility. These new elements clearly express their function and respond to the original building scale, form, and materials; deployed in a simple, abstract way to differentiate them.

The long-standing dysfunction of the building and its Grade II* listing combine to mean that the University must act. This is the conclusion reached through a series of forensic academic, technical, and financial gateways over two years as required by the University's established governance process, including the General Board and the Planning and Resources Committee. There is no disguising

the high cost given the building challenges, but the project has thoroughly investigated and presented all the alternatives. Critical scrutiny will continue through the programme ahead, so the refurbished Stirling Building will be an asset to the whole Sidgwick site, offering shared spaces for teaching, learning and research, and will be of benefit to the thousands of students and staff who rely on it every year.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor,

The environmental performance of the building is poor, particularly in extremely hot or cold conditions, and many spaces within the building are problematic from the point of view of accessibility and basic efficiency.

I can testify to that, having worked and lectured in the building for many years. The design never provided enough office space for teaching and there was no Common Room. One entered the building only to give lectures and empty one's pigeon-hole. The Seeley Library seemed rarely to be busy with readers in my time. They tended to prefer the nearby University Library.

The Stirling Building is an example of the University's regrettable tendency to allow an architect to design for appearance rather than practicality. The adjacent 'Foster' Law Faculty, opened in 1995, was a further instance. Its generous spaces subsequently had to be reshaped internally so as to provide rooms for its Faculty members, and Criminology had to be provided with an additional building in 2005.

Detailed arrangements for 'decanting the Faculty of History and the Seeley Library for the duration of the building works' are to be 'finalised as part of the Full Business Case' says the Report, but the projected cost is likely to rise during what is bound to be a considerable length of time for design, getting planning permission and even beginning on those 'works', let alone putting up a suggested extra 'interim' building on the Sidgwick site.

Approval is sought at this preliminary stage and before the promised Second-stage Report, both for 'the works outlined in this Report' and to allow the Director of Estates 'to apply for detailed planning approval in due course'. This is usual enough but one hopes that the second Report will focus on the need to ensure that a new building can avoid the failings of the present one and better meet the needs of the Faculty.

First-stage Report of the Council, dated 2 July 2024, on a new temporary facility for the Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus

(*Reporter*, 6748, 2023–24, p. 731).

CBC	Cambridge Biomedical Campus
EFB	East Forvie Building
MICL	Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory
PET	Positron emission tomography
WFB	West Forvie Building

Professor F. I. AIGBIRHIO (Department of Clinical Neurosciences and Magdalene College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I speak as the Director of the Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory.¹ The MICL was established in 2007 to address the need for a dedicated facility within the School of Clinical Medicine (SCM) for undertaking research in radiochemistry and the development of radiopharmaceuticals, specifically for the biomedical molecular imaging technology of positron emission tomography. In addition to my own research group being permanently based at the facility, we manage the facility on behalf of other researchers and students to perform radiochemistry and related research. These include researchers and students (Part III, M.Phil., Ph.D. and postdoctoral) from Departments and institutions within SCM – such as the Departments of Clinical Neurosciences, Radiology and Medicine – and from Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute and the wider University, such as the Department of Chemistry.

With other units on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, which includes the Wolfson Brain Imaging Centre (WBIC),² Cambridge University Hospitals PET/CT unit and the preclinical imaging unit at the Anne McLaren Building, the MICL is part of an integrated PET infrastructure on the campus that has enabled Cambridge to become one of the very few comprehensive PET and radiochemistry centres in the UK. This consists of an international leading research pipeline ranging from novel radiopharmaceutical development, through to small animal translational studies and human experimental medicine, to delivery of new PET scanning methods into clinical practice. As a result, PET is a core technology of many biomedical research programmes across the SCM and the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre. As part of this, MICL's capability for the development of novel PET radiopharmaceuticals is therefore central to

- (i) sustaining and building on Cambridge's competitive position in this fast-growing field of molecular imaging;
- (ii) its strategy for widening access to PET for new clinical research programmes in cancer, neuroscience, mental health, immunology, inflammation, cardiology, metabolism and stem cell biology; and
- (iii) scaling up the clinical impact of PET towards more precise diagnosis and more innovative treatments for a wide spectrum of disorders. A recent example of PET for this use is for the development of highly promising new drugs treatment for Alzheimer's disease.³

However, the relocation of other groups from the West Forvie Building on the Forvie site in 2018 (with MICL remaining as the last facility in the building, due to its specific radiochemistry infrastructure requirements) has

resulted in its capability degrading over time. The various building and maintenance issues with WFB and their impact on MICL are well outlined in the First-stage Report, so I will not go over them again.

However, I do think it is important to highlight the impact on the wellbeing of my group in being based in this building during this time. In addition to the immense stress and frustrations on them arising from a continuous range of building problems – some of which could result in immediate closure of the facility and hence their research – and recently compounded with the identification and remedial work for the reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete, a major issue has been the isolation of being the only group in the building. Therefore, isolated with regards academic, collaborative and social interactions from other researchers and students within the Department of Clinical Neurosciences and SCM. In all, this is simply not the type of environment for any person to experience working at the University of Cambridge, especially for postgraduate students and early career researchers.

To address this dire situation and finally move MICL out of the WFB, even though my preference is for relocation into a permanent long-term ‘MICL2’ facility within a proposed new building on the Forvie site, which to note the project team has already spent significant time on its design, I do welcome this proposal by University Estates, which is supported by the SCM to temporarily house MICL within a modular building, even though it will then entail double relocation.

This has virtues it can be built in a reasonable short time and by siting it on the Forvie site achieves a core requirement for MICL research of close proximity to the cyclotron at the WBIC for accessing short-lived radionuclides. To minimise the cost, it has been designed as described by the project team as a minimum viable product – therefore it will be based on the minimum requirements regards laboratory space and equipment for continuation of most of MICL research. In addition, the project team are making significant efforts with the building placement and design to minimise as much as possible any impact on other buildings and users on the Forvie site and I am aware they are now consulting further on the matter with these groups.

In summary I do support this temporary solution for relocating the MICL and so addressing this unsustainable situation. However, it is important there remains a focus and momentum for the permanent MICL accommodation in the new building and it does get built in approximately five years. This will then finally address this situation with MICL and also fully align with the SCM strategic plan to create an internationally leading centre for molecular imaging on the CBC.

¹ <https://www.micl.wbic.cam.ac.uk/>.

² <https://www.wbic.cam.ac.uk/>.

³ See <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2023/dec/17/new-alzheimers-drugs-bring-hope-of-slowing-disease-for-uk-patients> and <https://time.com/6987248/alzheimers-drug-donanemab-eli-lilly/>.

Professor S. J. GRIFFIN (Department of Public Health and Primary Care and Wolfson College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I make these remarks as Professor of General Practice in the Department of Public Health and Primary Care. The working environment of the Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory staff is unacceptable and has been for some considerable time. There is no doubt that a new site needs to be found for the important work undertaken in the MICL as quickly as possible although, with the benefit of hindsight, if work had been done on the West Forvie Site some time ago, the University might have avoided the current situation and the associated sense of urgency and incurred lower long-term costs.

My concerns are as follows:

With respect to the process that has been followed, it seems that this major project has advanced to an Outline Business Case and RIBA Stage 2 without a Strategic Business Case, a ‘Representative User’ to gather all relevant user views, and any meaningful consultation. I am particularly concerned about the lack of transparent equality and impact assessments, which should have been carried out on behalf of all East Forvie Building users, including our large student population. It is not clear how decisions regarding this project have been made, who made them and why this site was selected ahead of other potential locations on the Forvie site in closer proximity to scientists who actively collaborate with the MICL. I believe that this may have led to a bad decision, which also undermines staff trust.

I appreciate the scientific and logistical arguments for locating the MICL somewhere on the Forvie site. However, the pros and cons of the different options for the location of a temporary building have (as far as I am aware) not been published and seem to be driven by the impact on the protected trees, which is understandable. There does not appear to have been an assessment of the impact on the East Forvie staff and the 75 fee-paying M.Phil. students per year (the majority of whom are foreign nationals) who contribute a sizeable income stream for the University. A transparent demonstration that the suggested site represents the least worst option, after due consideration of impacts on all stakeholders of the range of potentially feasible options, has not been forthcoming.

Around a third of the proposed footprint appears to be designated as office space. The decision to include this amount of office space seems to have been made without reference to the recent survey of office occupancy on the Forvie site. I wonder if MICL staff could be located somewhere on the Forvie site/Addenbrooke’s campus rather than in new modular offices in the car park, thereby reducing the size and adverse impact of the ‘temporary’ building.

In summary, the case of need for temporary accommodation for the MICL is clear, the evidence underpinning the proposed choice of the location for the temporary building rather less so.

Professor S. MORRIS (Department of Public Health and Primary Care and Murray Edwards College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I make these remarks in my capacity as Head of the Primary Care Unit, a large teaching and research unit, which is part of the Department of Public Health and Primary Care in the School of Clinical Medicine, located mostly in the East Forvie Building. My colleagues and I are extremely concerned about the proposal to locate a large new modular building immediately adjacent to the East Forvie Building to accommodate the Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory. We understand that this structure is proposed to house power generators, labs with radioactive material, offices, and, on its roof, multiple machines. The structure would be placed a few metres from the East Forvie Building, and will operate for at least five years.

Our concerns arise for three main reasons. First, because of the impact that locating this structure so near to the East Forvie Building will have on the staff and students using the East Forvie Building. The East Forvie Building houses over 100 staff from the Department of Public Health and Primary Care, the MRC Biostatistics Unit and the UK Health Security Agency, plus it accommodates at least 75 students each year as part of the M.Phil. programme in Population Health Sciences. The proposed plans will have a detrimental effect on everyone located in the East Forvie Building, affecting their quality of life, and work and education experiences, for example, because of the noise emanating from the new structure, its impact on the quality of light, and possible impact on air quality.

Our second concern is that the appropriate assessments have not been carried out. A full impact assessment of the plan to locate the MICL next to the East Forvie Building has not been conducted, neither has a full options appraisal to consider all possible locations of the MICL. We are aware of other locations on the Forvie site that could be considered. These assessments should be conducted as a matter of priority and should include the impact on students, staff and other occupants of the East Forvie Building, and be conducted with transparent processes and findings.

Third, until about three weeks ago, we were completely unaware of this proposal. We are concerned about the apparent deviations that have occurred so far from the University's normal planning and governance processes, for example, the omission of the stage of drafting a 'strategic business case', and the omission of the appointment of a 'responsible user'. These deviations are especially concerning given the expected cost of the proposed building, which has been reported to be in excess of £9 million.

We do appreciate the MICL requirements. However, there are many negative implications to locating the structure adjacent to the East Forvie Building. Much more scrutiny and consultation is needed before any final decisions can be made about a proposed site.

Dr K. A. WINSTON (Department of Public Health and Primary Care and Institute of Continuing Education):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I make these remarks as Academic Director of the M.Phil. in Population Health Sciences, and as an occupant of the East Forvie Building. I was surprised and concerned to so recently learn about the proposal to locate a large temporary building immediately adjacent to the East Forvie Building and am particularly worried about the impact the development will have on staff and student experience and wellbeing.

Importantly, it seems there has not yet been any meaningful consultation with affected stakeholders, and there seems to be a lack of transparent risk and impact assessments, which surely need to be carried out on behalf of all East Forvie Building users, including our large student population, before we can approve this plan.

The M.Phil. in Population Health Sciences, the largest Masters course of the School of Clinical Medicine, with over 75 students per year generating substantial income and reputational value, is based in the East Forvie Building.

Given the large student numbers, and the need for proper ventilation in the post-Covid era, for all teaching sessions, ground floor and first floor classroom windows need to be open. We are extremely concerned about the potential air and noise pollution impact of construction work and subsequent ongoing generator and extraction fan use. Noise is likely to disrupt lectures and sessions in teaching facilities, and create additional challenges for students trying to grapple with new ideas and complex ways of thinking. Many of our students carry Student Support Documents that explicitly state the need for quiet spaces to work in, and a number of staff and students have conditions that can be severely impacted by air quality.

The large structure will be oppressive and is likely to diminish the quality of natural light for students studying full days in these classrooms. A degraded learning environment would adversely impact student experience, learning and wellbeing. As far as I know, this risk to the viability of the M.Phil. has not been considered in the planning process. Certainly no consultation has been done to evaluate this, and it is highly likely that a proper consultation could yield solutions that would benefit all stakeholders.

I believe the importance of the MICL to the University is not in doubt, nor is the need for relocation. This discussion is about finding the most suitable location for the Lab. I respectfully request, therefore, the following are considered before any final decisions are made about the site of this structure:

- (1) a full impact assessment be conducted which must include impact on students, staff and paying occupants of the East Forvie Building;
- (2) a full options appraisal (with transparent processes and findings) be conducted to identify a more suitable location.

Professor S. I. G. BARCLAY (Department of Public Health and Primary Care and Emmanuel College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I make these remarks as Professor of Palliative Care and Co-Director of the University Palliative and End of Life Care research and teaching group that comprises over twenty members. We are all accommodated in the East Forvie Building and are part of the Primary Care Unit within the Department of Public Health and Primary Care.

It is clear that the MICL group need to move out of their current unacceptable accommodation: the question is where they are relocated to.

Other speakers have clearly articulated some of the many concerns of the community of colleagues and students based in the East Forvie Building. I concur entirely with their comments and will therefore focus my speech on the human impact on staff and students based in the EFB.

Should the new building be based on the Forvie site, we can accept the loss of parking spaces. A new build so close to office windows of the EFB, even if only single storey in that part, will have a major impact in terms of loss of daylight, noise from plant on the roof and concerns over toxic fumes and radioactivity. Several offices accommodating senior academics will be among those most immediately impacted, with their windows facing directly onto the new build just 4.5 metres away.

We are told that the new building will be temporary, pending the demolition and rebuild of the West Forvie Building that currently houses the MICL group. At a cost of over £9 million I am concerned that it will become permanent, potentially housing another group in the future. Careful consideration of alternatives off and on the Forvie site, genuine consultation with the Forvie site community of staff and students and following of University due process are all needed. Rushed decisions are being made that are likely to have a permanent adverse impact on the Forvie site.

Until two weeks ago, the people who will be most impacted by the current proposal, the staff and students who work in EFB, had not been informed of the plan. The town hall meeting of 1 July presented information that was new to us all and was widely perceived to be a *fait accompli*.

To date there has been no consultation with the sizeable and flourishing community of the EFB, on whose behalf I wish to report that there are grave concerns over the current plan.

Consideration has been given to the trees on the Forvie site, but no consideration to the people who work in the EFB. I urge the University to pause, consider all the options in greater detail, and to consult with the Forvie site community in a meaningful way.

The remarks sent to the Proctors in advance of the Discussion follow below in order of receipt.

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, this is another proposal involving a new temporary building and asking for approval at the 'in principle' level, to allow the Director of Estates to apply for planning permission. Like the proposals for the History Faculty building this will involve a double relocation but with the difference that in this case the existing building has been partly vacated ahead of its intended demolition. I wonder about the relevance of the discovery of the one building outside central Cambridge found to contain the Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) which is found to be given to collapse?¹

This seems to have been put forward in quite a hurry. The Report tells us nothing about the consultation which has taken place in the framing of this proposal. Which Committees has it passed through and where are their Minutes? The Council asks for the approval of the Regent House, though the Estates Committee is yet to give its consent. This stage is to take place before 'issues with the longer-term plans' are resolved or 'a strategy for the University's landholdings across the Cambridge Biomedical Campus' are 'developed'. Delay and expense are inevitable and surely need at least a nod by way of quantifying them. Perhaps a Notice in reply will give more information?

¹ <https://www.cam.ac.uk/notices/news/university-statement-on-reinforced-autoclaved-aerated-concrete-updated>.

Dr S. S. VILLAR (MRC Biostatistics Unit):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a Principal Research Associate (Programme Leader) at the MRC Biostatistics Unit. I would like to express my concerns around the University's proposal to build a temporary building for the MICL adjacent to the East Forvie Building (where my Department currently has all their staff's offices). I would like to express the general sense of frustration from colleagues around the poor communication and the lack of early enough consultation around these plans with those most directly affected. There is a shared distress about what impact this proposal (if it goes ahead) could have on the EFB occupants, particularly thinking of the M.Phil. participants, which is perhaps exacerbated by the lack of information available to show that careful consideration of alternative sites has occurred.

This comes at a time in which there are many additional concerns already to our staff, not the least related to the change of funding model for MRC-funded Units. These changes combined are having wide-reaching effects at all levels, from students through to support staff and established Principal Investigators, therefore I urge the General Board and Council to carefully consider the University proposal and its possible effects to EFB occupants and University staff.

Dr W. J. ASTLE (MRC Biostatistics Unit):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, in this Report the Council asks the University to approve the submission of a planning application for the construction of a building to accommodate the Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory on the Forvie site of the Addenbrooke's Campus.¹

Presently, there are four University buildings on the Forvie site: the Herchel Smith Building, the E. D. Adrian Building (mistakenly labelled the 'Van Geest Building' on the plan submitted with the Report), the West Forvie Building and the East Forvie Building.² The West Forvie Building, which contains Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) and is described as 'falling into disrepair' has been evacuated – except for the MICL – in preparation for its demolition.³

The new building for the MICL – if constructed as proposed – would sit 4.5 metres north of the East Forvie Building,⁴ a two-story building which accommodates the MRC Biostatistics Unit and part of the Department of Public Health and Primary Care. In addition, the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) leases part of the ground floor. Although congested, it is a quiet building without laboratories, consisting mostly of offices, communal kitchens, meeting rooms and seminar rooms. It is used for the lectures and classes of the M.Phil. in Population Health Sciences, which admits about 75 graduate students per year.

If constructed, the proposed building, including its plant service-deck, will be two stories high. There will be a fume flue, the height of which is yet to be determined, because it will require 'detailed modelling and calculations ... by a specialist consultant'.⁵ The outlook from the East Forvie Building, which at present consists of a view of a landscaped car park surrounded by woodland, will be severely diminished. It seems inevitable that most of the offices and much of the communal space on the north side of the building will be obscured from natural light.

The Estates Division has ‘conducted a background noise survey which sets a baseline for the design to work to’, but it does ‘not yet know the external noise level that will be produced’.⁵ Although the building ‘will have to conform to [the local authority environmental health] requirements for operational noise’, ‘further work will be required by the design [*sic*]’.⁵ The School acknowledges that noise ‘is of great concern to current occupiers including UKHSA and [points out that it is] fully aware of the importance of the M.Phil. course’.⁵

The Report explains that the proposed building, which will cost £9.2 million, is to be temporary. Although no date is given for its deconstruction, ‘the requirements for the facility are based on the minimum viable product for the [MICL] team to continue to operate over approximately a five-year period’. Given the financial pressures on the University, is it plausible for such an expensive building to be planned, expecting that it will only be needed for five years? In the long term the School intends to demolish the West Forvie Building and construct in its place a new permanent building to house the MICL. What is the chance that this will happen within the next five years? How advanced are the plans for the redevelopment of the Forvie site? Has the University raised the necessary funds? Has anyone been consulted?

Although the proposal for the new building is said to have been ‘registered with the Planning and Resources Committee (PRC) in February’, the minutes of the PRC’s January meeting record that it approved the expenditure of £100,000 from the Investment Fund ‘to enable the project team to review feasibility of temporary accommodation for MICL’ by Chair’s action on 24 December 2023.⁶ The Estate’s Committee had recommended the expenditure at its meeting of 15 December 2023.

Notwithstanding that planning for the new MICL building began before the end of last year, the staff and Departments occupying the East Forvie Building were told nothing about it until 19 June, when they were invited to a briefing meeting by the Secretary of the School of Clinical Medicine, a Development Manager from the Estates Division and an architect from the firm Saunders Boston, to be held on 1 July.

Professor Aigbirhio (see p. 846), the leader of the MICL research group, explained to the meeting convincingly that the present building was wholly inadequate, that it had been inadequate for many years and that there was an urgent need for a replacement laboratory. The Secretary explained that the half-lives of the radiochemicals used by the MICL placed a limit on the distance between any replacement laboratory and the cyclotron in the Wolfson Brain Imaging Centre, which is close to the Forvie site.

The meeting was told that an Outline Business Case for a new building had already been submitted for consideration by the Estates Committee; the proposed location adjacent to the East Forvie Building was therefore a *fait accompli*. Consultation with those adversely affected was to be limited to ‘things that concern you’ for example, noise and vehicular access, ‘so that we can see if we’re able to sort of factor them into the design process’.

It may be that when the interests of all those affected are weighed in the balance the proposed location is optimal. However, it is difficult to know whether alternative possibilities – either on the Forvie site or on nearby NHS owned land – were properly investigated before they were discounted. The failure to consult the affected staff until after the Outline Business Case was submitted to the

Estates Committee and the failure to hold a briefing meeting for staff until two days before this First-stage Report on the proposal appeared in the *Reporter* at least suggest an administrative desire to evade rational discussion about alternatives.

Statute F II 3 requires that the erection of a new University building be approved by Grace of the Regent House.⁷ Paragraph 11 of the Report proposes that in this case, because of ‘the urgent need for a replacement facility’, a Grace should be submitted before the Outline Business Case has been reviewed by the Estates Committee and before it has been approved by the Planning and Resources Committee, as required by the Sites and Building Regulations.⁸ All this haste might be benevolent, but six months of planning veiled from those who work on the Forvie site creates suspicion about the imposition of administrative will without academic accountability.

Will the Council please delay submitting a Grace to the Regent House for the approval of this Report until there is a consensus amongst those affected by its proposal that there is no better location for the building? A delay may have unfortunate adverse consequences for the MICL, but a delay might have been avoided if there had been proper consultation by the School in the first place.

¹ See <https://www.micl.wbic.cam.ac.uk>, accessed 15 July 2024.

² University Map, <https://map.cam.ac.uk/Forvie+Site>, accessed 15 July 2024.

³ ‘Plans in the works for ‘world class’ research building in Cambridge’, *Cambridge News*, 18 November 2023, <https://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/news/cambridge-news/plans-works-world-class-research-28123169>, accessed 15 July 2024.

⁴ MICL Temporary Facility, Briefing Pack, slides circulated by the Estates Division, dated June 2024, available at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6750/MICL-TempFacility-BriefingPack.pdf>.

⁵ Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory (MICL) Temporary Facility – Questions & Answers, Version 1, dated 5 July 2024, available at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6750/MICL-TempFacility-QA.pdf>

⁶ Planning and Resources Committee, Minutes of 31 January 2024, [https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/PRC/2024-01-31/MeetingDocuments/PRC minutes 31 January 2024.pdf](https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/PRC/2024-01-31/MeetingDocuments/PRC%20minutes%2031%20January%202024.pdf), accessed 15 July 2024 (University account required).

⁷ *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 48.

⁸ *Statutes and Ordinances*, pp. 1061–1072.

Mr M. R. ANDREWS (MRC Biostatistics Unit):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the indicative location plan for the temporary MICL building published on page 732 of the *Reporter* appears to be misleading. On 1 July, in an open meeting held in the East Forvie Building, the architect for the scheme presented a different location plan indicating a footprint for the temporary building approximately double the size of that published in the *Reporter*.¹ The larger building design spans across much more of the frontage of the East Forvie Building. It would remove additional car parking space and impact more occupants of the building.

¹ See the plan labelled as ‘Adjacent to East Forvie Building’, on page 7 of the MICL Temporary Facility Briefing Pack, available at <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/reporter/2023-24/weekly/6750/MICL-TempFacility-BriefingPack.pdf>.

Professor J. WHITTAKER (MRC Biostatistics Unit and Murray Edwards College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I make these remarks as Director of the MRC Biostatistics Unit, a group of around a hundred staff and research students based in the East Forvie Building. As such I was surprised and concerned to learn about the proposal to locate a large temporary building immediately adjacent to the East Forvie Building to accommodate the Molecular Imaging Chemistry Laboratory. My concerns are with respect to both the process by which this proposal has advanced and the impact the development will have on staff and student experience and wellbeing.

With respect to the process, it seems this major project has advanced to an Outline Business Case and RIBA Stage 2 without a Strategic Business Case, a 'Representative User' to gather all relevant user views, and any meaningful consultation. I am particularly concerned about the lack of transparent equality assessments, which should have been carried out on behalf of all East Forvie Building users, including our large student population. It is not clear how decisions regarding this project have been made, who made them and why this site was selected. I believe this has led to a bad decision, which also undermines staff trust in the University broadly and the School of Clinical Medicine in particular.

With respect to the impact of the development, there are several site-specific issues that make the East Forvie Building a particularly problematic site for this proposed development.

Firstly, the M.Phil. in Population Health Sciences, which is the largest M.Phil. course of the School of Clinical Medicine, is based in the East Forvie Building. Educating over 75 students per year (70% international; 30% UK), the course is forecast to accrue over £11 million in income for the University over the next five years. However, in the event of the MICL re-location, there are serious concerns about the viability of continuing the M.Phil. course in its current location. Noise is likely to disrupt lectures and sessions in teaching facilities, located only a few metres from the proposed structure. A degraded learning

environment would adversely impact student wellbeing, and is unlikely to be a tenable one for attracting M.Phil. students, given a highly competitive global market. As far as I know, this risk to the viability of the M.Phil. has not been considered in the planning process. Certainly, no consultation has been done to evaluate this.

Secondly, part of the EFB is occupied by the UK Health Security Agency, who are paying tenants of the University and have not been consulted on this proposal. They have now expressed serious concern, noting the impact on their staff and the absence of an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA), and have requested that a comprehensive impact assessment, including an EIA, is conducted to address these critical issues before proceeding with the development. Has the University considered the damage to our relationship with UKHSA, and indeed whether there is a risk of legal challenge by UKHSA, in planning to date?

I respectfully request, therefore, the following before any final decisions are made about the site of this structure:

- (1) that a full impact assessment be conducted which must include impact on students, staff and paying occupants of the East Forvie Building, an Equality Impact Assessment, and financial impact (including opportunity costs);
- (2) that a full options appraisal (with transparent processes and findings) be conducted to identify a more suitable location.

In identifying an alternative location, it seems that options on the Forvie site are available and should be further considered. For example, it appears that the site behind the Van Geest Building could accommodate a multi-level modular structure adequate for the MICL's needs, and there is space to the rear of the Herchel Smith Building with low density parking and a lack of established trees. Such co-location of MICL with scientifically cognate groups of the Department of Clinical Neurosciences is more academically coherent than placing it next to the East Forvie Building, which accommodates population health science groups.

COLLEGE NOTICES**Elections****Newnham College**

Elected to a Fellowship in Category A with effect from 1 July 2024:

Jenny Zhang, B.Sc. (Adv.), Ph.D., *Sydney*

Peterhouse

Elected to an Official Fellowship and College Lectureship in World History with effect from 1 October 2024:

Adrián Lerner Patrón, B.A., *Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú*, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D., *Yale*

Vacancies

Homerton College: College Lectureship in Natural Sciences; tenure: from 1 September 2024 or as soon as possible thereafter, full-time or part-time depending on preference; salary: £34,980–£42,978 or *pro rata*; closing date: 6 August 2024; further details: <https://www.homerton.cam.ac.uk/college-lectureship-natural-sciences>

Lucy Cavendish College: Future Global Leaders Programme Director; tenure: four years from 1 September 2024 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 5 August 2024 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.lucy.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/future-global-leader-programme-director>

Pembroke College: Postdoctoral Research Associates (up to seven posts available, any subject); tenure: from October 2024, for one year in the first instance (with the possibility of renewal for a further two years); closing date: 2 September 2024; further details: <https://www.pem.cam.ac.uk/college/job-vacancies>

Peterhouse: Research Fellowships 2025 (several available); tenure: three years from 1 October 2025; stipend: £28,759 plus benefits; closing date: 9 September 2024; further details (available from 9 August): <https://www.resfell.pet.cam.ac.uk>

Queens' College: Junior Research Fellowships in Chemistry and in the History of the Brittonic-/Gaelic-Speaking Peoples, c. AD 350–1200 (one available in each subject); tenure: three years from 1 October 2025; salary: £32,332 (postdoctoral) or £27,979 (predoctoral), or may be non-stipendiary; closing date: 27 September 2024 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.queens.cam.ac.uk/life-at-queens/vacancies/junior-research-fellowshipsearly-career-fellowships>

St Edmund's College: College Teaching Officer (CTO) in Law; tenure: three years from 1 October 2024; salary: £34,590–£37,445; closing date: 28 July 2024; further details: <https://www.st-edmunds.cam.ac.uk/vacancy/college-teaching-officer-inlaw/>

Selwyn College: Master (part-time); tenure: seven years from 1 October 2025 (with a possibility of renewal for a further three years); closing date: 6 September 2024; further details: <https://www.sel.cam.ac.uk/jobs/master> and <https://www.minervasearch.com/current-opportunities/selwyn/>

EXTERNAL NOTICES**Oxford Notices**

Blavatnik School of Government and Wolfson College: Alfred Landecker Professorship of Values and Public Policy; tenure: from 1 August 2025; closing date: 2 September 2024 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk>, vacancy ID: 172179

Merton College: Head of Welfare; salary: £45,000–£55,000; closing date: 2 August 2024 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.merton.ox.ac.uk/vacancies>

Worcester College: Fixed-Term Stipendiary Lectureship in Engineering Science; tenure: one year from 1 October 2024; stipend: £15,244–£16,983; closing date: 31 July 2024 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.worc.ox.ac.uk/about/vacancies/fixed-term-stipendiary-lectureship-in-engineering-science>

© 2024 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

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

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

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

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

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.