

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6676

WEDNESDAY 16 NOVEMBER 2022

VOL CLIII No 9

CONTENTS

Notices

Calendar	120
Discussion on Tuesday, 22 November 2022	120
Elections to the Council and the Board of Scrutiny	120
Election to the Council	121

Vacancies, appointments, etc.

Vacancies in the University	122
-----------------------------	-----

Regulations for Examinations

Economics Tripos	123
Natural Sciences Tripos	123
Veterinary Science for the M.Phil. Degree by Thesis	123
Translational Biomedical Research for the M.Phil. Degree by Advanced Study	123
Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University	124

Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.

Annual meetings of the Faculties	124
----------------------------------	-----

Obituaries

Obituary Notices	124
------------------	-----

End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'

Report of Discussion: 8 November 2022

Twenty-seventh Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 3 October 2022	125
--	-----

College Notices

Election	130
Vacancies	130

Societies, etc.

Cambridge Philosophical Society	130
Society for the History of the University	130

External Notices

Oxford Notices	131
----------------	-----



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES

Calendar

- 18 November, *Friday*. Leslie Stephen Lecture at 5.30 p.m. in the Senate-House. Lecturer, Professor Kwame Anthony Appiah, FRSL, Honorary Fellow of Clare College and Professor of Philosophy and of Law, New York University.
- 22 November, *Tuesday*. Discussion by videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).
- 26 November, *Saturday*. Congregation of the Regent House at 10 a.m.
- 29 November, *Tuesday*. End of third quarter of Michaelmas Term.

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

- 22 November
6 December

Congregations

- 26 November, Saturday at 10 a.m.

Discussion on Tuesday, 22 November 2022

The Acting Vice-Chancellor invites members of the Regent House, University and College employees, registered students and others qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 111) to attend a Discussion by videoconference on Tuesday, 22 November 2022 at 2 p.m. The following item will be discussed:

1. Report of the Council, dated 25 October 2022, pursuant to Special Ordinance A (ii) 7 concerning an initiated Grace relating to fossil fuel industry ties (*Reporter*, 6673, 2022–23, p. 84).

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

In accordance with Grace 3 of 12 January 2022, the Chair of the Board of Scrutiny or any ten members of the Regent House² may request that the Council arrange for one or more of the items listed for discussion to be discussed in person (usually in the Senate-House). Requests should be made to the Registry, on paper or by email to UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk from addresses within the cam.ac.uk domain, by no later than 9 a.m. on the day of the Discussion. Any changes to the Discussion schedule will be confirmed in the *Reporter* at the earliest opportunity.

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

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

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

Elections to the Council and the Board of Scrutiny

11 November 2022

ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL

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

<i>Candidates:</i>	<i>Nominated by:</i>
Class (a): Two from among the Heads of Colleges	
Ms HEATHER JANE HANCOCK Master of St John's College	Mr C. F. Ewbank, <i>JN</i> , and the Revd Canon Dr M. D. Oakley, <i>JN</i>
Professor PHILIPPA JANE ROGERSON Master of Gonville and Caius College	Mr R. G. Gardiner, <i>CAI</i> , and Professor L. A. Merrett, <i>T</i>
Class (b): Two from among the Professors, Readers and Professors (Grade 11)	
Professor ARIF MOHIUDDIN AHMED, <i>CAI</i>	Professor Sir Gregory Winter, <i>T</i> , and Professor R. J. Anderson, <i>CHU</i>
Professor METTE EILSTRUP-SANGIOVANNI, <i>SID</i>	Dr D. E. A. Curtis, <i>EM</i> , and Dr B. D. Fulda, <i>SID</i>
Professor STYLIANOS KAVADIAS	Professor K. A. Munir, <i>HO</i> , and Professor C. H. Loch, <i>PEM</i>
Professor JASON EDWARD SCOTT-WARREN, <i>CAI</i>	Professor P. M. Gray, <i>G</i> , and Professor N. S. M. Guyatt, <i>JE</i>
Professor BENJAMIN DAVID SIMONS, <i>JN</i>	Professor U. C. Goswami, <i>JN</i> , and Professor M. E. Cates, <i>T</i>
Professor ANTONIO VIDAL-PUIG	Professor P. H. Maxwell, <i>T</i> , and Professor D. Chu, <i>SE</i>
Professor GARTH NATHAN WELLS, <i>JE</i>	Professor J. P. T. Clackson, <i>JE</i> , and Professor J. S. Dennis, <i>SE</i>

*Candidates:**Nominated by:*

Class (c): Four from among the other members of the Regent HouseMr JOHN TANNATT DIX, *DAR*Professor A. C. Ferguson-Smith, *DAR*, and Dr J. A. Tasioulas, *CL*

No other persons having been nominated, the candidates named above in classes (a) and (c) are duly elected. It is necessary to hold an election in class (b) to select two from among the seven candidates. Those elected will serve for four years from 1 January 2023.

Voting will open at 10 a.m. on Friday, 25 November 2022 and close at **5 p.m. on Monday, 5 December 2022.**

A new timetable has been announced to elect three candidates in class (c) (see below).

ELECTION TO THE BOARD OF SCRUTINY

The Acting Vice-Chancellor gives notice that he has received the following nominations, in accordance with Statute A VII 3, for election to the Board of Scrutiny to fill one vacancy in class (c)(i) (a person who has been a member of the Regent House for not more than ten years on 1 October 2022), and that it has been certified to him that the candidates have consented to be nominated:

*Candidates:**Nominated by:*Dr NAZIA HABIB, *N*Dr G. L. Burgess, *ED*, and Professor R. M. Mortier, *CHR*Mr ROBERT JOHN HOPWOOD, *MUR*Dr R. Anthony, *JE*, and Ms L. M. Thompson, *LC*

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

Voting will open at 10 a.m. on Friday, 25 November 2022 and close at **5 p.m. on Monday, 5 December 2022.**

Election to the Council

16 November 2022

The Acting Vice-Chancellor gives notice that an election is to be held to appoint three members of the University Council in class (c) (other members of the Regent House) under Statute A IV 2.¹ Those elected will serve for four years from 1 January 2023.

The Council is the principal executive and policy-making body of the University. It has general responsibility for the administration of the University, for defining its mission, for the planning of its work, and for the management of its resources. The Council deals with relations between the University and the Colleges, and conducts negotiations with outside bodies on many matters (other than those relating directly to the educational and research programmes of the University, which are dealt with on its behalf by the General Board of the Faculties). It is responsible for the appointment or nomination of certain members of internal and external bodies, and for many student matters (excluding undergraduate admissions, which is a College concern). Further information about the Council is available to members of the University on the Council website (<https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/>). Questions about its work can be addressed to the Registry by emailing registry@admin.cam.ac.uk.

The University is committed to equality, which includes supporting and encouraging all under-represented groups, promoting an inclusive culture, and valuing diversity. Nominations from groups that are under-represented on the Council are welcomed.

Reasons for serving on the Council

The Council of the University of Cambridge is one of the few principal bodies in the higher education sector with a majority of members elected from internal constituencies; most equivalent bodies are made up predominantly of external members. The Council draws its strength from the expertise, engagement, and scrutiny of its members – those elected in the classes noted above as well as its external and student members. It is key to the continuing success of the University that elections to the Council attract strong candidates who are willing to share their knowledge and commit their time for the benefit of the University as a whole.

Duties and responsibilities of Council members

The University is both an exempt charity,² and a corporation established by common law. Council members are therefore both charity trustees of the University and, effectively, its corporate directors. They have associated legal responsibilities and duties, including the promotion of the interests of the University and acting with integrity, care, and prudence. Under regulatory guidance, Council members must be ‘fit and proper persons’.³ It is important for candidates to recognise and accept the obligations that Council membership would confer upon them.

¹ The addition of a reference to Clinical Professors to Section 2(b) of Statute A IV, approved by Grace 2 of 9 March 2022, remains subject to the approval of His Majesty in Council. Pending that approval, Clinical Professors, as members of the Regent House, are eligible for election to the Council in class (c).

² The University has charitable status but is exempt from the statutory requirement which otherwise obliges a charity to register with the Charity Commission. The Office for Students is the principal regulator of the University as regards its compliance with its legal obligations in exercising control and management of its administration as a charity.

³ For a full definition of ‘fit and proper persons’, see: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/regulation/registration-with-the-ofs-a-guide/public-interest-governance-principles/>.

The Handbook for Members of the Council sets out the Council's primary responsibilities and provides advice and guidance to members of Council on their legal and other responsibilities. Members of the Council are expected to attend all meetings of the Council. Members will not normally be able to take more than one term of leave during their period on the Council and may instead carry forward their leave entitlement. Potential nominees might wish to familiarise themselves with the key aspects of the University's *Statutes and Ordinances* (<https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/>), and the most recent Budget Reports, Annual Reports and Financial Statements.⁴ A recording of an information session held in October 2022 with the Acting Vice-Chancellor and other members of the Council on the role of the Council is available at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/Pages/how-to-stand-for-election-to-Council.aspx>.

Further useful information is provided by the Office for Students (<https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/regulation/>) and the Charity Commission (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-essential-trustee-what-you-need-to-know-cc3>). This information includes details of the extent of a charity trustee's personal liability. Instances of personal liability are rare and unlikely to occur, providing trustees act honestly, prudently, in good faith, in the best interests of the University, and in compliance with legislation and the University's governing documents.

Nomination procedure and election timetable

In order to be eligible, candidates for election are asked to send their nominations to the Acting Vice-Chancellor, to be received not later than **12 noon on Tuesday, 29 November 2022**. The Acting Vice-Chancellor asks candidates to address their nominations to the Registry by email including electronic signatures to Registry@admin.cam.ac.uk. The nomination (which can be made on a form available on the governance site)⁵ should include (a) a statement signed by two members of the Regent House, nominating the candidate for election and specifying the class in which the candidate is nominated, and (b) a statement signed by the candidate confirming consent to be nominated. The candidate is also required to provide a personal statement by the same date (see below). Two periods of four years should normally be regarded as the maximum length of continuous service for elected members of the Council.

In accordance with the regulations governing the election (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 118), those standing for election should send to the Registry, by 12 noon on Tuesday, 29 November 2022, a statement in support of their nomination, which will be provided to voters. Each statement should be no more than 500 words in length and should cover the following points:

- the candidate's present position in the University;
- previous posts held, whether in Cambridge or in other universities or outside the university system, with dates;
- the candidate's reasons for standing for election, and the experience and skills they would bring to the role;
- a note of the candidate's particular interests within the field of University business.

The complete list of nominations will be published in the *Reporter* on Wednesday, 30 November 2022.

If the election is contested, it will be conducted by ballot under the Single Transferable Vote regulations. Online voting will open at 10 a.m. on Friday, 9 December 2022 and close at 5 p.m. on Monday, 19 December 2022. Hardcopy voting papers and supporting materials will be distributed not later than Friday, 9 December 2022 to those who opted by 2 November 2022 to vote on paper; the last date for the return of voting papers is 5 p.m. on Monday, 19 December 2022.

⁴ See respectively

<https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/finance-committee/Pages/budget.aspx>,
<https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/Pages/council-annual-reports.aspx> and
<https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/finance-committee/Pages/fmi.aspx>.

⁵ A nomination form is available at

<https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/committees/council/Documentspublic/CouncilNominationFormMT2022.pdf>.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Vacancies in the University

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

University Assistant Professorship in Fluid Mechanics in the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology; tenure: from 1 October 2023 or earlier as agreed; salary: £43,414–£54,949; closing date: 6 January 2023; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/37198/>; quote reference: NQ33330

University Assistant Professorship in Biotechnology in the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology; tenure: from 1 October 2023 or earlier as agreed; salary: £43,414–£54,949; closing date: 6 January 2023; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/37196/>; quote reference: NQ33328

Assistant Teaching Professorship in the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology; tenure: from 1 October 2023 or earlier as agreed; salary: £43,414–£54,949; closing date: 6 January 2023; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/37388/>; quote reference: NQ33489

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

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

REGULATIONS FOR EXAMINATIONS

Economics Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 309)

With effect from 1 October 2022

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Economics, has approved the suspension of Paper 5, *Political economics*, in Part IB of the Tripos in the 2022–23 academic year. A footnote noting the suspension has been added to the paper details in Regulation 19.

Natural Sciences Tripos

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 419)

With effect from 1 October 2022

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Committee of Management for the Natural Sciences Tripos, has approved the amendment of the regulations for the Natural Sciences Tripos to add a new subject, *Mathematical and Computation Biology*, to Part IB, as follows:

By adding ‘Mathematical and Computational Biology’ to the regulations as follows:

- Regulation 9: to the list for Part IB under the Faculty Board of Biology;
- Regulation 20: to the list of subjects for examination in Part IB;
- Regulation 21(b): to group (iv) before ‘Physics B’;
- Regulation 23(a): to the list in sub-paragraph (iii) and with the addition of an asterisk.

And by amending the first sentence of Regulation 22 to read as follows:

22. No candidate shall offer Mathematics if honours have previously been obtained in Part IB of the Mathematical Tripos, or unless the candidate:

Veterinary Science for the M.Phil. Degree by Thesis

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 523)

With effect from 1 October 2022

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Postgraduate Committee and the Degree Committee for the Faculty Board of Biology, has approved an amendment to the Special Regulations to admit candidates to the Department of Physiology, Development and Neuroscience for examination in Veterinary Science for the degree of Master of Philosophy by thesis, as follows:

By adding ‘or the Degree Committee for the Faculty of Biology’ to the end of the first sentence.

Translational Biomedical Research for the M.Phil. Degree by Advanced Study

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 559)

With effect from 1 October 2022

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board of Clinical Medicine, has approved the suspension of the examination in Translational Biomedical Research for the degree of Master of Philosophy for two years until the 2024–25 academic year. A footnote noting the suspension will be added to the Special Regulations for the examination.

Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University

(*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2021, p. 608)

The General Board, on the recommendation of the Strategic Committee for the Institute of Continuing Education, has approved the following amendments to the Schedule to the regulations for Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University:

With effect from 1 October 2021

By adding the following new courses to the Schedule:

Certificates

Institute of Continuing Education

Postgraduate Certificate in Learning Design and Teaching Innovation

Postgraduate Certificate in Learning Design and Teaching Innovation (Academic Professional Apprenticeship)

With effect from 1 October 2022

By inserting a footnote to suspend the following courses:

Certificates

Institute of Continuing Education

Postgraduate Certificate in Learning Design and Teaching Innovation

Postgraduate Certificate in Learning Design and Teaching Innovation (Academic Professional Apprenticeship)

Postgraduate Certificate in Research and Innovation Leadership

Postgraduate Certificate in Research and Innovation Leadership (Academic Professional Apprenticeship)

NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.

Annual meetings of the Faculties

Human, Social and Political Science

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Human, Social and Political Science gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at 2 p.m. on Thursday, 17 November 2022, via Zoom. The main business will be the election of four members of the Faculty Board in class (c), in accordance with the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards. There are three vacancies for four years and one vacancy for two years, from 1 January 2023.

OBITUARIES

Obituary Notices

Sir DEREK MORISON DAVID THOMAS, KCMG, M.A., Honorary Fellow of Trinity Hall, died on 25 October 2022, aged 92 years.

JOSEPH PETER McDERMOTT, Ph.D., Fellow and sometime Director of Studies of St John's College, Emeritus Reader in Chinese History and Honorary Keeper of the Chinese Books at the University Library, died on 30 October 2022, aged 76 years.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 8 November 2022

A Discussion was held by videoconference. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor Dame Madeleine Atkins was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Senior Pro-Proctor, the Junior Proctor and nine other persons present.

The following item was discussed:

Twenty-seventh Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 3 October 2022

(*Reporter*, 6672, 2022–23, p. 57).

Professor R. M. MORTIER (Department of Computer Science and Technology, and Christ's College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as Chair of the Board of Scrutiny in the last academical year, I wish to introduce its Twenty-seventh Report to the Regent House.

The Board of Scrutiny, established in 1995 to 'ensure the accountability of the Council (and through it of the other central bodies) to the Regent House', plays a key role in ensuring transparency of the University's operations to the Regent House. It annually scrutinises, on behalf of the Regent House, the Accounts of the University; the Annual Report of the Council (including the Annual Report of the General Board to the Council); and any Report of the Council proposing allocations from the Chest. It also may require to speak with any University officer, including senior officers. The Council is required by Statute to respond to formal recommendations made by the Board through its Reports, a point to which I shall return.

The Board's Report makes nine Recommendations this year, as well as including a wide-ranging commentary on the matters that were brought to the Board's attention and discussed with senior officers and others with expertise and insight to offer. I hope that the Regent House thinks it worth reading.

I do not intend here to repeat what the Report already says, but I do wish to draw attention to one particular theme. Set out in paragraphs 11–13, it was not captured directly in any Recommendation but is implicitly related to the first as well as chiming with comments made by the Acting Vice-Chancellor in his annual Address.

It continues to be a concern of the Board that engagement of the Regent House has not returned to pre-pandemic levels, and was arguably already declining before that. Given the rarity of the privilege that our governance arrangements afford, it would be a shame for it to be accidentally lost through disuse. Retention of this privilege demands, I believe, that members of the Regent House engage with governance, actively holding the Council and the University administration to account.

Use it or lose it.

This requires work, and I know only too well that many if not most of us already feel overworked. But there is a very real risk that the Regent House will become increasingly side-lined in decision-making processes that can directly affect academic matters. If members of the Regent House do not wish this to happen, then I think that more of us need to read the *Reporter*, to pay attention to Reports, to stand for positions on bodies such as the Council and the Board of Scrutiny, to vote in Ballots, and generally to engage with the governance of the University.

Of course, many of us already do and there have certainly been topics in the past year, and before, that have triggered Graces and other interventions from the Regent

House. When well-informed, such engagement should be welcomed by the University – but there is a risk that if it only occurs sporadically, triggered by specific actions or proposals (or their poor communication), then day-to-day oversight falls away and the privilege of our governance arrangements will be steadily eroded.

At the same time, University bodies such as the Council need actively to support and encourage the engagement of the Regent House. In that light it is particularly disappointing that this year, the late cancellation of the Council meeting scheduled for December coupled with the publication timetable of the *Reporter* means that the Council's Responses to the Report and to this Discussion will apparently not be published until mid-February. This extended timetable for engaging with a key mechanism for accountability in this University was supposed to have been made a thing of the past by the introduction of a new, streamlined process.

I hope that next year's Report will receive a more timely response.

Dr M. J. RUTTER (Department of Physics):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it is always pleasing to read the Board of Scrutiny's Annual Report, and I commend its members for the work they do on behalf of us all to ensure that the University is well-governed and learns from its successes and mistakes.

I always feel that the Board suffers from one major handicap. A lack of time, or perhaps of pages. Ten pages is a short space in which to report on all major activities of this University over twelve months.

There is one topic raised by the Report on which I particularly wish more had been written. As I am a Computer Officer, it will surprise no-one that this is the decommissioning of the Hermes mailserver.

The Board writes that the decommissioning was necessary due to a lack of support for the open-source components on which Hermes was based, and that 'the University was ill-placed to take on the burden of maintaining, supporting and extending such a critical but also complex and relatively niche piece of software itself'. The critical piece of software is not named, but a major component of Hermes is the Exim mail transport software. According to a survey carried out at the start of this month,¹ there are over a quarter of a million machines currently running this software. But more importantly, the software was developed here at Cambridge by Dr Philip Hazel.

Cambridge used to be able not simply to run a mailserver, but to write software for mailservers which was then used on numerous machines throughout the world. It may be the case that we are now 'ill-placed' to do so, but it does beg the question why? And also, can we retain IT staff who can support yet more niche areas of computing? Email is ubiquitous. Research Computing, and High Performance Computing, is much more specialised. Are we confident that we can retain IT staff in those areas, and thus give our researchers, whom we expect to be world-class, world-class support? The UIS has a growing Research Computing division. Does it have a future?

If we accept that the closure of Hermes was unavoidable, there are still questions about whether the solution chosen to replace it was the best one, and how it was chosen. Microsoft is not the only provider of email on this scale, Google being an obvious competitor. But one might wonder whether a company the size of Microsoft or Google is really required to run something which, I believe, fitted in one machine rack and was supported by about 1 FTE of personnel.

The Board omits to discuss more serious issues which have arisen since the move to Exchange Online. In early December 2021 a misconfiguration of some, but not all, of the mailservers that Microsoft used to send Cambridge email to external destinations caused some remote mailservers to reject Cambridge email. The misconfiguration was a simple mistake which not simply contravenes the specification to which email is meant to conform, but is one commonly seen in forged emails. It is unsurprising that other providers, including Google, tended to reject such emails.

Well before Christmas the misconfiguration had been identified and reported back to Microsoft. The fix was simple, and the need was obvious. However, it was not fixed until mid-March. So we suffered three months of unreliable outgoing email, a period which included the interview season. Microsoft appeared to be too big to care about poor little Cambridge.

More recently, after the Board would have concluded the Report we are discussing today, we suffered a similar problem in reverse. The mechanism by which Exchange Online decides whether to classify incoming email as spam, and place it directly in one's spam folder, is less well understood than the mechanism used by Hermes, and lacks the ability for users to tune its sensitivity. It has become very sensitive. Even emails sent by the UIS are occasionally ending up in their recipients' spam folders. An email I sent to a Ph.D. student suffered thus. A student from another university has missed out on being considered for an internship because his email to a colleague of mine suffered this fate.

This has thrown into focus that there are two main systems for email in use in the world currently. There is Microsoft's proprietary system, and there is the IMAP/SMTP system based on open standards and supported by a wide range of software, some free, some not free. The interface between these two worlds is lossy. We appear to have retreated into a world in which we can exchange email reliably, and quite securely, with other users of Microsoft Exchange, but our ability to communicate with those who have not signed up, and paid up, to the Microsoft way of doing things is lessened.

I do not deny that, in a world of increasing IT threats, pulling up the drawbridge can be a good solution. I do wonder whether the University ought to value being open and collaborative so highly that it is prepared to take an increased risk to itself rather than impede the free movement of information. I realise that speaking up for free movement may be unpopular in a world of Brexit, but I would have liked the Board to confirm that it had confidence in the process by which the reputational and financial damage of having less secure email was balanced against the reputational and financial damage of retreating into a walled garden. The balance point for an internationally-leading research University may not be the same as that for a company. The balance point may not even be the same for every role within this University.

I know nothing of the contract between the University and Microsoft. It would be interesting to know what penalties apply should failures on Microsoft's part disrupt our operations, or cause us reputational damage.

The Board rightly criticises the manner of the change. As just one point, it would appear that insufficient thought was given to the needs of elderly life Fellows to whom we owe a service, and who were confused by the change which required some of them to learn a completely new email client. Worse, the change occurred when the UIS was refusing to provide in-person support at its helpdesk. The University has a policy, the Children and Vulnerable

Adults Policy, which covers how the University should approach decisions which will impact those whose mental agility has significantly declined, in order to ensure that we comply with the Equality Act (2010). Some members of the UIS have indicated to me that they have no evidence that this policy was followed.

Some institutional IT staff were unimpressed by the level of support that the UIS expected them to provide for this change. The old understanding was that the UIS provided support for UIS systems, and institutional staff for institutional systems. The UIS neither line-manages, nor funds, institutional IT staff and has no right to make significant demands on their time without properly consulting those who do. Institutional IT staff were left in the dark about the detailed technical implications of the project until a TechLinks seminar on 2 March 2021. Whilst this was very late into the migration project, some basic questions still could not be answered by the UIS, concerning matters such as email provision for retired staff, and also the backup policy for emails, including retention time and manner of accessing backups. That meeting left me with a strong impression that the solution had been chosen for political reasons, and the technical implications of that political decision were still being worked out.

The Board recommends that Council ensures that the UIS is properly accountable. I feel at this point that the Board is being rather unfair to Council. It does not explain how proper accountability could be achieved, and I am not sure it ever has been. In the past, the University Computing Service (UCS) was regulated by the one thing that the Board recommends against, fragmentation. The UCS tended to have the policy that, if you did not like its services, you were free to do things your own way (within reason). It did not have a captive customer base, and crude market forces required it to be responsive to the University's needs in order to remain relevant and politically supported.

Academics work hard to raise grant money, and they will want to ensure that they receive best value from their money in furthering their specific research programmes. I fear defragmentation will reduce the ability of the UIS's customers to take their custom elsewhere, and that we are proposing to do this without any other proven mechanism for aligning the UIS with all the needs in a very diverse University in which one size is unlikely to fit all. The manner of the change from Hermes to Exchange Online has not helped the UIS 'to build confidence and trust of institutions and of Regent House', something the Board rightly sees as a prerequisite for defragmentation and centralisation.

¹ http://www.securityspace.com/s_survey/data/man.202210/mxsurvey.html

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Board's Report, touching on 'the ever-increasing volume and range of business that falls to the HR Division' suggests a review of its 'structure'. It notes that this has not been attempted for more than a decade. As the Board points out, 'matters have become more complex with, for example, the management of significant institutional change'. Some burrowing into its website will take you to a list of HR's sixteen current 'services'.¹

'The Human Resources Committee was established as a joint committee of the Council and the General Board in April 2000 in order to provide a more strategic and coherent approach to personnel management'.² 'Human

Resources' is now a UAS Division with a Director and the same supervisory committee. In the *Statutes and Ordinances* its permitted activity now extends to forty-eight assorted mentions.

The expansion of HR into teaching and research needs scrutiny. Academic Career Pathways are now an HR matter.³ In April 2018 it was the HR Committee which approved a draft Report containing steps towards a 'model aligned to academic titles, to replace the Senior Academic Promotions procedure'.⁴ A 'Pathway' was formally proposed in the ensuing Report of the General Board in the *Reporter* of 10 May 2018, proposing a scheme developed 'from the discussions of a Working Group formed in 2016 under the Talent Management strand of the University's People Strategy'.

The 'People Strategy' seems to have made its appearance in a Notice in the *Reporter* of 4 October 2017. This set out 'the strategic direction of the Human Resources Division for the period 2016 to 2021'.⁵ It has never been Graced. In Discussion of the Report on the detailed arrangements for the Academic Career Pathway in June 2019 a Pro-Vice-Chancellor praised 'the dedicated, professional Human Resources and Equality and Diversity staff who have worked tirelessly on this project'.⁶

HR's third Annual Review of the People Strategy for 2018–19 (apparently its most recent) says it has 'four key themes – recruitment, talent management, reward, and thriving and inclusive community'. 'Talent management' appears in the Annual Report of the General Board published on 11 December 2018, under 'Human Resources-academic staff' as part of HR's 'work on teaching and learning'.

The Board of Scrutiny identifies 'serious teething problems' with the new 'Teaching and Scholarship Pathway'.⁷ The *Reporter* of 19 August 2021 admitted that its launch was to be postponed from the planned date of 1 October 2021 to March 2022, 'to allow sufficient time for necessary system updates'. At its March 2022 meeting the HR Committee discussed problems with the 'Academic (Teaching and Scholarship) Career Pathway Guidance'. Since the scheme had been introduced in 2021 'eligible teaching staff had been invited to move to the new academic (Teaching and Scholarship) contract with effect from 25 March 2022' it noted, but 'it was reported that some Schools felt they had an incomplete picture of the new pathway. However, this was to be expected as some aspects of the scheme were yet to be approved'.

A radical change to this Pathway was made in a General Board Notice of 24 June 2022 with a Grace 'to prevent staff on the Teaching and Scholarship pathway from transferring to the Research and Teaching pathway'. That Grace was withdrawn in the face of a threatened *non placet* (*Reporter*, 6666, 2021–22, p. 639).

A further concern was noted by the HR Committee at its March 2022 meeting. 'It would be disappointing if individuals eligible for promotion, who had been waiting for some years for this opportunity, could not be supported due to lack of funds'. The Faculty with the largest number of staff affected 'had expressed concern about this issue'. The Board now points to 'a lack of clarity on how promotions of non-Chest-funded staff will be paid for and the Board is concerned that some institutions may therefore not allow such staff on open-ended contracts to apply for promotion'.

Here helpfully, and not for the first time, the Board is touching on the problem of the unregulated proliferation of unestablished posts in place of University Offices, of which this is a further instance. It 'recommends that the

Council and the General Board urgently work to resolve concerns over inequitable treatment of non-Chest-funded staff and lack of parity between the two promotion pathways'. It discusses a particular growing anomaly, the 'establishment of fixed-term Professorships supported by external funding'.

A further consequence of the proliferation of unestablished staff is the fact that the EJRA now discriminates against those appointed as Officers. The unestablished are not forced to retire. Officers may be. The aims Cambridge relied on in justifying its EJRA are surely overdue for revisiting? The HR Retirement Policy is dated 2017, so it is five years old.⁸

Now HR 'in conjunction with specialist Unified Administrative Services (UAS) as required, will advise on the most appropriate contractual arrangement to use'.⁹ But is it competent? In HR's 'Workforce Planning Toolkit' (2.2) is a misleading description of Established Officers as differing from the unestablished postholders in being 'on the Roll of the Regent House'. Yet since the approval of Grace 1 of 3 November 2021 there is now a Grade-based model also entitling the unestablished to membership of the Regent House. Did HR not know that?

If the expansion of Human Resources into academic and research matters needs review, so surely, does the disorderly organisation of its website. On its Home page a link (dated 10 October) offers 'Latest News': *New Workforce Policy and Review of Casual Workers*.¹⁰ This is mentioned approvingly by the Board of Scrutiny as covering 'an important aspect of the University's employment arrangements which affect many staff on whom the University relies for the delivery of core teaching, other instruction and research', it says.

On the HR website this policy has now been added at W, at the end of a vast alphabetical list of Policies and Procedures, some of whose contents are barred, including to a Raven password. The Policy mentions the University's *Statutes and Ordinances* here and there but it does not give the references. The enquirer is told to refer to HR's Recruitment Administration System to find out more but that is not accessible with a Raven password.¹¹ An HR Review of 'Casual Worker Status/Contracts'¹² suggests that 'it may be more appropriate to engage casual staff carrying out regular and ongoing teaching on employment contracts' but the last date mentioned is Easter Term 2021 and action is still 'to be confirmed'. There is an Update, 'subject to confirmation' from this Thursday. A webinar is scheduled for this afternoon but this is for 'department users' (not employees or the casual workers).¹³

The Board of Scrutiny recommends that the Council announce a timetable for the completion of the reviews on casual workers and use of fixed-term contracts. The engagement of substitute teaching has rates which were recently sent round by Yammer in pdf form as from 1 October 2022 but the HR website still gives the rates for 2020–21.¹⁴

There is an 'HR Transformation Programme' link on the Home page. Perhaps HR is taking itself and its website in hand? Under the heading 'Info' this tells me that 'the HR Transformation Programme (processes and systems) aims to transform HR capabilities and ways of working leading to an improved employee experience', with most of its front page consisting of Yammer.

I hope the failings of the HR website will be the first item for that overdue review, but there are surely substantive matters which need to be addressed, especially the point where its 'personnel' responsibilities should end

where teaching and research are concerned and the urgent need to revisit the EJRA procedure as employees doing the same job discover that some must retire because they are Officers while their unestablished colleagues need not.

¹ <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/hr-services>

² <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/hr-services/human-resources-committee>

³ <https://www.acp.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/>

⁴ 19 April 2018, Minute 1925/18 (Raven only).

⁵ <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/people-strategy>

⁶ *Reporter*, 6550, 2018–19, p. 655.

⁷ Grace 1 of 12 May 2021.

⁸ https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/retirement_policy_2017_-_web.pdf

⁹ https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/workforce_policy_v1.0_1_oct_22.pdf

¹⁰ <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/new-workforce-policy-and-review-casual-workers>

¹¹ <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/policies-procedures/workforce-policy-guidelines>

¹² <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/hr-staff/casual-workforce-project/review-casual-worker-statuscontracts>

¹³ <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/casual-workforce-project/latest-news/cambridge-casual-worker-system-update-october-2022>

¹⁴ The 2022 rates were not available on the HR website at the time of preparing these remarks but have since been uploaded.

Dr W. J. ASTLE (MRC Biostatistics Unit, and Cambridge University and College Union Executive Committee), read by the Senior Pro-Practor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Board of Scrutiny has produced a report which raises some important concerns about pay, pensions and employment practices in the University. As Treasurer of the Cambridge branch of the University and College Union (UCU), I wish to make some remarks in response. The UCU, which represents the academic-related, research and academic staff of the University, is in dispute with higher education employers in the UK because of their persistent refusal to address many of the problems identified by the Board.

The current run of concern from the Board about remuneration in the University goes back to the fourth recommendation of its Twentieth Report (*Reporter*, 6394, 2014–15, p. 770), in which the University was urged to ‘continue to explore total remuneration packages as a means of attracting the most talented staff’. In that report, the Board noted that ‘uncompetitive salaries’ meant that ‘neither a young post-doc nor a newly recruited Professor will find working in the University financially attractive’. Subsequently, reports from the Board have expressed concerns more firmly. In its Twenty-second Report the Board noted that ‘the effective deterioration in pay relative to cost of living urgently requires addressing’ and ‘doubt[ed] whether continuing to offer sub-inflationary pay increases to core academic and academic-related staff for the next seven years is sustainable’ (*Reporter*, 6478, 2017–18, p. 24).

Since the publication of the Board’s Twentieth Report in 2015, the annual increments applied to the single salary spine by the University and Colleges Employers’ Association amount to a compound increase in nominal salary or stipend of 9.5%, except for staff employed at the lowest spine points. The Office for National Statistics reports that, in the UK over the same period, inflation in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) was 24% and the increase in average weekly earnings was 26%.^{1,2} The pay of higher education workers has been cut substantially in real terms

and cut substantially relative to the pay of other workers. The Board points to the obvious consequence in this Report – professional support staff will vote with their feet ‘in the face of market competition where salaries may be up to 50% higher’. The willingness of academic and research staff to tolerate the continual suppression of their remuneration must also have its limit. A recent news item in *Nature* reports that ‘even high-profile scientists are struggling to recruit qualified postdoctoral researchers’.³ ‘I don’t know anyone worldwide who currently doesn’t complain how hard it is to find postdocs’, laments a Cambridge Professor.

The Monetary Policy Committee of the Bank of England predicts that CPI inflation, high since March, will remain above 10% until the end of the first quarter of 2023.⁴ In this context, the announcement last month by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for University Community and Engagement of an exceptional, non-pensionable payment to non-clinical staff, consisting of 4% of basic pay over six months, looks like the sort of charitable ‘tinkering at margins’ that the Board warns against here in its Report. How many years of sub-inflationary pay rises can the University afford if it is to maintain its academic standards?

The effect of national pay restraint on the recruitment and retention of staff at this University is particularly pronounced because of the high cost of accommodation in Cambridge. According to the Land Registry, since 1995 the price of housing in Cambridge has increased by 591%, while the price of housing in the UK generally has increased by 436%.⁵ Cambridge UCU supports national pay bargaining, but given the particular change in the cost of accommodation in Cambridge over the last three decades, is it time for the University to consider a permanent cost of living supplement for staff and research students?

Staff remuneration consists of pension as well as pay. A pension is a form of deferred pay and, whatever the legal technicalities, its value forms part of an implicit agreement with the employer. In 2018, Universities UK (UUK) – the employers’ representatives on pension matters – tried to close the defined benefit (DB) element of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS), in favour of the defined contribution (DC) element. This was an attempt to off-load the cost of insuring the risk associated with pension investments onto university staff. The response of this university to the UUK consultation on the proposal argued that ‘the balance of benefits between DB and DC should move much more towards DC’, and stated that: ‘The University has other demands on uses of money in pursuit of its mission than to pay more into USS. In particular, the University wishes to protect the long term health of the University as a major asset to the UK economy.’⁶ Skirting around the legitimacy of this administrative redefinition of the purpose of the University to include support for the national economy, it is important to remember that UCU strike action in 2018 altered the position of the University on USS and prevented the closure of the DB element of the scheme. The pensions of the staff whose labour sustains the major national asset were given a temporary reprieve.

In March 2020, the USS trustees chose to conduct a valuation of the USS scheme during a dip in asset prices caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. Unsurprisingly, this valuation concluded that the scheme had a significant deficit. Rather than temporarily increase their contributions until the next valuation, to maintain the value of staff benefits – to mirror a contribution holiday taken from 1997 – the employers chose to impose major cuts to the DB element of the scheme, effective from April 2022. UCU modelling suggests that staff beginning their careers stand

to lose approximately a third of the guaranteed portion of their future retirement income, unless these cuts are reversed.⁷ The good news is that recent data from the trustees suggests that the scheme now has a £1.8bn surplus,⁸ which is almost certainly sufficient to restore the benefits lost retroactively.^{9,10} The Board's Report 'welcomes the University taking a leadership role in the national negotiations over the 2020 valuation'. The ball is now in the employers' court.

Real terms cuts to pay and pensions are not the only material costs to staff in the era of the higher education market. Risk is increasingly transferred to staff through casual employment practices. The Board has expressed its concern before about 'the unregulated proliferation of unestablished posts: the risk to the University of employing individuals doing the same job on different terms and conditions, undermining the University office as the career path of staff delivering core teaching, research and professional services, and possible decline in academic standards as the workforce is casualised' (*Reporter*, 6633, 2020–21, p. 62 at p. 71).

Much of the casual employment associated with teaching at Cambridge is the responsibility of the Colleges, but graduate-level taught courses, which are the responsibility of the University, also depend on casual teaching, often performed by staff on research contracts or by research students. Research in the scientific Schools of the University is performed almost entirely by staff employed on short term contracts. Between July 2012 and July 2021 the number of contract research staff in the University rose by 27%, from 3,120 to 3,966, while the number of established academic staff rose by 8%, from 1,435 to 1,550. In July 2012, the academic-related staff of the University were employed in roughly equal proportions on an established ($n=710$) and unestablished ($n=703$) basis. By July 2021, one fifth ($n=526$) of such staff were employed on an established basis and four fifths on an unestablished basis ($n=2,224$).

As the Board points out, employment practices form an area 'in which the University has the flexibility to act without national negotiation'. Its recommendation that the Council announce a timetable for the completion of the review of the use of fixed-term contracts and unestablished posts in the University is welcome. So too, is the call for that review to consider the practice of appointing externally funded academics by a 'legal fiction' of employment coterminous with a position – often titular or honorary – that is logically equivalent to the continuation of external funding for the post. This appears to be an attempt to create by the backdoor an office of unestablished Professor *de facto*; the thin edge of a dangerous wedge.

This autumn, the UCU held national ballots to determine whether our members are willing to resort to industrial action to resolve the disputes over USS pensions and pay and working conditions. More than 80% of members voted to support strike action in each ballot. The ballots were nationally aggregated, which means the union has a mandate to strike at almost every university in the UK. It is regrettable that for the fourth time in five years it has become necessary for the UCU to disrupt the activity of the University and the education of its students, in order to defend the standard of living of University staff and their future security as pensioners. We hope that the University will use its influence with other employers to ensure the proper settlement of legitimate grievances. If not, we expect to see exceptionally strong support for the forthcoming strike action. Cambridge UCU received a record number of reports from members stating that they

had voted in the industrial action ballots. We invite all members of University staff who are eligible to join the picket lines and fight with us to defend their pay, pensions and working conditions.

¹ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflationandpriceindices/timeseries/d7bt/mm23>

² <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peoplinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/bulletins/averageweeklyearningsingreatbritain/latest>

³ Lab leaders wrestle with paucity of postdocs, *Nature*, Career News, 30 August 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-02781-x>

⁴ <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy-report/2022/november-2022>

⁵ <https://landregistry.data.gov.uk/app/ukhpi/>

⁶ https://www.staff.admin.cam.ac.uk/system/files/download/uoc_response_to_the_uuk_survey_on_the_2017_uss_valuation_final.docx

⁷ <https://www.ucu.org.uk/ussmodeller>

⁸ See *Reporter*, 6675, 2022–23, p. 112.

⁹ <https://www.uss.co.uk/-/media/project/ussmainsite/files/news-and-views/briefings-and-analysis/indicative-costs-of-enhancing-benefits.pdf>

¹⁰ <https://www.uss.co.uk/-/media/project/ussmainsite/files/news-and-views/briefings-and-analysis/indicative-contribution-requirements-for-the-pre-and-post-1-april-2022-benefit-structures.pdf>

Professor R. J. ANDERSON (Department of Computer Science and Technology and Churchill College), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as a former member of the Board, I would have preferred to speak in person to this excellent Report today, but it clashes with our Faculty Annual Meeting.

It is welcome that the University is returning to normal operation after the disruption of the pandemic. I would like therefore to bring to Regents' attention a policy issue which, I understand, the last Vice-Chancellor was talking about tackling before the pandemic struck. It cuts across many of the issues raised in the Board's Report, including HR policies, established versus unestablished posts, pensions, remuneration, and research grant income.

That issue is the forced retirement of officers at the end of the academic year in which they turn 67, under the Employer Justified Retirement Age policy that this House introduced in 2012.

We live in a different world now.

Ten years ago, we assumed that other universities would also keep a retirement age. They did not. I understand that in England only Oxford and Cambridge do so. Oxford has stopped it applying to academic-related staff and raised the retirement age for academic staff to 70.

Ten years ago, we were told that officers who remained active could stay on for a while on soft money, so that Professors could become Directors of Research if they could raise the funds. But in recent years, that path has been blocked: we are not allowed to apply for research grants that run past our retirement date. This blights the research of many officers in our sixties, and of the postdocs who work for us. It has been a disaster for some colleagues who accepted senior posts here without being aware of it.

Ten years ago, staff could look forward to retiring on a pension of half their final salary. Now, it looks like I'll get a third, while more junior staff will get even less.

But the issues are not just financial. It is the duty of an academic to devote themselves to the advancement of their

subject, and for many years officers at Cambridge did not sign contracts of employment, but just signed the admissions book to acknowledge this vocation.

Ten years ago, retired staff would usually keep their offices and continue to contribute to the life of the University. Now, some departments kick us out on retirement, and others after a year. There was even an attempt to kick retired staff off the University's email system. And as other services get outsourced and move to per-seat licensing, there will eventually be questions about access to libraries by people who are neither employees nor students.

It now appears that this policy is illegal. Professor Paul Ewart took Oxford to the Employment Tribunal for unlawful age discrimination. He won reinstatement and compensation. His victory was confirmed last year by the Employment Appeal Tribunal. His primary evidence was a statistical analysis of outcomes across Russell Group universities which showed that the mandatory retirement policy at Oxford and Cambridge had entirely failed to deliver the benefits claimed for its justification.

As well as being illegal age discrimination, our mandatory retirement age makes no economic sense. Every September we sack about thirty officers, many of them senior Professors who were pulling in major income streams until the Old Schools stopped them. We would surely be better off if we managed retirement the same way as almost all other UK universities, allowing staff to retire flexibly between 60 and 75 in accordance with USS provisions. Older staff must be treated fairly and encouraged to continue their contribution, including fundraising, for as long as they are willing and able.

I understand that the University's risk register has for some years contained an entry to the effect that a successful challenge to the retirement age poses a threat to our

finances. This was a mistake, both as a matter of fact and as a means of driving policy. Retirement policy must not be driven by legal defensiveness but by the best interests of both staff and the University, in the light of best practice and of evidence. It must respect our academic vocation and support our community of scholars. I therefore ask that when the Council publishes timetables for the review of established and unestablished posts, and of the inequitable treatment of staff funded from the Chest or otherwise, as demanded by this report, it also announces a timetable for a vote in this House for the repeal of the retirement age.

Dr P. BROOKS (Department of Computer Science and Technology), read by the Junior Proctor:

I have been a Computer Officer in the Computer Laboratory for over 40 years, and a Safety Officer for over 25 years. I am the only holder of a wealth of IT and HS knowledge going back to (before) the planning of the Department's move to the West Cambridge site (we have had four Building Service Managers since then). I would like to have a tapered retirement, to keep in touch with the Department while passing on most of my current duties. However, the University proposes to sack me on 30 September 2024. Yesterday the Registry mentioned that Oxford are raising the forced retirement age to 70, and that academic-related staff are not included, and that Cambridge will be 'looking into' doing something similar. Can I ask that this be done sooner rather than later, as such unlawful age discrimination does not reflect well on the University?

COLLEGE NOTICES

Election

Darwin College

Elected into an Advanced Research Fellowship (Title A) from 1 November 2022:

Edwin David Rose, Ph.D., *CHU*

Vacancies

Corpus Christi College: Non-Stipendiary Visiting Professorships (two available); tenure: one term: one post is available for Michaelmas Term 2023 (October to December 2023), the other for Lent Term 2024 (January to March 2024); closing date: 1 February 2023 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.corpus.cam.ac.uk/about/opportunities/visiting-professorships-and-visiting-fellowships>

Peterhouse: Graduate Studentships 2023 (several available); tenure: three years from 1 October 2023; full or partial funding available according to circumstances; closing date: 6 January 2023 at 5 p.m.; further details: https://www.resfell.pet.cam.ac.uk/phd_2023

SOCIETIES, ETC.

Cambridge Philosophical Society

The Society's final talk of the Michaelmas Term will take place in person at 6.30 p.m. on Monday, 21 November 2022 in the Bristol-Myers Squibb Lecture Theatre, Department of Chemistry, Lensfield Road. Professor Jim Secord, Emeritus Professor and Director of the Darwin Correspondence Project, Department of History and Philosophy of Science, will give a Lecture entitled *Eureka! How the history of science became a story of discovery*.

Further details and booking information are available at: <https://www.cambridgephilosophicalsociety.org/>

Society for the History of the University

The next meeting of the Society will be held at 5.30 p.m. on Thursday, 1 December 2022 in the John Bradfield Room, Darwin College. Dr Jill Whitelock will give a paper entitled '*Lock up your libraries?*': *Women readers at Cambridge University Library, 1855–1923*. Refreshments will be served from 5 p.m.

EXTERNAL NOTICES

Oxford Notices

Department of Education and Harris Manchester

College: Professorship of Education and Professorial Fellowship of Harris Manchester College; tenure: from autumn 2023 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 9 January 2023 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk/>, vacancy ID: 161406

Faculty of English and New College: Goldsmiths'

Professorship of English Literature; tenure: from 1 September 2023 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 16 January 2023 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk/>, vacancy ID: 160944

New College: The Astor Junior Research Fellowship in English; tenure: three years from 1 October 2023; salary: £24,833; closing date: 9 December 2022 at 11.59 p.m.; further details: https://isw.changeworkknow.co.uk/new_college_oxford/vms/e/careers/search/new

The Juliana Cuyler Matthews Junior Research Fellowship in Psychology; tenure: three years from 1 October 2023; salary: £24,833; closing date: 8 December 2022 at 11.59 p.m.; further details: https://isw.changeworkknow.co.uk/new_college_oxford/vms/e/careers/search/new

The Salvesen Junior Fellowship; tenure: three years from 1 October 2023; salary: £24,833; closing date: 6 December 2022 at 11.59 p.m.; further details: https://isw.changeworkknow.co.uk/new_college_oxford/vms/e/careers/search/new

St Cross College: 'A Medley of Dvořák and Dances', concert of dance music by the Crosswinds ensemble; on 1 December 2022 at 7 p.m. in the Hall; all welcome; information and booking: <https://www.stx.ox.ac.uk/event/a-medley-of-dvorak-and-dances-concert>

© 2022 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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