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NOTICES

Calendar

20 October, Thursday. End of first quarter of Michaelmas Term.
22 October, Saturday. Congregation of the Regent House at 11 a.m. (see p. 52).
1 November, Tuesday. All Saints’ Day. Scarlet Day.
6 November, Sunday. Commemoration of Benefactors. Scarlet Day. Preacher before the University at 11.15 a.m., Reverend Dr Jeremy Morris, Master of Trinity Hall (Lady Margaret’s Preacher).
8 November, Tuesday. Discussion at 2 p.m. in the Senate-House.

Discussion on Tuesday, 25 October 2016: Cancellation

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that the Discussion announced for Tuesday, 25 October 2016 will not take place as there are no Reports ready for discussion.

The Report published in this issue (p. 50) will be discussed on 8 November 2016.

Dates of Discussions, 2017–18

17 October 2016

The Vice-Chancellor gives notice that Discussions will be held on the following days in the academical year 2017–18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michaelmas Term 2017</th>
<th>Lent Term 2018</th>
<th>Easter Term 2018</th>
<th>Long Vacation 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 October</td>
<td>23 January</td>
<td>1 May</td>
<td>10 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 October</td>
<td>6 February</td>
<td>15 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>20 February</td>
<td>29 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November</td>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>12 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December</td>
<td>20 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Biomedical Services Building: Naming approved

17 October 2016

The Council and the General Board have approved the naming of the University Biomedical Services building on Huntingdon Road as the Barcroft Centre, in honour of Professor Joseph Barcroft, Professor of Physiology at the University, 1925–37. The Centre will replace the Barcroft Building, on the same site, which will be demolished in early 2017. Work at the Centre will continue to investigate some of the same themes that were the focus of Professor Barcroft’s research.

Christmas and New Year closing: University offices

17 October 2016

The Council has authorized the closure of the University Offices from 5 p.m. on Friday, 23 December 2016, until 8.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 3 January 2016. The University Messenger Service will not operate during the period of closure.

Student motor licence online applications

The Acting Special Pro-Proctor for motor vehicles gives notice that, in addition to applications in person and by post, it is now possible for students to apply for a motor licence online at http://www.proctors.cam.ac.uk/motor-proctor.
VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Electors to the Professorship of Anatomy

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

Professor Duncan Maskell, W, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor’s deputy

(a) on the nomination of the Council
   Professor Abigail Fowden, G
   Dr Sean Munro, MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology

(b) on the nomination of the General Board
   Professor Sarah Bray
   Professor Matteo Carandini, University College London
   Professor Anne Ferguson-Smith, DAR

(c) on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Biology
   Professor Francois Guillemot, Francis Crick Institute
   Professor Ole Paulsen, JN
   Professor Elizabeth Robertson, University of Oxford

Electors to the Herchel Smith Professorship of Biochemistry

The Council has appointed members of the ad hoc Board of Electors to the Herchel Smith Professorship of Biochemistry as follows:

Professor Duncan Maskell, W, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor’s deputy

(a) on the nomination of the Council
   Professor Abigail Fowden, G
   Professor Michael Yaffe, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

(b) on the nomination of the General Board
   Professor Kevin Brindle, F
   Professor Xin Lu, University of Oxford
   Professor Dale Sanders, John Innes Centre, Norwich

(c) on the nomination of the Faculty Board of Biology
   Professor Martin Buck, Imperial College London
   Professor Gerard Evan, CHR
   Professor Gillian Griffiths, K

Vacancies in the University

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

Wolfson Professor of Criminology in the Institute of Criminology; informal enquiries: Professor Loraine Gelsthorpe, Convenor of the Board of Electors (email: lrg10@cam.ac.uk or tel.: 01223 335369); closing date: 1 December 2016; further details: http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/11817/; quote reference: JL10446

University Lecturer in Exoplanetary Science in the Department of Earth Sciences; salary: £38,896–£49,230; closing date: 7 January 2017; further details: http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/11727/; quote reference: LB10363

Temporary Lecturer in the Department of Physiology, Development, and Neuroscience; tenure: from 1 January 2017 to 30 September 2021; salary: £38,896–£49,230; closing date: 30 November 2016; further details: http://www.jobs.cam.ac.uk/job/11693/; quote reference: PM10332

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.
Elections and appointments

The following elections and appointments have been made:

Elections

Professor David Adrian Freedberg, B.A., Yale, D.Phil., Oxford, Professor of the History of Art and Director of the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America, Columbia University, Director of the Warburg Institute, University of London, and Chair of the Academic Board of the German Institute for Advanced Studies, Wissenschaftskolleg, elected Slade Professor of Fine Art from 1 October 2016 until 30 September 2017, assigned to the Department of History of Art.

Professor Antonio Sérgio Alfredo Guimarães, B.Sc., M.Sc., Livre-Docência, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brazil, Ph.D., Wisconsin, Professor Titular, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil, Sérgio Buarque de Holanda Chair, Université de Bordeaux IV, France, elected Simón Bolívar Professor of Latin American Studies from 1 October 2016 until 30 June 2017, assigned to the Centre of Latin American Studies.

Sir John Grant McKenzie Laws, R, M.A., Oxford, Lord Justice of Appeal (1999–2016), Honorary Fellow of Robinson College, Judicial Visitor, University College London, Visitor, Cumberland Lodge, and President of the Constitutional and Administrative Law Bar Association, elected Arthur Goodhart Visiting Professor of Legal Science from 1 October 2016 until 30 September 2017, assigned to the Faculty of Law.

Professor Loïc Jean Daniel Marie Wacquant, Maîtrise en sociologie, University of Paris X, M.A., Ph.D., Chicago, elected Pitt Professor of American History from 1 October 2016 until 30 September 2017, assigned to the Faculty of Human, Social, and Political Science.

Appointments

University Senior Lecturer


University Lecturers

Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics. Dr Roman Rafikov, B.Sc., Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, M.S., Ph.D., Princeton, appointed from 20 September 2016 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of three years. Dr Hamza Fawzi, B.Sc., Mines Paris Tech, M.Sc., California Los Angeles, Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, appointed from 1 October 2016 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Materials Science and Metallurgy. Dr Nicholas Gwilym Jones, M.Eng., Ph.D., London, appointed from 3 October 2016 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics. Dr Holly Christine Krieger, MUR, B.S., Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, M.S., Ph.D., Illinois, Chicago, and Dr Peter Pal Varju, Discipuli pro Universitate, Szeged, Hungary, Ph.D., Princeton, appointed from 1 October 2016 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of five years.

Clinical Lecturers

Clinical Neurosciences. Dr Richard James Mair, M.B.Ch.B., Leicester, MRCS (Eng), FRCS (Neuro Surg.), appointed from 1 October 2016 until 30 September 2020 and subject to a probationary period of twelve months. Mr Harry John Christopher James Bulstrode, M.A., CHI, B.M.B.Ch., Oxford, Ph.D., Edinburgh, appointed from 1 February 2017 until 31 January 2021 and subject to a probationary period of twelve months.

Surgery. Mr Foad Jafari Rouhani, M.A., M.B.B.Chir., M.Phil., Ph.D., CHR, MRCS, appointed from 3 October 2016 until 2 October 2020 and subject to a probationary period of twelve months.

Principal Assistant Registrary

University Offices (Human Resources Division). Ms Andrea Louise Elsie Hudson, B.A., London, M.A., Westminster, MICIPD, appointed from 1 October 2016 until the retiring age and subject to a probationary period of nine months.

Senior Technical Officer

Physics. Mr Peter Michael Tibbit Norman appointed from 1 October 2016 until the retiring age.
Announcement of lectures, seminars, etc.

The University offers a large number of lectures, seminars, and other events, many of which are free of charge, to members of the University and others who are interested. Details can be found on individual Faculty, Department, and institution websites, on the What’s On website (http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/whatson/), and on Talks.cam (http://www.talks.cam.ac.uk/).

Brief details of upcoming events are given below.

**Equality and Diversity**

2016 Annual Race Equality Lecture: *Race, representation, and visibility*, with Professor Laura Serrant, Mr Anwar Uddin, and Dr Sandie Okoro, on 24 October 2016, at 5.30 p.m., in the Palmerston Room, St John’s College

Information and booking: https://racelecture2016.eventbrite.co.uk/

**Asian and Middle Eastern Studies**

Japan and the world: the continent and Japan’s first economic miracle, inaugural lecture by Professor Mikael Adolphson, Keidanren Professor and Chair of Japanese Studies, on 21 October 2016, at 4.30 p.m., at the Møller Centre, Churchill College

Information and booking: http://www.japanandtheworld.org/

**NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD**

Certificate of Postgraduate Study in Management

*(Statutes and Ordinances, p. 564)*

**With effect from 1 October 2017**

Following the approval of Grace 6 of 13 July 2016 (Reporter, 6433, 2015–16, p. 783), the General Board and the Board of Graduate Studies have approved a proposal from the Degree Committee for the Faculty of Business and Management to introduce a Certificate of Postgraduate Study in Management. Special regulations for the examination have been approved as follows:

**Management**

1. Certificates of Postgraduate Study shall be awarded for advanced study and training in research in Management.
2. The study and training shall include:
   (a) coursework as specified by the Degree Committee for the Faculty of Business and Management, which will fall within the field of research methodology;
   (b) a seminar presentation;
   (c) a proposal defence of no more than 10,000 words in length, including diagrams, footnotes, and appendices, but excluding bibliography, on a subject approved by the Degree Committee.

**NOTICES BY FACULTY BOARDS, ETC.**

Annual meetings of the Faculties

**Architecture and History of Art**

The Chair of the Faculty Board of Architecture and History of Art gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at 1.45 p.m. on Tuesday, 15 November 2016, in the Boardroom, Faculty of Architecture and History of Art, 1–5 Scroope Terrace. The main item of business will be the election of one member of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve for four years from 1 January 2017, in accordance with Regulation 1 of the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards *(Statutes and Ordinances, p. 585).*

Nominations for election, for which the consent of the candidate must be obtained, signed by the proposer and seconder, and notice of any other business for the meeting, should be sent in writing to the Secretary of the Faculty Board of Architecture and History of Art, 1–5 Scroope Terrace, to arrive not later than 12 noon on Tuesday, 1 November 2016.
History
The Chair of the Faculty Board of History gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 15 November 2016, in Seminar Room 6 in the Faculty of History. The agenda for the meeting will be circulated to each member of the Faculty. One of the items of business will be the election, in accordance with Regulation 1 of the General Regulations for the Constitution of the Faculty Boards (Statutes and Ordinances, p. 585), of two members of the Faculty Board in class (c) to serve for four years from 1 January 2017.

Nominations, for which the consent of the candidate must be obtained, signed by the proposer and seconder, and notice of any other business, should reach the Principal Secretary at the Faculty of History, West Road, not later than 12 noon on Tuesday, 8 November 2016.

Physics and Chemistry
The Chair of the Faculty Board of Physics and Chemistry gives notice that the Annual Meeting of the Faculty will be held at 2.15 p.m. on Friday, 25 November 2016, in the Committee Room, Institute of Astronomy, Madingley Road.

Notice of any business should reach the Secretary by Monday, 14 November 2016.

Historical Tripos, Part I, 2017–18
The Faculty Board of History gives notice that it has amended the list of options for Paper 1 of Part I of the Historical Tripos, 2017–18, as published on 13 July 2016 (Reporter, 6433, 2015–16, p. 766), as follows:

By adding the following to the list of options for Paper 1 of Part I:
(vi) Comparative histories of race, class, and culture: Southern Africa, 1850–2013

Natural Sciences Tripos, Part III: Entry requirements 2017–18
The Committee of Management for the Natural Sciences Tripos, in consultation with the Faculty Boards of Physics and Chemistry, Biology, Earth Sciences and Geography, and the Board of History and Philosophy of Science, has defined the standards required for entry to each subject of Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos (see Regulation 5(a) for the Tripos (Statutes and Ordinances, p. 391)), with effect from the courses commencing in the academical year 2017–18, as follows:

Astrophysics
In order to be a candidate for honours in Astrophysics in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Astrophysics or Physics in Part II. Mathematics Tripos students should have obtained at least a II.1 and will be considered on a case-by-case basis because it is required that they should have demonstrated a good grasp of at least three appropriate applied mathematics courses in the examination.

Biochemistry
In order to be a candidate for honours in Biochemistry in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Biochemistry in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Chemistry
In order to be a candidate for honours in Chemistry in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Chemistry in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Earth Sciences
In order to be a candidate for honours in Earth Sciences in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should:

either have obtained at least a II.2 in Earth Sciences in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos;
or have obtained a II.2 in Part II Physical Sciences with at least 70% in Half Subject Earth Sciences.

Materials Science
In order to be a candidate for honours in Materials Science in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Materials Science in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

History and Philosophy of Science
In order to be a candidate for honours in History and Philosophy of Science in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in History and Philosophy in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Students who have not taken History and Philosophy of Science in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos will be considered on a case-by-case basis. These students should have obtained at least a high II.1 overall class in Part II.

Physics
In order to be a candidate for honours in Physics in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student should have obtained at least a II.1 in Physics in Part II.

Students who have not taken Physics in Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos (for example, those who have read Part II of the Mathematical Tripos, Part II Astrophysics, or Part II Physical Sciences Half Subject Physics) will be considered on a case-by-case basis. These students should usually have obtained at least a high II.1 overall class in Part II, and have covered an appropriate range of courses in physics.
Systems Biology

In order to be a candidate for honours in Systems Biology in Part III of the Natural Sciences Tripos, a student from the Natural Sciences Tripos should:

1. either (a) have obtained at least 55% in either Mathematics or Mathematical Biology in Part IA of the Natural Sciences Tripos;
   
or (b) have obtained at least 55% in Mathematics in Part Ib of the Natural Sciences Tripos;

   and

2. have obtained at least a II.1 in a single-subject Part II of the Natural Sciences Tripos.

Participation by students from the Mathematical Tripos will be considered on a case-by-case basis and a II.1 in Part II is normally expected.

All subjects

In addition to the standards mentioned above, candidates should have fulfilled any subject prerequisites as outlined in the appropriate programme specification.

The application process for each subject is defined on the subject webpage together with details of any constraints on numbers or additional information that may be required.

Consideration of special cases

A student who has not met the required standard or who has not offered the required subjects as specified above, or who has not complied with the published deadline for receipt of applications, may request consideration as a special case. A request for special consideration should be forwarded by the student’s Director of Studies or Tutor to the Secretary of the relevant Faculty Board using the pro forma provided, at the earliest opportunity and, at the latest, within two weeks of the results being announced. The Director of Studies or Tutor should state the reasons for requesting dispensation, confirm that the College supports the request and is able to support the student, and confirm her/his belief that the student will be capable of undertaking the Part III course successfully. The application must be accompanied by copies of supervision reports, and a detailed breakdown of the student’s marks, year by year and subject by subject. The Committee nominated by the Faculty Board to consider special cases is not expected to consider circumstances of a nature on which the Applications Committee would normally make a judgement.

Representations regarding progression decisions are allowed for under the review procedure for examinations for undergraduate and certain other qualifications.

REPORTS

Second-stage Report of the Council on the construction of an off-site storage facility for low-use library material

The Council begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. A First-stage Report on the construction of an off-site storage facility for low-use library material was submitted to the Regent House on 22 June 2016 (Reporter, 6431, 2015–16, p. 696) and approved by Grace 5 of 13 July 2016. This Second-stage Report is to inform the Regent House about further development of the scheme and to seek approval for construction to proceed.

2. The capital and opportunity costs of continuing with a policy of on-site storage for all of the University’s printed library materials were articulated in the First-stage Report. Detailed migration plans for the transfer of appropriate material, informed by previous consultation with Faculty and Departmental librarians and in the University Library itself, are in preparation. Material held at the off-site storage facility will remain available to staff and students via a regular retrieval service, which is expected to run daily.

3. The facility will be constructed on a site at Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely. It will provide storage for up to 106,000 linear metres of unique but low-use printed library material and will comprise a gross internal area of approximately 5,000m², incorporating a main book storage hall and ancillary accommodation. The facility has been designed to achieve a BREEAM Excellent rating and incorporates photovoltaic panels and a low energy strategy.

4. The Full Case for this facility was approved by the Planning and Resources Committee on 24 June 2015. At its meeting on 22 June 2016 the Committee agreed that the project could proceed within a budget of £17.1m, including land costs. £12.8m is allocated within the University’s Capital Fund. The balance of funding will come from the University Library.

5. The project will follow a single-stage ‘Design and Build’ approach. A contractor has been appointed to develop the design and prepare drawings for the planning application, which was submitted to East Cambridgeshire District Council in September 2016. The project is planned to start on site in February 2017 and to be completed so that the new building is operational by May 2018.

6. Drawings of the proposed scheme are displayed for the information of the University in the Schools Arcade, and are reproduced online at http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/cam-only/offices/planning/building/plans_and_drawings/. A plan showing the location of the proposed new building is shown below (p. 51).
7. The Council recommends:

1. That approval is confirmed for the construction of an off-site storage facility for low-use library material as proposed in this Report.

L. K. BorysieWicz, Vice-Chancellor
CHAD ALLEN
ROSS ANDERSON
RICHARD ANTHONY
JEREMY CADDICK
R. CHARLES
ANNE DAVIS

AMATEY DOKU
DAVID GOOD
NICHOLAS HOLMES
ALICE HUTCHINGS
FIONA KARET
UMANG KHANDELWAL
STUART LAING

MARK LEWISOHN
SUSAN OOSTHUIZEN
RACHAEL PADMAN
SHIRLEY PEARCE
JOHN SHAKESHAFT
SARA WELLER
I. H. WHITE

Location plan of the proposed off-site storage facility for low-use library material
OBITUARIES

Obituary Notice

Professor MARY BRENTA HESSE, M.A., (Hon.)Sc.D., B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D. (London), FBA, Honorary and Emerita Fellow of Wolfson College (Fellow 1965–92 and Vice-President 1976–80), Emerita Professor of the Philosophy of Science, died on 2 October 2016, aged 91 years (see also p. 59).

GRACES

Graces submitted to the Regent House on 19 October 2016

The Council submits the following Graces to the Regent House. These Graces, unless they are withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (Statutes and Ordinances, p. 103), will be deemed to have been approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 28 October 2016.

1. That Ms Nicola Padfield, Master of Fitzwilliam College, be appointed one of the Septemviri to serve from 1 October 2016 until 31 December 2017.

2. That Professor Dame Carol Black, Principal of Newnham College, be reappointed one of the Septemviri to serve for two years from 1 January 2017.

3. That Professor Mary Fowler, Master of Darwin College, be reappointed one of the Septemviri to serve for two years from 1 January 2017.

4. That Professor Richard Penty, Master of Sidney Sussex College, be reappointed one of the Septemviri to serve for two years from 1 January 2017.

Graces to be submitted to the Regent House at a Congregation on 22 October 2016

The Council has sanctioned the submission of the following Graces to the Regent House at a Congregation to be held on 22 October 2016:


2. CHRISTOPHER EDWARD THOMAS, Fellow of Christ’s College and University Lecturer in the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Oxford (2009).


4. ABIGAIL BARNETT, Assistant Director in the Local Examinations Syndicate.

5. XIANG CHENG, Senior Advisory Officer in the Estate Management Division of the University Offices.

6. JOANNA MAY HALL, Senior Assistant Treasurer in the Finance Division of the University Offices.

7. SARA HENNESSY, Fellow of Hughes Hall and Reader in Teacher Development and Pedagogical Innovation in the Faculty of Education.

8. SARAH PETRINA TUCKER, Administrative Officer in the Finance Division of the University Offices.

9. CATHERINE LINDON, Fellow of Newnham College and University Lecturer in the Department of Pharmacology.
10. **JOHN JAMES MURRAY**, Deputy Director in the Local Examinations Syndicate.

11. **MATTHEW DEREK RICHARDS**, Deputy Director in the Local Examinations Syndicate.

12. **NOELLE SEXTON**, Under-librarian in the University Library.

13. **DAVID JOHN SIZER**, Administrative Officer in the Finance Division of the University Offices.


**ACTA**

**Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 5 October 2016**

The Graces submitted to the Regent House on 5 October 2016 (*Reporter*, 6438, 2016–17, p. 31) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 14 October 2016.

J. W. NICHOLLS, *Registrar*

**END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE ‘REPORTER’**
REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Tuesday, 11 October 2016

A Discussion was held in the Senate-House. Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Ellis Ferran was presiding, with the Registrar’s deputy, the Senior Proctor, the Junior Proctor, the two Pro-Proctors, and ten other persons present.

The following Report was discussed:


Dr L. N. Drumright (Chair of the Board of Scrutiny, Department of Medicine, and Hughes Hall):
Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Regents, I address you today in my capacity as the new Chair of the Board of Scrutiny.

It is conventional for the outgoing Chairperson to speak to the Board’s Annual Report. However, Dr Matthew Vernon, the 2015–16 Chair of the Board of Scrutiny, has left the University, and is unable to attend the Discussion today. He has asked me, as the newly elected Chair of the Board, to speak to the Board’s Annual Report on his behalf.

As we are breaking tradition, I have also opted to reflect on last year’s report, not with a focus on the past year, but with a view to the future – to this year and the many to come.

The University is in the midst of change and uncertainty. Economic and political concerns have been brought on by the outcome of the Referendum to leave the European Union, resulting in subsequent ambiguity about how this outcome will take form and what it will mean to the University. Within the University, this year we will say farewell to both our Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar and welcome new University officers into these guiding posts. The University is growing in both teaching and research activities, and with this there is a growing need for expansion of physical locations to accommodate these activities. Our students have changed, they have different needs and preparation for taking on lead roles in the world is different today. As Regents we have also changed – in our values, our priorities, our concerns, and our demographics. We are not the same Regents that started governing this University so long ago, nor are we likely to resemble the Regents of even thirty years ago. I stand before you as an example in point.

Whilst it is important to move forward and recognize the need for change, it is also important to preserve the fabric from which this institution was woven. The University of Cambridge is a democracy. This is a unique and precious attribute that few universities in the world possess. It is a key element in supporting our academic success, and one of the many features that makes Cambridge one of the world’s great academic institutions. In order for democracy to prevail, we, as Regents, must be enabled to engage in our self-governance. The Board hopes that this has been communicated on many levels throughout the Twenty-first Report.

Looking forward, the Board will be engaged in understanding the University’s actions with respect to our changing position in the European Union. We commend the Vice-Chancellor in his continued support for protecting the University’s international diversity. Although the Twenty-first Report of the Board was submitted prior to the outcome of the Referendum to leave the European Union, we are fully committed to protecting the diversity of our students, staff, and Regents; and we are committed to keeping the Regents informed of how our University will overcome the obstacles and economic challenges that such change may create.

The outcome of the Referendum is not the only factor raising economic challenges for the University today. The assessment of the University finances in the Twenty-first Report of the Board highlighted the impending loss of the Research and Development Expenditures Credit that all Universities in the UK will face, which will have a significant impact on our financial situation. Furthermore, we noted our increased dependency on the non-academic activities of the University, namely Cambridge University Press and Cambridge Assessment. Last year the University Finance Committee established a working group to review these non-academic divisions of the University, culminating in the Freeling Report. The Board greatly appreciated the foresight and thoughtfulness of the Finance Committee in commissioning this activity. The Board read this report with great interest, and while it clearly contains commercially sensitive items, it also serves as an important guide to supporting the stability of our important non-academic assets. Along with our other finance recommendations, it is the Board’s hope that the less commercially sensitive aspects of the Freeling Report will be shared with the Regents, so that they may be provided with necessary information to self-govern and engage in discussion and comment on the management of these important assets.

Whilst finances are clearly important to our University, our human assets cannot be replaced by any amount of money. The people of this University are what make it a great institution. To this end, the Board demonstrated great concern for the management of Human Resources at the University in the Twenty-first Report, and our concern continues. These are highlighted in our comments and recommendations regarding:

1. firstly, ensuring that our developments are timely and within budget, so that housing and resources to support the living and working conditions of our students, staff, and faculty are in place, without generating financial deficits for future generations;
2. secondly, enabling members of the University to purchase housing in one of the fastest growing housing markets in the country;
3. thirdly, supporting safe and effective transportation methods; and
4. finally, guaranteeing dignity of all members of our community through our HR policy and actions.

Human Resources have ‘played the back bench’ for far too long at our University. There are important issues to be addressed. No university should fail in providing a socially safe environment that supports dignity at work, yet our staff surveys still report experiences of bullying. Where is our zero-tolerance policy and action? We need to come to a harmonious decision about how to usher in new faculty and staff with exciting new ideas and still support our older, yet productive and active, academics and staff. It is not clear that simply upholding the Employer Justified Retirement Age policy is the best answer. If we want to maintain academic excellence, we need to competitively compensate our faculty and staff at all levels, not just senior posts. In our Twenty-first Report, the Board called for a ‘holistic review of HR policy and practice’, which we wait for with anticipation.

In focusing on the people who make our University what it is, the Board raised concern in the Twenty-first Report about our ability to self-govern. Anyone who comes
to a Discussion will be well aware that they are generally poorly attended. Today is no exception. It is not clear if this lack of engagement in self-governance is a matter of geographic spread, competing demands on time, or a lack of understanding of one’s rights and duties as a member of the Regent House, or indeed, knowledge of whether or not one is a Regent at all. The Board is delighted to see the new websites and documentation that the University has published to help support and preserve our structure of self-governance. We look forward to working together with the Vice-Chancellor’s Office, the Unified Administrative Service, and you, the Regents, in ensuring that our democratic governance not only remains intact, but is used as intended.

John Adams, the second president of the United States said, ‘Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy yet that did not commit suicide’. I don’t agree.

The University of Cambridge is still here, self-governing as a democracy. The Board intends to support this.

I am well aware that the Board has been viewed in many lights over its twenty-one years in existence. I would like to remind the Regents and all members of the University that we are here to support the self-governance that contributes to the many wonderful attributes of the University of Cambridge. We welcome all members of the University to bring any matters of concern to us, including Regents, students, Heads of School, Heads of Departments, Pro-Vice-Chancellors, members of the Office of the Registrary, the Vice-Chancellor, and everyone else who is part of this community.

I would like to take this opportunity to endorse the Twenty-first Report of the Board of Scrutiny. The Board is very much looking forward in the coming year to supporting the University through the change that lies ahead and working together with administrative and academic offices and the Regents to ensure that the main concerns of the Regents are effectively addressed. To that end, we look forward to the response to the Twenty-first Report of the Board of Scrutiny.

Professor A. W. F. Edwards (Gonville and Caius College):

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I wish to speak to paragraph 23, which invites the Council to ‘review how Regents may be effectively engaged in the governance of the University (including Discussions and voting), particularly those working outside the city centre’.

I note first the Board’s suggestion that the venue of the Senate-House is not meeting the needs of current Regents. This is a canard. I am one of the 112 Fellows of Gonville and Caius College, a short jump away from the Senate-House. We are not all members of the Regent House because those of us over seventy have been disenfranchised, but around 90 of us are. How many are here today? I can see only the Bursar, and he is anyway a signatory of the Report. The lack of participation in Discussions is nothing to do with distance or format or timing.

I have frequently described the real reasons, often from this very spot. We have been round the course before. The Council took no notice. In May 2000, the majority of Council members signed a ‘Report of the Council on arrangements for Discussions and related matters’ (Reporter, 5811, 1999–2000, p. 722). When the Registrar, Dr Mead, told me of the Council’s intention I advised him against it not only on the grounds that it would lead nowhere, but also because it would be widely and correctly interpreted as an attempt to curb the efforts of certain loquacious speakers, probably including me. Since the control of speakers lies in the hands of the Vice-Chancellor or such Deputy as he sends in his stead, I pointed out that the first step would be for him to exercise it.

The Discussion of this Report on 13 June 2000 (Reporter, 5815, 1999–2000, p. 896) went its full length. It covers 27.5 columns of the Reporter plus 28 words from Professor Bowring which the editor, that is, the Registrary, censored as was his right. My remarks occupy 4.5 columns, and if I were to read them out again today it would not be the first time I have repeated an entire speech because no notice had been taken of it. I will limit myself to repeating one paragraph and part of another. The Council should read the entire Discussion.

‘Discussions, which are but the meetings of the governing body to discuss proposals emanating from the Old Schools, have over the years degenerated not only as a consequence of the wider constitutional decline but specifically because of three further factors: the unsatisfactory nature of Council replies, the absence of the signatories of the Reports that are being discussed, and the inaction of the chair.’...

‘Council replies, in my experience, have been the worst factor of all. Most intelligent people long ago saw that raising points in a Discussion was futile; the administrative mind was made up, and the Council too feeble to challenge it. Time and again as a member of the Council or the General Board (and sometimes of both) I tried to have replies improved, but it was an impossible task. They had been carved on tablets of stone in some dungeon of the Old Schools and neither facts nor reason nor compassion could change them.’

In my personal experience the ensuing fifteen years have been just as bad, partly because of the Council’s delegation of replies to its Business Committee (sometimes ill-attended) and the default position that they are deemed to have been approved by the Council if no member objects.

The Council never did reply to the Discussion of June 2000. Dr Evans, a member of the Council, commented in her note of dissent to the Report, ‘Replies to Discussions are often much delayed or not forthcoming at all’. She proposed ‘that we create a Question Time at Discussions on the model of the Parliamentary accountability procedure, at which, with notice, Chairmen of Committees and senior administrative officers, may be required to answer questions put’. Her proposal was ignored. I had myself proposed many years previously that at the end of each academic year the Council should publish a list of those Discussion remarks to which it had not yet responded. It too had been ignored.

Let me end with a current example. In 2010, the Council published a ‘Report of the Council on membership of the Regent House (age limit)’ (Reporter, 6203, 2010–11, p. 187). It proposed relaxing the age limit for a new class of members of the Regent House in addition to the Heads of Houses and the ceremonial officers such as the Chancellor. Two Fellows of Caius spoke.

Professor Herbert thought the age limit itself was ‘outrageous’ and gave his reasons. I drew attention to an existing class, Fellows of Colleges, who would expect to be similarly treated. I then explicitly proposed, giving the historical background, that the age limit be revoked anyway. It was only introduced in 1996 and on very slender grounds. Six years later the Council has still not replied to my proposal. Is it any wonder that Regents do not bother with Discussions?

My advice to the Council comes from Plutarch: ‘Know how to listen and you will profit even from those who talk badly.’
Dr. A. L. Feldman (President of the Postdocs of Cambridge Society, MRC Epidemiology Unit, and Churchill College): Deputy Vice-Chancellor, I am a postdoctoral career development fellow at the MRC Epidemiology Unit. I am also the President of the Postdocs of Cambridge (PdOC) Society and I submit these remarks regarding the Twenty-first Report of the Board of Scrutiny on behalf of the Committee of the PdOC Society.

We would like to commend the Board for considering postdocs in this year’s Report in such a profound way. The University estimates that there are currently 4,000 postdoctoral research staff on fixed-term contracts, commonly referred to as postdocs. This number has almost doubled over the last 15 years and there are now postdocs in every discipline and from every corner of the world in our community. In this year’s annual address to the University at the start of the academic year, the Vice-Chancellor highlighted postdocs’ contribution to the University, describing it as ‘the engine that powers our research capacity’. Thus, it is important, as the Board has realized, that the perspective of this large and diverse group be considered along with that of students, academic staff, and other staff groups.

But before we give you our perspective on the Board’s Report, there are two key facts about postdocs at this University that are important to note.

First, at most only one-third of postdocs are members of the Regent House. The deciding factor for who is included is not related to any systematic rule such as number of years of service or involvement in teaching, but rather to which Faculty or Department the postdoc is affiliated.

And second, only around 10% of postdocs have a College affiliation.

The Board notes in several paragraphs of the Report with regards to the ever-increasing geographic spread of the University that this poses a risk of increased isolation and loss of the ‘fruitful interdisciplinary encounters’ which enrich our academic community, and a risk of diminished engagement of Regents with the governance of the University. This is a serious concern which we share. But a majority of postdocs, being the largest staff group at the University, are already doubly affected by these risks, by both not being members of the Regent House, and not being affiliated to any College. We wish that the Board would widen the scope of its concerns to include not only the Regents but also those who already are ‘isolated from each other and from the governance of the University’ to use the phrase in paragraph 18 of the Report.

The University has made considerable progress in meeting the needs of our widespread community, most recently with the opening of a second Postdoc Centre on the Biomedical Campus, which follows the Postdoc Centre in the City that opened three years ago, and which will be followed by a third due to open at the North West Cambridge site next year. We very much welcome and praise these increased resources, but at the same time there are concerns over an unintended fragmentation of the postdoctoral community in the future. The key worker houses currently under construction at North West Cambridge will soon be home to many hundreds of postdocs and their families, and the whole development is sorely needed and much anticipated. However, it cannot be denied that even if there will be food stores and coffee shops and Postdoc Centres around the corner in this new neighbourhood, it is still several miles from Cambridge City Centre and at least half-an-hour’s cycle in the best conditions from the Biomedical Campus where about one-third of all research and academic staff work. In addition, the current public transport options to and from North West Cambridge are very limited and non-existent on evenings and Sundays. Thus, coupled with this great opportunity, there are certainly considerable risks of fragmentation, isolation, and disengagement of research staff from the University that need to be considered.

In paragraphs 25 and 26, the Board raises its concerns about the lack of career development opportunities and job security for postdocs. We share this concern and indeed it is one of the main issues with which PdOC is continuously engaged. The Board notes rightly that one of the main causes of the often uncertain situation for unestablished research staff is the funding climate, which of course the University will not be able to solve on its own. However, there are measures that can be taken by the University to improve the situation. Indeed, examples include the already existing excellent resources in career services, and the personal and professional development and researcher development programmes. We also agree that a change in policy and increased support for all staff to bring in grant funding would be a welcome development. However, this is not the only pathway to increased job security and career development possible, and it is not the only policy that is in the power of the University to change. Other possibilities include increased opportunities to create ‘staff scientist’ positions, an overview of contract lengths, and increased transparency and opportunities for promotion within the postdoctoral career phase, such as from Research Associate to Senior Research Associate. While the University certainly has an excellent reputation and is good at attracting and recruiting staff, perhaps there should be an increased focus on how to retain staff as well, and we believe that measures to improve these aspects of employment conditions for research staff would help in that respect.

Since its launch three years ago, the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs has been governed by a sub-committee of the University HR committee. But soon the governance structure for OPDA will change with the inception of the Committee for Postdoctoral Matters which will be a joint committee of the University Council and the General Board. This is in many ways a very positive development that further embeds and builds on the University’s commitment to its postdoctoral staff and ensures longevity of the support and provisions that have been established and continue to be developed. However, it is important to monitor that HR issues relating to postdocs are not lost in the move. An example is the forthcoming starting salary uplift for Research Associates and equivalent posts in grade 7. Just like the Board, we welcome this development but we also hope that it is just the first step towards generally improved salary and employment conditions for research staff including improved possibilities for promotion and incremental increases, and more opportunities to access the discretionary points at the top of grade 7 for research staff.

As mentioned at the beginning of these remarks, the majority of postdoctoral researchers, including myself, are not members of their Faculties and consequently not on the Roll of the Regent House. As such, according to the Statutes and Ordinances, we do not have an automatic right to attend and submit remarks at these Discussions. On behalf of the Committee of the Postdocs of Cambridge Society, thank you for allowing me to do so.
Professor G. R. Evans (Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History), read by the Junior Proctor:

Deputy Vice-Chancellor,

‘The Board wishes to highlight considerable concern being expressed formally and in staff satisfaction surveys about human resources (HR) issues’

In my own experience of ‘case-work’ to assist members of Cambridge’s staff involved in disputes, I see much to support these concerns. One’s confidence in Cambridge HR is not strengthened by the fact that the online Minutes of the HR Committee end in 2014, and its membership list still names as attending, the last but one of the two Directors of HR who have left rather abruptly in the last couple of years.

Let me read into the record two recent decisions of the Employment Appeal Tribunal which have drawn attention to unsatisfactory HR practices. One, last year, was Ramphal v. Department for Transport.1 The other, in July this year, was Dronsfield v. University of Reading.2 In both, HR was reproved because it overstepped the mark and interfered with the decision-making. That kind of thing happens in Cambridge too.

Among the concerns listed by the Board is ‘enforced retirement by age’. It was startling to see in the first Reporter of the year on 21 September 2016 a mere Notice3 entitled ‘Review of the University Retirement Policy’. This purported to have been approved by the Council in July, though the Council’s Agenda seems only to have an item called ‘Employment in the University’ and no Minutes are yet visible.

In any case, surely the Council cannot have authority to approve changes of this importance without reference to the Regent House, which has certainly not been consulted. The Regent House graced the original policy on a ballot,4 foolishly (in my view) consenting to a footnote saying ‘the draft policy refers to subsidiary documentation which is intended in due course to be made available on the University website’. Was it? Perhaps the Council in its reply will tell us which ‘documentation’ this is deemed to refer to and where it may be found? That seems a staggeringly vague way of creating domestic legislation under our Statutes. The governing Statute, then D, 1, 11, which has now sunk to the level of Special Ordinance C (ii) 12 certainly implies a need for Regent House consent to changes of its intent, as this Notice proposes.

It is I think not in dispute that the University must comply with the law. The law about retirement has changed in line with the inclusion of discrimination by reason of ‘age’ in equality legislation in the Equality Act 2010. So to make a University Officer retire at 67 is unlawful unless the University can justify doing so as ‘a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim’.

A Report on a retirement policy for University staff5 was published in 2012. It was proposed that the University should maintain its retirement age of 67 for University Officers and thus create an Employer Justified Retirement Age (EJRA) for them. Officers might be permitted to continue working beyond that age ‘in appropriate cases’. Other staff would not be subject to any compulsory retirement age.

The new rules, deemed to have come into force on 1 October this year, further restrict University Officers by adding a new principle to reflect ‘the importance of the EJRA in helping institutions to plan their staffing structures to allow maximum effectiveness across their activities’. It is made clear that there is a presumption against continuing beyond the EJRA. That is to be ‘exceptional’.

This is interesting to anyone who is keeping up with events in Oxford. There a working party began to revisit Oxford’s EJRA in 2015 and hopes to report during this academic year.6 This review was prompted in the light of the outcome of the first Appeal against a decision not to allow an academic to stay on.

Oxford’s Appeal Court for these purposes is roughly the counterpart of Cambridge’s Septemviri but instead of Cambridge’s seven wise persons, a senior member of the judiciary such as a retired High Court judge or Lord Justice of Appeal is appointed case by case to hear the Appeal. The Gazette contained a Notice on 25 September 2014 to the effect that ‘the University’s Appeal Court has recently heard such an appeal and has raised some issues regarding the EJRA policy and procedure’.7 No detail was given and the judgement was not published. The problem for the University was that the judge had concluded that ‘the procedure for extension beyond the EJRA is so unfair that denial of extension is inevitably unfair dismissal’.

I do not know whether the ‘group’ appointed by Cambridge’s HR Committee had a copy of that first judgement before it, but it had an opportunity to learn a good deal of relevance to its own deliberations from the Oxford Magazine this summer. In May 2016, Congregation debated a Resolution on Good Governance of the University in Relation to the Administration of the EJRA Scheme. The Resolution named the appellant and the judge and provided a cross-reference to an article which contained quite extensive quotations from the judgement, D. J. Galligan ‘Goodbye to the EJRA’, Oxford Magazine, No. 355, Noughtth Week, Hilary Term 2015, p. 4. (They get the Magazine in the Old Schools, I believe.) The debate was published in a supplement to the Gazette on 25 May,8 well before the Cambridge Council was asked to approve the Notice now published.

The judgement was not then published, but the judge had given written consent to its full disclosure to Congregation and so had the appellant. Since then a retired Lord Justice of Appeal, hearing another Appeal for its full disclosure by a different appellant who needed it to make his own case, ruled on 6 July that the University’s claim that the judgement was confidential was ‘misconceived’. A judgement in a particular Appeal might not be ‘binding’, he said, but ‘consistency in decision making is a well-established principle. A Court of Appeal decision should not be departed from without good reason’. He added that the relevance of the first judgement could be established only ‘upon analysis of the full judgement’ which must therefore be disclosed to the appellant (and presumably other appellants). The University is still withholding it from publication though of course copies are circulating.

Cambridge’s ‘officer’ appellants against their ‘enforced retirement’ do not get to appeal to the Septemviri. They will have to write to the Director of Human Resources and the Council appoints an ad hoc committee of three, none of whom is required to be legally qualified.9 That Oxford judgement is important. I have a paper copy (plain brown envelope job). It was written by the judge in a form clearly intended to allow for the publication of its main part. That contains 40 pages of analysis of the lawfulness of the Oxford procedure, with the matters relating to the specific appellant placed in an appendix. There are clear warnings for Cambridge to take note of, which should surely have been noted before that Notice was approved by Council. It reads:
‘as soon as the employer applies the policy in a different way for different people (as here, by pursuing a process for allowing some but not others to stay on) the reason for an individual’s dismissal ceases to be retirement at the EJRA and becomes a dismissal under the selection process.’ [A person is dismissed] not because he is 67 but because his application to stay on was refused.’

Cambridge’s stated presumption of refusal in making it ‘exceptional’ to allow an Officer to continue makes the same error as Oxford, in failing to conduct any ‘balancing exercise between the wishes of the individual and the needs of the University’. As the first judge in an Oxford appeal put it:

‘My clear impression that the whole procedure for applying for extensions is designed not to mitigate the discriminatory effect of the EJRA but rather to enable the University to pick out those members of staff which it wishes to retain while requiring any others to retire’… ‘The balance is entirely concerned with the interests of the University’.

Is that not exactly the thrust of that Notice in the Reporter?

I could quote much more but the fifteen-minute rule does not allow. However, surely the Oxford judgement ought to be relied on in Cambridge too. As a member of Congregation said in the debate this May ‘our employees are hiding something from us’. I think the Regent House’s UAS ‘employees’ and its committee member ‘employees’ are doing the same with reference to this EJRA Notice and the process of its construction and approval – and much else in that long-running saga of the raising of HR ‘issues’ in Cambridge.

Board of Scrutiny, please redouble your efforts.

COLLEGE NOTICES

Elections

Fitzwilliam College
The following elections have been made:

Elected into a Fellowship in Class A, with effect from 1 October 2016:

- Enrico Ryunosuke Crema, M.A., Bologna, M.Sc., Ph.D., University College London

Elected into a Fellowship in Class C, with effect from 1 October 2016:

- Daria Frank, Ph.D., ED

Elected into a Fellowship in Class A, with effect from 1 April 2017:

- Richard Charles Powell, B.A., Oxford, M.A., British Columbia, Ph.D., EM

Homerton College
The following elections have been made:

Elected to an Emeritus Fellowship from 1 October 2016:


- John Eric Hopkins, B.Mus., M.Mus., Cardiff, D.Phil., Sussex

- Molly Warrington, B.A., Ph.D., K

Elected to a Professorial Fellowship from 1 October 2016:

- Simone Hochgreb, B.Sc., São Paolo, Ph.D., Princeton

Elected to a Fellowship from 1 October 2016:

- Stephen Rennard, M.A., Harvard, M.D., Baylor College of Medicine, Texas

- Hayk Kupelyants, M.L., UCL, Ph.D., SID

- Thomas Peter Leppard, M.A., St Andrews, M.A., Sheffield, Ph.D., Brown

- Stuart David Wallace, L.L.B., Limerick, L.L.M., Galway, Ph.D., Nottingham

Elected to a Junior Research Fellowship from 1 October 2016:

- Paolo Heywood, B.A., M.Phil., Ph.D., SID

- Maja Spanu, B.A., Sorbonne, M.Res., M.A., Sciences Po, Paris, Ph.D., EUI, Italy

Elected to a Bye-Fellowship from 1 October 2016:

- Laurie Denyer Willis, B.A., Guelpf, M.Sc., MIT, Ph.D., McGill

- Aaron Douglas Hornkohl, B.A., Biola, M.A., Ph.D., HUJII

- David Geoffrey Kent, B.Sc., Western Ontario, Ph.D., British Columbia

- Dario Palumbo, B.Sc., University of Naples

3 https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2016-17/weekly/6435/section1.shtml#heading2-3
6 http://www.ox.ac.uk/gazette/2014-2015/2july2015-no5103/notices/#210772
8 https://www.ox.ac.uk/media/global/wwwoxacuk/localsites/gazette/documents/supplements2015-16/Voting_on_a_resolution_in_Congregation_on_Good_Governance_of_the_University_in_Relation_to_the_EJRA_Scheme_-__(1)_to_No_5133.pdf
9 http://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/policies-procedures/retirement-policy/appeals-procedure
**Cambridge Philosophical Society**

The Society’s second lecture of the Michaelmas Term will be this year’s Larmor Lecture and will take place at 6 p.m. on Monday, 24 October 2016, in the Bristol-Myers Squibb Lecture Theatre, Department of Chemistry, Lensfield Road. Professor Sir Harry Bhadeshia, FRS, FREng, will give a lecture entitled *Nanostructured steel: the challenge of manufacture*.

Further details are available at http://www.cambridgephilosophicalsociety.org/lectures.shtml.

**EXTERNAL NOTICES**

**University of Oxford**

*St Antony’s College: Alistair Horne Visiting Fellowship* for historians and first authors; modest expenses allowance and generous College benefits plus full use of College facilities; closing date: 30 November 2016; further details: https://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/current-members/senior-members/visiting-fellowships/alistair-horne-fellowship

**Darwin College: David MacKay Newton Research Fellowship** (in mathematics and information theory); tenure: three years from 1 October 2017; stipend: in the region of £20,874 plus College benefits; closing date: 21 November 2016; further details: http://www.dar.cam.ac.uk/research-fellowships or contact the College Registrar, Janet Gibson (email: jb323@cam.ac.uk)

**Sidney Sussex College: Stipendiary and non-stipendiary Research Fellowships (two); tenure: three years from 1 September 2017; stipend: up to £21,605; closing date: 25 October 2016 at 12 noon; further details: http://www.sid.cam.ac.uk/aboutus/personnel

**SOCIETIES, ETC.**

**Homerton College Resident Ensemble**

The College’s Resident Ensemble will be holding its inaugural concert on Thursday, 17 November 2016 at 6 p.m. in the Paston Brown Room, Homerton College. The performance will include music by Stravinsky, Kurtag, and Ligeti. Tickets cost £10 (£5 for students and concessions) and may be purchased on the door or booked online at http://www.eventbrite.co.uk (search ‘Ligeti’).

**St John’s College**

**Memorial service for Professor Milsom**

A memorial service for Professor Stroud Francis Charles (Toby) Milsom, M.A., Hon. LL.D., QC, FBA, Fellow of St John’s College and Emeritus Professor of Law, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, who died on 24 February 2016, aged 92, will be held in St John’s College Chapel on Saturday, 19 November 2016 at 12 noon.

**Wolfson College**

**Funeral service for Professor Hesse**

A funeral service for Professor Mary Hesse (see p. 52) will take place on Tuesday, 25 October 2016 at 12.30 p.m. at St Andrew’s Church, Girton, followed by cremation at East Chapel, Cambridge Crematorium, at 2.30 p.m.