

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6635

WEDNESDAY 3 NOVEMBER 2021

VOL CLII No 6

## CONTENTS

<b>Notices</b>			
Calendar	95		
Discussion on Tuesday, 9 November 2021	95		
Election of a member of the Council's Finance Committee in class (b)	95		
Report of the Council on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff: Notice in response to Discussion remarks	96		
University-wide Conflict of Interest Policy	96		
<b>Vacancies, appointments, etc.</b>			
Electors to the Professorship of English	97		
Vacancies in the University	97		
<b>Notices by Faculty Boards, etc.</b>			
Mathematical Tripos, Part III, 2021–22: Papers	97		
Anthropocene Studies for the M.Phil. Degree, 2021–22	99		
Holocene Climates for the M.Phil. Degree, 2021–22	99		
<b>Graces</b>			
Graces submitted to the Regent House on 3 November 2021	99		
<b>Acta</b>			
Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 20 October 2021	100		
Congregation of the Regent House on 3 November 2021: Honorary Degree	100		
		<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
		<b>Report of Discussion: 26 October 2021</b>	
		Remarks on the Report of the Council on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff	102
		Remarks on the Report of the Council on the arrangements for Discussions	104
		Remarks on the Report of the General Board on the establishment of a Professorship	105
		<b>College Notices</b>	
		Elections	106
		Vacancies	106
		Events	107
		Awards	107
		<b>External Notices</b>	
		Oxford Notices	107



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

**NOTICES****Calendar**

3 November, *Wednesday*. Scarlet Day. Congregation of the Regent House at 3.30 p.m. (Honorary Degree) (see p. 100).

7 November, *Sunday*. Commemoration of Benefactors. Scarlet Day. Preacher before the University at 10 a.m., Sarah Teather, of St John's College, Director of the Jesuit Refugee Service UK (Lady Margaret's Preacher).

9 November, *Tuesday*. Michaelmas Term divides. Discussion in the Senate-House at 2 p.m. (see below).

**Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 pm.)**

9 November

23 November

7 December

**Congregations (Saturdays unless otherwise stated)**

3 November (Wednesday), 3.30 p.m. (Honorary Degree)

27 November, 10 a.m.

**Discussion on Tuesday, 9 November 2021**

The Vice-Chancellor invites members of the Regent House, University and College employees, registered students and others qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105 as amended by Grace 2 of 28 April 2021) to attend a Discussion **in the Senate-House**, on Tuesday, 9 November 2021 at 2 p.m. The following Reports will be discussed:

1. Twenty-sixth Report of the Board of Scrutiny, dated 7 October 2021 (*Reporter*, 6633, 2021–22, p. 62).
2. Report of the General Board, dated 21 October 2021, on the re-establishment of a Professorship (*Reporter*, 6634, 2021–22, p. 82).

Those wishing to attend should refer to the Notice on arrangements for attending Discussions (*Reporter*, 6630, 2021–22, p. 4). Contributors who are unable to attend in person may email remarks to [contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk](mailto:contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk), copying [ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk), by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion, for reading out by the Proctors,<sup>1</sup> or ask someone else who is attending to read the remarks on their behalf. General information on Discussions is provided on the Governance site at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions>.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**Election of a member of the Council's Finance Committee in class (b)**

*1 November 2021*

There will be a vacancy on the Council's Finance Committee for a member of the Regent House, elected by representatives of the Colleges, to serve for three years from 1 January 2022.

The election is conducted in accordance with the Single Transferable Vote regulations. Voting is by postal ballot.

Nominations should be made in writing to the Head of the Governance and Compliance Division, University Offices, The Old Schools, Cambridge, CB2 1TN, and must include a statement by the person nominated that they are willing to serve on the Finance Committee. Nominations should be supported by the signatures of two members of the Regent House. The deadline for receipt of nominations and statements is 12 noon on Wednesday, 17 November 2021. Please send them as a scan/photograph by email to [HdGCDEA@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:HdGCDEA@admin.cam.ac.uk); an email from the nominee received from a University email account, copied to the University email accounts of the proposer and seconder of the nomination will also be accepted.

If a ballot is necessary, papers will be dispatched by Monday, 22 November 2021, for return by 12 noon on Friday, 3 December 2021.

## Report of the Council on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff: Notice in response to Discussion remarks

The Council has received the remarks made on the above Report at the Discussion on 26 October 2021 (*Reporter*, 2021–22: 6632, p. 47; and p. 102 below).

Professor Evans and Dr Rutter both interrogate whether a model for Regent House membership for University staff based on employment grade is the best way to identify the membership of the University's governing body. They and Dr Holmes point to the importance of the University being an academic-led institution. Professor Evans records the history of the inclusion of academic-related staff and warns against 'any further departure from an 'academic' towards a 'general employee' Regent House.' Dr Rutter suggests that the Grade 9 threshold should be applied to academic and research staff only. The Council has some sympathy with the view that a model based on roles would be preferable, but, as it noted in its report in March 2021 (*Reporter*, 6609, 2020–21, p. 395), the proliferation of job titles has made such a model unworkable. In the modelling of the numbers, it notes that those included in the categories of 'Academic' and 'Research' far outnumber those in the 'Professional Services' category, together accounting for 73% and 74% of the total membership in the G9 and GG9 models (*Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 452).

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 99) for the approval of the recommendations of this Report, on which a ballot will be held (*Reporter*, 6633, 2021–22, p. 56).

## University-wide Conflict of Interest Policy

The Council is grateful to all those who responded to the invitation for comments on the supporting documentation for the new University-wide Conflict of Interest Policy and who participated in the pilot of the annual declaration of interests form over the summer (see the Notice published in July 2021: *Reporter*, 6627, 2020–21, p. 771).

In response to the feedback received, the Council has now approved a minor amendment to the Policy to clarify that those who regularly attend meetings of the University's principal decision-making bodies, such as the Council, the General Board and the Finance Committee, should participate in the annual declaration of interests process. The original version of the Policy asked only members of those bodies to declare their interests. For the purposes of the Policy, 'regular attendees' are those individuals who have a standing invitation to attend the meetings and who receive a full set of the unreserved papers. The associated documentation and annual declaration of interests form have been updated to reflect the change and to take account of other feedback which was received during the consultation.

The Policy will take effect on 1 January 2022. Members of staff are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the Policy which, as detailed in the Notice in July 2021, is designed to present a risk-based and proportionate approach to managing conflicts of interests.

Faculties, Departments and other institutions are asked to implement the Policy by:

- ensuring that staff within their institutions, plus any student or external members of their institution's committees, are made aware of the Policy;
- ensuring that an up-to-date register of conflicts of interests is maintained for their institution; and
- determining, in liaison with the declarer, how to manage each conflict within their local context.

By 1 January 2022, these local registers of conflicts of interests should record the agreed actions for managing any declared conflicts (including noting where no actions are necessary).

The Governance and Compliance Division will also invite Heads of Institutions, plus members and regular attendees of the University's principal decision-making bodies, to complete an online declaration of interests form. The level of disclosure required in this form is greater than that expected for other staff because it encompasses not only existing conflicts of interest but also potential conflicts of interests with the individual's University duties. These declarations will be recorded in the appropriate registers of interests, together with a record of any mitigating actions that are deemed necessary to ensure that business decisions are made objectively and in the best interests of the University.

The University-wide Conflict of Interest Policy is published on the Governance and Compliance Division's website at <https://www.governanceandcompliance.admin.cam.ac.uk/governance-and-strategy/university-wide-conflict-interest-policy>, together with various associated materials, including FAQs for:

- individuals in institutions;
- Heads of Institutions and Departmental Administrators;
- the Chairs and Secretaries of the principal decision-making bodies;
- the declaration of interests form.

Queries and comments on the Policy should be sent to [GCDEnquiries@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:GCDEnquiries@admin.cam.ac.uk).

## VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

### Electors to the Professorship of English

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Professorship of English as follows:

Ms Sonita Alleyne, *JE*, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Raphael Lyne, *MUR*

Professor Ros Ballaster, *University of Oxford*

(b) *on the nomination of the General Board*

Professor Heather Love, *University of Pennsylvania*

Professor Clair Wills, *MUR*

Professor Chris Young, *PEM*

(c) *on the nomination of the Faculty Board of English*

Professor Peter de Bolla, *K*

Professor Priyamvada Gopal, *CHU*

Professor Maureen McLane, *New York University*

### Vacancies in the University

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

**Professorship of English in the Faculty of English;** tenure: from 1 October 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; informal enquiries: Professor Raphael Lyne, Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: [rtr100@cam.ac.uk](mailto:rtr100@cam.ac.uk)); closing date: 15 December 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/32052/>; quote reference: GG28730

**Genzyme Professorship of Experimental Medicine in the Department of Medicine;** start date: as soon as possible, on a date to be agreed with the Board of Electors; informal enquiries: Professor Ken Smith, Head of Department (email: [hodmed@medschl.cam.ac.uk](mailto:hodmed@medschl.cam.ac.uk)); closing date: 23 November 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/32133/>; quote reference: RC28801

**Gnodde Goldman Sachs Professorship of Neuroinformatics in the Department of Psychiatry;** tenure: from 1 October 2022; informal enquiries: Professor Ed Bullmore, Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: [etb23@medschl.cam.ac.uk](mailto:etb23@medschl.cam.ac.uk)); closing date: 22 November 2021; further details: <https://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/32026/>; quote reference: RN28705

*The University values diversity and is committed to equality of opportunity.*

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

## NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.

### Mathematical Tripos, Part III, 2021–22: Papers

The Faculty Board of Mathematics gives notice that, in accordance with Regulations 15 and 16 for the Mathematical Tripos (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 384), there will be set in 2022 if candidates desire to present themselves therein, a paper in each of the subjects in the following list. The duration of the paper is also shown.

101	Commutative algebra	3 hours
102	Finite dimensional lie and associative algebras	3 hours
104	Infinite groups	3 hours
105	Analysis of PDEs	3 hours
106	Functional analysis	3 hours
107	Elliptic PDEs	3 hours
109	Combinatorics	2 hours
111	Coxeter groups	2 hours
112	Knots	3 hours
113	Algebraic geometry	3 hours
114	Algebraic topology	3 hours
115	Differential geometry	3 hours
116	Large cardinals	2 hours
117	Five ways to think about primes	3 hours
118	Complex manifolds	3 hours
119	Category theory	3 hours
120	Computability and logic	3 hours
125	Elliptic curves	3 hours
129	Introduction to additive combinatorics	2 hours

136	Local fields	3 hours
137	Modular forms	3 hours
140	Symplectic geometry	2 hours
152	Toric geometry	3 hours
154	Introduction to non-linear analysis	3 hours
156	Mapping class groups	2 hours
160	Representation theory of symmetric groups	3 hours
201	Advanced probability	3 hours
202	Stochastic calculus and application	3 hours
203	Schramm-Loewner evolutions	2 hours
204	Percolation and related topics	2 hours
205	Modern statistical methods	3 hours
207	Statistics in medical practice	3 hours
208	Concentration inequalities	2 hours
210	Topics in statistical theory	2 hours
211	Advanced financial models	3 hours
215	Mixing times of Markov chains	2 hours
218	Statistical learning in practice	3 hours
219	Astrostatistics	3 hours
221	Causal inference	2 hours
223	Robust statistics	2 hours
224	Information theory	2 hours
225	Functional data analysis	2 hours
301	Quantum field theory	3 hours
302	Symmetries, particles and fields	3 hours
303	Statistical field theory	2 hours
304	Advanced quantum field theory	3 hours
305	Standard model	3 hours
306	String theory	3 hours
307	Supersymmetry	3 hours
309	General relativity	3 hours
310	Cosmology	3 hours
311	Black holes	3 hours
312	Field theory in cosmology	3 hours
313	Solitons, instantons and geometry	2 hours
314	Astrophysical fluid dynamics	3 hours
315	Extrasolar planets: Atmospheres and interiors	3 hours
317	Structure and evolution of stars	3 hours
319	Unbounded operators and semigroups	2 hours
320	Modern stellar dynamics	2 hours
321	Dynamics of astrophysical discs	2 hours
322	Binary stars	2 hours
323	Quantum information theory	3 hours
324	Quantum computation	3 hours
325	Quantum information, foundations and gravity	2 hours
326	Inverse problems	2 hours
327	Distribution theory and applications	2 hours
329	Slow viscous flow	3 hours
332	Fluid dynamics of the solid Earth	3 hours
333	Fluid dynamics of climate	3 hours
336	Perturbation methods	2 hours
339	Topics in convex optimisation	2 hours
341	Numerical solution of differential equations	3 hours
344	Theoretical physics of soft condensed matter	2 hours
345	Fluid dynamics of the environment	3 hours
346	Formation of galaxies	3 hours
347	Astrophysical black holes	2 hours
354	Gauge/gravity duality	2 hours
355	Biological physics and fluid dynamics	3 hours
356	Stochastic processes in theoretical physics and biology	2 hours

The Faculty Board reminds candidates and Tutors that requests for papers to be set on additional subjects should be sent to the Secretary of the Faculty Board, c/o the Undergraduate Office, Faculty of Mathematics, Wilberforce Road (faculty@maths.cam.ac.uk) not later than 9 November 2021.

## Anthropocene Studies for the M.Phil. Degree, 2021–22

The Faculty Board of Earth Sciences and Geography gives notice that, with effect from the assessments held in 2021–22, the form and conduct of the examination in Anthropocene Studies for the degree of Master of Philosophy will be as follows:

Essay of 4,000 words (20%): The Anthropocene

Written paper of two hours duration (30%): The Anthropocene and interdisciplinary concepts

Dissertation (50%), consisting of:

- a written proposal – three pages (5%)
- an oral presentation (5%)
- a dissertation – 15,000 words (40%)

The written examination paper will contain no fewer than eight questions of which candidates will be required to answer two, one from Section A (Interdisciplinary concepts) and one from Section B (Anthropocene studies). Each question carries equal weight.

## Holocene Climates for the M.Phil. Degree, 2021–22

The Faculty Board of Earth Sciences and Geography gives notice that, with effect from the assessments held in 2021–22, the form and conduct of the examination in Holocene Climates for the degree of Master of Philosophy will be as follows:

Essay of 4,000 words (20%): Holocene climates

Written paper of two hours duration (30%): Holocene climates and interdisciplinary concepts

Dissertation (50%), consisting of:

- a written proposal – three pages (5%)
- an oral presentation (5%)
- a dissertation – 15,000 words (40%)

The written examination paper will contain no fewer than eight questions of which candidates will be required to answer two, one from Section A (Interdisciplinary concepts) and one from Section C (Holocene climates). Each question carries equal weight.

## GRACES

### Graces submitted to the Regent House on 3 November 2021

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. Grace 1 is subject to a ballot (see *Reporter*, 6633, 2021–22, p. 56) and the deadline for requests for its amendment, in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 105), is **4 p.m. on Friday, 12 November 2021**. Grace 2 will be deemed to have been approved by the same deadline unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House. Further information on requests for a ballot or the amendment of Graces is available to members of the Regent House on the Regent House Petitions site.<sup>§</sup>

**1.** That the recommendations in paragraph 10 of the Report of the Council, dated 11 October 2021, on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff (*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 47) be approved.<sup>1</sup>

**2.** That the recommendations in paragraph 4 of the Report of the General Board, dated 8 October 2021, on the establishment of a Professorship (*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 51) be approved.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the Council's Notice on p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> The Council thanks Dr Astle for his remarks on this Report (p. 105), to which a response will be published in due course. As Dr Astle states that his remarks are not specific to the Report's proposals, the Council is putting forward a Grace for the approval of the recommendations of the Report.

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

## ACTA

**Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 20 October 2021**

The Graces submitted to the Regent House on 20 October 2021 (*Reporter*, 6633, 2021–22, p. 73) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 29 October 2021.

**Congregation of the Regent House on 3 November 2021: Honorary Degree**

A Congregation of the Regent House was held this day at 3.30 p.m. The Chancellor was present and a procession formed in the Schools Arcade, which then entered the Senate-House by the South Door. Ringing from the University Church was organised by the University Bellringer, Dr Frank King, of Churchill College.

Music was performed during the Congregation by the Cambridge University Brass Ensemble, directed by Christopher Lawrence, of Newnham College, by members of the choir of St John's College, and by Alex Semple, also of St John's College. The programme of music was arranged by the University Organist, Andrew Nethsingha, of St John's College. The Chancellor's train-bearer was Max Murphy, of Pembroke College.

The following titular degree was conferred:

*Doctor of Law* (honoris causa)

**His Excellency ANTÓNIO GUTERRES**

*Secretary-General of the United Nations*

The Orator delivered the following speech when presenting to the Chancellor the recipient of the Honorary Degree:

**D**VOBVS fere his annis, Magistri, pestilentiam adhuc ignotam ultimas etiam terras peragrante populos uastare uidemus. praesaeptis aditibus atque itineribus omnium nationum haud multum abest quin gens quaeque commodis suis potius consuluisse quam contra commune periculum praesidium commune parasse uideatur. etiam hoc senaculum desertum et totum silentio relictum est, neque eos quos honestare nobis placuit solito more ad uos adducere poterat Orator. quae cum ita sint quanto gaudio hoc tempore redundamus, quod tanto spatio temporis intermisso nunc demum hunc uirum primum possumus salutare qui claustris inter nationes interpositis demoliendis studet. quantam quoque gratiam ei habemus qui otium nobis uisitandis suppeditat, βουλευφόρος ἄνηρ ᾧ λαοί τ' ἐπιτετράφαται καὶ τόσσα μέμληε.

cum immensam et interminatam in omnis partis multitudinem regionum aut impotenti incendio conflagrare aut surgente mari inundari aut tempestatis subito coortae uiolentia et imbris eradi uideamus, quis est qui hunc uirum monentem non audiat? naturae ipsi nos bellum inferre ait quo fieri possit ut posteritas prius euertatur quam periculum intellexerimus. cum per speciem uitia tollendi et uirtutis colendae mulieres et omnes qui qualibet causa a maiore parte hominum contemnuntur aequo iure destituti iniquitate opprimantur, quis huius uiri signum belli clarissimum neglegat, numquam fore ut omnes in iuris conditionem aequam recipiantur dum dimidia pars gentis humanae in ui odio impotentia quotidie uersetur? nec, ut opinor, si quis quantulaecumque bonitatis se esse simulat, cum conspiciat consocios undique in summum periculum et discrimen adductos esse, uerborum eius erit immemor qui refugientibus erat praepositus: qui de capite, inquit, uerentur nullo modo prohibere possumus quominus ad salutem fugere conentur. hoc solum constituendum esse, quanta liberalitate, quanta humanitate aduenas accepturi simus.

dignissime domine, Domine Cancellarie, et tota academia, praesento uobis excellentissimum hunc uirum Vnitarum Nationum senatui praefectum, ab eisdem summum refugientibus olim praepositum, ministrorum Lusitanorum quondam caput,

ANTÓNIO GUTERRES,

ut honoris causa habeat titulum gradus Doctoris in Iure.



**I**T IS almost two years now since a hitherto unknown virus began its inexorable spread throughout the world. Millions of people have died. Countries closed their borders, and it has often seemed that they have looked to their own interests rather than try to build a common defence against a common enemy. Even this Senate-House was abandoned and silent, nor was your Orator able to present to you in the customary fashion those whom the University had chosen to honour. With what joy, then, after so long an interval, do we now welcome this man, who has dedicated himself to breaking down the barriers between nations. How grateful are we that he has made the time to visit us, for he is, as Homer put it, a statesman to whom the care of the nations is entrusted, and he has a great deal on his plate.<sup>1</sup>

When boundless tracts of land are consumed by wild fires or submerged beneath the waters of the rising oceans or ravaged by the violence of freak storms, who will not heed this man's warning: we have declared war, he says, on nature herself; and we might destroy our very future before we have even understood the risk. When, in the name of the propagation of virtue and the prevention of vice, we see women and minorities deprived of their fundamental rights, who could ignore his Call to Action? For there can be no human rights for all people while half of the population of the world is subject to violence, misogyny and exclusion. Nor, I think, when faced with the catastrophes we see across the globe, with the extremes of desperation to which so many are reduced, could anyone who makes even the slightest pretence of decency ignore his admonition: we cannot deter people fleeing for their lives, he says; they will come. The only choice we have is how humanely we receive them.

*Distinguished Chancellor, members of the University, I present to you*

ANTÓNIO GUTERRES,

*His Excellency The Secretary-General of the United Nations,  
sometime United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees  
and former Prime Minister of Portugal,*

*that he may receive the title of the degree of Doctor of Law, honoris causa.*

<sup>1</sup> II. 2.24.

Following his admission to the degree, the Honorary Graduate delivered an address.<sup>2</sup>

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

**END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'**

<sup>2</sup> The text of the address is available at: <https://www.cam.ac.uk/about-the-university/how-the-university-and-colleges-work/processes/honorary-degrees/un-secretary-generals-remarks-2021>. A video of the proceedings has also been made available via the University's YouTube channel, at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WPN99Uv1RI4>.



## REPORT OF DISCUSSION

### Tuesday, 26 October 2021

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Deputy Vice-Chancellor Mr Roger Mosey was presiding, with the Registry's deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Junior Pro-Procutor and one other person present.

The following Reports were discussed:

***Report of the Council, dated 11 October 2021, on changes to the criteria for Regent House membership of University staff***

(*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 47).

Dr N. J. HOLMES (University Council and Department of Pathology), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a member of the Council and Chair of the Governance Review Working Group, but my remarks are made in a personal capacity.

This Report sets out proposals for revising the basis for determining the Regent House membership for the majority of University staff. Those proposals draw on the recommendations made by a Working Group of which I was Chair, and follow the direction provided by indicative votes held in Easter Term 2021.

The voting suggested that there was strong support for the introduction of a grade-based model for the Regent House membership of staff in the University. The Working Group was satisfied that this would provide a fairer membership model than the existing criteria. Pay grades provide the most practicable means to assess qualification, given the unworkable number of role titles among all our staff. A fuller note on the rationale for the adoption of this model is set out in the Council's report on the proposals published in March.<sup>1</sup>

For the rest of my remarks, I wish to focus on the question as to the location of the grade boundary. The Working Group spent some time developing the principles that would guide who should be included in the membership. It took the view that these pointed to a membership at Grade 9 and above. Such a membership reflects a University that considers itself 'academic-led'. Under the G7+ model, even with a three-year service requirement, the number of research staff and professional services staff at Grades 7 and 8 will exceed the number of University academic staff. Without the service requirement, staff in Grades 7 and 8 would exceed academic staff by nearly 3,000.

The Working Group took the view that it was important that transitional arrangements were in place. Under this Report's recommendations, current Regent House members at Grades 7 and 8 will retain their membership while they remain in post.

Although a wider enfranchisement would present a slight improvement in gender balance (but none in ethnicity), this improvement is small (3.3% initially).<sup>2</sup> We all recognise the importance and value of a diverse University staff, but the need to improve imbalances among staff in Grade 9 and above should not drive decision-making about the criteria for Regent House membership.

<sup>1</sup> *Reporter*, 6609, 2020–21, p. 395.

<sup>2</sup> *Reporter*, 6612, 2020–21, p. 452.

Dr M. J. RUTTER (Department of Physics), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Cambridge University is an academic community. It is a remarkably successful one, and one which is remarkably open and inclusive in at least some aspects of its governance. The Regent House is a good example of this.

A few months ago I made some remarks at the Discussion concerning the public display of class-lists. Then I wondered whether undergraduates lacked self-confidence, and, if so, whether this lack would serve them ill in later life.

Now I wonder the same about our academic staff. Should they not be confident that an academic community is best led by academics, and that there is no need to introduce administrative and support staff into its decision-making, particularly in such numbers? Administrative and support staff are very valuable, but that does not mean that they have a clear insight into the direction an academic community should take when most of them have no direct involvement in postgraduate research or teaching. Should our academics not be able to distinguish between a mechanism which sets one's salary or stipend, and one which determines one's suitability for the narrower task of guiding the academic community? This Report suggests not.

I myself am a member of the academic-related staff, and, as a Computer Officer, a Regent. I am not sure that I could justify being a Regent, but I think I can justify the 'academic' part of my 'academic-related' title, in that I am active in both research and teaching.

I note a trend of restyling 'academic-related staff' as 'professional service staff'. In some ways this seems sensible, for many are active in neither research nor teaching, and thus have little claim to the word 'academic'. For my own position, the change would seem to be unnecessary. Unflattering too, for I would regard the word 'academic' more highly than 'professional' in the context of an academic community. But, in many ways, I must recognise that I am in a minority. But is the point at which the word 'academic' is being eroded from certain posts the point to give those same posts a greater role in the governance of an academic institution?

Those who are indeed professional may realise that they are being asked to do something important and, for them, particularly difficult and time-consuming: generating an informed opinion on matters which come to a Ballot of the Regent House. Yet they will need to do this, as an uninformed democracy is very dangerous. Can we not give those overwhelmed by this prospect the option of declining their Regent House membership without the need to resign their posts?

I am glad that a blanket Grade 7 criterion has not gained support. It is very unclear to me that Grade 7 support staff have, in general, necessarily demonstrated greater understanding and experience of the functioning of the University than final year Ph.D. students, who will be research-active, are likely to be teaching-active, may well be Members of the Senate too, and may have been Members of the University for half a dozen years. Indeed, what message does it send to our more experienced students, many of whom are not actually *in statu pupillari*, about how we value their role in the University? In many Departments we rely on their research and teaching contributions. We have recruited them in a competitive process which extends far beyond national boundaries. But, with reference to another Report being Discussed this afternoon, we do not seem to think that they should even be able to request that a Discussion should be in person, let alone vote. Of course we

do value our students; the extent of our valuing they will realise on receiving a lifetime's worth of fund-raising letters from our Alumni Office.

I could be content with a 'Grade 9' criterion for Regent House membership, if further restricted to academic and research staff. As it stands, academics will have a minority vote in the governance of a supposedly academic institution. I cannot see how that is in the long-term interests of the University. Much as I think the current membership criteria are flawed, I still do not see that this Report is an improvement.

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History), read by the Senior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, this is a staging-post Report in a process of review of membership of the Regent House which is unlikely to end here. It is sensitive to current calls for 'inclusivity' and recognises that that means further expansion, noting only that some changes have already been made to extend the right to attend Discussions and issue fly-sheets 'to include University employees not otherwise entitled to do so'. Statute A IV 2 of course links the right to elect members of the Council and the right to stand for election to the Council to membership of the Regent House. This Report promises that 'the Council will have further discussions around how to create greater mechanisms for inclusion with regard to Council membership as part of its self-effectiveness review in 2022'.

Inclusivity as envisaged here is seen in terms of employment status. Under Statute A III 8 the Regent House is the University and it is only very recently that its composition has been thought of in those terms. The University's governing body was originally an academic democracy, composed of its Masters of Arts, for they were the Masters of a *universitas* which was a medieval 'guild'. At a degree ceremony the Congregation is still called to order with a cry of '*Magistri*'. At the beginning of the nineteenth century an anonymous author attempted to explain how things worked when Cambridge as 'a sort of literary commonwealth' needed to discuss and vote on any matter. In the Senate-House only certain members of the University were qualified to speak, those holding Masters or higher degrees and maintaining their involvement with it:

All persons, who are Masters of Art, Bachelors or Doctors in Divinity, Civil Law, or Physic, having their names on the college boards or resident in the town of Cambridge, have votes in this assembly.<sup>1</sup>

The Regent House was then the 'Upper House' or 'White Hood House', so-called after the colour of the M.A. hood. This House was made up of those who had graduated in the last five years and those holding doctoral degrees of less than two years' standing. These recent graduates could be taken to represent members who were still up-to-date with the University's affairs. The non-Regents formed the 'Black Hood House'. Doctors of more than two years standing and the Public Orator might vote in either house.<sup>2</sup>

The core requirement of a qualifying degree for membership of the governing body which became the Regent House has been modified in recent generations, first by the introduction of a qualification of 'M.A. status'<sup>3</sup> granted among others to holders of University Offices. University Officers are entitled to membership of the Regent House.

However, the range of University Offices has expanded considerably beyond the strictly academic. When the 'Revised Eighth Report of the Council of the Senate on the administrative organisation of the University' was being discussed more than forty years ago,<sup>4</sup> the relationship between having a sufficiently senior degree and holding a University Office was still a matter at issue. A speaker deplored the compromise of the expectation that a University Officer would be an M.A. of the University, for, he said, 'anyone appointed to a university office (and there is nowadays a bewildering number of such offices, many quite unconnected with academic matters) could collect his M.A. as he passes GO' with 'a computer-printed degree certificate attached to his first month's pay slip'.

The Education Reform Act 1988, s. 203(4) included the provision that:

Any reference in this section to academic staff includes a reference to persons whose terms of appointment or contracts of employment are, in the opinion of the Commissioners, so similar to those of academic staff as to justify their being treated as academic staff for the purposes of this section.

That was freely applied not only to patently 'academic-related' staff such as those running libraries and laboratories, but also to staff who were solely administrators whose work was hard to define as 'similar' to that of academic staff. The Statutes still preserve a link to the Oxford and Cambridge Act of 1877, s. 15, which defines the purposes of a university in terms of having regard to 'education, religion, learning and research'. In Statute C I 4 these feature among the duties of University Teaching Officers, who are 'to promote the interests of the University as a place of education, religion, learning, and research'.

Such an Office in the University is also an employment, by the University but it is only comparatively recently that that involved a written employment contract. When those were first introduced some existing Officers presented with one on promotion refused to sign theirs, for they could (and still should) enter office by signing 'a book kept at the Registry'.<sup>5</sup> There was a stand-off between entry to employment and entry to the office when it was realised – as Stephen Cowley confirmed in a Discussion in April 2003 – that a University Officer could 'get appointed, sign 'the book', and tear up your contract. It works'.<sup>6</sup>

The grading introduced less than twenty years ago as a requirement in all English universities required the making of difficult decisions about the equivalence of different kinds of employee in Cambridge. That has now become a major consideration in favour of moving to 'grade' as the qualifying criterion for membership of the Regent House. But the apparent simplification is in reality no such thing.

The present Report notes that approval of the Affiliated Titles Pathway establishes Regent House membership for those granted the new 'affiliated' titles.<sup>7</sup> Cambridge retains categories with very different employment rights, differentiating between established and unestablished posts. The disciplinary and grievance procedures continue to be different for University Officers, 'Unestablished academic and academic-related staff' and Support staff.<sup>8</sup>

The 'Twenty-sixth Report of the Board of Scrutiny', just published, points to a risk of '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' and regrets that '[t]here is currently no plan to develop a new policy or criteria to dictate to institutions whether a post should be created and filled on an unestablished or established basis'.

I hope that before ‘inclusivity’ in membership of the Regent House is taken further some of this remaining unfinished constitutional business will be tidied up and hard thought given to the implications of any further departure from an ‘academic’ towards a ‘general employee’ Regent House.

The hard question is how far to take ‘equality’ in granting the franchise among the University’s thousands of employees.

<sup>1</sup> Anon., *A History of the University of Cambridge* (1811–2, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 1814), pp. 9–10.

<sup>2</sup> Anon., *A History of the University of Cambridge* (1811–2, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 1814), p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 169.

<sup>4</sup> Revised Eighth Report of the Council of the Senate on the administrative organisation of the University, *Reporter*, 1978–79.

<sup>5</sup> Special Ordinance C (ii) 4 (*Statutes and Ordinances*, p. 74).

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2002-03/weekly/5923/29.html>.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2020-21/weekly/6612/6612.pdf>, Grace 1 of 6 May 2021 (Privy Council approval awaited).

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/policies-procedures/disciplinary-action-grievances-and-appeals-0>.

### ***Report of the Council, dated 11 October 2021, on the arrangements for Discussions***

(*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 50).

Mr G. P. ALLEN (Wolfson College and Secretary to the Board of Scrutiny):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, in July 2018, the Council published a Notice (*Reporter*, 6516, 2017–18, p. 842) inviting comments by 31 October 2018 on proposed options for changes to the arrangements for Discussions. The proposal in the Report before us today appears to be essentially the same as that which was the subject of the consultation, although it is noteworthy that the threshold for the number of members of the Regent House to request a physical meeting has increased from five in the consultation, to ten in the current Report. Also, whereas the consultation laid out a procedure and a timetable for requesting a physical meeting, the current Report lacks any such detail which surely should be in Ordinances?

Secondly, although paragraph 3 of this Report refers briefly to the 2018 consultation, where it suits the Council’s case, shouldn’t the Regent House be told a little more about the outcome of the consultation to place the current proposal in context – or is it simply an opportunistic response in the light of the circumstances of the pandemic? I know from the report of the Governance Review Working Group, considered by the Council in December 2019 (made available by the Registry to the Board of Scrutiny), that there were eighteen such responses, thirteen from individuals and five on behalf of bodies (including the Board of Scrutiny). Don’t those respondents deserve to be told the Council’s thought processes in moving from the consultation to the current proposal?

That proposal is to be welcomed up to a point; it’s clearly a waste of time and money to open the Senate-House and organise the necessary officers if no one intends to speak in person. However, has an opportunity been missed to overhaul Discussions to encourage greater participation and responsiveness? The report of the Governance Review Working Group in December 2019 contained, in paragraph 46, a number of imaginative recommendations intended to address the facilitation, and improve the interaction, of Discussions. What became of those recommendations?

Professor G. R. EVANS (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History), read by the Junior Pro-Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Board of Scrutiny’s Twenty-sixth Report expresses concerns about the inadvisability of rushing changes made possible by the ‘deployment of technology’. It says that:

while the outcomes may well be valuable in the long-term, it is vital that they be objectively assessed now that the initial impetus towards them seems to have passed. It is important to understand the consequences of these changes across a range of fronts lest the University ends up enacting significant policy changes through unthinking configuration and deployment of technology.

When the Report we are discussing ‘acknowledges that Discussions by videoconference are likely to become the norm’ it is surely doing exactly that? A relatively small number of us took part in the Discussions held by ‘Teams’ during the last academic year. I hope those who have actually experienced this sort of Discussion will be asked what they think. The Deputy Vice-Chancellors presiding during the last year have made a praiseworthy job of it but have lacked the opportunity to get the sense of a meeting. A digitally raised hand is not at all the same thing.

A live Discussion has an atmosphere. It is an occasion warranting the wearing of gowns. Experienced speakers in Discussions held live in the Senate-House may miss the flexibility which allows a would-be speaker to get a sense of the flow of the occasion and raise a hand requesting to speak when he or she chooses. Those who stand at the lectern should feel that they are contributing to the University’s historic process of deliberation towards decision-making by its governing body. I doubt whether the owners of the little faces in squares on a screen are likely to feel any of that.

Important for constitutional reasons is the proposal to allow Council (or the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor) to ‘determine’ (without applying any agreed criteria?) ‘whether a Discussion would take place in person or by videoconference’. The Regent House is surely the only body which is entitled to take that decision?’

Getting a live discussion will involve considerable effort and organisation. Yes, ‘members of the Regent House’ may request a live meeting which can allow a larger attendance and list of speakers than can easily be accommodated on a small screen, but that is apparently to require ten signatures and even with the Petitions website that will take some organising. It is hardly a concession to note that ten could do so (if they remembered) while calling a Topic of Concern Discussion. Could the Board of Scrutiny intervene to demand a live discussion? The Report does not propose any amendment to Statute A VII 5 adding that to its powers.

The addition of ‘unlawfulness’ to the grounds on which remarks may be edited also needs more thought. There is of course a potential risk to the University in publishing speech in print which might give rise to litigation but the way that risk is to be determined seems somewhat high-handed in these proposals. I have some experience of occasions twenty years ago when a former Registry wished to remove remarks of mine from the proof of a speech on the grounds that they might be defamatory. It was all friendly enough and the offending word ‘cronyism’ was eventually permitted, as a quick search of the *Reporter* will show. But ‘remarks that may be held to be unlawful’ is dangerously vague. These are times when there are going to be disputes about what may be ‘unlawful’ and there appears to be no provision for those to be addressed and if possible resolved in a civilised exchange between the Registry and the speaker;



and there is no provision for appeal. So the exercise of a Registry's 'discretion' needs clarification.

Discussions are surely too important to be changed at breakneck speed as proposed with constitutional consequences which, as the Board of Scrutiny warns, may not be foreseen. It is to be hoped that the Council will not dismiss such concerns and go ahead to a Grace regardless.

Dr M. J. RUTTER (Department of Physics), read by the Junior Pro-Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, it would be hard for me, *in absentia*, to make a strong case that Discussions should always be in person (Covid restrictions permitting). I shall leave that for others.

I do though think that there is value in in-person Discussions. Sensing the mood of the audience, or individuals in it, is much easier in the Senate-House than over a video link, and there is more to a Discussion than simply reading remarks into the written record. I regret that I am unable to be present this afternoon.

I am pleased therefore that it is proposed that there should remain a mechanism for Regents to request that a Discussion be in person. I am less pleased that this privilege is reserved to Regents, rather than extended to all entitled to speak at a Discussion. And the detail is very unclear. By what time must the requests be received? How is the change of venue from online to in-person to be announced, so that those who were planning to attend virtually know of the change in good time? Will it still be necessary to give four hours' notice of one's desire to attend a virtual Discussion, whereas no notice is required to attend a physical Discussion?

I note too that most students prefer in-person lectures to ones conducted over a video link, and that most attendees of seminar series are eager to return to in-person seminars. There was a novelty in remote participation at Discussions, but I fear once the novelty wears off, a Discussion via a videolink is unlikely to attract more people than an in-person one, and may well attract even fewer.

***Report of the General Board, dated 8 October 2021, on the establishment of a Professorship***

(*Reporter*, 6632, 2021–22, p. 51).

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

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I congratulate Professor Whittaker, who will be my new Head of Department, on the recommendation of the Report and welcome him to the MRC Biostatistics Unit and the University.

On behalf of Cambridge UCU, I would like to make some remarks on the mechanism of 'co-terminous' appointment as a method for qualifying the tenure of a Professor (*Reporter*, 6509, 2017–18, p. 678) and the importance of job security in the University. I emphasise that these remarks are made independently of Professor Whittaker and do not concern his appointment specifically but rather the general principle.

Cambridge UCU is the trade union for the research, academic-related and academic staff of the University. Many of the research and academic-related staff of the University are employed on fixed-term contracts, supported by external funds. They are easily and routinely made redundant when a research council, NHS trust, business or

charity withdraws or refuses to renew the funding supporting their employment. In its Twenty-first Report (*Reporter*, 6433, 2015–16, pp. 776–80, at para. 25), the Board of Scrutiny noted the 'job insecurity and relative lack of career development' of research staff which causes them to 'struggle establishing new and independent research agendas', despite that they are 'increasingly indispensable to the University's research operation'.

Job security is a prerequisite for high quality academic work. Without it, an eye to the next job or funding application inevitably influences decisions about the direction of research; there is an incentive to choose conservative topics likely to appeal to the consensus opinions of funding panels and an incentive to pursue work likely to produce 'high-quality outputs' rather than work likely to answer important questions in a field. The problem is particularly acute in biomedicine, which is heavily dependent on external funding. In the academic year 2017–18, the University employed 3,362 members of staff on fixed term contracts across School and Non-School Institutions; 2,221 of these contracts were with research staff and 740 of these were with research staff working in the School of Clinical Medicine.

Since 2018, Cambridge UCU has worked relentlessly to fight casualisation in the University. In November 2018, we submitted an anti-casualisation claim. This was followed by the establishment of an anti-casualisation sub-committee of the Partnership Working Group. One of the projects that the University has agreed to work on is a review of the Fixed-Term Contracts Policy. Academic staff are generally employed in established positions, although they are not safe from the threat of casualisation: in 2018, 117 members of staff in academic posts were employed in unestablished positions, against 1,520 staff members in established academic posts (*Reporter*, 6521, 2018–19, pp. 42–51).

This Report is the third proposing a Professorship in the School of Clinical Medicine to be held co-terminously with an appointment under the control of an external funder (*Reporter*, 2020–21: 6612, p. 465; 6613, p. 471; and 6618, p. 662), a system which risks extending to Professors the constraints on academic freedom felt by more junior researchers. In the Discussion of one of the previous reports (1 June 2021, *Reporter*, 6621, 2020–21, pp. 698–700), Professor Evans rightly pointed to the risk that the external funder 'exercise[s] a potentially unacceptable degree of control, perhaps interfering with the definition of the duties of office and perhaps even their performance, certainly with the academic freedom of the Professor.'

One purpose of the tenure protection attached to an established position is to reduce the risk that teaching and research are influenced by institutional interests. On the face of it, a co-terminous appointment gives the external funder the power to dismiss the Professor, transforming the relationship between Professor and funder *de facto* into one between employee and employer, potentially subjecting the Professor *de facto* to external 'line-management.' The Regent House may wish to consider retrospectively whether it fully appreciated the consequences of co-terminous appointments and whether the Report proposing them received the scrutiny it deserved (*Reporter*, 2017–18: 6509, p. 678; 6512, p. 750).

An appointment co-terminous with a position controlled by a private company or a government would seem obviously concerning, perhaps in a way that one co-terminous with a position controlled by a research council or an NHS trust at first sight does not, but the principle is the same. The protection of academic freedom from external interference by the Research Councils has become more important since they were subjected to

tighter government control by the Higher Education and Research Act 2017. Will a Professor, whose salary is supported by an NHS trust, feel free to publish if her research identifies harm to patients caused by mismanagement or clinical negligence in a trust with which she holds a co-terminous appointment?

More generally there is a risk that co-terminous appointments reduce the University, at least in part, from an independent ‘community of scholars’ to a contractor of research services. We do not have to look far to see the academic destruction that may be caused when a ‘buyer’ of such services decides to withdraw its ‘custom.’ Members of Cambridge UCU have been affected by the decision of the University to close a department of the Clinical School, the MRC Cancer Unit, following a decision by the MRC to withdraw funding from all but two of the department’s research groups. The leader of one of the groups offered continued funding from the MRC has nevertheless decided to leave the University.

In March 2022, many MRC Cancer Unit staff, some with service to the University over a period of 25 years, are almost certain to face redundancy. The consultation on the closure has taken place during a period of dramatic contraction in funding for cancer research, due to the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic on the cancer charities. Many specialised interdisciplinary staff have yet to find new employment. The University repeatedly offers counselling to those affected, but for most staff there has been little in the way of organised material support. Researchers have been told that they must find a sympathetic Head of Department to obtain permission to write applications for fellowships, which might support their continued employment, or even to write applications for grants, which might make them employable at other institutions.

It is difficult to see why anyone should commit to a research career if there is a risk that after twenty years of dedication to an academically important but possibly idiosyncratic field, you might become an unemployable specialist as a result of a redundancy decision, even when employed by the country’s most scientifically prestigious university. At the very least this risk creates perverse incentives for researchers, damaging the research culture and the quality of scientific work, through irrational competitive pressure.<sup>1,2</sup>

The relationship between the University and the MRC with respect to the Cancer Unit, is governed by a ‘Strategic Alliance Agreement’ between the two institutions, signed in 2013. Despite a request from UCU, our members have not been allowed to see this document. We do not believe that an agreement between two publicly funded institutions, each subject to democratic oversight, should be confidential. The same can be said of the ‘Future Vision Statement’ for the Cancer Unit written shortly after the resignation of the former Director of the Unit and presented by the University to the MRC before the funding appraisal (‘the quinquennial review’) that precipitated the decision to close the Unit.

Cambridge UCU are particularly keen that there should be maximum transparency because there is a dispute between the University and the MRC about the redundancy rights of a particular class of employees, which arose well into the consultation process, following an intervention from the MRC. We are concerned that while the ‘Strategic Alliance Agreements’ concerning MRC units absorbed into the University remain confidential, staff are unclear about who has ultimate responsibility for meeting the costs of their employment rights. It would also be interesting to know whether these agreements place any restrictions on the tenure of any staff employed in MRC units.

In each case where employment is created based on external funding, Cambridge UCU urges the University to make every effort to prioritise the creation of permanent established tenured posts over fixed-term positions. This is a matter where the interests of staff and the University are concordant. Indeed, the Board of Scrutiny commented on the threat of a ‘possible decline in academic standards as the workforce is casualised’ in its recently published Twenty-sixth Report (*Reporter*, 6633, 2021–22, p. 62, at para. 112).

If the University finds itself unwilling to take on the financial risk of being ‘expected to continue to fund’ established posts that lose external funding support ‘potentially until retirement’ (*Reporter*, 6509, 2017–18, p. 678), because such posts have become too numerous, then instead of watering down tenure protections for academics, its senior officers should follow the advice of Dr Kell (*Reporter*, 6535, 2018–19, p. 379; *Reporter*, 6613, 2020–21, p. 489) to respond politically, by making representations to the Government and its Research Councils to adjust the balance of funding to allow a stable career structure for staff working across all grades of university teaching and research. In the meantime, Cambridge UCU will continue to engage with institutions across the University to fight employment casualisation and other consequences of the marketisation of higher education on the University, its staff and academic standards.

<sup>1</sup> *Research fraud: a long-term problem exacerbated by the clamour for research grants*, Quality in Higher Education, Vol. 26, No. 3, 2020, pp 243–261.

<sup>2</sup> *Three steps to fraud*, Nature Physics, Vol. 3, No. 73, 2007.

---

## COLLEGE NOTICES

### Elections

*Murray Edwards College*

Elected to an Honorary Fellowship from 1 October 2021:

Bina Agarwal, M.A., Ph.D., *NH*

Chantal-Aimée Doerries, QC, M.A., *NH*

### Vacancies

*Christ’s College*: J. H. Plumb College Lectureship and Fellowship in History; tenure: four years from 1 September 2022, or as agreed (non-renewable); closing date: 11 January 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/college-life/vacancies-christs-college>

*Clare Hall*: Non-Stipendiary Research Fellowships in the Sciences; tenure: three years from 1 October 2022; closing date: 24 November 2021; further details: <https://www.clarehall.cam.ac.uk/research-fellowships>

*Corpus Christi College*: Stipendiary Early-Career Research Fellowship (Modern and Medieval Languages, Classics, Linguistics or Asian and Middle Eastern Studies); tenure: four years from 1 October 2022; salary: £21,135–£24,871; closing date: 6 January 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.corpus.cam.ac.uk/about-corpus/people/academic-vacancies>

*Gonville and Caius*: Communications Assistant; tenure: permanent, part-time (0.5 FTE); salary: £25,000 *pro rata*; closing date: 10 November 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.cai.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/communications-assistant>

Development Officer; tenure: permanent, full-time; salary: £29,000; closing date: 10 November 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.cai.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/development-officer>

Master's Lodge Housekeeper; tenure: permanent, part-time (0.8 FTE); salary: competitive; closing date: 14 November 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.cai.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/the-masters-lodge-housekeeper>

Conference and Events Coordinator; tenure: permanent, full-time; salary: 24,972; closing date: 14 November 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.cai.cam.ac.uk/vacancies/conference-and-events-coordinator>

*Jesus College*: Research Fellowships in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (two available); tenure: three years from 1 October 2022; salary: £22,847–£25,627; closing date: 22 November 2021 at 5 p.m.; further details: <https://www.jesus.cam.ac.uk/fellows-staff/vacancies/>

Research Fellowship in Science; tenure: three years from 1 October 2022; salary: £22,847–£25,627; closing date: 22 November 2021 at 5 p.m.; further details: <https://www.jesus.cam.ac.uk/fellows-staff/vacancies/>

*Newnham College*: Deputy Development Director; tenure: permanent, full-time; salary: £43,434; closing date: 22 November 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://newn.cam.ac.uk/vacancy/deputy-development-director/>

Conference and Events Manager; tenure: permanent, full-time from January 2022; salary: £36,382; closing date: 22 November 2021 at 12 noon; further details: <https://newn.cam.ac.uk/vacancy/conference-and-events-manager/>

*Peterhouse*: Research Associateships (up to four available); non-stipendiary; tenure: two years from 7 February 2022 with a possible extension for a further year; closing date: 14 January 2022 at 9 a.m.; further details: <https://www.pet.cam.ac.uk/research-associateships>

*Robinson College*: Head of Student Wellbeing and Welfare; tenure: permanent, full-time; salary: up to £42,633 depending on experience; closing date: 22 November 2021; further details: <https://www.robinson.cam.ac.uk/about-robinson/job-vacancies/head-student-wellbeing-and-welfare-full-time>

## Events

### Emmanuel College

*Cambridge Seminars in the History of Cartography* Florin-Stefan Morar, City University of Hong Kong, presents *At the limits of China: Frontiers, borders, and political geography in early modern Sino-Western cartographic exchanges*, at 1 p.m. on Tuesday, 16 November 2020 via Zoom. For joining instructions, please email [events@emma.cam.ac.uk](mailto:events@emma.cam.ac.uk); further details are also available at <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/departments/maps/cartographic-events/camsem>

## Awards

### Jesus College

#### *Chadwick essay prizes for University members*

The College is offering one or more prizes of £500 in 2022 for essays concerning Theology, the Philosophy of Religion, the History of Religious Thought or Scriptural Interpretation by members of the University who meet the qualifying criteria. Essays of approx. 4,000 words, submitted in accordance with the rules for the Prize, should be submitted by the first day of Easter Full Term 2022. Further details: <https://www.jesus.cam.ac.uk/articles/chadwick-essay-prizes-university-members-2021-2022>

## EXTERNAL NOTICES

### Oxford Notices

*Department of Computer Science and Wolfson College*: Christopher Strachey Professorship of Computing; tenure: from 1 September 2022; closing date: 28 February 2022 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk>, vacancy ID: 154058

*Nuffield College*: Postdoctoral Prize Research Fellowships in Politics (up to three available); tenure: three years from 1 September 2022 or as soon as possible thereafter; salary: £32,632; closing date: 6 December 2021; further details: <https://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/the-college/jobs-and-vacancies/postdoctoral-prize-research-fellowships-in-politics/>