

deserving projects when the criteria of success are linked not with the promise of academic gain but, rather, with the promise of economic benefits of various kinds. One obvious difficulty is that the foundation will find itself having to encourage extremely speculative ventures. If the object, for example, is to improve the productivity of the electronics industry, there will be no point in looking for mechanical inventions which will actually improve the production process, for industry is

likely to have thought of projects like that off its own bat. By the same token, the foundation is unlikely to find much scope for its activities in projects of the kind which the Government establishments at present carry out. But this, however, seems to be fully appreciated. The object is somehow to devise new ways in which universities at present too detached from the problems of the economy and industry can make useful contributions.

## Changes for Cambridge ?

THE University of Cambridge publishes this week its answer to the Franks Commission Report. In fact the comparison is unfair, because the committee under Dr W. W. Grave considered only the administrative functions of the university, and excluded consideration of admission procedures, the relationship between the university and the colleges, and the like, which took the Franks Commission so long to work out. Dr Grave, Master of Fitzwilliam, has taken only a year to produce the report, advised by a committee of three, Mr J. S. Boys-Smith, Sir Frank Lee and Lord Butler.

The report recommends a number of administrative adjustments. The Senate of the university, to which all holders of the MA belong, would give up some of its powers to the Regent House, the body representing the resident teaching and administrative members of the Senate. The Senate should retain only the power to elect the chancellor of the university and the high steward. The Regent House, which should consist of all teaching members of the university (and not only those already members of the Senate) should be responsible for electing the vice-chancellor, conferring degrees, approving new courses leading to degrees, and deciding broad questions of building policy. At present, though, Regent House is often asked to determine detailed implementation of policy, and the report recommends that these detailed decisions be transferred to central bodies such as the Council of the Senate. The central bodies themselves should also be reorganized. At present there are three—the Council of the Senate, the General Board of the Faculties and the Financial Board; the report recommends that the Council of the Senate should become the supreme body, and that the other two should rank as committees of the Council. This change, the committee hopes, will reduce the continuous reference back that exists between the three administrative offices. The new council would consist of the chancellor, vice-chancellor, two members from among the heads of colleges, two professors or readers and twelve members of the Regent House.

The report also seeks to make it harder for the Regent House to block new legislation. Requests for ballots should need at least twenty signatures, and proposals should not be rejected unless objectors are in a majority and number more than 100. In proposing changes in the tenure of the vice-chancellorship, the committee has reached a compromise between the two year period now in operation and the four year term which the University of Oxford has adopted. Rather half-heartedly, it recommends a term of three years. The election of proctors should not be changed, but women should be eligible. The report also recommends,

perhaps with the Prince of Wales in mind, that a press officer for the university should be appointed.

## . . . and for Oxford

from our Oxford Correspondent

THE University of Oxford is ringing in the academic year with some long awaited changes. For the past three terms Congregation, the assembly of the senior members of the university, has been debating fourteen new statutes reframing the administration of the university according to the proposals of the Franks Commission. The statutes have now been published, and will become effective subject to the formal approval of the Queen in Council. From 1969 onwards, the vice-chancellor, who will no longer have to be the head of a college but only a senior member of the university, will be elected by Congregation on the nomination of a committee. Since 1957 the term of office of the vice-chancellor has been fixed at two years, a period too short for him to do much more than learn his duties, which include the chairmanship of all the more important committees of the university and the representation of the university to outside bodies. Under the new statutes vice-chancellors will remain in office for four years; the term of the present vice-chancellor will be extended until the election of his successor. The Hebdomadal Council, whose functions are comparable with those of a government cabinet, is to be made formally responsible for the administration of the university, and the administrative services which execute its decisions are to be unified under the registrar.

The new statutes differ from the proposals of the Franks Commission over the question of the composition of the General Board, the concern of which is with matters academic rather than administrative. At present the board consists of the vice-chancellor, certain other university officials, and one representative from each of the sixteen faculties. The Franks Commission had proposed that there be only five faculties, each with two members of the board, and that many of the present faculties be reduced to sub-faculties. A year ago, Congregation approved the scheme in principle, by 114 votes to 112. The Hebdomadal Council and the General Board itself, however, opposed the proposal "because it seemed to them that the new faculty boards would have no clear function to perform, and that the new sub-faculty boards (up to forty in number) would fragment academic administration too greatly". Congregation was therefore advised to reject the statute, and the constitution of the General Board will remain the same, with the important