

(Group ii) *La Chanson de Roland*, ed. F. Whitehead, 1671–1760, 2375–2475; *Le Mystère d'Adam*, ed. P. Aebischer or P. Noomen, 205–357, 591–744; Marie de France, *Lais*, ed. A. Ewert: 'Lais: "Chevrefoil"'; Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain*, ed. T. B. W. Reid, lines 269–482, 3341–3562; Bérout, *Tristan*, ed. A. Ewert, lines 1835–2146; Thomas, *The Romance of Horn*, ed. M. K. Pope, lines 4082–329.

(Group iii) Nigel of Longchamps, *Speculum Stultorum*, ed. J. H. Mozley and R. R. Raymo, lines 1503–1804; Medieval Latin Lyrics (selected), available in a booklet from the Faculty Office; Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. M. R. James, rev. C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors, Dist. III, cap. I, p. 224, line 17-p. 236, line 23; Andreas Capellanus, *De Amore*, ed. P. G. Walsh, Lib. I, p. 104, para. 229, end of para. 263; *Gesta Herewardi* ed. P. G. Schmidt (exerpts in a booklet available from the Faculty Office).

PART II

Group B (i)

Paper 4. Medieval English literature, 1066–1500 (also serves as Paper 13 of Part II of the Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic Tripos)
Subject for special study: Courts and Courtliness.

Paper 5. Special period of English literature (taken from the period after 1500 and before 1700): 1500–1547.

Paper 6. Special period of English literature (taken from the period after 1700): 1847–1872.

Paper 7. Special subject I

- (a) Shakespeare and the development of English literature: Shakespeare in performance.
- (b) Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot.
- (c) Milton and his time.
- (d) Samuel Johnson.

*Group B (ii)**Paper 12. Special Subject II*

- (a) Commonwealth and international literature in English.
- (b) Gender and writing: 1879–1941.
- (c) Literature in English since 1970.

Group C (i)

Paper 13. History of the English language (also serves as Paper 13 of Part I) Section A Specified Topic: The Language of Spenser.

Group C (ii)

Paper 24. A special period or subject in French literature, thought or history (Paper 11 of Part II of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos, in any year in which the subject announced by the Faculty Board of Modern and Medieval Languages has been approved for this purpose by the Faculty Board of English)
Subject for special study: Modern critical theory.

The Faculty Board give notice that, under Regulation 3 of the English Tripos (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 279), a candidate who offers this paper in the English Tripos may not also offer Paper 11 of Part II of the English Tripos (History and theory of literary criticism).

Second Report of the Board of Scrutiny*

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

1. The Board was established on the recommendation of the Wass Syndicate and came into existence on 1 October 1995. The Board's current duties, as defined in Statute A, VII, 1, are to 'scrutinize on behalf of the Regent House the Annual Report of the Council, the abstract of the accounts of the University, and any Report of the Council proposing allocations from the Chest'. The Board's first Report was published in the Easter Term 1996 (*Reporter*, 1995–96, p. 795), and made five recommendations. It was discussed on 11 June 1996 (*Reporter*, 1995–96, p. 882), and the Council responded in a Notice dated 22 July 1996 (*Reporter*, p. 1028). In this Report, we begin by summarizing progress made on our previous recommendations. Then we report on matters that we considered this year, which arise in turn from the Allocations Report for 1996–97 (*Reporter*, 1995–96, p. 772), the Abstract of Accounts for 1995–96 (*Reporter*, 1996–97, Special No. 8), and the Council's Annual Report for 1995–96 (*Reporter*, 1996–97, p. 287) with its Annex comprising the General Board's Report to the Council. Finally, we report on certain constitutional matters.

Progress on last year's recommendations

2. In their Notice of 22 July 1996 the Council accepted, with certain provisos, the first three of the Board's recommendations, but postponed consideration of the remaining two. Recommendation I proposed that the Abstract of Accounts should be accompanied by a fuller explanatory commentary, and this was accepted by the

* This Report is available on the World Wide Web, at <http://www.cam.ac.uk/CambUniv/Scrutiny/>. The Discussion at which this Report will be brought forward will be held on Wednesday, 9 July, at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House.

Council. Indeed, the accounts are now accompanied by an extensive Report from the Treasurer, for which the University will be most grateful. Recommendation II proposed that the provision of proper management accounting procedures should be treated as a matter of urgency. This was accepted by the Council, who indicated that the work would be carried forward as rapidly as practicable, given that new resources would be required in competition with other priorities. We are pleased to be able to report on subsequent progress towards a system of this kind, in paragraphs 14–15. Recommendation III proposed that, for those Trust Funds for which it was a problem, action should be taken to enable surplus income to be put to good use. The Council responded that steps were being taken to ensure that Trust Funds were used as effectively as possible, and stated that they would explore the possibility of extending the University's power to vary the application of Trust Funds. Subsequently the Treasurer's Report confirmed that a 'careful review of the terms of individual trusts and of applicable law needs to be undertaken'. We look forward to learning the outcome of these investigations. The Council also accepted our suggestion (paragraph 21 of our first Report) that the central offices could save time by making greater use of modern electronic communication to put information and correspondence online, and they indicated that this would be taken forward as rapidly as practicable. We report further on this subject in paragraphs 22–24.

3. Recommendation IV proposed that the accounts of the University Press should be brought within the scope of the Board of Scrutiny, and that the Statutes and Ordinances be amended accordingly. Consideration of this item was postponed by the Council, and we report on developments in paragraphs 34–36. Recommendation V proposed that a small committee, with external representation, be established to administer the scheme for awards to Professors for exceptional performance, and that existing holders should not be given preference over other candidates. Consideration of this item was postponed pending the installation of the new Vice-Chancellor, and after dialogue between the Board and the officers, the Council published a Notice (*Reporter*, 1996–97, p. 724) accepting our recommendation.

The academic year 1996–97

4. During the course of the current academic year, the Board have met on twelve occasions, and have received numerous documents from a wide variety of bodies. As last year, we chose a number of topics (arising from the Accounts or Reports) about which we felt that members of the Regent House might entertain a reasonable concern, or a legitimate curiosity. We looked into these matters by requesting relevant minutes and other papers, and by holding discussions with appropriate officers. The Board (or Board members) held about a dozen meetings with officers, including: the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), the Registrar, the Secretary General, the Treasurer, the Draftsman, the Director of the Computing Service, the Development Director, the Director of the Estate Management and Building Service, the Head of the Research Grants section, and the Chairman of the Press Syndicate. A further three meetings were held between representatives of the Board and representatives of the University Press, including the Chairman of the Syndicate, the Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executive, and several Syndics. We should like to thank all these officers for the extensive information that they provided to the Board.

THE ALLOCATIONS REPORT

5. The main emphasis of the Allocations Report (for 1996–97, published on 30 May 1996) was the maintenance of the University's mission of excellence in teaching and research, in spite of the severe reduction in government funding. In response to those reductions, the Council have been obliged to cut allocations for capital expenditure and to propose a strategy for making savings. These cuts are harsh, but they appear unavoidable, and we offer comment in only two areas: expenditure on central administration and on maintenance.

Central administration

6. In the climate of continual pressure for cuts, we would remind the Regent House of the need for adequate provision of central administrative services. In the heightened competition for limited resources, members of the central bodies may at times be inclined to support 'academic' ventures to the exclusion of 'administrative' ones. But we should like to raise awareness of the need for a strong central administration, especially in view of the recent moves by government towards greater and greater accountability of academics and of academic departments. We have detected a tendency for Cambridge academics to view the central administration as the body *preventing*, rather than *enabling*, new initiatives. However, our observations indicate that the Cambridge central administration is very efficient, and suggest that its deficiencies arise from under-resourcing. In comparison with other UK universities, Cambridge's central administration is funded at a low level. The Cambridge expenditure on 'Administration and central services', at 2.7 per cent. of total recurrent expenditure, is the lowest of all UK universities (*Universities Statistical Record*, 1993–94, Table 7). This is about half the national average (5.3 per cent.), and considerably less than the Oxford figure (4.8 per cent.). We congratulate the University's administrative officers for running the University so efficiently on minimal resources. But at the same time we point out to the Regent House that certain services are seriously under-resourced, and in paragraphs 22–27 we comment on two specific cases.

Maintenance

7. Under the pressure of enforced cuts, expenditure on maintenance might appear an easy target. Indeed, our investigations suggest that expenditure on maintenance is presently set at the minimum possible level. However, the University expects to maintain most of its buildings into the indefinite future – a strategy recognized in the University's accounts by the absence of any allowance for depreciation. It would clearly be short-sighted in the extreme to allow either the standard or the amount of maintenance to fall to such a level that the effect was to cause the accumulation of problems for the future. We therefore urge that any further pressures to cut the expenditure on

maintenance be resisted. Moreover, when new buildings are added to the University's stock, explicit consideration should be given not only to the amount of maintenance that will be required, but also to the way in which the costs of maintenance will be met.

THE UNIVERSITY ACCOUNTS

Trust Funds

8. We welcome the renewed publication, after a lapse of many years, of a summary of the funds of which the University is Trustee. In addition to informing members of the Regent House of the overall position, this information is of considerable value to Departments and to the Managers of individual Trusts, who in the past have not always been aware of the financial position of the Trusts that they managed. We hope that awareness of the situation will help to lessen the problem of unspent income to which we referred last year (in paragraph 12). However, awareness is not the whole solution, and we await the outcome of the review mentioned by the Council and the Treasurer in their respective Reports.

Separation of the accounts of the Local Examinations Syndicate

9. For the first time, the accounts of the Local Examinations Syndicate have been separated from those of the rest of the University, and a separate abstract is attached as an Appendix to the University's accounts. We welcome the increased transparency provided by this separation, but it is unfortunate that the information is so out-of-date; thus, the published accounts of the LES refer to the year October 1994 to September 1995. For the future, we recommend that the accounts of the LES be published as soon as they have been audited. We note that the present scheduling difficulty could be avoided if the Syndicate's financial year were to be synchronized with the University's financial year. Although we are aware of the difficulties involved in making such a transition, we recommend that the Council investigate the possibility. Finally, we wish to seek the assurance of the Council that, despite their publication as an Appendix, the accounts of the LES are still to be regarded as forming an integral part of the University's accounts, for the purposes of Statute A, VII.

Separation of HEFCE funding from other sources

10. For each of the last two years the Council have included with the Accounts a Notice, on p. 2, referring to an earlier Notice dated 22 May 1995 (*Reporter*, 1994-95, p. 807) in which they responded to Dr Edwards's proposal (*Reporter*, 1994-95, p. 320) that the University's accounting system be revised so as to separate expenditure of funds provided by HEFCE from other expenditure. Such separation would appear to have merit, and we hope that the University will soon be informed of the outcome of the Council's review.

Transparency of information provided in the accounts

11. Last year we recommended that the accounts be accompanied by a fuller explanatory commentary, and we warmly welcome the additional information provided this year in the Treasurer's expanded Report. Our analysis of the Accounts was greatly aided by the unpublished *Explanatory Notes to the Draft Abstract of Accounts* prepared for the Finance Committee, and by detailed discussions with the Treasurer. However, in the absence of information of this kind, we consider that ordinary members of the Regent House will remain unable to fathom a variety of matters of legitimate interest relating to the University's financial position.

12. One area of legitimate interest to members of the Regent House is the financial relation between the University and its two 'trading' Syndicates. Readers will find, under Note 4 to the accounts, the item 'General Donations: Local Examinations Syndicate, £9.4m', but they will be unable to find any comparable figure for the generous donations from the University Press. Similarly, the ordinary reader will be unable to interpret, under Note 23, the item 'Special Funds, Income: Donations, £21.5m'. And it would take a very careful reader to interpret the link between the Treasurer's statement about 'a reorganization of Chest capital so as to show money previously held in the Local Examinations Syndicate Special Fund as part of the Chest assets' and the transfers, recorded in Notes 23 and 24 to the accounts, between Special Funds and General Endowments. In the spirit of our first recommendation from last year, we consider it reasonable for the Council to inform the Regent House, in comprehensible language, of the meaning of these and other similarly obscure figures.

Conformity of accounts to SORPs

13. The University's main accounts already conform to the requirements of the *Statement of Recommended Practice* (SORP), *Accounting in Higher Education Institutions*, but at present the accounts of subsidiary bodies do not similarly conform. Although some ambiguity may remain in relation to the legal requirement for conformity with a SORP, a written parliamentary answer indicated that "the statement of recommended accounting practice *Accounting by Charities*, published by the Charity Commission, applies in relation to all charity accounts unless a more specific statement of recommended practice applies" (Mr Sproat, on behalf of the Secretary of State for National Heritage, 28 January 1997). Such SORPs have been drawn up within the framework of the Charities Act 1993, and incorporate accounting principles that command widespread support. In the words of Earl Ferrers, Minister of State at the Home Office, moving the second reading of the Bill in the House of Lords, "It is not a question of increasing bureaucracy, which none of us wants; ... We think that the best way of maintaining the public's goodwill is to ensure that every charity is accountable, publicly and openly, for the manner in which it conducts its affairs". In our view it is important, both for public accountability and openness, and for the provision of full and meaningful financial information to the Regent House, that all of the University's accounts should conform to the appropriate SORP. We ask the Council to confirm that in future the published accounts of all University bodies will conform in this way.

THE COUNCIL'S ANNUAL REPORT

Management accounting

14. Last year we recommended that the provision of proper management accounting procedures be treated as a matter of urgency, and this was accepted by the Council, subject to competition for limited resources. During the course of the present year, the central bodies have approved a proposal for a 'commitment accounting' system, to be developed and implemented throughout the University over the next three years. This system will provide University-wide access to information on the central administrative computer, and in particular will allow departmental input of purchase order and invoice information, and it will provide relevant officers with an overview of the state of accounts, both at departmental and at University level. We warmly welcome this initiative, and we expect that it will go a considerable way towards providing the kind of management accounting information that the central bodies require.

15. We would sound one note of caution in relation to the implementation of this system. Since a lukewarm and haphazard take-up by Departments would jeopardize the whole scheme, it is essential that the system be adopted uniformly by Departments. We therefore regard it as important that the implementation phase should be under the direct control of a very senior officer in the Old Schools (see also paragraph 18).

Information technology

16. We wish to comment on two aspects of information technology in the University. Firstly, we recommend a review of the organization and administration of computing in the Old Schools, and secondly we report on the urgent need for electronic dissemination of information from the Old Schools. During the Lent Term we discussed these issues with the Vice-Chancellor and senior officers, and we understand that they are currently being addressed. Nevertheless, we think it appropriate to report on them to the University, to raise awareness of the issues.

Management of information systems

17. We take the view that there is a need for a radical change in the management of, and responsibility for, information systems in the Old Schools. Whereas most academic Departments are making (or have made) the transition to networking and distributed systems, the experience and ethos of the Old Schools seems not to have moved from the days of main-frame computers.

18. Our discussions have indicated that there is a pressing need for a very senior officer in the University, who could take responsibility for all aspects of information systems in the central administration. The duties of this officer ought to include: implementing the move to full networking and electronic communication within the administration; overseeing all networked administrative resources; overseeing the administration's central web site; overseeing the introduction of commitment accounting; overseeing the computing aspects of further moves towards full management accounting; overseeing the provision of computing resources for the next HEFCE Research Assessment Exercise; and running a training programme to bring administrative staff into the modern computing era.

19. There are at least two routes towards a solution. The first would simply involve the creation of a new senior post within the Old Schools, probably at about professorial level (and possibly for a fixed term), but without any changes in responsibility for computing at a University level. A more radical solution would involve a review of the overall responsibility for computing within the University.

20. In our view, the advent of distributed computing systems, the installation of the Granta Backbone Network, the recent introduction of a unified administrative service in the University, and the need for a post of the kind just mentioned, have combined to blur the justification that previously existed for the separation of academic and administrative computing responsibilities within the University. We believe that much of the difficulty that we now see facing administrative computing in the University could be alleviated by the formation of a single authority with ultimate responsibility both for the University's academic computing and for its administrative computing.

21. It seems clear that either of these approaches would create substantial implications for the allocation of resources. However, we consider it critical that a proper solution be found, and we urge the central authorities to bring forward a suitable plan prior to the next Allocations Report.

Electronic dissemination of information

22. In response to our recommendation last year that greater use be made of modern electronic communication to put information and correspondence online, the Council responded that this would be taken forward as rapidly as practicable. While it is welcome that electronic mail ('e-mail') is being utilized by some administrative officers, it is disconcerting to find that others (including some senior officers) are apparently still not using e-mail. It is also disappointing that the majority of the University's circular notices are still sent to Departments only on paper. We recommend that all officers in the Old Schools be contactable by e-mail, and that all circular notices from the centre be available electronically, with provision for Departments to send their replies electronically. We are not suggesting that paper circulars be discontinued, but simply that electronic versions be made available; paper versions are likely to remain important for some Departments, and as a permanent record.

23. It is extremely disappointing that dissemination of information via the World Wide Web is almost non-existent. In this area the University's central administration lags far behind its Departments, and behind other universities such as Oxford. For example, one cannot obtain electronically any information about applying for a research grant. Nor can one consult official publications, such as the *Statutes and Ordinances* or the *Reporter*. Although the University's *Prospectuses* (Graduate and Undergraduate) are available on the web, this information is aimed at those external to the University. The glaring omission in Cambridge is the lack of availability of information for members of the University's own staff.

24. We have recently learned that authorization has been given for the setting up of an Old Schools web server and for two associated posts, and we enthusiastically welcome these moves. In our view the additional quite modest resources required for this initiative are entirely justified. We hope that this venture will proceed rapidly, and we recommend that by the end of 1997 the following information be available (at least to those with '.cam.ac.uk' addresses):

- an e-mail directory of the Old Schools (listed by function as well as by name)
- the University telephone directory
- the *Research Grants Handbook*
- the *Reporter* (including a proper search facility)
- a continually updated 'Officers number'
- the *Statutes and Ordinances*
- the University's *Staff Handbook*.

THE GENERAL BOARD'S ANNUAL REPORT

Research Grants Section

25. During 1996 a unified Research Grants and Contracts Section was formed, by the merger of the two former sections in the General Board and Financial Board offices. This merger has been an important step in co-ordinating the University's handling of research grant policy and practice, and we welcome it greatly. Our investigations indicate that the merger has been very successful, and suggest that it is widely welcomed in academic Departments. We support the General Board's policy of giving high priority to streamlining the checking and approval of grant applications, and we congratulate the staff of the section for substantially reducing applicants' waiting time.

26. An efficient Research Grants Section is a very high priority in a University with such an outstanding research profile as Cambridge, and one may view its role as facilitating the conduct of research of the highest quality. In addition to acting as the formal interface between researchers and grant-giving bodies, this section of the administration ought to be able to ease the burden on researchers by providing them with ready access to all the relevant information on policy and practice (both of the University and of sponsors). It also serves an important role in ensuring that the University maximizes its recovery of the direct and indirect costs of research. We commented on the last of these items in our first Report, and we know that the General Board currently have the matter under review.

27. The provision of appropriate facilities in the Research Grants Section requires a considerable allocation of resources, and in our view the present level is not adequate. In paragraph 6 we commented in general terms on the low level of funding of Cambridge's central administration, and we would point to the Research Grants Section as one particular area that deserves increased resources. We note that there is an urgent need for the University's policy on research grants (the *Research Grants Handbook*) to be brought up-to-date, and to be maintained current. Yet we are told that because of lack of staff this has not been possible for a number of years. Similarly, we note that there is an urgent need to make information on research grant policy and practice available online to the University's researchers (see also paragraphs 22-24). Overall, we believe that the importance of research grants to the University makes it imperative that the Research Grants Section be adequately resourced. On the two specific matters that we have mentioned above (preparation of an updated *Handbook*, and its availability online), it would in our view be a great pity if these had not been implemented by the end of the present calendar year.

Research Assessment Exercise

28. We note that the General Board are reviewing the local handling of the 1996 Research Assessment Exercise in order to improve the conduct of future exercises (paragraph 12 of their Annual Report). Having discussed the situation with the Secretary General of the Faculties, we examined the relevant minutes and papers of the General Board, and of its Needs Committee. It is widely acknowledged that there were significant problems with the preparation of Cambridge's submission, on a number of fronts. However, it is clear to us that the General Board are taking these shortcomings seriously, and that they are working actively towards the introduction of improved procedures for the future. They are aware of the need for a substantial range of improvements, including: the provision of additional staff during future exercises; the establishment of a more formal organizational structure; the provision of adequate computing systems and personnel; the setting-up of annual procedures for the acquisition and checking of data; the provision of better communication with Departments; and the setting out of a clear timetable of actions and a clear statement of responsibilities so as to ensure timely submission. They are also considering strategic matters relating to future assessment exercises.

29. Early in December 1996, the Secretary General wrote to Heads of Departments and to Chairmen and Secretaries of Faculty Boards and Councils of Schools, enumerating many of these points, and inviting comment. Our main concern is that awareness of the existence and scope of the Board's review does not appear to have seeped through to the academic members of most Departments, with the consequence that widespread lack of confidence regarding the conduct of future exercises appears to persist. We feel that it would have been helpful for the Board to have publicized their review more widely, since in our view the brief description in their last Annual Report was quite inadequate. We understand that the Board intend to provide detailed information on the outcome of their review in their next Annual Report to the Council, to be published in December 1997. While we are pleased that a detailed report will be given to the University, we think it a pity that the information will not be available until so long after submission of the assessment material, in April/May 1996. We note that HEFCE have already published two reviews of the conduct of the national exercise, on their Web page at <http://www.niss.ac.uk/education/hefc/rae96/>.

CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

Remit of the Board

30. In the course of the first two years of existence of the Board of Scrutiny, it has become apparent to us that there is some uncertainty in the University as to our role, and we feel that it would be helpful to try to clarify the situation.

31. The Board of Scrutiny appears unique amongst the University's statutory bodies, in having no Ordinances to amplify or clarify its statutory role. Statute A, VII, 1 states that 'There shall be in the University a Board of Scrutiny, which shall in each year scrutinize on behalf of the Regent House the Annual Report of the Council, the abstract of the accounts of the University, and any Report of the Council proposing allocations from the Chest. In addition the Board shall perform such other duties, and shall have such powers, as may be specified by Ordinance or Order'. No such Ordinances have yet been enacted.

32. In interpreting the Statute, we have thought it important to bear in mind the aims of the Wass Syndicate, who proposed the establishment of the Board of Scrutiny 'in order to make the central bodies genuinely accountable to the Regent House' (*Reporter*, 1988-89, p. 622, Paragraph 5.2.1). We have therefore viewed our duty to scrutinize the Accounts and Reports in wide terms, in an attempt to provide the accountability that the Wass Syndicate desired. Indeed we have taken the view that, should some hypothetical topic of importance to the University not be addressed in the Council's Annual Report (or in the accounts or other Reports), it would nevertheless be incumbent upon us to scrutinize the matter. Should we not do so, we feel certain that the Regent House would see us as failing in our duty. We would stress, however, that no such situation has arisen.

33. The Wass Syndicate suggested (paragraph 5.2.3) 'that the establishment of the Board by Statute should include provision for its duties to be adjusted in the light of experience', and the Statutes and Ordinances Revision Syndicate commented in their Third Report that 'to some extent it will be necessary for the Board to establish its own conventions and to devise rules of procedure in the light of experience' (*Reporter*, 1992-93, p. 772, paragraph 4.11). Now that the Board has been in operation for two years, it seems appropriate to inform the Regent House of our experience, and to set out a statement of our conventions. After discussion with the officers, we wish to submit the following 'statement of remit' to the Regent House for consideration. We hope that this statement will be acceptable to the University, in which case we ask the Council to propose regulations putting it into effect.

Statement of Remit by the Board of Scrutiny

1. We understand the scope of our scrutiny to encompass the University as a whole. This includes administrative and academic institutions, as well as bodies under the control of Syndicates. We note that our power to consult official documents, under Statute A, VII, 6(a), currently excludes those of the University Press.
2. Within the context of Statute A, VII, 1, we consider our remit to include scrutiny of the following, when arising in relation to the Annual Report of the Council, the abstract of accounts of the University, and any Reports of the Council proposing allocations from the Chest:
 - lines of management, responsibility, and accountability within the University;
 - processes of decision-making within the University, and whether decisions have been taken at the most appropriate level, by the most appropriate body, and with all the relevant information;
 - whether systems are in place to ensure that appropriate financial and administrative checks are operating within the University;
 - the allocation of resources from the Chest;
 - the accounts of any University organization;
 - financial arrangements, whether or not these have been put to the Regent House for approval;
 - any other financial matters that appear relevant to the Board.
3. We will avoid, as far as possible, duplicating the work of other University bodies.
4. We will not scrutinize the cases of individuals (e.g. individual appointments, promotions, grievances, etc.) unless matters arise in relation to our scrutiny of relevant Council Reports and University accounts which appear to indicate that proper systems of management are lacking. In such situations, we will restrict our consideration to the systems.

*University Press**

34. Last year, in Recommendation IV, we proposed that the accounts of the University Press be brought within the scope of the Board of Scrutiny, and that the Statutes and Ordinances be amended accordingly. This proposal was made without consulting the Press Syndicate, a course which, with hindsight, we regret. During the year discussions have been held between representatives of the Board and representatives of the Syndicate, seeking to establish common ground. Broadly speaking, the views of the two bodies are as follows. The Board of Scrutiny consider that, in order properly to scrutinize the financial position of the University as a whole, it is necessary for the Board to have access to appropriate financial information about all component parts of the University, including the Press. The Syndicate, who are responsible for the Press and are keenly aware of its unique position in the University, have opposed any statutory change which, in their view, could damage the Press. Nevertheless, the Syndicate are sympathetic to the argument that, in order for the Board to be able properly to consider the Annual Report of the Council, the University Accounts, and any Report dealing with allocations from the Chest, they

* Dr Garling, as a Press Syndic, absented himself from discussion of this item.

might think it necessary to have access to information about the University Press which is not in the public domain. The Syndicate have looked at ways of accommodating the Board's wish without statutory change.

35. After discussions between the representatives of the two bodies, the Syndicate have agreed to put the relationship between themselves and the Board on a written basis in the Ordinances. In particular, the Syndicate are willing for the Board to have access to any paper that the Press submit to the Council or to the Council's Finance Committee, and in addition they would be willing to entertain requests for further information, or for meetings between the Board and the Syndicate (or their representatives). During the course of this year the documents mentioned above have been provided by the Press and, in addition, other relevant papers requested by the Board have also been provided.

36. It will be important to ensure that any new Ordinances are consistent with the Statutes. At present Statute A, VII, 6(a) empowers the Board "to consult any official documents or accounts (other than those of the University Press) which may be relevant to any enquiry", and the Press are strongly opposed to the removal of the parenthetical words in this subsection. In order to meet the Press's concerns that removal of the phrase would give the Board excessive access to sensitive material, and to avoid any possible conflict between Statute and Ordinance, we have proposed as an alternative the addition of a new subsection (b) in Statute A, VII, 6:

(b) to consult such official documents or accounts of the University Press as may be specified by Ordinance.

This has been agreed by the Syndicate, and we therefore ask the Council to submit the proposal to the Regent House for approval. In formulating the accompanying regulations to govern the interaction between the two bodies, we recommend that the Council consult both the Syndicate and the Board.

Eligibility for re-election to the Board

37. We wish to inform the University of one provision in our Statute that has proved troublesome in the course of our first two years of operation, and which we anticipate will prove troublesome in the future. The final sentence of Statute A, VII, 4 provides that 'No retiring member of the Board may be elected or re-elected as a member in class (c) until one year has elapsed after the end of his or her period of service'. While this provision is entirely reasonable in the case of a member who has served a full term, it creates an absurdity in the case of a member elected to fill a casual vacancy. This year, one member retires after having filled a casual vacancy for a single year, but is precluded by Statute from standing for re-election; another member is resigning after two years' service, and the elected replacement will be excluded from serving beyond a two-year period. When taken in conjunction with the fact that six members retire in alternate years, the statutory provision enforces an unacceptable lack of continuity on the Board. In addition, it makes the filling of a casual vacancy quite unattractive, as the year or so that is needed to accumulate experience cannot be built upon. We therefore recommend removal of the statutory restriction on re-election of a member who has been elected to fill a casual vacancy, at least in cases where the member has served for only a short term (say, not more than two years).

Recommendations

38. We recommend:

- I. That prior to the next Allocations Report the Council address the issue of the under-resourcing of the central administration (paragraph 6).
- II. That any pressures to make further cuts in expenditure on maintenance be resisted (paragraph 7).
- III. That the review of Trust Funds referred to by the Council and the Treasurer be brought forward soon (paragraphs 2 and 8).
- IV. That the Council arrange for the publication of the accounts of the Local Examinations Syndicate as soon as they have been audited, and that the University be assured that these accounts remain an integral part of the University's accounts (paragraph 9).
- V. That the explanatory notes to the Accounts be expanded to provide information of the kind referred to in paragraph 12.
- VI. That the Council confirm that in future the published accounts of all University bodies will conform to the relevant SORP (paragraph 14).
- VII. That the implementation phase of the new system of commitment accounting be the responsibility of senior management (paragraph 15).
- VIII. That the Council bring forward plans for the management of information systems in the Old Schools (paragraphs 17-21).
- IX. That the material listed in paragraph 24 be made available on a Web server by the end of 1997.
- X. That the provision of resources for the Research Grants and Contracts Section be given higher priority than at present (paragraphs 25-27).
- XI. That approval be given to the statement of remit of the Board of Scrutiny set out in paragraph 33.

XII. That the Council implement Recommendation IV of our first Report, by the insertion of a new subsection within Statute A, VII, 6 and by the formulation of appropriate Ordinances (paragraphs 34–36).

XIII. That the statutory exclusion from eligibility for re-election to the Board be revised, in the case where the member was elected to fill a casual vacancy (paragraph 37).

2 June 1997

TREVOR LAMB, <i>Chairman</i>	ELLEN CLARK-KING	DEBBIE LOWTHER
MARK BAILEY	JOHN E. FFWCS WILLIAMS	MICHAEL A. MESSAGE
CLAIRE Y. BARLOW	D. J. H. GARLING	OLIVER RACKHAM
MARKUS BOCKMUEHL	D. R. HOWARTH	T. J. SMILEY

Correction of a class-list

(*Reporter*, 1995–96, Special No. 16)

Diplomas in Modern Languages, 1996 (p. 77)

Under the heading **German** the name Thompson, A. C., *Q*, should be added and the name Wilson, C. J., *CL*, should be deleted.

Under the heading **Hungarian** the entry for Schmidt, J. H., *T*, should have (c), to denote a mark of credit, added.

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 18 June 1997

The Council submit the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, other than any which is withdrawn or for which a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 113) will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 27 June 1997.

1. That the recommendations contained in paragraph 57 of the Report, dated 26 May 1997, of the Council on the financial position of the Chest, recommending allocations for 1997–98 (*Reporter*, p. 768) be approved.¹
2. That the recommendations contained in paragraph 6 of the Report, dated 26 May 1997, of the Council on the construction of an extension to the Fitzwilliam Museum (*Reporter*, p. 789) be approved.²
3. That the recommendations contained in paragraph 9 of the Joint Report, dated 26/21 May 1997, of the Council and the General Board on the implementation in Cambridge of the April 1996 and 1997 pay increases for non-clinical academic and academic-related staff (*Reporter*, p. 793) be approved.
4. That the recommendations contained in paragraph 5 of the Report, dated 15 May 1997, of the Faculty Board of Classics on certain Studentships for research in Classical subjects (*Reporter*, p. 795) be approved.

¹ See the Council's Notice, p. 848.

² This Grace is to be the subject of a ballot. See the Council's Notice, p. 849.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 19 July 1997

The Council have sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on 19 July 1997:

That the following persons be admitted to the degree of Master of Arts under Statute B, III, 6:

1. ANDREW VON HIRSCH, Fellow of Fitzwilliam College.
2. ANNETTE BOHR, Research Fellow of Sidney Sussex College.

S. G. FLEET, *Registrar*