

Senior Tutors' Committee

MINUTES of the meeting held at 2.15 pm on Friday 1 November 2024 in the Benson Hall at Magdalene College.

The meeting was chaired by Judith Bunbury (W); the Executive Secretary was Malcolm Millbrook (Office of Intercollegiate Services).

Members' Attendance: Please note that blank cells below represent Colleges that were not represented at the meeting. Names marked with an asterisk (*) attended as a substitute for the respective member.

Christ's	Tom Monie	Murray Edwards	Victoria Harvey
Churchill	Rita Monson	Newnham	Sheila Watts
Clare	Jackie Tasioulas	Pembroke	Robert Mayhew
Clare Hall	Holly Hedgeland	Peterhouse	James Carleton Paget
Corpus Christi	Marina Frasca-Spada	Queens'	Andrew Thompson
Darwin		Robinson	Scott Annett
Downing	Guy Williams	St. Catharine's	Holly Canuto
Emmanuel	Corinna Russell	St. Edmund's	Mike Finn
Fitzwilliam	Paul Chirico	St John's	Richard Partington
Girton	Toni Williams	Selwyn	Mike Sewell
Gonville & Caius	Andrew Spencer	Sidney Sussex	Max Beber
Homerton	Georgie Horrell	Trinity	Catherine Bernard
Hughes Hall	Tori McKee	Trinity Hall	Michael Sutherland
Jesus	Paul Dominiak	Wolfson	Judith Bunbury
King's	Myfanwy Hill	CSU: UG President	Sarah Anderson
Lucy Cavendish	Jane Greatorex	CSU: PG President	
Magdalene	Stuart Martin (Deputy Chair)		

Attendees

University	Alice Benton, Head of Education Services Deborah Prentice, Vice-Chancellor Bhaskar Vira, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education
Colleges	Robert Gardiner (CAI), Deputy Chair of the Bursars' Committee Matthew Mellor (PEM), representative of the College Development Directors' Committee Alan Short (CLH), Deputy Chair of the Colleges' Committee
OIS	Diane Brooker, Office Manager Malcolm Millbrook, Deputy Head Matthew Russell, Head Martin Thompson, Director of Admissions

There were no declarations of interest.

The following people were invited to attend the meeting:

For all items: Junius Olivier (Deputy Senior Tutor, Homerton College)
Martin Parker Dixon (Deputy Senior Tutor, St. Catharine's College)
For Item 24.8 only: Jenny Raine (Head of Student Support Services)

STC.24.1 Welcome

The following new members were welcomed to their first formal meeting:

- Sarah Anderson, Cambridge SU President (UG)

- James Carleton Paget, Peterhouse
- Paul Chirico, Fitzwilliam College
- Victoria Harvey, Murray Edwards College
- Matthew Mellor, Pembroke College (Colleges' Development Directors Committee representative)
- Alan Short, Clare Hall (Colleges' Committee representative)

STC.24.2 Minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2024

The Committee approved the unreserved minutes and reserved minutes of the meeting on 12 July 2024 as a true record.

STC.24.3 Terms of Reference

The following documents were circulated for reference and to serve as reminders to Committee members about the role of the Committee and the management of public information about its minutes:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Paper 1 | Senior Tutors' Committee: Terms of Reference |
| Paper 2 | Privacy Statement |

STC.24.4 Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

a) Medicine entry requirements (minute STC.23.110.a, 12 July 2024)

At its previous meeting the Committee approved the appointment of a suitable individual to a new joint role as Medicine Group Chairs' Convenor and as Admissions Convenor (previously known as Subject Convenor). The Committee noted that Robert Abayasekara (F) had agreed to take on this new role.

PRINCIPAL AND SUBSTANTIVE BUSINESS

STC.24.5 Undergraduate admissions governance proposal

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions reported on the penultimate proposal of a new undergraduate admissions governance structure, following a request for feedback from Colleges over the Long Vacation:

- | | |
|---------|--------------------------------------|
| Paper 3 | UG Governance combined document pack |
|---------|--------------------------------------|

Six Colleges had responded to the second part of the consultation with concerns regarding the proposal, and the Senior Tutors' Business Committee had raised certain issues at its recent meeting. The finalised proposal had been altered to take into account that feedback, which would be circulated soon for Senior Tutors to take to their Colleges for formal approval. This would enable members to report on their Colleges' positions at the Committee's meeting on 14 February 2025. The proposal would also require approval by the University's General Board.

A show of hands suggested that five or six Colleges could have difficulty convincing their Governing Bodies to support the proposal. A second show of hands indicated that no members supported the current governance structure. If at the Committee's 14 February 2025 meeting unanimous support for the proposal from the collegiate university was not reached then the matter would be taken to the Colleges' Committee for further consideration, following the protocol for the consideration of a 'common action' decision within the framework of intercollegiate decision-making.

If the proposal was approved by the Committee then the new governance structure would begin in 2025/26, with necessary elections for the new committees called during 2024/25.

STC.24.6 Report from the Black, Asian and Minoritised Ethnic (BAME) Student Mental Health Advisory Group

The Committee considered a request from the Joint Wellbeing Committee, for it to take forward certain recommendations raised by a report from the BAME Student Mental Health Advisory Group. Following a request from the Senior Tutors' Business Committee, extracts from the report and a paper summarising current EDI student support practice were provided alongside:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Paper 4 | Recommendations for consideration by the Senior Tutors' Committee |
| Paper 5 | Extracts from BAME Student Mental Health Advisory Group report |
| Paper 6 | Current provision of EDI student support |

The Committee discussed each recommendation turn:

- a) Recommendation 1, to develop a mechanism to enable dialogue about student-related race issues across the University and Colleges, was supported by the Committee. **The Committee agreed that discussions first needed to be held on how to develop such a mechanism, and if a suitable collegiate university committee was not available then one should be created to lead the work in meeting the recommendation.**
- b) Recommendation 2, to review pre-arrival and induction support for Black, Asian and minoritised ethnic students with a view to developing a systematic, consistent programme of support, was supported by the Committee. **Andrew Spencer (CAI), as Chair of STEC agreed to lead on the work to fulfil the recommendation.** Sarah Anderson (Cambridge SU) reported that the Access, Education & Participation Officer (UG) Katie Clarke was also campaigning to standardise prep-week support across Colleges. Katie Clarke was encouraged to liaise with STEC on the matter.
- c) The Executive Secretary reported that the Academic and Welfare Review process referred to in the report had been replaced with the Senior Tutor Peer Support scheme, which gathered good practice initiatives across Colleges but at a slow pace. **The Committee agreed that Recommendation 3, to share good practice examples of support provision for ethnically minoritised students at different Colleges, could be achieved by collating examples via the Senior Tutors' Forum.** The Director of Undergraduate Admissions reported that the recently launched 'What Works' project would also encourage the gathering of examples of evidence-based good practice across Colleges.
- d) Members discussed at length Recommendation 4, for Colleges to develop a plan of work to address the under-representation of ethnically minoritised staff among College workforces. **The Committee agreed that examples of good practice to encourage the recruitment of a diverse workforce should be shared via the Senior Tutors' Forum, for Colleges to take forward individually, but it otherwise could not support a general plan of work due to regulatory and legislative obligations on recruitment practices.**
- e) **The Committee supported Recommendation 5, for Colleges to collect data on the usage of College-based mental health provision by Black, Asian and Minoritised Ethnic students in order to monitor equality of access to provision, but not also for wellbeing provision due to GDPR concerns.** The Mental Health Transformation Programme's Data Task and Finish Group was in the process of creating a universal case management system for recording student engagement of mental health services. Until such a system was available Colleges could gather their own data on the usage and effectiveness of their mental health provision, whilst being mindful of their own GDPR policies.

STC.24.7 Teaching Review

a) Teaching Review update

The Committee received an update on progress by the Teaching Review's Steering Group from its Project Lead:

Paper 7 Teaching Review update

b) Proposed undergraduate supervisor policies (minute STC.23.50.a, 16 February 2024)

The Executive Secretary presented a redrafted version of a guidance document by which Departments and Faculties should support undergraduate supervisors, based on research conducted to support the Teaching Review and discussions with the 'Justice 4 College Supervisors' campaign. The original draft of the guidance was endorsed by the Teaching Review's Steering Group, circulated to Departments and Faculties, and supported by the Committee:

Paper 8 Supporting supervisors – Guidance for Faculties and Departments

The guidance was not considered controversial but was needed to ensure supervisors were sufficiently supported, and to reduce occurrences of postgraduates being pressurised to teach. The Executive Secretary and the Project Lead of the Teaching Review were currently meeting with Departments or Faculties which had expressed difficulties in reducing preparation time to deliver a supervision or reducing the number of singleton supervisions.

The Committee approved the guidance for publication, with a minor amendment made regarding preparation time for supervisions. The General Board's Education Committee would also need to approve the guidance and would discuss how to prevent certain Departments from insisting that their postgraduates teach.

STC.24.8 Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students

The Committee was reminded of the briefing paper from the Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students which was circulated to Senior Tutors for comment:

Paper 9 Review briefing paper for Senior Tutors

Paper 10 College feedback on Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students proposals

The Committee discussed further points Colleges wished to raise with the Review's Steering Group, represented at the meeting by Jenny Raine (Head of Student Support Services), prior to finalised recommendations being presented to the Committee for endorsement at its next meeting:

- a) It was recommended that the fourth potential guidance principle ("to be cognisant that students from different cultures and backgrounds might need different support") should also include wording to the effect that students with disabilities should be enabled to fulfil their potential.
- b) The review did not appear to refer to the broader objectives of the University, such as its delivery of world class research, which raised the concern that the review's recommendations would have unintended implications for research staff. Jenny Raine reported that the intention of the review was to reduce the variety of plans needed to support disabled students, which would then lessen the burden on academic staff supporting those students rather than increase their workloads.

Members were invited to send any further comments to Jenny Raine.

STANDING REPORTS

STC.24.9 Reports of the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)

The Vice-Chancellor provided an oral report:

- a) The University was currently recruiting for a new Chief Information Officer and Chief Financial Officer.
- b) The Vice-Chancellor had recently been meeting with various representatives of other HE institutes, including the Mastercard Foundation in Edinburgh. There she met alumni who were keen to encourage more Scottish students to study at Cambridge, via the organisation CAMSoc.
- c) The General Board was in receipt of a draft report by an internal committee reviewing the Veterinary Medicine course, as well as student feedback from the recent National Student Survey and the School's recent accreditation report. The collated information showed that the General Board would need to take an important decision on the course's future, the Vice-Chancellor would appreciate any input from Colleges on that decision.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) provided that a Memorandum of Understanding between the University and Trinity College had recently been signed, to launch a new postgraduate studentship funding scheme. This would provide £2.4M annually for five years towards matched funding for new studentships and would be led through the six Schools. Further details would emerge in the next few weeks.

STC.24.10 Report of the Chair of the Committee

The Chair of the Committee had nothing to report which was not included elsewhere on the agenda.

OTHER BUSINESS

STC.24.11 Mature Strategy Group

As a development arising from the reform of undergraduate admissions governance, it was proposed that the current strategy group relating to matters concerning mature undergraduate students (a sub-committee of the Admissions Forum) be adopted formally as a sub-committee of the Senior Tutors' Committee.

The Senior Tutors' Business Committee recommended that the Committee approve the following proposed terms of reference for the Mature Strategy Group (MSG):

Paper 11 MSG terms of reference

Due to the change in focus of the new Access and Participation Plan, which was more interested in the whole student cycle not just access, it was more appropriate for the MSG to report directly to the Committee than via the Admissions Forum.

The Committee approved the new terms of reference, with the minor adjustment of the student representative position to be held by the Access, Education & Participation Officer (UG).

STC.24.12 Chair of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee included in its terms of reference membership including “the Secretary or an Associate Secretary of the Senior Tutors’ Committee”, who was also designated as a joint Chair of the Committee. The role had, in recent years, been undertaken by Stuart Martin (M), whose position on the Committee had now been re-defined as Deputy Chair.

Stuart Martin agreed to carry on as Co-Chair with the expectation that the role was temporary, to reexamine the matter if the proposed new governance structure was not approved in the current academic year. To enable this, the Senior Tutors’ Business Committee recommended that the Committee appoint Stuart Martin as “Associate Secretary”.

The Committee approved Stuart Martin’s appointment as Associate Secretary.

STC.24.13 Communicable Diseases reminder

Jane Greatorex (LC), as Chair of the Communicable Diseases Sub-Committee, reminded the Committee on protocols for managing incidents and outbreaks of communicable disease across the collegiate university:

- Paper 12 Communicable Diseases *aide-mémoire*
Paper 13 Infectious disease action process map

Jane Greatorex informed the Committee that Colleges had been requested to report on any occurrences of mpox, following concerns raised in September, but no cases had been reported.

STC.24.14 Membership of Sub-Committees and Other Bodies

The Committee approved the following proposals for representation on other committees:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Appointment of ...</i>	<i>Replacing ...</i>
Black Advisory Hub Steering Group	Toni Williams (G)	Judith Bunbury (W)
Committee on Prevent and Freedom of Speech	Tori McKee (HH)	Marina Frasca-Spada (CC)
Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Steering Group	Martin Parker Dixon (CTH)	Judith Bunbury (W)
Postgraduate Tutors’ Committee, Deputy Chair	Holly Hedgeland (CLH)	<i>new</i>
REF Delivery Group (RDG)	Toni Williams	<i>new</i>
University Library Education Strategy Committee	Mike Finn (ED)	<i>new</i>

The following paper was circulated for information:

- Paper 14 Membership reports as of 25 October 2024

Senior Tutors were asked to check the report for accuracy and advise OIS of any amendments/additions.

STANDING BUSINESS – MATTERS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

STC.24.15 Senior Tutors’ Business Committee

The unconfirmed minutes of the most recent meeting of the Senior Tutors’ Business Committee were circulated for information:

- Paper 15 Minutes of the meeting on 21 October 2024

- a) Updating the Business Committee’s Terms of Reference (minute STBC.24.3)

The Committee approved minor adjustments to its Business Committee's terms of reference, to reflect the new titles of its officers and to remove a redundant list of current members:

Paper 16 Recommended amendments to STBC ToR

STC.24.16 Reports of Standing Committees

The following business was for report: where there were matters for decision or substantial discussion, these were raised in Principal and Substantive Business or Other Business above.

a) Postgraduate Tutors' Committee (PTC)

The unconfirmed minutes of the meetings held on 30 May 2024 were circulated for information:

Paper 17 Postgraduate Tutors' Committee: Minutes 30 May 2024

b) Standing Committee on Education (STEC)

The Committee noted that a pilot merging of the General Board's Education Committee (GBEC) with STEC took place during 2023-24. The Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education agreed that, from 1 October 2024, two additional Senior Tutors could attend GBEC (instead of all STEC members). STEC reviewed the pilot and recommended that it continue as an independent committee supported by the University's Education Quality and Policy Office. The Senior Tutors' Business Committee agreed with the recommendations, including that meetings of STEC need to be properly sequenced ahead of GBEC and following the Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee (ASEC).

Terms of reference were currently being drafted, in part for STEC to take on the responsibility of providing College oversight of Directors of Studies Committees.

c) Colleges' IT Committee

Minutes from the Colleges' IT Committee meeting on 16 October 2024 were circulated for information:

Paper 18 Colleges' IT Committee: Minutes 16 October

d) Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee

The Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee meeting on 16 October 2024 was cancelled, due to a lack of business.

e) Joint Wellbeing Committee (JWC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2024 were not yet available.

STC.24.17 Matters arising from Working Groups

a) College Transfers Working Group

The Committee received an update from Andrew Spencer (CAI, Chair) and Matthew Russell (OIS) on work of the College Transfers Working Group. A guidance document and e-mail templates had been created to assist Senior Tutors in dealing with future informal transfer requests:

- Paper 19 Restricted access – future provision
Paper 20 Email templates

The Committee thanked members of the Working Group for their substantial work. It approved the dissolution of the Working Group and College Transfers Panel, and reaffirmed its decision under reserved business at its previous meeting to formally disestablish the College Transfer Procedure.

b) ChatGPT and AI Working Group

The notes of the meeting held on 24 September 2024 were circulated for information:

- Paper 21 Chat GPT & AI Working Group Notes 24 September 2024

STANDING BUSINESS – UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS MATTERS

STC.24.18 Minutes from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the Admissions Forum

The Committee received minutes from:

Paper	Committee/body	Date of meeting
22	Admissions Forum	14 August 2024
23		11 October 2024
24	Undergraduate Admissions Committee	17 June 2024

The Director of Admissions drew the Committee's attention to the following matters arising from the Admissions Forum:

a) Numbers update (minute 24/105.ii, 14 August 2024)

The Director of Admissions provided a summary of admissions against numbers targets and APP targets.

- a) For 2024 entry the University fell 96 places short of its overall target, particular in the Arts and Humanities and Medicine. The previous APP's POLAR and state school targets had been exceeded but the IMD target had not been reached, which was the only target under the new APP.
- b) 2025 applicant numbers were 2% higher than the previous year, including an 11% rise in international applicants. There was a significant increase in Physical Sciences applicants, a decrease in Humanities and Social Sciences, and a tapering of the previous decline in MML applications. Medicine applications dropped significantly, particularly for the graduate course, which meant it likely that the University would again miss its quotas. The Director of Admissions was liaising with the Clinical School on how to respond to this difficulty, which followed a trend seen across the UK.

b) Interview invitation notice period

The Admissions Forum reaffirmed the policy that Colleges should continue to aim to give applicants two weeks' notice of invitation to interview, wherever possible. This was particularly important when interviewing in person.

c) Entry requirements in PBS

Following a request from the Department and Director of Studies Committee, the Admissions Forum recommended that the PBS Tripos broaden their entry requirements to

at least one science subject, for 2026 entry onwards. The subject would continue to be numbers-managed, despite the low application rate, primarily to assist with managing the August Reconsideration Pool.

d) August Reconsideration criteria

The Admissions Forum recommended some changes to the ARP criteria:

- The OAC flagging would now draw on OAC2021 data (using 2021 census) for England and Wales and remain using the 2011 data for Scotland and Northern Ireland, where the 2021 data was not available yet.
- FSM eligibility would no longer be a 'superflag' but would move to the basket of measures for eligibility.
- Estrangement would be added to the basket of eligibility criteria.

REPORTED BUSINESS

STC.24.19 Minutes and Reports from Other Intercollegiate Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

<i>Committee minutes</i>	<i>Meetings since last STC</i>
Bursars' Committee	4 July 2024
Colleges' Committee	<i>Has not met</i>
College Development Directors' Committee	<i>Has not met</i>
Colleges' Standing Committee	8 October 2024
Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee	<i>Has not met</i>
Legal Affairs & Employment Sub-Committee	9 October 2024
University and Colleges Joint Committee	15 October 2024

Items arising that required discussion or decision were included elsewhere on the agenda.

STC.24.20 Minutes and Reports from Committee Representatives on University Committees and Joint Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

<i>Committee minutes</i>	<i>Meetings since last STC</i>
Access and Participation Plan Scrutiny Group	<i>Has not met</i>
Admissions Research Steering Group	8 October 2024
Cambridge Outreach Strategy Group	13 June 2024
Information Services Committee	24 May 2024 16 July 2024
Joint Student Numbers Management Group	<i>No minutes</i>
Joint Wellbeing Committee	13 June 2024
Mature Strategy Group	21 October 2024
Mental Health Funding Task and Finish Group	<i>No minutes</i>
Postgraduate Admissions Committee	7 March 2024 6 June 2024
Review of Part Time Students Steering Group	<i>No minutes</i>

FINAL DISCUSSIONS

STC.24.21 Discussion of other items raised in advance

No other items were raised in advance of the meeting.

STC.24.22 Future meetings

Meeting dates for 2024-25 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm:

29 November 2024	Murray Edwards
14 February 2025	Queens' College
14 March 2025	Robinson College
23 May 2025	Selwyn College
11 July 2025	Darwin College

2024-11-01 STC minutes

Malcolm Millbrook
4 November 2024

SENIOR TUTORS' COMMITTEE – summary bulletin

This is a summary of outcomes of the Senior Tutors' Committee meeting on 29 November 2024:

STC.24.25	Veterinary Medicine accreditation: Admissions Tutors were asked not to communicate anything to candidates which could be construed as a promise or guarantee of what the course's accreditation might be in the future, and interviewers were encouraged not to be drawn in to correspondence or to attempt to answer questions about the course. Instead, enquires should be forwarded on to the Veterinary School or Office of External Affairs and Communications where relevant. It was recommended that Colleges consider their agreement to admit veterinary students on balance with their legal liability. The Committee agreed to delegate the handling of the ongoing matter to the Chair, Deputy Chair, and Director of Undergraduate Admissions.
STC.24.26	Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students: The Committee endorsed the direction of travel proposed by the final summary report of the Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students.
STC.24.27	Consultation on proposed exam allowances: the Committee discussed an initial draft proposal for eleven exam allowances across all taught matriculated courses.
STC.24.28	Senior Tutor meeting regarding mental health funding: a meeting will be held in Lent Term 2025 to assist Colleges in moving towards the agreed provision of mental health support before the intercollegiate levy is significantly increased. Data on the use of College and University services would be presented, as well as data on how comparable universities funded their student mental health services.
STC.24.29	Operational review of undergraduate admissions: Robert Gardiner (CAI) and the Director of Admissions informed the Committee of the ongoing work of the Levies Panel to examine criteria for funding the Cambridge Admissions Office (CAO), and the emerging need for a strategy to co-ordinate operations for undergraduate admissions to ensure its financial sustainability across Colleges and the University. The Committee agreed that the Director of Undergraduate Admissions should gather data on how other comparable institutes conducted their admissions processes, and to investigate reported College costs and their origins. Once this data was available it could be considered who should support the operational review.
STC.24.30	Report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education): an oral report was provided by Alice Benton (Head of Education Services) on Pro-Palestinian protests and the University's new regulatory requirement for all students to receive harassment and sexual assault preventative training.
STC.24.32	Senior Tutors' Education Committee (STEC) terms of reference: The Committee approved new terms of reference for STEC.
STC.24.35.a	Postgraduate Tutors' Committee (PTC): The Committee approved updated terms of reference for PTC.
STC.24.36.a	ChatGPT and AI Working Group: The Committee agreed to dissolve the Group following its final two meetings in Lent Term 2025.
STC.24.37.a	Identity checks: the Committee approved intercollegiate guidance on how the identification of undergraduate candidates are checked at interview.

M Millbrook
2 December 2024

This bulletin is received by Heads of House, Bursars, Senior Tutors, Admissions Tutors, and Development Directors. College officers are invited to discuss the points raised with their Senior Tutors.

Senior Tutors' Committee

**MINUTES of the meeting held at 2.15 pm on Friday 29 November 2024
in the Long Room at Murray Edwards College.**

The meeting was chaired by Judith Bunbury (W); the Executive Secretary was Malcolm Millbrook (Office of Intercollegiate Services).

Members' Attendance: Please note that blank cells below represent Colleges that were not represented at the meeting. Names marked with an asterisk (*) attended as a substitute for the respective member.

Christ's	Tom Monie
Churchill	Rita Monson
Clare	Jackie Tasioulas
Clare Hall	Holly Hedgeland
Corpus Christi	Marina Frasca-Spada
Darwin	Ducan Needham
Downing	Guy Williams
Emmanuel	Corinna Russell
Fitzwilliam	Paul Chirico
Girton	Toni Williams
Gonville & Caius	Andrew Spencer
Homerton	Georgie Horrell
Hughes Hall	Tori McKee
Jesus	Paul Dominiak
King's	Myfanwy Hill
Lucy Cavendish	Jane Greatorex
Magdalene	Stuart Martin (Deputy Chair)
Murray Edwards	Victoria Harvey
Newnham	Sheila Watts
Pembroke	Robert Mayhew
Peterhouse	James Carleton Paget
Queens'	Andrew Thompson
Robinson	Scott Annett
St. Catharine's	Holly Canuto
St. Edmund's	
St John's	Richard Partington
Selwyn	Mike Sewell
Sidney Sussex	*Catherine Sumnall
Trinity	Catherine Barnard
Trinity Hall	Michael Sutherland
Wolfson	Judith Bunbury
CSU: UG President	Sarah Anderson
CSU: PG President	

Attendees

University	Natalie Acton, Head of Student Support Alice Benton, Head of Education Services Sarah d'Ambrumenil, Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration Mark Holmes, Head of the Department of Veterinary Medicine Jon Simons, Head of the School of Biological Sciences
Colleges	Robert Gardiner (CAI), Deputy Chair of the Bursars' Committee Matthew Mellor (PEM), representative of the College Development Directors' Committee Alan Short (CLH), Deputy Chair of the Colleges' Committee
OIS	Diane Brooker, Office Manager Malcolm Millbrook, Deputy Head Matthew Russell, Head Martin Thompson, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

There were no declarations of interest.

The following people were invited to attend the meeting:

For Item 24.25 only: Mark Holmes (Head of the Department of Veterinary Medicine)
Jon Simons (Head of the School of Biological Sciences)

For Items 24.25 – 24.27: Natalie Acton (Head of Student Support)
Sarah d'Ambrumenil (Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration)

STC.24.23 Minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2024

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting on 1 November 2024 as a true record.

STC.24.24 Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda**a) Proposed undergraduate supervisor policies (minute STC.24.7.b, 1 November 2024)**

The Committee noted that the General Board's Education Committee had approved the new guidance for Faculties and Departments on how best to support undergraduate supervisors, with minor amendments. The guidance would be circulated to appropriate stakeholders and was published on the Senior Tutors website with other documents for new or current supervisors¹.

PRINCIPAL AND SUBSTANTIVE BUSINESS**STC.24.25 Veterinary Medicine accreditation**

Mark Holmes (Head of the Department of Veterinary Medicine) and Jon Simons (Head of the School of Biological Sciences) were invited to attend the meeting to discuss the 'conditional accreditation' awarded for Veterinary Medicine, and the potential move to 'terminal accreditation' if the Department did not show real progress by September 2025.

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions reported that applicants for deferred 2026 entry had been contacted, offering them their UCAS choice back or to withdraw and have their fees refunded. The three deferred offer holders for 2025 entry had been contacted, to explore whether they wished to continue for 2025 entry at Cambridge, or be considered by their insurance choices instead. There were otherwise no available application changes possible for candidates for 2025 entry. Admissions Tutors had been asked not to communicate anything to candidates which could be construed as a promise or guarantee of what the course's accreditation might be in the future, and interviewers were encouraged not to be drawn in to correspondence or to attempt to answer questions about the course. Instead, enquires should be forwarded on to the Veterinary School or Office of External Affairs and Communications where relevant. It was recommended that Colleges consider their agreement to admit veterinary students on balance with their legal liability.

Mark Holmes reported that the Department of Veterinary Medicine was committed to having an intake for 2025 entry, though he expected it to be smaller than typical years, and for all students to see through the six-year course. He took full responsibility for the course failing to be awarded full accreditation. He confirmed that it was the Department's, School's, and University's intent for the course to receive full accreditation as rapidly as possible, and for all students to graduate with full accreditation.

The Committee agreed to delegate the handling of the ongoing matter to the Chair, Deputy Chair, and Director of Undergraduate Admissions for the vacation period.

¹ www.seniorstutors.admin.cam.ac.uk/undergraduate-supervisions#Supervisor%20guidance

STC.24.26 Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students

Natalie Acton (Head of Student Support) presented to the Committee the final summary report from the Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students:

Paper 1 Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students Final Report

The review had been begun in Easter Term 2024 by SUMS Consulting. Comments on the external report were now being gathered from the Committee, the Joint Wellbeing Committee, and General Board's Education Committee to inform the creation of an implementation plan.

In the resulting discussion the following matters were raised:

- a. A likely area of tension when attempting to implement the recommendations would be setting standard core adjustments, and deciding what the eligibility criteria would be for a student to receive enhanced reasonable adjustments. When setting what were 'reasonable adjustments' it should be considered against the burdening of academics in a research-based university.
- b. The report recommended a substantial role change for the Accessibility & Disability Resource Centre (ADRC), therefore it was hoped that ADRC staff were appropriately supported through those changes. Natalie Acton confirmed that the ADRC had been actively involved in the review, and whilst everyone agreed that change was needed only a minority expressed very dissatisfied views with the ADRC's current provision. It was hoped that implementing the recommendations would see the centre's resources more effectively used, and its mission recast away from advocacy, but it would not lose the reasons why it received positive views from students and staff.
- c. There were concerns regarding the adaptation of a 'hub and spoke' model for the ADRC, due to difficulties with implementing a similar model for the University Counselling Service, and the need for staff in every Department and Faculty to have the necessary training to assess student needs. An underlying issue not explicitly recognised by the report was tension between necessary adjustments and increasing the ease of plagiarism. Natalie Acton agreed that academic skills training would need to be provided, and that several Departments had offered pilot ideas to explore how assessment formats could be redeveloped to reduce plagiarism whilst providing inclusive assessments.
- d. The report appeared to suggest that the development of competency standards would be achieved over a long period of time, ideally this process should be completed quickly.
- e. Natalie Acton confirmed that the proposal for an identified College lead for disability would not require the creation of a separate post in each College. It was also expressed that such a role should already exist to support College staff, and it would be unusual for that post not to support students as well.
- f. Natalie Acton confirmed that the recent judgement on the University of Bristol v Abrahart case had been considered during the review, the report's recommendations were therefore compatible with that judgement.

Natalie Acton thanked the Committee for its views, which would be taken into account when deciding how to respond to the high-level report. The Chair thanked Natalie Acton and all members of the review steering group for their work. **The Committee endorsed the direction of travel proposed by the final summary report of the Review of the Approach to Provision for Disabled Students.**

STC.24.27 Consultation on proposed exam allowances

Sarah d'Ambrumenil (Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration) presented the Committee with an initial draft proposal for eleven exam allowances across all taught matriculated courses, which had received feedback from Senior Tutors prior to the meeting:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Paper 2 | Draft Exam allowances options consultation |
| Paper 3 | Collated College feedback |

Sarah d'Ambrumenil clarified that the presented paper was for consideration by key stakeholders, further feedback could be received by 13 December 2024 before a finalised proposal was presented in a full collegiate university-wide consultation during Lent Term 2025.

In the resulting discussion the following matters were raised:

- a. Sarah d'Ambrumenil confirmed that the proposal's focus was on providing options for final year Tripos students, where assessments mattered most for employment and postgraduate study, as it was recognised that creating sufficient support for one cohort would require reducing options elsewhere. How this balance of support between finalists and lower years would be developed would be decided following the consultation, via the normal governance process.
- b. Sarah d'Ambrumenil confirmed that the current proposal included where granting an exam allowance, also automatically providing a statement on transcripts which clarified that the student's academic performance was hindered by illness or grave cause.
- c. The Careers Service should be closely liaised with, to confirm what was required for internships. What was assumed to be critical factors to be competitive for internships and further study might not be the case.
- d. Sarah d'Ambrumenil recognised that the proposal for a 'Classed Degree', whereby a student would be awarded an overall Degree Class but otherwise no marks or Class, would be contentious, as it required re-assessment during the long vacation period. It was hoped that feedback would include judging the proposal based on whether it was hypothetically possible and practical, rather than solely disagreeing with the proposal on principle.
- e. A potential significant practical challenge for implementing the proposals was timing, in the possibility of providing student accommodation for examination resits. There was the concern that if accommodation was offered, it would be difficult for Colleges not to provide further assistance to students when it was requested. Typically accommodation was not provided by other universities to students in such situations.
- f. Sarah d'Ambrumenil confirmed the current proposal expected a student to undertake re-assessment during the long vacation period, when fit to do so, rather than expecting the student to wait until the next planned opportunity in the following year.

The Chair thanked Sarah d'Ambrumenil for her work, and encouraged members to provide feedback before the December deadline and when the consultation opened more widely.

STC.24.28 Senior Tutor meeting regarding mental health funding

The Chair informed the Committee that a breakfast meeting for Senior Tutors would be held towards the beginning of Lent Term 2025, likely at 8am on 23 January 2025, to discuss long-term funding of student mental health services. Data on the use of College and University services

would be presented, to assist Colleges in moving towards the agreed provision of mental health support before the intercollegiate levy was significantly increased:

Paper 4 2025-26 mental health support funding

The Executive Secretary agreed to also provide data on how comparable universities funded their student mental health services.

STC.24.29 Operational review of undergraduate admissions

Robert Gardiner (CAI) and the Director of Undergraduate Admissions informed the Committee of the ongoing work of the Levies Panel to examine criteria for funding the Cambridge Admissions Office (CAO), and the emerging need for a strategy to co-ordinate operations for undergraduate admissions to ensure its financial sustainability across Colleges and the University:

Paper 5 UG admissions costs
Paper 6 Towards a Funding Settlement for the Cambridge Admissions Office
Paper 7 Progress of Strategic Review of Admissions recommendations

Robert Gardiner (CAI) summarised the presented paper on undergraduate admissions costs: it was difficult to calculate the exact amount spent by the Colleges on admissions. Two sources offered information: one being disclosures in accounts which totalled £23m per year, though Colleges would differ in their compilation of the number which also included allocations of overheads; another from the Cost of Education return which identified some admissions indirect costs of £5m. However, it was undoubtedly a very substantial cost and amounted to most of a first-year undergraduate's fee. This implied that the current admissions process was more complex than needed, leading to inefficiencies which created heavy burdens for staff; confusion for applicants; and increased the likelihood of regulatory difficulties (as just seen arising at the Veterinary School). Concurrently, the new Access and Participation Plan encouraged Colleges to focus resources on progression initiatives instead of outreach activities, with the likelihood that resource might be asked for there without any more income available, such that a reduction of funding for admissions processes would be a logical call. An operational review of undergraduate admissions, and support for the undergraduate admissions governance reform, was therefore recommended to reduce the range of risks inherent in the current system.

In the resulting discussion the following views were expressed:

- a. The hypothesis as presented in the paper was seen as difficult to refute: the costs of the undergraduate admissions process were clearly unsustainable. One College would vote for the proposed undergraduate admission structure, despite concerns, as change was required to address the problems raised in the current admissions process.
- b. Granular data was needed on how funding was spent on undergraduate admissions specifically. It was noted that some expenditure was supported by restricted funding, which would reduce options on how to lower spending (but noting also that donors would want their contributions to be used efficiently).
- c. A full review of admissions processes was needed considering significant reforms, rather than slight amendments. This should include whether the use of central or College resources were being spent in the right areas.
- d. The highly devolved admissions process had allowed innovation, however that innovation was often not evaluated.

- e. There was a risk that any operational review could see invested stakeholders justifying preferentially their own expenses and operations, and perceive Colleges losing their autonomy to the University. Innovation was needed whilst still retaining College personalities and control. Alice Benton (Head of Education Services) highlighted that the University wished to work together with the Colleges on whichever model would work best.
- f. Clarification on what a reasonable cost for admissions should be was needed first, before the admissions process was altered, by gathering data on how other universities funded admissions. Another view expressed that such clarification could not be made, as the University was not sufficiently comparable to any other institutes: the University of Oxford had agreed a coordinated framework for admissions, with every course having the same entry requirements across Colleges, which was not currently achievable at Cambridge. A further view believed that there were benchmarks on how to run admissions processes at a certain cost, which would likely be less complex and needlessly bespoke than the current process.
- g. The Director of Undergraduate Admissions noted that a significant amount of work CAO provided, and therefore why central costs and control had expanded, was due to requests from Colleges for that work to be produced. Creating a Service Level Agreement would clarify the relationship and funding level of CAO.
- h. The increasing complexity and costs of undergraduate admissions did not appear to result in better decisions being made. One College was considering what minimal process could be followed, due to the unsustainable costs involved.

The Chair thanked Robert Gardiner (CAI) and the Director of Undergraduate Admissions for their work. The Senior Tutors' Business Committee agreed that the Director of Undergraduate Admissions should gather data on how other comparable institutes conducted their admissions processes, and to investigate reported College costs and their origins. Once this data was available it could be considered who should support the operational review. **The Committee approved this direction of travel.**

STANDING REPORTS

STC.24.30 Report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)

Alice Benton provided an oral report on behalf of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education):

- a. The occupation of Greenwich House and the encampment on the Senate House lawn by pro-Palestinian protestors were being closely monitored. The upcoming congregation would go ahead, relocated to Great St. Mary's Church with an extended schedule: a risk assessment had determined that the congregation could proceed but it could not be guaranteed that it would proceed as scheduled or would not need to be abandoned. If the latter occurred students would be able to graduate *in absentia* or attend another later ceremony.

Views were expressed sympathising with graduating students affected by a small number of protestors. More serious measures were being considered due to the protestors having breached earlier promises, Colleges were welcome to utilise their own disciplinary measures if their students were known to be taking part in the occupation or encampment.

New contingency plans for disrupted congregations were currently being developed that could be used for the long-term, which would not rely on staff being required to work on weekends at short notice.

Several Colleges were planning to host internal events if the upcoming congregation was significantly disrupted.

- b. The University's new regulatory requirement for all students to receive harassment and sexual assault preventative training was clarified: Colleges would not be assessed on the delivery of the training as the matter was a condition of registration for the University to meet, unlike PREVENT training which was a legal duty. The Addressing Sexual Violence Strategy Group was exploring the matter currently, with a priority to achieve the minimum requirements necessary by the August deadline and then develop the established process further.

STC.24.31 Report of the Chair of the Committee

The Chair of the Committee had nothing to report on not already covered under other items.

OTHER BUSINESS

STC.24.32 Senior Tutors' Education Committee (STEC) terms of reference

On its Business Committee's recommendation, the Committee was invited to approve new terms of reference for STEC which replace its general remit to consider educational matters:

Paper 8 STEC draft terms of reference

Andrew Spencer (CAI) informed the Committee that the terms of reference were a result of a pilot held the previous year, with STEC not formally meeting but instead its members attending GBEC. Two more Senior Tutors would attend GBEC, and the terms of reference would provide College oversight of Directors of Studies Committees, a review of Tripos reform and bridging courses, and explore the provision of Tableau data. STEC meetings would also be scheduled to align with those for the Academic Standards and Enhancement Committee and GBEC, for the three committees to coordinate more closely.

The Committee approved the terms of reference.

STC.24.33 Membership of Sub-Committees and Other Bodies

The Committee approved the following proposals for representation on other committees:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Appointment of ...</i>	<i>Replacing ...</i>
General Board's Education Committee	Richard Partington (JN)	New
General Board's Education Committee	Michael Sutherland (TH)	New
Veterinary Education Committee	Myfanwy Hill (K) from Jan 2025	New

The following paper was circulated for information:

Paper 9 Membership reports as of 22 November 2024

Senior Tutors were asked to check the paper for accuracy and advise OIS of any amendments/additions.

STANDING BUSINESS – MATTERS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

STC.24.34 Senior Tutors' Business Committee

The unconfirmed minutes of the most recent meeting of the Senior Tutors' Business Committee were circulated for information:

STC.24.35 Reports of Standing Committees

The following business was for report: where there were matters for decision or substantial discussion, these were raised in Principal and Substantive Business or Other Business above.

a) Postgraduate Tutors' Committee (PTC)

The unconfirmed minutes of the meetings held on 17 October 2024 were circulated for information:

Paper 11 Postgraduate Tutors' Committee: Minutes 17 October 2024

i) Terms of reference

The PTC reviewed its terms of reference, and recommended minor amendments to a) include reference to the Deputy Chair, and b) clarify that exceptions for remote attendance are made by the Chair:

Paper 12 PTC Terms of Reference

The Committee approved the updated terms of reference.

b) Standing Committee on Education (STEC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2024 were not yet available.

c) Colleges' IT Committee

The Colleges' IT Committee had not met since the Committee's previous meeting.

d) Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2024 were not yet available.

e) Joint Wellbeing Committee (JWC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2024 were circulated for information:

Paper 13 Joint Wellbeing Committee: Minutes 16 October

i) Annual Report on Student Deaths 2023-24 (minute 9)

The Committee received a report on student deaths, referencing data collected since 2011:

Paper 14 Annual Report on Student Deaths 2023-24

ii) Annual Report on Serious Incident Case Reviews 2023-24

The Committee received a revised summary report on Serious Incident Case Reviews in 2022-23:

Paper 15 Annual Report on Serious Incident Case Reviews 2023-24

STC.24.36 Matters arising from Working Groups

a) ChatGPT and AI Working Group

The notes of the meeting held on 31 October 2024 are circulated for information:

Paper 16 Chat GPT & AI Working Group Notes 31 October 2024

The Working Group's Chair, Michael Sutherland (TH), informed the Committee of outputs from the Group: guidance on the use of AI in undergraduate supervisions, guidance on producing AI-resistant College-registered admissions tests and interview questions, a policy statement on the use of AI by undergraduate applicants, and statements and polices which could be adopted to minimise the use of AI in online interviews. A report had also been created on an experiment exploring whether the use of AI in an interview could be reliably detected. These outputs would be made available to Admissions staff.

The Committee agreed to dissolve the Group following its final two meetings in Lent Term 2025.

STANDING BUSINESS – UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS MATTERS

STC.24.37 Minutes from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the Admissions Forum

The Committee received minutes from:

Paper	Committee/body	Date of meeting
17	Admissions Forum	8 November 2024
18	Undergraduate Admissions Committee	28 October 2024

The Director of Admissions drew the Committee's attention to the following matters arising from the Admissions Forum:

a) Identity checks (minute 24/156.ii, 8 November 2024)

On its Business Committee's recommendation, the Committee was asked to approve intercollegiate guidance on how the identification of candidates are checked at interview:

Paper 19 Identity checks at interview

The Committee approved the guidance.

b) Decliners' survey (minute 24/162, 8 November 2024)

A report on the 2023/24 annual survey on reasons why applicants declined their offers was made available to the Committee for comment:

Paper 20 Decliners' survey report

The Chair encouraged members to read the report, and discuss its significant findings with the Director of Admissions.

REPORTED BUSINESS

STC.24.38 Minutes and Reports from Other Intercollegiate Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

Committee minutes	Meetings since last STC
Bursars' Committee	14 November 2024
Colleges' Committee	Has not met
College Development Directors' Committee	30 November 2024
Colleges' IT Committee	16 October 2024
Colleges' Standing Committee	19 November 2024
Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee	Has not met
Legal Affairs & Employment Sub-Committee	Has not met
University and Colleges Joint Committee	Has not met

Items arising that require discussion or decision were included elsewhere on the agenda.

STC.24.39 Minutes and Reports from Committee Representatives on University Committees and Joint Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

Committee minutes	Meetings since last STC
Access and Participation Plan Scrutiny Group	No minutes
Admissions Research Steering Group	Has not met
Digital Admissions Programme Board	9 October 2024
Cambridge Outreach Strategy Group	No minutes
Information Services Committee	No minutes
Joint Student Numbers Management Group	No minutes
Joint Wellbeing Committee	16 October 2024
Mature Strategy Group	Has not met
Mental Health Funding Task and Finish Group	No minutes
Postgraduate Admissions Committee	No minutes
Review of Part Time Students Steering Group	No minutes

FINAL DISCUSSIONS

STC.24.40 Senior Tutor Peer Support meetings

The Business Committee agreed that two matters raised at a recent Senior Tutor Peer Support meeting should be shared more widely, as examples of good practice Colleges might wish to adopt:

a) Gonville & Caius College Education Strategy

The Education Strategy² created by Gonville & Caius College was highlighted as a particularly strong model that other Colleges might be interested in adopting.

²www.cai.cam.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Gonville%20and%20Caius%20College%20Education%20Strategy%202022-27.pdf

b) StELA (Student Engagement and Learning Action) plans

Trinity Hall's StELA plan, developed from a similar document used at Wolfson College, was highlighted as a good example of how a College could assist a student through the capability to study process:

Paper 21 StELA Plan

STC.24.41 Discussion of other items raised in advance

No other matters were raised for discussion.

STC.24.42 Future meetings

Meeting dates for 2024-25 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm:

14 February 2025	Queens' College
14 March 2025	Robinson College
23 May 2025	Selwyn College
11 July 2025	Darwin College

2024-11-29 STC minutes

Malcolm Millbrook
2 December 2024

Senior Tutors' Committee

MINUTES of the meeting held at 2.15 pm on Friday 14 February 2025 in the Bowett Room at Queens' College.

The meeting was chaired by Judith Bunbury (W); the Executive Secretary was Malcolm Millbrook (Office of Intercollegiate Services).

Members' Attendance: Please note that blank cells below represent Colleges that were not represented at the meeting. Names marked with an asterisk (*) attended as a substitute for the respective member.

Christ's	Tom Monie
Churchill	Rita Monson
Clare	Jackie Tasioulas
Clare Hall	Holly Hedgeland
Corpus Christi	Marina Frasca-Spada
Darwin	Duncan Needham
Downing	Guy Williams
Emmanuel	Corinna Russell
Fitzwilliam	Paul Chirico
Girton	Toni Williams
Gonville & Caius	Andrew Spencer
Homerton	Georgie Horrell
Hughes Hall	Tori McKee
Jesus	Paul Dominiak
King's	Myfanwy Hill
Lucy Cavendish	Jane Greatorex
Magdalene	

Murray Edwards	Victoria Harvey
Newnham	Sheila Watts
Pembroke	Robert Mayhew
Peterhouse	James Carleton Paget
Queens'	Andrew Thompson
Robinson	Scott Annett
St. Catharine's	Holly Canuto
St. Edmund's	Kieron Devey
St John's	Richard Partington
Selwyn	Mike Sewell
Sidney Sussex	Max Beber
Trinity	Catherine Barnard
Trinity Hall	Michael Sutherland
Wolfson	Judith Bunbury
CSU: UG President	Sarah Anderson
CSU: PG President	

Attendees

University	Alice Benton, Head of Education Services Bhaskar Vira, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Environmental Sustainability
Colleges	Tim Harvey-Samuel (TH), Deputy Chair of the Bursars' Committee Matthew Mellor (PEM), representative of the College Development Directors' Committee Alan Short (CLH), Deputy Chair of the Colleges' Committee
OIS	Diane Brooker, Office Manager Malcolm Millbrook, Deputy Head Matthew Russell, Head Martin Thompson, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

Scott Annett (R), Michael Sutherland (TH), and Andrew Thompson (Q), declared a conflict of interest regarding Item 46.b, as College Teaching Officers. The Director of Undergraduate Admissions declared a conflict of interest regarding Item 57.c.ii, as a Director of UAT-UK. None of those conflicts were considered sufficient for those members to be excluded from the resulting discussions.

STC.24.43 Welcome

The Committee welcomed Tim Harvey-Samuel (TH), Deputy Chair of the Bursars' Committee, to their first meeting. The Chair thanked Andrew Thompson for his College's hospitality.

STC.24.44 Minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2024

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting on 29 November 2024 as a true record.

STC.24.45 Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

a) Veterinary Medicine accreditation (minute STC.24.25, 29 November 2024)

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Environmental Sustainability updated the Committee on matters concerning the Veterinary Medicine course. The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons had confirmed it would deliver its outcome of its September visit to the Veterinary School in November 2025, it was hoped full accreditation would be rewarded however if the course received terminal accreditation this would greatly impact current candidates. The General Board was therefore due to decide whether 2026 entry to the course should be paused at its meeting on 5 March 2025, as this was the last meeting prior to UCAS going live for the next admissions round. This direction of travel had been shared with key shareholders to keep them informed ahead of the March meeting, however this had created the mistaken belief for many that the General Board had lost confidence in the Veterinary School or that it did not support the ongoing efforts to reestablish full accreditation.

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions reported that he had worked with the Office of External Affairs & Communications to draft communications ready to send to all stakeholders if 2026 entry was paused. If terminal accreditation was awarded then the intercollegiate university would be expected to immediately suspend all admissions processes for the course. There were therefore concerns that School Liaison Officers needed to be appropriately informed of the current situation, to ensure they did not wrongly advise potential applicants at ongoing outreach events arranged by Colleges and the Veterinary School, otherwise Colleges could be placed in a difficult position.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Environmental Sustainability confirmed that no public statement on admissions for 2026 entry would be made until after the General Board had made its decision.

A recent communication by the Head of the Veterinary School to all Senior Tutors, asking if they were willing to admit students for 2026 entry, was seen as unhelpful in mistakenly implying that the Colleges were involved in the decision to pause entry.

PRINCIPAL AND SUBSTANTIVE BUSINESS

STC.24.46 Teaching Review

a) Draft recommendations

Members of the Teaching Review Steering Group provided an update on the work of the Teaching Review. Recommendations were currently being finalised, to be presented to the Committee at its next meeting for its approval on behalf of the Colleges:

Paper 1 Teaching Review Final Recommendations: Summary direction of travel

Rita Monson (CHU) reported that the Senior Tutors' Education Committee (STEC) had already begun to review the delivery of undergraduate supervisions. She and the Executive Secretary were currently gathering further data on 2023/24 supervisions, which would provide more granular information on courses which were not adhering to the published supervision norms.

Members discussed at length the recommendation for the General Board's Education to reconsider how rankings were communicated to students, of which one option was for

students to opt-in to accessing their rank. The recommendation was based on a key concern from students that ranks assisted in creating a perceived culture of competitiveness. There were differing views as to the utility of ranking, and whether limiting their visibility to students was appropriate or feasible without creating other difficulties.

The Executive Secretary noted that he was leading on the recommendation to improve support for Directors of Studies: a SharePoint site would be created to share examples of best practice from the University and Colleges on how to support Directors of Studies; provide a repository of minutes of STEC and Directors of Studies' Committee meetings; and collate resources for Directors of Studies and undergraduate supervisors.

It was requested that the 'Quality' heading for a subsection of recommendations regarding supervisions and Directors of Studies be altered, as it implied that only the quality of College teaching required improving.

Alice Benton (Head of Education Services) reported that many of the recommendations from the Teaching Review were similar to those from the Review of Disability Support, therefore work was ongoing to create a consolidated programme of work for Faculties and Departments to implement the recommendations collectively.

b) CTO contracts encouraging singleton supervisions

Drawing from matters raised by the Teaching Review and the 'Justice for College Supervisors' campaign, the Executive Secretary had explored to what extent CTOs were inadvertently encouraged to deliver singleton supervisions and therefore block College reform of the undergraduate supervision system:

Paper 2 CTOs incentivised to deliver singleton supervisions

A model CTO contract developed in 2009 was currently being re-assessed by the Bursars' Legal Affairs & Employment Sub-Committee, to assist Colleges in reviewing their own practice. Language in the model contract would be altered to measure teaching hours based on student contact, thereby removing the incentive to supervise students individually.

Members discussed the ongoing difficulty of ensuring UTOs delivered appropriate levels of teaching instead of many Faculties and Departments relying on CTOs. Andrew Spencer (CAI) reported that STEC had met yesterday with representatives from the Faculty of History, where it had been noted that a curriculum had been created by a Faculty without the resources to teach it, with CTOs relied upon to teach more without any consideration of the views of the Colleges.

Rita Monson welcomed members contacting her on how to best utilise statistics provided by CamCORS, to understand to what extent CTOs were supporting Faculties and Departments in their teaching.

STC.24.47 Operational review of undergraduate admissions

The Committee received a report from the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, regarding an initial exploration of admissions costs extracted from the Colleges' Cost of Education returns:

Paper 3 Insight from Cost of Education returns

More detailed data had revealed that, of the £23m originally identified as admissions costs in 2023/24, £14m was from bursary funding including the Cambridge Bursary Scheme. £10m, or approximately half the fee income of a Home student, was still considered an extraordinary

amount to spend on admitting undergraduates each year. The largest increase on prior years was from College admissions staff and non-staff costs. There was no data on what income other than fees was used to fund admissions and outreach costs, but some members reported that most of their widening participation activities were fully funded by benefactions.

Members discussed the usefulness of determining an appropriate amount to spend on undergraduate admissions, to rethink best practice as sensible limits on spending rather than unlimited support, to then provide a target by which to reduce spending to. Such a benchmark could then be considered as a proportion of funding given to support a first-year student, so that admissions costs could be compared to those incurred in other areas such as onboarding and mental health support.

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions noted that it was difficult to separate admissions costs from widening participation work and recruitment, due to the varied and changing ways those costs were allocated by Colleges, but that this would be explored further in the University's planned review of outreach and the Area Links Scheme.

Members discussed the need for strategic thinking on what the University and Colleges wanted to achieve in its outreach and recruitment work, whether it should instead concentrate its efforts in supporting the local area; and the efficiency of School Liaison Officers.

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions would meet with a sample of Colleges individually to clarify ambiguous data contained in the returns, before providing a more in-depth report. The Chair thanked him for his continued work.

STC.24.48 Undergraduate admissions governance proposal

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions reported on known intercollegiate support of the proposed undergraduate admissions governance structure, which was recommended by the Strategic Review of Admissions held four years ago and followed 18 months of consultation:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Paper 4 | College decisions on admissions governance proposal |
| Paper 5 | Appendix – Christ's College amendments |

Senior Tutors of Colleges which had rejected, or were likely to reject, the proposal were invited to explain their College's reasoning; whether any alterations to the proposal could be made to gain their College's approval; and to confirm whether their Colleges explicitly supported the current governance structure. This information would be used to guide the Colleges' Committee when it considers how to take the matter forward.

Robert Mayhew (PEM) reported that his College had rejected the proposal due to the belief that the proposed governance structure would not achieve better decisions than the current system. It wasn't clear what elements of the proposal could be altered for the College to give its support, but it was recognised that the Committee was not the right body to consider admissions matters. The Oxford model, whereby a majority decision could be made on a matter rather than all Colleges needing to agree, was preferred. He believed that if the matter was moved to the Colleges' Committee that Pembroke College would continue to oppose on principle, but would be happy to acquiesce on a formal vote due to the overwhelming majority of Colleges supporting the proposal.

Mike Sewell (SEL) reported that his College Council was unanimous in voting against the proposed governance structure, as it was not clear that it would necessarily provide improvements. Further reassurances regarding the freedom of action of Colleges in such areas as interview format, offer levels, courses offered and deselections would be needed to change the College's position. So would greater clarity that Colleges were suitably represented in the

new model, particularly regarding voting rights and the structures of the sub-committees. It was not clear how Selwyn College would consider the matter if all other Colleges accepted the proposal.

It was noted that Pembroke's concerns related more to the intercollegiate decision-making protocol, which had been lifted directly from the Committee's own terms of reference into those of the proposed Undergraduate Admissions Committee, and that therefore it could be useful to separate that matter and reconsider the proposed governance structure separately. Catherine Barnard (T) reported that her College held many concerns similar to Selwyn's regarding centralisation when it approved the proposal, and would be against any move to a majority rule policy.

The Chair noted that there was time to identify any alterations that could be made to the proposed governance structure, such as those requested by Christ's College, before the matter would be discussed by the Colleges' Committee. She reminded members that the governance structure, if approved, would be reviewed after a year.

STANDING REPORTS

STC.24.49 Reports of the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability)

The Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability) provided oral reports:

- a. The University was currently exploring the use of injunctions to protect the Senate House, Greenwich House, and the Old Schools so that congregations could be held and sensitive documents kept secured. Contingency planning was being created to find a permanent alternative venue for congregations which did not rely on short-notice support from the Colleges or St. Mary's Church.
- b. The process of selecting a new Chancellor had begun, a webpage and various communications had been created to encourage applications and keep stakeholders informed.
- c. Evening of 28 February 2025 marks the start of Ramadan, it was requested that Colleges provide their taxi scheme to support relevant students during that period.

STC.24.50 Report of the Chair of the Committee

The Chair had nothing to raise which wasn't already covered under other items on the agenda.

OTHER BUSINESS

STC.24.51 Review of mutual expectations supporting part-time students

The Committee received a report produced by the Steering Group of the Review of Part-time Students, which revised a document outlining how the University and Colleges should support part-time students:

Paper 6 Review of PT student and mutual expectations

The paper was recently seen by the Postgraduate Tutors' Committee and General Board's Education Committee, the latter approved the new mutual expectations document and dissolved the steering group. **The Committee approved the revised document.**

STC.24.52 Oversight and membership of weapons clubs

The Committee received a paper detailing the oversight and membership of various University weapons clubs from Simon Cornish, the University Sports Service's Safety and Compliance Manager, following concerns raised regarding a target shooting club membership form:

Paper 7 Firearms clubs, oversight and membership

Scott Annett had agreed to liaise with Simon Cornish on the matter, on behalf of the Committee.

STC.24.53 College Rowing Review

The Committee received information on a working group being established by the University Sports Service to review College rowing:

Paper 8 College Rowing Review

Andrew Spencer (CAI) had agreed to join the review.

STC.24.54 Membership of Sub-Committees and Other Bodies

The Committee approved the following proposals for representation on other committees:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Appointment of ...</i>	<i>Replacing ...</i>
Chair of the Postgraduate Tutors' Committee	Holly Hedgeland (CLH), from Michaelmas Term 2025	Duncan Needham (DAR)
University Library Education Strategy Committee	Andrew Spencer (CAI)	Mike Finn (ED)

The following paper was circulated for information:

Paper 9 Membership reports as of 7 February 2025

Senior Tutors were asked to check this for accuracy and advise OIS of any amendments/additions.

STANDING BUSINESS – MATTERS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**STC.24.55 Senior Tutors' Business Committee**

The unconfirmed minutes of the most recent meeting of the Senior Tutors' Business Committee were circulated for information:

Paper 10 Minutes of the meeting on 3 February 2025

STC.24.56 Reports of Standing Committees

The following business was for report: where there are matters for decision or substantial discussion, these are raised in Principal and Substantive Business or Other Business above.

a) Postgraduate Tutors' Committee (PTC)

The minutes of the meetings held on 14 November 2024 and 25 January 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 11 PTC: Minutes 14 November 2024

Duncan Needham (DAR) drew the Committee's attention to the following matters arising from PTC:

i) 2024 College Allocator – measures of success

The Committee received a paper from the College Allocator Working Group evaluating the success of the 2024 College Allocator:

Paper 12 CAWG 2024 measures of success

b) Standing Committee on Education (STEC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2024, and unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2025, were circulated for information:

Paper 13 STEC: Minutes 22 November 2024

Paper 14 STEC: Unconfirmed Minutes 15 January 2025

Andrew Spencer (CAI) drew the Committee's attention to the following matters arising from STEC:

i) Supervisions: pedagogical rationale and purpose (minute 11, 22 November 2024)

The Committee discussed wording which clarified the purpose and value of undergraduate supervisions, for the University and Colleges to use as a basis for setting expectations for all stakeholders:

Paper 15 Supervisions – agreed purpose & value

Members suggested various amendments to the proposed wording, and clarification as to how it would be utilised. Further feedback from members would be requested ahead of the Teaching Review Steering Group's next meeting.

ii) Tableau assessment results (minute 44/68, 15 January 2025)

Rita Monson (CHU) reported that she had arranged for the University's Head of the Business Information and Strategic Insights Section to attend a future meeting of STEC, to explain how assessments data was presented on Tableau. That would provide an opportunity for Senior Tutors to raise suggestions/concerns about how Tableau was utilised by Colleges. A discussion on the Senior Tutors' Forum would be created for members to raise enquires about Tableau, ahead of the STEC meeting.

c) Colleges' IT Committee

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 16 CITC: Minutes 29 January 2025

d) Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee

The minutes of the meetings held on 27 November 2024 and 22 January 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 17 FSF: Minutes 27 November 2024

Paper 18 FSF: Minutes 29 January 2025

e) Joint Wellbeing Committee (JWC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2024 were circulated for information:

Paper 19 Joint Wellbeing Committee: Minutes 11 December

i) Annual Reporting (minute 4.1, 11 December 2024)

The Committee's attention was drawn to the proposal to cease production and circulation of statistical Annual Reports about University Support Service provision to intercollegiate/University committees.

STANDING BUSINESS – UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS MATTERS

STC.24.57 Minutes from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the Admissions Forum

The Committee received minutes from:

Paper	Committee/body	Date of meeting
20	Admissions Forum	24 January 2025

The Director of Admissions drew the Committee's attention to the following matters arising from the Admissions Forum:

a) Black Undergraduate Data from Black Advisory Hub (minute 25/08, 24 January 2025)

Following discussions at the Admissions Research Advisory Group, a report from the Black Advisory Hub was discussed at Admissions Forum. The Committee received the report, its attention was directed to sections 4.1 and 5.2:

Paper 21 BAH

Victoria Harvey (MUR) noted that there were fundamental flaws with the data, with inaccurate ratios of a College's accepted students to applicants, giving the wrongful impression that Colleges which relied heavily on the Pool were admitting white applicants at a significantly higher rate than other applicants. This raised concerns as to whether the report had been sufficiently reviewed before it was presented to intercollegiate committees.

Andrew Thompson, a member of the Research Advice Group, reported that the group had not itself conducted the research so had only offered advice that disaggregated data by College was not helpful.

Toni Williams (G) noted that the Black Advisory Hub had recognised that there could be limitations in the data's presentation, but reiterated that such data was needed to raise awareness of the broader issues given in the report. There was no plan to publicise the report, but just to circulate it to relevant committees to inform conversations on the matter. She welcomed ideas of how to engage stakeholders, and was happy to receive feedback to pass on to the Black Advisory Hub's data analyst.

The Chair noted that the Black Advisory Hub did not sit in any intercollegiate university governance structure, so capacity was lacking for the collegiate university to engage with and review its considerable work. Alice Benton reported that this issue was currently being considered, although the group was supported by the Cambridge Centre for Teaching & Learning it needed a more suitable governing structure.

b) Summer Pool timing 2025 and Winter Pool timing 2026

The Admissions Forum had agreed dates for the Summer Pool, with a discussion about moving the Winter Pool earlier in 2026 to avoid a clash with the start of Full Lent Term:

Paper 22 Deciding on the undergraduate admissions decision communication date

The Business Committee disagreed with the Admissions Forum's operational decision. It instead recommended that the Committee should adopt a policy whereby the date that offers were communicated on should take place before full Lent Term begins. Members discussed whether to approve the recommended policy:

- a. The Chair informed the Committee of views from the Deputy Head of Education Services (Student Admissions and Access): UCAS had decided to move their equal consideration deadline for applicants to mid-January from 2026 onwards. The University of Oxford would therefore have to move their decision deadline back to later in January, making the difference in the two University's communication dates less stark.
- b. Andrew Spencer had proposed the policy due to frustration felt at the date continually moving later. The length of time given after the end of the Winter Pool before decisions were communicated appeared unnecessary, and this caused there to be a significant overlap of workloads for staff who also supported current students.
- c. A decision would need to be made soon so that annual leave dates for Cambridge Admissions Office and University Information Services staff could be agreed, as staff would likely have to work through the Christmas break if the policy was approved.
- d. Jane Greatorex (LC) informed members of several counter arguments from her Director of Admissions, the details of which would be shared with Senior Tutors.
- e. Scott Annett reported that many Directors of Studies wished to re-interview applicants, therefore it was perceived that the proposed policy was an attempt to reduce such a practice by removing the time available to re-interview. If this was the case then re-interviewing as a practice should be explicitly considered before any new policy discouraged it.

As a consensus was not reached the default was to leave the dates as they were, due to the matter remaining an operational decision of the Admissions Forum. **The Executive Secretary agreed to share the Deputy Head of Education Services' views on the Senior Tutors' Forum, to continue the discussion there.**

c) Admissions Tests (minute 25/07, 24 January 2025)

i) Admissions Tests - LNAT

The Admissions Forum reviewed tests including central marking ahead of the next meeting of the Levies Panel. It recommended that the LNAT continued as a required admissions test for Law:

Paper 23 LNAT Review Meeting 3 notes

Paper 24 LNAT Survey Unedited responses

The Business Committee agreed with the Admissions Forum's recommendation to continue use of the LNAT, subject to employment issues concerning the centralised marking being resolved. The Committee discussed whether it approved the

recommendation to continue use of the LNAT, and whether Colleges should fund the centralised marking.

Requests were made for greater transparency about the centralised marking process, and for Colleges to receive LNAT scripts at the same time as the central markers. Andrew Spencer clarified that the LNAT results should not be used in isolation to deselect a candidate.

The Committee approved the continued use of LNAT and its centralised marking, on the assumption that the latter's employment issues would be resolved.

ii) PBS Tripos Admissions Tests

The PBS Tripos Directors of Studies Committee was considering use of a new test offered by UAT-UK, the Test of Academic Reasoning (TARA), as a deselection tool for those applying for 2026 or 2027 entry. The likely total cost to Colleges for use of this test was approximately £1,000, due to its candidate-paid model. The Business Committee supported the use of the test for the PBS Tripos on a trial basis.

Members raised concerns that it there wasn't enough evidence to know whether TARA would have a similar lack of utility as the previous Thinking Skills Assessment. The Director of Undergraduate Admissions clarified that TARA was an entirely new test, and presently being considered by other universities.

The Committee agreed that the PBS Tripos Directors of Studies' Committee needed to present a formal proposal, including a plan for how TARA's capabilities would be evaluated, before the use of TARA could be supported.

d) Photo collection in the application process (minute 25/11, 24 January 2025)

At its 12 July 2024 meeting the Committee had agreed that interviewees should be asked for their identification during interview, following the same policy used for admitting Foundation Year students. This followed the decision to stop collecting photos at the point of application in October 2021.

Several College officers wished to revisit the decision, as many interviewers found it easier to remember and compare candidates when photos were on the application form. The Digital Admissions project was progressing work on removing photo collection from the application process and developing a photo collection solution for students to upload photos later in the process. The Admissions Forum had requested that the Committee reconsider the matter:

Paper 25 Admissions Forum photo collection

The Business Committee could not reach a consensus on the matter. The Committee was asked whether it wished to request that photos were i) collected at the point of application, and ii) displayed on the CAPO once again.

The following views were raised in the resulting discussion:

- a. Arguments against obtaining photos at the point of application included the perceived biases in deselection, data protection implications due to unnecessarily collecting photos of children, and resulting reputational risks.

- b. The Digital Admissions project was using considerable resources to create a separate photo collection method other than at the point of application, it was likely that if the Committee reversed its decision that the University would therefore expect the Colleges to cover the cost to undo that work. In any case, it was unlikely that photos could be made present on the CAPO for the next admissions round.
- c. Arguments for reintroducing photos was the vital *aide-mémoire* they provided to interviewers, who were interviewing candidates at a significantly greater number than any other university. Investigating appeals and complaints regarding events outside of the interview itself had been found to be much more difficult without the use of photos.
- d. The Chair shared views from the Deputy Head of Education Services (Student Admissions and Access): the University collected photos on behalf of the Colleges, but the risk and responsibility for their appropriate use would lie with the individual Colleges concerned.
- e. Alternative methods for collecting photos for the interview process were shared, and several members agreed that photos should not be available on the CAPO before selection.

The Committee's views would be received by the Levies Panel for its consideration of intercollegiate funding for Digital Admissions.

e) Confirmation of entry requirements for 2026 and 2027 entry (minute 25/06, 24 January 2025)

i) Interview formats

Colleges had been asked to decide on their interview formats for December 2025 (and for a longer period if possible, desirable or practicable) by the end of Lent Term 2025. The University website would only report the majority position, applicants would otherwise be sent to College websites for information.

ii) Publication of 2026 Entry Requirements

Colleges had been asked to complete a survey with their entry and assessment requirements. The Colleges were consulted on new wording for the University website regarding College choice, to ensure compliance with CMA regulations and the law. The Admissions Forum and the Business Committee were against wording stating that College choice significantly mattered, and requested that the University's legal advice on the matter be disclosed when available.

The Committee received a paper outlining revised wording regarding College choice, which had found a different balance in describing how Colleges and the chance of applicants being admitted might differ:

Paper 26 Post-UAC Editorial Group content on College choice

iii) Medicine Entry Requirements

The Admissions Forum had discussed the recommendations made by the Medical Education Committee on the future entry requirements for Medicine:

Paper 27 For STC Consultation on Medicine entry requirements Nov 2024

Paper 28 Medicine entry requirements for 2026 entry (final)

The Medical Education Committee recommended that the A-Level entry requirements for Medicine across Colleges should be two core sciences (including chemistry) and a third of any subject. The Admissions Forum could not reach a consensus on this specific recommendation. It did agree that all Colleges should have the same A-Level requirements for Medicine, and that if the Committee decided to choose A-level entry requirements of three core sciences then this change should happen from the 2027 admissions round. The Business Committee supported the Medical Education Committee's recommended A-Level entry requirements.

In the discussion which followed it was noted that in the recent cycle only two applicants had been made an offer of two science A-Levels, numerous members therefore supported the requirement of three sciences. It was recognised this went against the recommendation of the Medical Education Committee, which therefore needed to provide further information as to how they reached their viewpoint. **The Clinical Dean would be invited to discuss the matter at the next meeting of the Business Committee.**

iv) International Entry Requirements

Colleges would shortly be sent a survey on their alignment with the recommendations from the Qualifications Reference Group on overseas qualifications, including the Gaokao.

Paul Chirico (F) viewed decisions by individual Colleges to not accept the Gaokao without additional qualifications (a position recommended by the Qualifications Reference Group) as an important one which required careful consideration following the survey, and which highlighted the lack of an intercollegiate international recruitment strategy.

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions clarified that the survey was not part of a consultation, as Colleges were free to set their own requirements with reference or not to advice from the Qualifications Reference Group. The group had discussed use of the Gaokao at each of its meetings over the last six years, from this it was clear there was a difference of views across the Colleges.

REPORTED BUSINESS

STC.24.58 Minutes and Reports from Other Intercollegiate Committees

Minutes had been received from the following committees:

<i>Committee minutes</i>	<i>Meetings since last STC</i>
Bursars' Committee	Has not met
Colleges' Committee	1 February 2025
College Development Directors' Committee	Has not met
Colleges' IT Committee	29 January 2025
Colleges' Standing Committee	21 January 2025
Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee	29 January 2025
Legal Affairs & Employment Sub-Committee	22 January 2025
University and Colleges Joint Committee	28 January 2025

Items arising that required discussion or decision were included elsewhere on the agenda.

STC.24.59 Minutes and Reports from Committee Representatives on University Committees and Joint Committees

Minutes had been received from the following committees:

<i>Committee minutes</i>	<i>Meetings since last STC</i>
Access and Participation Plan Scrutiny Group	21 November 2024
Admissions Research Advisory Group	27 November 2024
Digital Admissions Programme Board	<i>No minutes</i>
Cambridge Outreach Strategy Group	13 November 2024
Information Services Committee	3 October 2024 3 December 2024
Joint Student Numbers Management Group	15 November 2024 and 17 December 2024
Joint Wellbeing Committee	11 December 2024
Mature Strategy Group	<i>Has not met</i>
Mental Health Data Task and Finish Group	24 October 2024
Mental Health Funding Task and Finish Group	2 December 2024
Postgraduate Admissions Committee	12 September 2024
Review of Part Time Students Steering Group	<i>No minutes</i>

Reports had been received from the following committees:

Paper	Committee/body
29	Digital Admissions Project Board

FINAL DISCUSSIONS

STC.24.60 Discussion of other items raised in advance

a) Meningitis case in Cambridge

Jane Greatorex reminded Senior Tutors of the confirmed case of meningitis in a University student, and encouraged them to have heightened awareness of any reported illnesses in their Colleges.

STC.24.61 Future meetings

Meeting dates for 2024-25 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm:

14 March 2025	Robinson College
23 May 2025	Selwyn College
11 July 2025	Darwin College

Meeting dates for 2025-26 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm (venues to be confirmed):

7 November 2025
5 December 2025
20 February 2026
20 March 2026
29 May 2026
17 July 2026

Senior Tutors' Committee

**MINUTES of the meeting to be held at 2.15 pm on Friday 14 March 2025
in the Plenary Room, Crausaz Wordsworth Building at Robinson College**

The meeting was chaired by Judith Bunbury (W); the Executive Secretary was Malcolm Millbrook (Office of Intercollegiate Services).

Members' Attendance: Please note that blank cells below represent Colleges that were not represented at the meeting. Names marked with an asterisk (*) attended as a substitute for the respective member.

Christ's	Tom Monie	Murray Edwards	Victoria Harvey
Churchill	Rita Monson	Newnham	*Sam Lucy
Clare	Jackie Tasioulas	Pembroke	Robert Mayhew
Clare Hall	Holly Hedgeland	Peterhouse	James Carleton Paget
Corpus Christi	Marina Frasca-Spada	Queens'	Andrew Thompson
Darwin	Duncan Needham	Robinson	Scott Annett
Downing	Guy Williams	St. Catharine's	Holly Canuto
Emmanuel	Corinna Russell	St. Edmund's	Kieron Devey
Fitzwilliam	Paul Chirico	St John's	Richard Partington
Girton	*Stuart Davis	Selwyn	Mike Sewell
Gonville & Caius	Andrew Spencer	Sidney Sussex	
Homerton	Georgie Horrell	Trinity	Catherine Barnard
Hughes Hall	Tori McKee	Trinity Hall	Michael Sutherland
Jesus	Paul Dominiak	Wolfson	Judith Bunbury
King's	Myfanwy Hill	CSU: UG President	Sarah Anderson
Lucy Cavendish	Jane Greatorex	CSU: PG President	Sumouli Bhattacharjee
Magdalene	Stuart Martin (Deputy Chair)		

Attendees

University	Alice Benton, Head of Education Services Sarah d'Ambrumenil (Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration), for Items 66 & 68. Bhaskar Vira, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Environmental Sustainability, for Items 64 & 65.
Colleges	Tim Harvey-Samuel (TH), Deputy Chair of the Bursars' Committee Matthew Mellor (PEM), representative of the College Development Directors' Committee Alan Short (CLH), Deputy Chair of the Colleges' Committee
OIS	Diane Brooker, Office Manager Malcolm Millbrook, Deputy Head Matthew Russell, Head Martin Thompson, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

There were no declarations of interest.

STC.24.62 Minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2025

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting on 14 February 2025 as a true record.

STC.24.63 Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

a) Teaching Review (minute STC.24.26, 14 February 2025)

Finalised recommendations from the Teaching Review would be received by the University's General Board at their meeting of 9 April (for approval), and the University Council on 28 April (for endorsement). The extended altered governance timeline meant that the final wording

of recommendations was not ready for the Committee's consideration, College representatives on the Teaching Review and on the General Board's Education Committee (GBEC) would input into the final document sent for approval. The final version would be circulated to members when available and presented to the Colleges' Committee for formal endorsement from the Colleges.

PRINCIPAL AND SUBSTANTIVE BUSINESS

STC.24.64 Proposed E6 Student Training Framework

Sarah d'Ambrumenil (Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration) presented to the Committee a proposed student training framework in line with Office for Students (OfS) Condition E6 on harassment and sexual misconduct:

Paper 1 Student Training Framework Draft

Members had recently received an update on ongoing work by a Steering Group and Operations Group to ensure compliance with Condition E6, of which the student training framework was one part. It was proposed that all students would complete a mandatory online training module, supplemented by College-led face-face training monitored by the University. The latter could take the form of a College continuing with its current provision (if compliant with Condition E6 requirements), joining Harassment and Violence Support Service (HVSS) Consent Workshop programme, or the HVSS assisting the College to find an alternative training provider. The University would shortly survey Colleges on which type of provision they planned to use.

Members were invited to provide their views on the proposal, which was endorsed by the Senior Tutors' Business Committee. The following matters were raised by members in the resulting discussion:

- a. It appeared difficult to fulfil the recommendations where it concerned postgraduates, particularly part-time Masters students, as they would be difficult to gather for any face-to-face training. Sarah d'Ambrumenil noted that the Operations Group was currently considering how to meet Condition E6 for all student types, including those who did not matriculate. Further work was needed, however OfS was clear that the training could be proportionate to the student type.
- b. Clear expectations needed to be set on when Colleges and Departments scheduled onboarding sessions for new students, to ensure any Condition E6 training arranged by Colleges did not clash with University induction events.
- c. Templates for Colleges to adopt were requested on information sharing and revising student and Fellow disciplinary procedures to co-align with University procedures. It was also requested that exemplary case studies were provided of how Colleges should liaise with Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals (OSCCA). Sarah d'Ambrumenil agreed to create such templates and guidance.
- d. Sarah d'Ambrumenil informed the Committee that the HVSS had stated it was able to scale up its pilot Consent Workshop programme so that all Colleges would be able to utilise it. She also confirmed that the online module alone would not be sufficient to meet Condition E6 compliance, due to an interactive element being needed.
- e. It was queried whether Condition E6 was fully satisfied by the Level 1 online module, and therefore whether the Level 2 in-person training went beyond the requirements. Sarah d'Ambrumenil reported that, the OfS guidance stated that an 'interactive' element to the training was required and that an online was module was 'unlikely' to fully comply with

Condition E6. A clear baseline –was requested for Colleges on what training was strictly required to be compliant with Condition E6, as opposed to what was recommended by the University.

- f. Outcomes from OSCCA hearings had required Colleges to provide training to remedy the students' behaviour, yet no such training could be recommended by HVSS. Sarah d'Ambrumenil believed that suitable training for those circumstances had recently been found, and would share the information with relevant Colleges.

Sarah d'Ambrumenil was thanked for presenting the training framework, and members were encouraged to contact her directly with any further queries.

STC.24.65 OSCCA discipline investigations support

Sarah d'Ambrumenil presented to the Committee a new intercollegiate levy request for the Colleges to extend the capacity for OSCCA to conduct student disciplinary investigations:

Paper 2 OSCCA levy request

When OSCCA was established in 2016 the agreed principle was that it would be fully funded by the University, however due to the increasing caseload it now appeared reasonable to ask for financial support from the Colleges. The Business Committee had supported the proposal as a positive direction of travel, for Colleges to fund half the cost of student sexual harassment investigations.

The following matters were raised by members in the resulting discussion:

- a. Sarah d'Ambrumenil expected that the proposed funding arrangement would be set for the long-term, however it was unclear what effect Condition E6 would have on OSCCA's caseload.
- b. Sarah d'Ambrumenil reported that OSCCA was undertaking an internal process to align its disciplinary procedures with the University's lean-management framework, it was expected that after this exercise OSCCA would be able to provide assurances on the timeframe of its procedures to set appropriate expectations for Colleges and students. As part of that exercise it was being considered how to shorten the steps within the procedure, without increasing the risk of the procedure being incorrectly followed and thereby increasing student complaints. In the meantime OSCCA was trialling a monthly update to Senior Tutors on the progress of their cases.
- c. Tim Harvey-Samuel (TH) reported that the Bursars' Business Committee had recently discussed the proposed levy request: the committee had requested a clear articulation of OSCCA's services and assurances that they could be met, in order to gain financial support from the Colleges. The committee had concerns regarding student-on-staff cases, which had different parameters for burdens of proof and balancing safeguarding with privacy to the extent that UUK guidance wasn't being followed. Sarah d'Ambrumenil noted that the OSCCA had created procedures which worked within the conditions set by different regulatory bodies for any staff types or employment, the University's HR Division investigated staff-on-staff cases to ensure the staff members' rights and responsibilities were taken into account.
- d. Clarity was requested on whether Colleges were able to require a student to raise their complaint via OSCCA instead of their College. Sarah d'Ambrumenil reported that external legal advice showed that best practice was for a College to be explicit and transparent in its procedures what types of complaint would be investigated by the College and which would

be referred to the University. A template of suitable wording could be created for Colleges to adopt.

Sarah d'Ambrumenil was thanked for presenting the levy request, which was received positively by the Committee.

STC.24.66 Veterinary Medicine 2026 entry (minute STC.24.45, 14 February 2025)

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability) updated the Committee on the recent decision by the General Board to continue with 2026 entry for Veterinary Medicine. Additional evidence and outside opinion had been received since the Pro-Vice-Chancellor's report to Committee at its last meeting, which meant the General Board's views had changed to not pause admissions. This included the Oversight Board's clear recommendation that the pause would hamper ongoing work to regain the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) accreditation; academics from the University of Bristol providing lessons learnt from their own reaccreditation process; a positive exit interview from the recent European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE) accreditation visit; additional resources provided by the School of Biological Sciences and Education Services to communicate current provision in a more professional manner; and clear legal advice that there was no bar to advertising the course on UCAS as long as prospective students were given clear communications about the implications of conditional accreditation.

Matthew Russell (OIS) reported that draft request for liability guarantees would be circulated to Colleges shortly, to finalise within a week and then sent to the University's Academic Secretary. With those reassurances gained Colleges would be able to make informed decisions as to whether to admit students for 2026 entry. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor agreed to ask Office of External Affairs & Communications (OEAC) to provide a public statement Colleges could use to explain the University's position on liability.

The Chair thanked the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for his detailed update.

STC.24.67 Undergraduate admissions governance proposal (minute STC.24.48, 14 February 2025)

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions presented the finalised undergraduate admissions governance structure proposal, incorporating minor changes recently requested by three Colleges. The amendments did not materially affect the governance structure but sought to provide necessary clarity to the limits of the proposed new committees:

Paper 3 Changelog 2.3 to 2.4
Paper 4 UG admissions governance proposals v2.4

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions thanked those members who had assisted in drafting the amended proposal to satisfy their Colleges. The Chair reported that, prior to the meeting, she had confirmed with Robert Mayhew (PEM) that his College was content to abstain from the matter, and that Mike Sewell (SEL) and Tom Monie (CHR) now had the support of their Colleges to approve the proposal. Richard Partington (JN) confirmed that his College supported the proposal. No objections were received from members to the finalised proposal.

The Committee approved the proposed undergraduate admissions governance structure, to be implemented for 2025/26.

STANDING REPORTS

STC.24.68 Report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability)

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability) updated the Committee on the University's recent response to protests affecting graduation ceremonies: an interim judgement had recognised the importance of ceremony occasions and explicitly recognised that in Cambridge there was no suitable venue that offered similar grandeur. Relief for 24 hours had been granted for 1 March ceremonies, which were not significantly disrupted.

Alice Benton (Head of Education Services) reported that the National Student Survey response rate was 38%, 2% higher than the previous year. Members were asked to encourage their students to respond to the survey ahead of its 30 April deadline.

STC.24.69 Report of the Chair of the Committee

The Chair of the Committee had nothing to report which was not already covered under another agenda item.

OTHER BUSINESS

STC.24.70 Examination Access and Mitigation Committee (EAMC) Annual Report

Jackie Tasioulas (CL) presented to the Committee the EAMC Annual Report for 2023/34:

Paper 5 EAMC Annual Report 2023/24

20% of the student body were approved for examination access arrangements in 2023/24. The number of applications for Adjusted Modes of Assessments had greatly increased but those approved had remained steady. The allowance of Reconsideration of an Original Result attracts the highest number of applications annually and had the highest percentage of applications declined. The Foundation Year ran for the second time in 2023-24 with a cohort intake of 42, of which 20 had made 38 applications.

The following matters were raised by members in the resulting discussion:

- a. It was requested that, due to a College's concern regarding the abolishment of the allowance of Reconsideration of an Original Result for first and second year cohorts, data be provided on how many applications were made by subject and year group. Data on why applications were declined, such as whether they were ineligible rather than being too weak to approve, was also requested. Jackie Tasioulas agreed to provide such data.
- b. The option for resits to be approved following consideration by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) was queried. Jackie Tasioulas noted that the EAMC had always been able to allow resits, by the student rejoining the cohort and sitting exams in the usual schedule.
- c. Multiple members reported difficulties with Departments and Faculties differing on how EAMC advice and outcomes was applied. For example, it was mistakenly believed that an EAMC outcome would requiring students to progress onto Part III, rather than simply confirming that there was a case for the relevant Department or Faculty to consider their progression. Alice Benton agreed to issue a guidance note to Departments and Faculties about the issue.

- d. The Chair reported that she had examined data on the number of applications by College and course, but the findings were as expected. Jackie Tasioulas agreed to distribute a copy of the data to anyone who was interested.

The Committee thanked Jackie Tasioulas and other members of the EAMC for their considerable work, in particular the effort and attention to detail of the EAMC's medical advisors.

STC.24.71 Intercollegiate size and shape 2025 survey

Mathew Russell (OIS) informed the Committee of the objectives of a recently published survey, which gathered College views on the future size and shape of its student bodies:

Paper 6 Size and shape 2025

Unlike previous size and shape surveys Colleges were not asked for specific estimates of the makeup of their student bodies, but what their general plans were and the drivers behind them. Members noted the difficulty in defining an overrunning PhD student, and anticipated concerning discussions that would be generated by the survey regarding the future of the arts and humanities. Matthew Russell confirmed that formal College approval was not needed to respond to the survey, but could be provided if it felt necessary. Responses to the survey from College senior teams was requested by 25 April 2025, members were asked to contact Matthew Russell if this deadline wasn't compatible.

STC.24.72 Linguistics and Modern Languages Tripos

Andrew Spencer (CAI) informed the Committee on recent discussions held by the Senior Tutors' Education Committee (STEC) and the Business Committee, regarding the proposed new Linguistics and Modern Languages Tripos from the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics (MMLL):

Paper 7 Proposed LML Tripos

Members were invited to provide further feedback on the proposal, in the resulting discussion the following matters were raised by members:

- a. It was queried how capacity in Colleges would be found to admit students to the new Tripos, and which subjects were expected to reduce their intake to provide space for LML students.
- b. There were concerns as to the intellectual case for the new course, and MMLL's ability to sufficiently staff it. It was reported that French linguistics had already reached capacity, resulting in the subject no longer being available to Part IA students. The initial plans for the new course had been created 20 years ago, so that many of those elected to teach the course were no longer members of MMLL or able to teach. This raised the concern that pressure would be placed on Colleges to employ a large quantity of CTOs to teach the LML Tripos.
- c. STEC had discussed 15 months ago the viability of a Tripos with only 10 entrants and an expected steady state of 30 students. There was the concern of a proliferation of small courses, despite the high financial cost of creating and supporting a new degree. Logistically it was difficult for Colleges to administer such small subjects, with it unclear how to recruit Directors of Studies to sufficiently support students.
- d. It appeared that the requirements for the MML Tripos were putting candidates off applying, and instead studying joint degrees at other universities. Research was needed on how the University could remain competitive and relevant to potential applicants. The market research presented in the proposal was considered poor.

- e. Alice Benton believed that the matter highlighted the issue that there was not enough control on how new courses were approved, or which bodies made decisions. She agreed to propose to GBEC that clarity was needed on the approval process.
- f. Though it seemed that there was some form of crisis nationally for the study of languages and linguistics this did not mean that any solutions should be approved without due care. MMLL needed to consider in detail what its problems were and how to resolve them.
- g. The requirement that students study two languages was a marked difference against the University's competitors, it appeared that the creation of the HML Tripos and LML Tripos were a method by which to allow the study of only one subject, but it wasn't clear why the MML Tripos could not provide a track to study a single subject within it rather than create multiple separate degrees. There seemed to be no pedagogical justification to not provide multiple tracks within one degree, similar to the format used by the HSPS Tripos or Natural Sciences Tripos.
- h. It was reported that some MMLL colleagues mistakenly believed that the LML Tripos had already been approved, and were already running outreach activities for the new course.

MMLL had been asked by the University to address concerns raised by Senior Tutors regarding the proposed course, for consideration at GBEC's next meeting on 26 March.

STC.24.73 Membership of Sub-Committees and Other Bodies

The Committee approved the following proposals for representation on other committees:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Appointment of ...</i>	<i>Replacing ...</i>
College Rowing Review	Holly Hedgeland (CLH)	<i>N/A, joining Andrew Spencer (CAI)</i>
Mastercard Foundation Programme Management Board	Myfanwy Hill (K)	<i>Mike Finn (ED)</i>

The following paper was circulated for information:

Paper 8 Membership reports as of 7 March 2025

Senior Tutors were asked to check it for accuracy and advise OIS of any amendments/additions.

STANDING BUSINESS – MATTERS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

STC.24.74 Senior Tutors' Business Committee

The unconfirmed minutes of the most recent meeting of the Senior Tutors' Business Committee were circulated for information:

Paper 9 Minutes of the meeting on 3 March 2025

STC.24.75 Reports of Standing Committees

The following business was for report: where there were matters for decision or substantial discussion, these were raised in Principal and Substantive Business or Other Business above.

a) Postgraduate Tutors' Committee (PTC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 10 PTC: Minutes 27 February 2025

b) Standing Committee on Education (STEC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 11 STEC: Minutes 13 February 2025

c) Colleges' IT Committee (CITC)

The CITC had not met since the Committee's previous meeting.

d) Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee (FSFSC)

The FSFSC had not met since the Committee's previous meeting.

e) Joint Wellbeing Committee (JWC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 12 Joint Wellbeing Committee: Minutes 30 January 2025

i) Student pastoral survey 2023-24 (minute 6.1, 30 January 2025)

The Committee received a report on outcomes from a survey of pastoral support in Colleges:

Paper 13 Student pastoral survey 2023-24

The JWC endorsed the report, and for it to be shared with relevant stakeholders. The survey would be conducted in 2024-25, following which its continual use will be considered.

ii) Governance 2025-2027 (minute 11, 30 January 2025)

The JWC proposed that it be extended for a further three academic years:

Paper 14 JWC governance extension

It was noted that, whilst the JWC oversaw matters of mental health there was no sub-committee which considered physical health issues, except for the Communicable Diseases Sub-Committee.

The Committee approved the proposal, and delegated its oversight of physical health matters to the Joint Wellbeing Committee.

STANDING BUSINESS – UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS MATTERS

STC.24.76 Medicine Entry Requirements

At its previous meeting the Committee considered whether all Colleges should adopt the same A-Level entry requirements for Medicine. Clarification was since received from the Medical Education Committee (MEC), that its primary concern was for entry requirements to be consistent across Colleges to meet General Medical Council (GMC) preferences. MEC therefore supported the requirement for three sciences if it was put in place only for 2027 entry onwards.

The Senior Tutors' Business Committee noted that at least two Colleges did not wish to move to requiring three science A-Levels for Medicine, therefore as the GMC did not appear to require a standard entry requirement a common-action decision was not proposed on the matter. Instead,

the setting of Medicine entry requirements would continue to be a free-action decision. **The Committee agreed with this position.**

STC.24.77 Minutes from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the Admissions Forum

The Committee received minutes from:

Paper	Committee/body	Date of meeting
15	Admissions Forum	28 February 2025

REPORTED BUSINESS

STC.24.78 Minutes and Reports from Other Intercollegiate Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

<i>Committee minutes</i>	<i>Meetings since last STC</i>
Bursars' Committee	27 February 2025
Colleges' Committee	Has not met
College Development Directors' Committee	12 February 2025
Colleges' IT Committee	Has not met
Colleges' Standing Committee	4 March 2025
Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee	Has not met
Legal Affairs & Employment Sub-Committee	No minutes
University and Colleges Joint Committee	Has not met

Items arising that required discussion or decision were included elsewhere on the agenda.

STC.24.79 Minutes and Reports from Committee Representatives on University Committees and Joint Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

<i>Committee minutes</i>	<i>Meetings since last STC</i>
Access and Participation Plan Scrutiny Group	No minutes
Admissions Research Advisory Group	5 February 2024
Digital Admissions Advisory Group	10 February 2024
Digital Admissions Programme Board	8 January 2025
Cambridge Outreach Strategy Group	No minutes
Joint Student Numbers Management Group	No minutes
Joint Wellbeing Committee	No minutes
Mature Strategy Group	Has not met
Mental Health Data Task and Finish Group	No minutes
Mental Health Funding Task and Finish Group	No minutes
Postgraduate Admissions Committee	No minutes
Review of Part Time Students Steering Group	No minutes

FINAL DISCUSSIONS

STC.24.80 Discussion of other items raised in advance

No other matters were raised for discussion.

STC.24.81 Future meetings

Meeting dates for 2024-25 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm:

23 May 2025	Selwyn College
11 July 2025	Darwin College

Meeting dates for 2025-26 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm (venues to be confirmed):

7 November 2025
5 December 2025
20 February 2026
20 March 2026
29 May 2026
17 July 2026

2025-03-14 STC minutes

Malcolm Millbrook
20 March 2025

Senior Tutors' Committee

MINUTES of the meeting held at 2.15 pm on Friday 23 May 2025 in the Quarry Whitehouse Auditorium, Selwyn College

The meeting was chaired by Judith Bunbury (W); the Executive Secretary was Malcolm Millbrook (Office of Intercollegiate Services).

Members' Attendance: Please note that blank cells below represent Colleges that were not represented at the meeting. Names marked with an asterisk (*) attended as a substitute for the respective member.

Christ's	Tom Monie
Churchill	Rita Monson
Clare	Jackie Tasioulas
Clare Hall	Holly Hedgeland
Corpus Christi	Marina Frasca-Spada
Darwin	Duncan Needham
Downing	Guy Williams
Emmanuel	Corinna Russell
Fitzwilliam	Paul Chirico
Girton	Toni Williams
Gonville & Caius	Andrew Spencer
Homerton	Georgie Horrell
Hughes Hall	*Joe Ellis
Jesus	
King's	Myfanwy Hill
Lucy Cavendish	
Magdalene	Stuart Martin (Deputy Chair)

Murray Edwards	Victoria Harvey
Newnham	Sheila Watts
Pembroke	Robert Mayhew
Peterhouse	James Carleton Paget
Queens'	Andrew Thompson
Robinson	Scott Annett
St. Catharine's	Holly Canuto
St. Edmund's	Kieron Devey
St John's	Richard Partington
Selwyn	Mike Sewell
Sidney Sussex	Max Beber
Trinity	Catherine Barnard
Trinity Hall	Michael Sutherland
Wolfson	Judith Bunbury
CSU: UG President	Sarah Anderson
CSU: PG President	Sumouli Bhattacharjee

Attendees

University	Alice Benton, Head of Education Services Bhaskar Vira, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Environmental Sustainability
Colleges	Tim Harvey-Samuel (TH), Deputy Chair of the Bursars' Committee Matthew Mellor (PEM), representative of the College Development Directors' Committee Alan Short (CLH), Deputy Chair of the Colleges' Committee
OIS	Diane Brooker, Office Manager Malcolm Millbrook, Deputy Head Matthew Russell, Head Martin Thompson, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

There were no declarations of interest.

STC.24.82 Apologies

Due to poor health Mike Nicholson (Deputy Head of Education Services (Student Admissions and Access)) was unable to attend the meeting to discuss the University's communication of undergraduate entry requirements. The matter would be raised at the Committee's next meeting instead.

STC.24.83 Minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2025

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting on 14 March 2025 as a true record.

STC.24.84 Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

a. Teaching Review update (3 March 2025, minute STC.24.63.a)

A final version of the Teaching Review's recommendations, not significantly altered from the previous draft presented to the Committee, were circulated to Senior Tutors soon after the Committee's previous meeting. No serious concerns were raised and so the finalised recommendations were considered supported by the Committee, on behalf of the Colleges.

The University Council recently endorsed the finalised recommendations, which were now published: [Teaching Review final recommendations](#). Implementation of the recommendations would be coordinated with those of the Disability Review, a plan was recently presented to the General Board's Education Committee (GBEC) and would be considered by the Senior Tutors' Education Committee (STEC) in June 2025.

b. Veterinary Medicine 2026 entry (3 March 2025, minute STC.24.66)

Assurances from the Academic Secretary were recently given to Colleges, providing guarantees that Colleges would not be liable for damages in a scenario where the Veterinary Medicine course lost its RCVS accreditation. Following this, one College had stated it would not admit students for 2026 entry in Veterinary Medicine.

PRINCIPAL AND SUBSTANTIVE BUSINESS

STC.24.85 Undergraduate admissions governance structure proposal (3 March 2025, minute STC.24.67)

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions (OIS) provided an update to the Committee on the establishment of the new undergraduate admissions governance structure, following its approval by the Committee at the previous meeting. Remarks on the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the governance reform were recently published in the Reporter, it would be known on 6 June 2025 if a ballot of Regent House was called on the proposal. College members of the new Undergraduate Admissions Committee had been confirmed, and requested to populate the new Sub-Committees.

STC.24.86 Proposed E6 Student Training Framework (3 March 2025, minute STC 24.64)

The Chair noted the recent Café held for Heads of Houses and Senior Tutors about the University's plans for implementation of the registration condition. Attention had previously been drawn to the need for "interactive elements" to be included in student training and awareness, and the need to adjust College disciplinary procedures (for staff, students and Fellows) to allow for the use of third-party investigators (which may or may not be OSCCA). The Committee received a post-Café note of clarification relating to the University's expectations of Colleges for their contributions to student training:

Paper 2 Further communication regarding the University response to E6

Alice Benton (Head of Education Services) reported that a proposed training framework offered to College staff would be detailed at the Committee's next meeting. Richard Partington (JN) noted that the Steering Group believed, as did many Senior Tutors, that it was more appropriate for Departments and Faculties to deliver the supplementary interactive training for postgraduate students. However, it would be one or two years before that delivery was possible, in the meantime Colleges would need to provide supplementary training to their postgraduates to the best of their ability. Colleges would be contacted shortly with detailed information on how to provide that training.

STC.24.87 For Women Scotland v The Scottish Ministers Supreme Court judgement implications

The Committee discussed implications of the Supreme Court's judgement regarding the Equality Act 2010, following the recent publication of the EHRC's interim guidance and the University's response on 1 May 2025:

Paper 3 Supreme Court ruling

Bhaskar Vira (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Environmental Sustainability) noted that the main concerns expressed by University institutes were ensuring that appropriate toilet facilities were available, and that students were sufficiently supported with their own concerns and self-identity. A collective response to the judgement did not seem appropriate, but for the collegiate university to be empathetic to all staff and students. A meeting of University EDI staff would be held soon to discuss a response to a EHRC consultation on its recently updated code of practice, which the Executive Secretary would attend to ensure College issues were reflected in the University response.

Catherine Barnard (T) reported that the Faculty of Law had recently held a webinar debating the judgement, featuring the King's Counsel who appeared for For Women Scotland. From the discussion it was clear that if an institute had a single sex designated space it had to be for a biological sex, a position not held by Stonewall. Colleges would therefore need to provide toilets for biological men and women, and 'third space' toilets for those who did not identify as either. The main difficulty caused by the EHRC guidance was in facilitating appropriate sports teams, it was unlikely that the guidance would be changed in the near future as the European Court of Human Rights was concerned with other issues.

Members discussed the need to support their JCRs and societies in navigating issues arising from the law, such as the suitability of Women's Officers and handling complaints. It was generally agreed that sports societies should follow the policies agreed by their national bodies. Most sports governing bodies were relying on self-identification to determine whether a facility was appropriate under the law, if Colleges followed the same policy then in practice there would be little change.

STANDING REPORTS

STC.24.88 Reports of the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability)

Bhaskar Vira raised with the Committee two issues affecting the University:

- a. Congregations were currently taking place; one disruption had occurred however it did not affect proceedings inside Senate House. The message being reinforced to students was to respect others graduating and to keep disruptions to a minimum, whilst recognising the right to protest.
- b. Harvard University was currently blocked from enrolling international students, although the Department of Homeland Security's decision was being challenged it was unlikely that the courts would resolve the issue for incoming students to take their places in August. The escalation between Harvard University and the Trump administration reflected broader issues facing American academics, conversations had therefore begun within the University on how to support American colleagues wishing to be visiting scholars.

Members discussed the difficulty of determining how many Cambridge students were affected by losing places at Harvard, and the number of American students studying at Cambridge whose federal loans may unexpectedly be withdrawn.

STC.24.89 Report of the Chair of the Committee

The Chair reported that a breakfast meeting on 12 June 2025 had been arranged at Wolfson College, for Senior Tutors to discuss findings by Rita Monson (CHU) on undergraduate supervision arrangements.

OTHER BUSINESS

STC.24.90 Intercollegiate size and shape 2025 survey

Matthew Russell (OIS) provided an oral report on initial findings from a survey to establish College views on the future size and shape of its student bodies:

- i. 12 Colleges did not want to change their student size at all, so any future discussions with the University would not involve all Colleges. No College wanted to shrink in size.
- ii. Only two Colleges wanted to grow their undergraduate bodies, one only modestly and dependant on its estates plan, the other only with targeted growth in small subjects. This meant that the University needed to work on a strategy within the Schools on how to meet demands for subject growth, as other subjects would need to decline.

All Colleges accommodated undergraduates who wanted College rooms. Half of the Colleges wanted to increased direct applicants, which implied increasing competition between Colleges and costs to admissions and outreach. There was a limited appetite to grow international student numbers, where growth was desired it was at the expense of home students. There was no appetite to shift the Arts/Sciences subjects balance.

- iii. Nine Colleges wanted to grow their full-time postgraduate numbers, which did not include Wolfson College. 14 Colleges wanted to grow their postgraduate accommodation capacity, 11 wanted to shift the balance of postgraduates from masters to doctoral students.
- iv. 12 Colleges were interested in increasing their part-time postgraduate numbers, six were confident about providing sufficient accommodation for their part-time students.
- v. All but two Colleges reported overrunning PhD students being an issue, due to a lack of financial support and means to assist doctoral students in finishing. 17 Colleges now felt that overrunning students were at a significant enough quantity to be recognised in student number counts for resource allocation purposes. 20 Colleges planned for PhD students to routinely take three and a half years to complete their degrees.
- vi. There was little appetite from Colleges to form clusters of subjects for full-time students: six Colleges were interested in clustering small subjects, two for clustering postgraduate subjects. Otherwise, Colleges were strident about the need for community-building and interdisciplinarity.

Members raised the following points in the resulting discussion:

- a. As Colleges did not wish to significantly increase undergraduate numbers this required the University to put more strategic thought into the creation or expansion of courses. Bhaskar Vira confirmed that academic planning was at the School level, which meant that the desire by the Department of Computer Science and Technology to increase the size of the Computer Science Tripos would need to be at the expense of other subjects within the

School of Technology. The Department of Architecture had recently extended its degrees to four years in the same year that the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics had received approval for the new Linguistics and Modern Languages Tripos, despite the two institutes being within the same School it was clear that they had not communicated with each other as to where the additional space for their new cohorts would come from.

- b. If the University provided an indication of where it wished to grow or shrink the size and shape of its student bodies this would assist Colleges in financial planning and estates projects. The Colleges were committed to providing accommodation to all undergraduates, which meant that if there were insufficient rooms then postgraduates would need to rely further on the overburdened private rental market. Bhaskar Vira noted that the University and Colleges Joint Committee had recently agreed that the General Board needed to consider a strategy on size and shape, and was able to adjust student plans made by the Schools.
- c. Bhaskar Vira, regarding the matter of PhD student numbers, reported that the University's Fees and Student Sub-Committee was considering the introduction of a continuation fee model. The Colleges' Committee had previously discussed whether there was any appetite for further investment in the Eddington, to expand postgraduate accommodation for certain Colleges. The next fundraising campaign was still in the planning stages, but would likely commit to a £1 billion endowment target to fund all PhD students.
- d. There was an argument for student numbers planning to be considered at the Tripos level, instead of at the Student Management Committee, and for numbers to be planned well in advance of the admissions cycle than the current lead time.
- e. Similar to overrunning doctoral students, the number of students intermitting each year had increased to an extent that they were causing Colleges difficulty in finding sufficient accommodation.
- f. Departments and Faculties wishing to increase the size and number of undergraduate cohorts increased not just the burden on College accommodation, but also placed further strain on the supervision system and the capacity of Directors of Studies. A Department or Faculty seeking to expand its student numbers should not discourage UTOs from taking up College Fellowships, positions which provided teaching and support to its students.

The Committee thanked Matthew Russell for summarising the preliminary findings from his survey, and looked forward to receiving a full report at its next meeting.

STC.24.91 Computer Science Expansion

The Committee noted a paper from Alastair Beresford, Head of the Department of Computer Science and Technology, detailing plans to grow the Department over the next five years:

Paper 4 Computer Science Expansion

Alastair Beresford would be attending the next meeting of STEC to present the paper. Members were invited to send any questions they wished raised at that meeting to the Chair, Andrew Spencer (CAI).

STC.24.92 Membership of Sub-Committees and Other Bodies

The Committee is invited to approve the following proposals for representation on other committees:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Appointment of ...</i>	<i>Replacing ...</i>
Military Education Committee	Victoria Harvey (MUR)	Mike Sewell (SE)
Non-payment of Fees Panel	New	Rita Monson (CHU)

The draft terms of reference for the new Non-payment of Fees Panel were circulated for information:

Paper 5 Non-payment of Fees Panel ToR

Members interested in the following vacancy was invited to contact the Executive Secretary:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Replacing...</i>
Mature Strategy Group	<i>New - a Senior Tutor from a standard-age College</i>

The following paper was circulated for information:

Paper 6 Membership reports as of 16 May 2025

Senior Tutors were asked to check the paper for accuracy and advise OIS of any amendments/additions.

STANDING BUSINESS – MATTERS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**STC.24.93 Senior Tutors' Business Committee**

The unconfirmed minutes of the most recent meeting of the Senior Tutors' Business Committee were circulated for information:

Paper 7 Minutes of the meeting on 12 May 2025

STC.24.94 Reports of Standing Committees

The following business was for report: where there were matters for decision or substantial discussion, these were raised in Principal and Substantive Business or Other Business above.

a. Postgraduate Tutors' Committee (PTC)

The meeting scheduled for 8 May 2025 was cancelled due to a lack of business requiring discussion. Notes of matters agreed via circulation in lieu of minutes were circulated for information:

Paper 8 PTC: Notes 8 May 2025

b. Standing Committee on Education (STEC)

Unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 29 April 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 9 Unconfirmed Minutes 29 April 2025

Andrew Spencer (CAI) drew the Committee's attention to the following matters:

i. Revisions to examination allowances (29 April 2025, minute 6)

STEC and the Business Committee had discussed a paper regarding a proposal to adjust examination allowances and introduce resits for certain students, which had been revised following feedback provided by STEC:

Paper 10 Revisions to examination allowances

The Business Committee had raised concerns regarding examinations being held in Colleges based on the student's residence, and what expectations should be set for hardship funding for those students taking resit examinations. The Chair reported that this concern had been resolved: the intent of the wording concerned was to confirm that no in-person invigilated assessments would take place in Colleges, but that students completing coursework or sitting remotely-invigilated assessments would naturally be within Colleges.

Andrew Spencer requested that members send him any further queries concerning the proposal, to raise any necessary changes at GBEC's next meeting.

c. Joint Wellbeing Committee (JWC)

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 11 JWC: Minutes 31 March 2025

i. Case Management System (CMS) (31 March 2025, minute 5.2)

Rita Monson asked for clarity on pursuing a collegiate university CMS, following the report at JWC that the University was exiting its contract with [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] The Education Services was therefore reassessing what other CMS were available: no third-party system seemed appropriate and it was unlikely the University could build its own due to limited resources. Work to redevelop current CMS was needed, as the software currently used was no longer supported. Formal communications detailing the plans for a new CMS would be made soon.

Three CMS were widely used by the Colleges, there wasn't one that was particularly favoured so encouraging Colleges to adopt one system was difficult.

STANDING BUSINESS – UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS MATTERS

STC.24.95 Minutes from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the Admissions Forum

The Committee received minutes from:

Paper	Committee/body	Date of meeting
12	Admissions Forum	2 May 2025

REPORTED BUSINESS

STC.24.96 Minutes and Reports from Other Intercollegiate Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

Committee minutes	Meetings since last STC
Bursars' Committee	<i>No minutes</i>
Colleges' Committee	10 May 2025
College Development Directors' Committee	<i>No minutes</i>
Colleges' IT Committee	7 May 2025
Colleges' Standing Committee	29 April 2025
Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee	<i>No minutes</i>
Legal Affairs & Employment Sub-Committee	30 April 2025
University and Colleges Joint Committee	6 May 2025

Items arising that required discussion or decision were included elsewhere on the agenda.

STC.24.97 Minutes and Reports from Committee Representatives on University Committees and Joint Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

Committee minutes	Meetings since last STC
Admissions Research Advisory Group	<i>Has not met</i>
Digital Admissions Service Board	<i>Has not met</i>
Cambridge Outreach Strategy Group	<i>Has not met</i>
College Wellbeing Stimulus Fund	13 March 2025
Joint Student Numbers Management Group	28 February 2025
Joint Wellbeing Committee	31 March 2025
Mature Strategy Group	<i>Has not met</i>
Postgraduate Admissions Committee	13 March 2025
University Financial Assistance Committee	19 March 2025

FINAL DISCUSSIONS

STC.24.98 Discussion of other items raised in advance

a. Thanks to Cambridge SU President (Undergraduate)

The members thanked Sarah Anderson (Cambridge SU President (Undergraduate)) for her considerable work supporting the Cambridge SU and Colleges. She was completing her term early due to gaining employment, and therefore would not attend the Committee's next meeting. The incoming Cambridge SU Presidents would attend instead, with Sumouli Bhattacharjee (Cambridge SU President (Postgraduate)).

STC.24.99 Future meetings

Meeting dates for 2024-25 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm:

Meeting dates for 2025-26 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm (venues to be confirmed):

7 November 2025
5 December 2025
20 February 2026
20 March 2026
29 May 2026
17 July 2026

2025-05-23 STC minutes

Malcolm Millbrook
26 May 2025

Senior Tutors' Committee

MINUTES of the meeting held at 2.15 pm on Friday 11 July 2025 in the Bradfield Room, Darwin College

The meeting was chaired by Judith Bunbury (W); the Secretary was Malcolm Millbrook (Intercollegiate Services Limited).

Members' Attendance: Please note that blank cells below represent Colleges that were not represented at the meeting. Names marked with an asterisk (*) attended as a substitute for the respective member.

Christ's	Tom Monie	Murray Edwards	Victoria Harvey
Churchill	Rita Monson	Newnham	Sheila Watts
Clare	Jackie Tasioulas	Pembroke	Robert Mayhew
Clare Hall	Holly Hedgeland	Peterhouse	James Carleton Paget
Corpus Christi	Marina Frasca-Spada	Queens'	Andrew Thompson
Darwin	Duncan Needham	Robinson	Scott Annett
Downing	Guy Williams	St. Catharine's	Holly Canuto
Emmanuel	Corinna Russell	St. Edmund's	
Fitzwilliam	Paul Chirico	St John's	Richard Partington
Girton	*Stuart Davis	Selwyn	Mike Sewell
Gonville & Caius	Andrew Spencer	Sidney Sussex	*Catherine Sumnall
Homerton	Georgie Horrell	Trinity	Catherine Barnard
Hughes Hall	Tori McKee	Trinity Hall	Michael Sutherland
Jesus	Paul Dominiak	Wolfson	Judith Bunbury
King's	Myfanwy Hill	CSU: UG President	
Lucy Cavendish	*Sophie Hughes	CSU: PG President	Sumouli Bhattacharjee
Magdalene	Stuart Martin (Deputy Chair)		

Attendees

University	Alice Benton, Head of Education Services Sarah d'Ambrumenil (Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration), present for Items 11 & 14 Mike Nicholson, Deputy Head of Education Services (Student Admissions and Access), present for Items 100 – 105, 11 & 14 Bhaskar Vira, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Environmental Sustainability
Colleges	Matthew Mellor (PEM), representative of the College Development Directors' Committee
Cambridge SU	Matthew Copeman (incoming Undergraduate President) Augustin Denis (incoming Postgraduate President)
ISL	Malcolm Millbrook, Deputy Head Matthew Russell, Head Martin Thompson, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

There were no declarations of interest.

STC.24.100 Welcome

The Committee welcomed Sarah d'Ambrumenil (Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration), Mike Nicholson (Deputy Head of Education Services (Student Admissions and Access)), and incoming Cambridge SU presidents Matthew Copeman and Augustin Denis.

STC.24.101 Minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2025

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting on 23 May 2025 as a true record.

STC.24.102 Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

- a) Undergraduate admissions governance structure proposal (23 May 2025, minute STC.24.85)

The Committee approved changes to its terms of reference, to reflect the new undergraduate admissions governance structure coming into effect from Michaelmas Term 2025:

Paper 1 Recommended changes to STC terms of reference

PRINCIPAL AND SUBSTANTIVE BUSINESS

STC.24.103 University communication of undergraduate entry requirements

The Committee discussed how it would prefer undergraduate entry requirements to be communicated by the University to those potentially applying for 2027 entry onwards. A potential avenue to consider the matter was detailed by the Director of Undergraduate Admissions:

Paper 2 Discussion paper in response to University

In the resulting discussion the following points were made:

- a. Mike Nicholson (Deputy Head of Education Services (Student Admissions and Access)) reported that the University was being encouraged to be as transparent as possible in informing potential applicants of the Colleges' entry requirements and expectations. It was hoped that information could be consolidated where possible, but otherwise it needed to be considered how to present information to potential applicants clearly so that they made the appropriate choices.
- b. The Business Committee had recommended that attainment profiles should be removed from the University's undergraduate admissions websites, replaced with links to further information on College standards and statistics, and that recommendations for A-Level subjects were not required. This was argued against by Mike Nicholson, due to attainment profiles being created to reduce the number of Freedom of Information requests received by the University and Colleges. UCAS was currently considering how to provide similar data to candidates, which could make the profiles redundant, but it was considered worth waiting to see how such statistics were presented before changing the use of attainment profiles.
- c. Mike Nicholson noted that as physical prospectuses were no longer published there was more time to make decisions on matters such as entry requirements. However, decisions were still being made too late in the admissions cycle, up until the week of Open Days. It would therefore be worthwhile to hold a discussion on setting a suitable deadline for applicant information being altered.
- d. Concerns were raised that the University's current display of information gave the appearance that the admissions process was more complex than in reality. A more in-depth discussion on the matter, under the new undergraduate admissions governance structure, was needed soon.

The Committee agreed that a discussion on how undergraduate entry requirements were communicated by the University should initially be considered by the Operations Sub-Committee.

STC.24.104 Undergraduate admissions operational review (29 November 2024, minute STC.24.29)

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions (ISL) outlined the findings of a recent review of undergraduate admissions spending, commissioned by the Senior Tutors' and Bursars' business committees to provide context to levy requests from the University:

Paper 3 Operational Review

Members welcomed the information and transparency provided by the review. In the resulting discussion the following points were made by members:

- a. The statement "commitments the University has made in the current APP cover University activity only" was challenged: expenses at one College were increasing primarily due to providing free accommodation for the STEM SMART initiative, an APP activity. Mike Nicholson noted that STEM SMART had originated from collaboration between Colleges and Departments as an initiative that could easily scale. It needed to be decided what the collegiate university wanted to achieve in widening participation, and how to best employ the resources available.
- b. Cost savings could be made by reconsidering the purpose and management of Open Days, and reviewing the use of merchandise. It appeared that potential applicants attending multiple events was a poor use of resources. A less complex admissions system could make repetitive events unnecessary, so it needed to be considered how admissions processes intersected with recruitment.
- c. Removing the Cambridge-specific elements of the UCAS application process was welcomed, if transcripts could still be uploaded. The admissions structure reflected decades of iteration which had encouraged complexity. It was suggested that unnecessary elements be removed, to revert to a process similar to how other universities primarily relied on UCAS data.

The Committee noted that the Colleges' Standing Committee has convened a Working Group to discuss the paper and feedback from the intercollegiate committees and individual Colleges, with an aim of articulating a common strategic intent across Colleges about the future of undergraduate admissions and the resource implications of current practice. Members were encouraged to discuss the paper's findings within their own College structures, to provide feedback to the Working Group in Michaelmas Term 2025.

STC.24.105 National Network for the Education of Care Leavers (NNECL) Quality Mark application

The University had drafted its application for the NNECL (National Network for the Education of Care Leavers) Quality Mark. The Quality Mark was designed to demonstrate an institution's support for the inclusion and success of students with care experience and who were estranged.

Paper 4 NNECL Quality Mark application

The Committee approved the draft application, with corrections made by its business committee.

STC.24.106 Intercollegiate size and shape 2025 survey (23 May 2025, minute STC.24.90)

The Committee received an executive summary of the output of a recent survey on Colleges' intentions and aspirations about the size and shape of its collective student body, authored by Matthew Russell (ISL):

Paper 5 2025 Size and Shape Survey: Executive summary

Members were invited to provide reflective feedback on the executive summary, in the context of their individual submission as well as the submissions of other Colleges. In the resulting discussion the following points were made:

- a. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability) noted that departments didn't use the term 'overrunning' for PhD students, but instead '4th year' or 'continuing'. He acknowledged the low level of confidence Colleges had in achieving their postgraduate numbers. An Academic Fellow had recently been appointed to work on a strategy for all non-standard forms of education, they were encouraged to engage with Colleges on the matter. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Resources and Operations was currently exploring how to manage strategic student planning.
- b. It was important to intersect implications uncovered by the size and shape survey with those of admissions and recruitment: if several Colleges wished to receive more direct applicants, but did not want to increase their undergraduate numbers, then this would create a more competitive rather than collaborative relationship between Colleges in student recruitment.
- c. A strategic approach to accommodation was needed to enable the growth in postgraduate numbers desired by Colleges and the University, at present the Accommodation Service already appeared to struggle with demand. Bhaskar Vira reported that the matter had been considered by the Postgraduate Tutors' Committee, and the Cambridge SU had conducted research into the availability of rooms for postgraduates. It appeared that improving the quality of housing information available to incoming students, particularly overseas students, would greatly lessen the difficulty students found in finding accommodation.
- d. Improved planning and lines of communication between the Colleges and Schools were needed regarding where postgraduate growth was desired, as at present Colleges were not informed of new MPhil programmes were being launched until their applicants appeared in the admissions process. Consideration was also needed to ensure the student allocator could manage the likely shift in applicants applying more to wealthier Colleges due to the increasing financial pressure.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor agreed to circulate the executive summary to Heads of Department and Faculties, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions agreed to circulate it to Admissions Convenors. The Chair encouraged members to circulate the executive summary as widely as possible so that all stakeholders were aware of the Colleges' aspirations.

STC.24.107 University Education Vision

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor presented a vision statement for undergraduate education at Cambridge, to serve the University as a focus for future strategic development. The statement's creation was a consequence of the recent Teaching Review: members of the Teaching Review and the General Board's Education Committee had proposed the initial wording, which had then been received well by other groups. The formal document had subsequently been approved by the General Board's Education Committee and the Senior Tutors' Education Committee:

Paper 6 Education Vision

In the resulting discussion the following points were raised:

- a. Other stakeholders believed that the vision statement could be used as a basis to create separate statements for other students such as postgraduates or part-time students, or could be developed further to encompass all student types.

- b. The statement should not emphasise mental health support to the extent that undergraduates were not resilient enough to sustain themselves after graduating, but as a means to fulfil an undergraduate's educational aims.
- c. It was questioned how "exceptional" was defined in the statement. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor believed that this was achieved by the University being in the top end of the spectrum in any established rankings.
- d. The use of images in the statement was questioned, as either being inappropriate or unnecessary.
- e. The statement should articulate the need for the level of teaching desired to be sustainable.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor clarified that the statement was not a strategy document, as one strategy for the entire university might not be practical, but would serve as a measure by which the delivery of undergraduate education could be evaluated against.

The Committee approved the vision statement with minor amendments as discussed.

STC.24.108 Proposed E6 Staff Training approach

Alice Benton (Head of Education Services) presented to the Committee a proposed risk-based prioritisation of staff training related to harassment and sexual misconduct, approved by the E6 Steering Group and reviewed by the Business Committee:

Paper 7 Staff training prioritisation proposal [*Late paper*]

It was confirmed that the training would be deliverable by the start of Michaelmas Term 2025, with further details being sent to senior officers in the first week of August ahead of communications to staff and students.

The Committee approved the staff training prioritisation approach.

STANDING REPORTS

STC.24.109 Reports of the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Environmental Sustainability)

The Vice-Chancellor encouraged eligible members to vote in the current election for the next Chancellor, voting was open until the 16th July.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported on the following matters:

- a. The US State Department had resumed the processing of Harvard University student visa applications, however it was still anticipated that there would be a larger number of postgraduates accepting their Cambridge offers. It was expected that this would be a temporary difficulty, as cover ratios would be adjusted to reflect the shifting interest away from American universities.
- b. Members were thanked for their work in supporting recent graduation events and the Open Days.
- c. The 2025 National Student Survey had received responses beyond the required threshold. Compared to the previous year most student views had not significantly changed, except for an increase in the "student voice" score. Cambridge scores were ahead of the Russell Group

and the sector in a number of categories, but continued to lag on “assessment and feedback”, “organisation and management” and “student voice” (despite the increase).

STC.24.110 Report of the Chair of the Committee

The Chair of the Committee had nothing to report that wasn’t already raised under other items.

OTHER BUSINESS

STC.24.111 ‘Double time’ application deadlines change

Jackie Tasioulas (CL) and Sarah d’Ambrumenil (Interim Deputy Head of Student Administration) informed the Committee of the new deadlines for EAMC applications to allow students to study one year over two years ('double time'): either before the Michaelmas Term or Lent Term, with the applications submitted for the latter deadline not applying until the beginning of Lent Term. Guidance would soon be circulated to Senior Tutors, who were content with the changes.

STC.24.112 Updated near miss guidance

The Committee noted that guidance to support staff on appropriately responding to and supporting students following attempted suicide, misadventure, or potentially fatal self-harm had recently been updated:

- Paper 8 Near miss guidance cover note
- Paper 9 Near miss guidance v2

Key changes to the guidance were the removal of checklists and templates for in-depth assessments within Colleges, and a significant reduction in content related to welfare and safety assessments. Colleges could adopt or adapt the guidance as needed.

STC.24.113 ChatGPT & AI Working Group

The ChatGPT & AI Working Group’s scheduled meeting on 19 May 2025 was cancelled due to a lack of business, however it provided feedback on updating guidance on the use of AI by undergraduate supervisors:

- Paper 10 Supervisor AI guidance

The updated guidance added a restriction to the use of AI by supervisors unless they gained explicit consent from their students, as recommended by the Business Committee. Following this the work of the ChatGPT & AI Working Group was concluded, however the group would be reinstated should the need arise due to the evolving use of AI. **The Committee approved the updated guidance.**

STC.24.114 Membership of Sub-Committees and Other Bodies

The Committee approved the following proposal for representation on other committees:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Appointment of ...</i>	<i>Replacing ...</i>
Undergraduate Admissions Committee	Stuart Martin (M), as STC rep.	New

Members interested in the following vacancies were invited to contact the Secretary:

<i>On ...</i>	<i>Replacing...</i>
Mature Strategy Group	New - a Senior Tutor from a standard-age College

The following paper was circulated for information:

Paper 11 Membership reports as of 3 July 2025

Senior Tutors were asked to check this for accuracy and advise ISL of any amendments or additions.

STANDING BUSINESS – MATTERS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

STC.24.115 Senior Tutors' Business Committee

The unconfirmed minutes of the most recent meeting of the Senior Tutors' Business Committee were circulated for information:

Paper 12 Minutes of the meeting on 30 June 2025

a) Principle on the University contacting offer holders (30 June 2025, minute STBC.24.80)

The Business Committee recommended that the Department or Faculty should directly contact offer holders regarding course changes, and copy in Senior Tutors to the communications. **The Committee approved this change, from the general principle that only Colleges contacted offer holders.**

b) Undergraduate admissions ID checks (30 June 2025, STBC.24.81)

Colleges had previously approved intercollegiate guidance on how the identification of candidates were checked at interview. It was reported that the guidance was not being followed by several Colleges. The Business Committee therefore recommended that it should be a free action for Colleges confirmed the identities of their interviewees, so long as they were checked. **The Committee approved this change in policy.**

c) Undergraduate admissions appeals process (30 June 2025, STBC.24.82)

The Business Committee recommended minor changes to the undergraduate admissions appeals process:

Paper 13 Draft appeals process for 2025-26

The two main proposed differences were to set an absolute deadline for appeals, rather than relative to the last correspondence with College, and to bring the documented process into line with the published flowchart that reviews of upheld appeals were not possible. **The Committee approved the recommended changes.**

STC.24.116 Reports of Standing Committees

The following business was for report: where there were matters for decision or substantial discussion, these were raised in Principal and Substantive Business or Other Business above.

a) Postgraduate Tutors' Committee (PTC)

Minutes from the PTC meeting on 5 June 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 14 PTC – Minutes 5 June 2025

Duncan Needham (D) drew the Committee's attention to the following matters:

i) **Update on UKRI Terms and Conditions (5 June 2025, minute 25.31.1)**

The Committee noted that PTC had discussed the revised UKRI Terms and Conditions, one change would mean students who were contracted to undertake teaching must have a formal contract of employment to differentiate 'extra' paid work that is not part of their research project. The Business Committee had also discussed the matter, but believed it was unlikely that this change would affect undergraduate supervisors as they didn't have formal contracts and were not employed by the University.

ii) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. University contingency planning and student support were in hand, Colleges had been asked to sympathetically consider requests from students who needed to extend their accommodation as a result.

b) **Standing Committee on Education (STEC)**

Unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2025 were circulated for information:

Paper 15 Unconfirmed Minutes 3 June 2025

Andrew Spencer (CAI) drew the Committee's attention to the following matters:

i) **Offer reading lists (3 June 2025, minute 5)**

STEC had recommended the discontinuation of reading lists for offer holders by Departments and Faculties:

Paper 16 Offer-Holder Reading Lists at Cambridge

The Committee approved this recommendation.

ii) **Historical Thinking classes (3 June 2025, minute 9)**

STEC had recommended that Historical Thinking classes in the Historical Tripos should count towards UTO teaching stints. **The Committee approved this change.**

STANDING BUSINESS – UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS MATTERS

STC.24.117 Undergraduate admissions portal embargo risk

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions raised the risks of admissions portals created by Colleges: other than implications for cybersecurity, data protection, and the student experience there was a significant risk of a College admissions portal inadvertently breaking the UCAS embargo. Online portals were the primary way in which other universities had breached the embargo, due to the ease in which students could be contacted. Members were encouraged to ensure the UCAS embargo training was offered as widely as possible to relevant College staff.

STC.24.118 Minutes from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the Admissions Forum

The Committee received minutes from:

Paper	Committee/body	Date of meeting
17	Admissions Forum	6 June 2025

The Director of Undergraduate Admissions drew the Committee's attention to the following matters:

a) Feedback policy (6 June 2025, minute 25/72)

The Committee noted that the Admissions Forum discussed recommendations from its Working Party on Feedback. The complaints and appeals process and standard communications to candidates would be revised to more accurately reflect current practice, as it was found that most Colleges had stopped providing individual feedback.

b) Publication of Admissions Statistics on PowerBI dashboard (6 June 2025, minute 25/78)

The Committee noted that the Admissions Forum had received information on moving admissions statistics from Tableau¹ to PowerBI².

c) Admissions fraud policy (6 June 2025, minute 25/79)

The Committee approved a proposed whistleblowing policy recommended by the Admissions Forum:

Paper 18 Policy on Undergraduate Admissions Fraud, Including Third-Party Claims

REPORTED BUSINESS

STC.24.119 Minutes and Reports from Other Intercollegiate Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

Committee minutes	Meetings since last STC
Bursars' Committee	5 June 2025
Colleges' Committee	No meetings
College Development Directors' Committee	No meetings
Colleges' IT Committee	No meetings
Colleges' Standing Committee	10 June 2025
Fees and Student Finance Sub-Committee	No meetings
Legal Affairs & Employment Sub-Committee	14 June 2025
University and Colleges Joint Committee	17 June 2025

Items arising that required discussion or decision were included elsewhere on the agenda.

¹ <https://tableau.blue.cam.ac.uk/#/site/InformationHub/views/LandingPage/HomePage?:iid=1>

²

<https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiOTFiZGUwMDItMWIzM000NDNkLTgzZDQtNGZjODM4MzM3NWYwliwidCI6IjQ5YTUwNDQ1LWJkZmEtNGI3OS1hZGUzLTU0N2I0ZjM5ODZIOSlsImMiQjh9>

STC.24.120 Minutes and Reports from Committee Representatives on University Committees and Joint Committees

Minutes were received from the following committees:

Committee minutes	Meetings since last STC
Admissions Research Advisory Group	<i>No minutes</i>
Digital Admissions Service Board	1 July 2025
Cambridge Outreach Strategy Group	<i>No minutes</i>
College Wellbeing Stimulus Fund	13 June 2025
Joint Student Numbers Management Group	9 May 2025
Joint Wellbeing Committee	13 June 2025
Mature Strategy Group	<i>No minutes</i>
Postgraduate Admissions Committee	13 March 2025
University Financial Assistance Committee	19 March 2025

FINAL DISCUSSIONS

STC.24.121 Discussion of other items raised in advance

a) Farewells

Members wished farewell to outgoing Senior Tutors Catherine Barnard (T), James Carleton Paget (PET), and Kieron Devey (ED).

Members warmly thanked Alice Benton for her long service to the Committee and Colleges, and Sumouli Bhattacharjee (Cambridge SU) for their work in supporting the Committee.

STC.24.122 Future meetings

Meeting dates for 2025-26 are listed below: all meetings will take place at 2:15 pm, with coffee served from 2:00 pm (venues to be confirmed):

7 November 2025
5 December 2025
20 February 2026
20 March 2026
29 May 2026
17 July 2026

2025-07-11 STC minutes

Malcolm Millbrook
16 July 2025