

The University of Manchester**Board of the School of Natural Sciences**

**2pm – 4pm Wednesday 5th May 2021, Zoom (<https://zoom.us/j/93491969067>) – Passcode
– 399694**

Agenda

1. Chairs Business 2:00 – 2:05
 - a. Minutes from the previous meeting held on 23.03.2021 and Extraordinary School Board meeting held on 27.04.2021
2. Faculty Business Engagement & Innovation; what can we do to help you? 2:05-2:20 (**Aline Miller, Associate Dean for Business Engagement & Innovation in FSE**)
3. Head of School Report and Q&A 2:20-2:45 (led by **Chris Hardacre**)
4. Items from the Departments 2:45-2:55 (led by **Chairs of Department Fora**)
5. Items from the Faculty Committee and Senate 2:55-3:05 (led by **Faculty committee reps** and **Senate reps**)
6. Head of School Operations Report 3:05-3:10 (led by **Sam Ryder**)
7. Head of EDIA Report 3:10 -3:15 (led by **Giles Johnson**)
8. Items from the Student Reps 3:15 – 3:30 (led by **Student reps**)
9. Head of Education Report and discussion on teaching and learning 3:30 – 3:55 (led by **Andrew Horn / Peter Green (subject to prior meeting finishing on time)**)
 - Assessment for Semester 2
 - Teaching arrangements for 2021-2022 academic year
10. Head of Research Report [written report]
11. AOB
12. Date and time of next meeting – to be confirmed

Reports

Senate Members Report
Faculty Committee Members Report
Head of Operations Report
Head of Education Report
Head of EDIA Report
Head of Research
HR Report (report only)

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL BOARD
HELD ON TUESDAY 23 March 2021 AT 2-4PM, ZOOM

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Item No.	Item	Action By	Date Due
1	Chair's business		
	<p>The minutes of the last meeting were approved as an accurate record with an amendment to Item 5 Issues from the Departments. The motion was raised as a proposal for discussion by staff members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair provided clarification around the voting rights of the Board, although the Board had previously voted in favour of PS holding the right to vote on Board matters this change had not yet been agreed by the University. Recognition of Covid memorial day today – 23 March <p>Matters arising: All actions have been done.</p>		
2	Head of School Report (Chris Hardacre)		
	<p><u>Budget planning process</u></p> <p>Two phases, Phase 1: has been undertaken - tuition fees, student numbers, pay and capita, Phase 2 is ongoing - research, OOE and overall position</p> <p>Contribution target not yet set, so discussions on OOE and staffing has been a little tricky. Discussions with the Board of Governors and the Finance Director are ongoing. Challenging budget round.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of new posts may be limited. Discretionary spend may be reduced Economies of scale across the School are being considered <p><u>Campus management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you to staff as across the Faculty there has been extremely good compliance, still some breaches, and issuing of sanctions, but no onsite transmission to date 29 March - Hoping Government 'stay at home' instruction will end 12 April – potential for more UG/PT students on campus Visitors to campus can access onsite Covid tests, will need an email from the dept to access this service Business travel requests – restrictions remain, meaning essential travel only <p>Questions/comments raised verbally and in chat function include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End of the "stay at home" instruction, what this means for academic staff?: This will be a University decision rather than FSE, and will be communicated soon Students travel: Yes can be facilitated Increase in maximum occupancy: Yes can apply to get to max capacity <p><u>Admissions</u></p> <p>If we don't take into account grade inflation – numbers are reasonable</p>		

	<p>Faculty Contribution Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April - Release of FCM in 'beta-mode' to seek feedback • June – FCM available to use for PDR process, use for 22/23 duties allocation • Comments made reflected a desire to see the overall framework (abstract detail) before it is applied to individuals • Comments referenced concern and worry about the formulae and how this will be affect academic staff • Suggestion from one colleague that the HoS had disregarded an instruction by the School Board to bring a paper detailing the formulae – this was disputed as inaccurate with a response that the HoS had provided what was asked. The Chair recalled that it had been agreed that the details of the scheme would be brought to the Board, but that this had been overtaken by the Covid crisis. <p>Vote on FCM motion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We propose that the details of the formula and the model are discussed and approved by the School Board before it is applied to individuals • Votes cast: 72 of 152 in attendance • Results: Yes: 66 92% No 6 8% <p>Agreed to hold extraordinary School board meeting to discuss. FCM formulae to be circulated ahead of meeting, allowing time for Easter holiday and departmental forum discussions</p> <p>Action 1: Circulate FCM formulae</p> <p>Action 2: Schedule an extraordinary School board</p> <p>NB. Chris suffered with connection issues during delivery and responding to questions.</p>		
3	<p>Items from the departments</p> <p><u>No-Confidence-Motion-16.12.20.pdf (ucu.org.uk) – raised via by Mathematics Department Fora for consideration at Jan 2021 School Board.</u></p> <p>Chair shared onscreen a proportion of the written motion previously circulated in January. A link to the motion was shared with the March agenda. It was explained that this originated as a UCU motion, had been circulated widely and is understood to have been discussed at other school boards.</p> <p>The motion was not read out, the Chair assumed all members had read it in advance. The Chair invited any member to speak to it or against it. A debate was not held and dept fora had not voted on the motion although it had been discussed.</p> <p>Comments from department forum chairs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemistry was discussed at forum with strong views expressed: clearly unhappy with the way the University has been run over last year. But no vote took place so can't say comments are representative of the views of Chemistry • Mathematics not been discussed at forum, discussion deferred to School Board • Earth and Environmental Sciences not been discussed at forum • Physics and Astronomy not been discussed at forum • Materials not been discussed at forum <p>Comments:</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledged some aspects are dated (given time lapse), but feel there is a constant trend of management not listening to staff, indicated through feedback in surveys over time, shows decreasing confidence in SLT management Noted that the colleague from Mathematics whom had originally proposed the motion had stated to the dept fora chair that s/he was happy to drop the motion <p>The Chair proposed to continue with a vote as the motion was an agenda item. The motion could not be read out by the Chair due to viewing availability whilst voting.</p> <p><u>Vote on motion</u> Do you support the motion?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> First vote - academic only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Votes cast: 71 of 169 in attendance Results: Yes: 55 No: 17 Second vote – All staff (academic and PS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Votes cast: 97 of 169 in attendance Results: Yes: 76 No: 21 <p><u>Survey on the Impact of the Pandemic on parents and carers - raised by Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences</u> Rob Sansom, brought the above to the Board's attention and asked people to identify any other ways in which colleagues have been impacted that haven't been considered.</p> <p>Questions/comments raised verbally and in chat function include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were PS staff included? – Yes we did also want to acknowledge equivalent impacts on PS staff, while recognising the focus of this particular letter relates to academic concerns. Feel PS staff particularly affected, and have no route back to campus, feel suffer because of this – Sam Ryder responded to clarify that PS and all staff have route to wellbeing access and discussions are ongoing to facilitate a PS return to campus. Is it solely childcare or other caring responsibilities? - <p><u>Items from other Department Forums</u> None raised</p>		
4	Items from the Faculty Committee Reps and Senate Report		
	<p>The Chair reported from Senate. There was a vote at Senate on the proposal from the Board of Governors to appoint the Chancellor instead of being elected by alumni and staff. Senate members voted and did not support the proposal. There was also a vote on the proposal from the Board of Governors to appoint PS staff representatives to sit on the Board of Governors instead of being elected by PS staff on General Assembly. Senate also voted against this proposal</p> <p>Simeon Gill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elections for Faculty Committee members are currently open Important opportunity for PS voices to be heard Example of matters discussed: Faculty governance, contribution model, campus management, size/shape It was highlighted that availability of the Faculty Committee Minutes would enhance communication Encourage staff to press for minutes to be available, so easier to communicate 		
5	Head of Education Report (Andrew Horn)		
	<i>A report by Andrew Horn had been received and circulated.</i>		

	<p>Andrew showed a presentation, highlighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigating circumstances submission now online • Many lessons learnt • 700 online exams – interesting scheduling task • Online marking, good for academic colleagues, but created more work for PS colleagues; need to look at reallocating resource to support this. <p>Questions/comments raised verbally and in chat function include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just an aside from the perspective of a student who has been anxiously waiting for results along with my peers since about 1:30 today, I think in future it would be better to be more realistic/allow more time between the exam board and results being released as many students are so nervous they are not able to focus on anything • Students have waited 2 months for the marks to be released, a concern raised by reps in a teaching review meeting earlier today. Will this time be reduced for future exams?– Andrew acknowledged it had taken a long time, explained there had been some complications, will hopefully do it a lot faster in S2 and in the future. Has been a system of moderation and scaling, details of which will be available to students • Why isn't more resource devoted to sorting out the bulk download and uploading or marked scripts? Marking via BB is so painful – this is something that should be considered • I got the impression that the Education office (at least in my dept) was overwhelmed at the time of the exam marking, which has undoubtedly slowed things. PLEASE can more "central resource" be allocated to depts. for S2 – Regarding resources for exam marking and processing, we now have a much clearer picture of how to improve the processes, resource the bottlenecks and streamline the paperwork. • If, in 2021-22, pen and paper campus exams are permitted, does that mean there will definitely be no remote learning or will students have to come to Manchester just to take their exams? – My understanding is that the remote option would be until the end of December, and that if there were on-campus exams in January, there would be an expectation that students would return/attend for them. 		
6	<p>First Steps to Flexible Learning (led by Dan George, Associate Vice President Blended and Flexible Learning and Stephen Pettifer, Academic Lead for Digital Learning)</p> <p><i>A paper 'First steps to flexible learning' and presentation had been received and circulated</i></p> <p>Steve Pettifer gave presentation overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listening to opinions and views - Students and staff both want to get back on to campus to teach but have also valued the flexibility to work online • Main aim is around a change of mindset rather than setting a particular way of teaching • Consider a framework to support and encourage to do things in the best way, not assume the old way is the best way • What has been done over the last year isn't blended learning – blended learning is bringing together the best of online and in-person teaching • For September, we need to plan for a scenario that isn't totally back to how we were pre-Covid-19. • Blended at Programme level 		

	<p>Steve requested feedback: Questions to respond to: What is good? – What is bad?</p> <p>Questions/comments raised verbally and in chat function include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to understand how we teach Mathematics and transmit mathematic ability before making radical changes. There are issues comparing the success of the Open University's Blended Learning teaching with producing mathematicians as the input if different. • Blended workload in S1 was huge, correct tools to deliver would minimise this • Will sit-down with pen and paper Jan and June exams continue under blended learning? There are many problems with online exams and tests. – Yes online exams is Covid response rather than a flexible working approach • Staff have invested a huge amount of time in preparing this year's online materials, with the (implicit?) promise that these can be used as part of future blended learning offerings. Will this be the case? – Yes • How do you see the decision making at programme level working? Will this be democratic or decided by a few people such as DoE? – the FLP won't be involved in department decisions • Have students been asked their opinion on blended learning? If so, what was the feedback? – difficulties of separating blended learning from Covid learning • How will the student workload be monitored in relation to the study budget? Last semester students reported spending far longer than the allocated budget – Note: question posed in the chat and not directly answered • One major difficulty students are facing is struggles with wi-fi/ not having laptops that can run certain programmes or to remotely access University computers – Note: question posed in the chat and not directly answered • FSE Teaching College has been extremely proscriptive throughout the pandemic. Under normal conditions it was left to staff to decide how best to deliver their content to meet the ILOs. Are there plans to return to allowing staff to decide what is best for them rather than this new inflexible and proscriptive approach to deciding how staff teach- which ironically caused much of the workload problems with staff in this academic year? – Note: question posed in the chat and not directly answered <p>Agreed to discuss more at departmental forums and provide feedback. The feedback opportunities include an open meeting and an online document to comment on, details will be circulated soon.</p>		
7	<p>Items from the Student Reps (led by Student reps)</p> <p><u>Student Survey Results: 'How are SoNS finding semester 2' (Alannah Williams)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 400 responses but not distributed in Mathematics, Materials, or FBT. • Students feel not much has changed from semester 1. • Feel workloads have increased from semester 1 • Feel semester 2 has more structure than semester 1 • 50% of respondents said communications have not improved since semester 1, although 20% (mainly from DESS) said they had felt these had improved • All deadlines seem to be concentrated in one period • Students want to thank staff for efforts they have made • Consider: Easing level of exams, i.e. shorter, less questions, another light content week <p>Questions/comments raised verbally and in chat function include:</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for this and a reminder of the School student open meetings, for students to raise and discuss concerns • This was a huge amount of work by the student reps many thanks for putting this all together • Suggestion to bring this together with the work that Fran Moss, TLSE Student Experience Manager, is doing. • Agree with the students that there has been an unacceptable delay regarding results, feels students have been treated badly, from SLT downwards, he shares the feeling that students are being treated as numbers - the delay is largely due to the implementation of the assessment pledge, which has several components that impact the marking moderating and exam boards, including a Faculty Exam Board. The results from FSE are actual marks rather than raw, unmoderated marks that the other faculties are releasing. Our students can be confident in the fairness of the whole process, which is the point of the pledge. • Clearly everything is well intentioned, but if our processes yield a 2-month gap between assessment and returning marks, then we should explain to students that this is a consequence of our well-intentioned attempts at being fair. Once again, our communications let us down. A good point - we have tried but clearly not done as well as we can. Hopefully all colleagues and student members can spread this message. • As a physics rep, I can confirm that comment is in line with a lot of the feedback we have been receiving this year • This was a huge amount of work by the student reps many thanks for putting this all together • The thing about having something between academic advising and counselling is an interesting point, however it may put people in an awkward position because not all advisors have training in dealing with problem cases • Someone had to contact the Chemistry education office to find out that our results are not being released today after we were promised they would be. This is not fair on students who have had such a turbulent exam season! • It's probably true that the quantity of "content" hasn't changed compared with previous years. However there are clearly big problems with student workload. Is anyone clear what the source of the problem is, and how we fix this to improve the satisfaction for our students? - the feedback we have collected seems to point to that a 1h video does not take 1h to do when the lecturers go through slides quickly and often require pausing. This usually brings the lecture content to 2 hours per course or more, but then the addition of synchronous sessions adds even more workload. There is then an issue of many courses demanding several hours of reading before the several hours of questions can be started. This neglects issues faced from COVID directly and technological hurdles, however this is probably the largest contributor based on what we have received. <p><u>Funding extensions for international students – the funding sources are vast and varied, but can anything be done to appease concerned internationally-funded students with looming deadlines? (James Bird)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James couldn't talk to this point due to connection issues <p><u>Compensation for the impact of the move to the Royce Hub building, by means of funded extension (James Bird)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris: UKRI – have been extended via UKRI phase 2 funding 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment from James in chat: I raise the issue on Royce-funded extensions as a more broad issue on the move to new buildings. Many more will be involved in the move to MECD, and I feel that there are many lessons to be learned - especially with regards removing researchers from labs before the new ones are ready. 		
8	Head of Research Report (led by Kevin Taylor)		
	<p><i>A report by Kevin Taylor had been received and had been circulated.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank all those who worked on REF: DoR; Impact and output champions; and PS colleagues • More than 70 people across the Faculty have been directly involved and even more who have helped indirectly - everyone that has worked on REF will receive a thank you email • 717 eligible staff across six Units of Assessment - together submitting almost 1700 outputs • 44 impact case studies and narratives of more than 81,000 words across 6 environment statements • As of Monday there were no validation errors. We will be submitting this week <p>Questions/comments raised verbally and in chat function include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks to you as well Wendy. Amazing job. • Yes, well done Wendy, you and the team did an incredible job <p>Chris Hardacre: Kevin is stepping down from his role as Head of Research, on behalf of the School would like to thank you for all your work and wish you well in the future.</p>		
9	Head of EDIA Report (led by Giles Johnson)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of time – so not discussed <p>Questions/comments raised verbally and in chat function include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we move this meeting to outside school runs? The School has core business hours, and this meeting falls within them but a suggestion that we vary the times of the Board should be considered. <p>Bring attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manchester Gold mentoring scheme available for all staff: https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/staff-learning-and-development/academicandresearch/personal-skills-and-development/mentoring/manchester-gold/ • Trans awareness sessions next week: https://app.manchester.ac.uk/training/profile.aspx?unitid=9233&parentid=4 		
10	Student Experience Programme Engagement: Your Views Matter. (led by Steve Olivier)		
	<p><i>An SEP presentation had been received and circulated.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of time – so not discussed • Steve recommend staff engage with the feedback opportunities available 		
11	Head of School Operations Report (led by Sam Ryder)		
	<p><i>A report by Sam Ryder had been received and circulated.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of time – so not discussed 		
12	AOB		

13	Date of Next Meeting		
	The next meeting would be held on 5 May 2021 at 2pm (venue TBC)		

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE EXTRAORDINARY SCHOOL BOARD
HELD ON TUESDAY 27 APRIL 2021 AT 11:30AM – 12:30PM, ZOOM

DISCUSSION SUMMARY ON THE FACULTY CONTRIBUTION MODEL

Item No.	Item	Action By	Date Due
	Summary of FCM (led by Head of School)		
	<p>Philippa Browning (PB) welcomed everybody to the meeting and thanked Peter Green (PG) and Ian Cotton (IC) for being in attendance in their respective roles to answer any question. Pointed out that there would be a vote on the FCM at the end of the meeting, endorsing it or otherwise. The motion wording allows for accepting the model subject to minor revisions, similar to accepting a paper for publication or a PhD thesis subject to minor corrections/revisions.</p> <p>IC is in attendance as he has been implementing the model into the computer programme.</p> <p>Only academics with appointment lasting over 12 months should vote at the end of the meeting either yes, no or abstain on: "The School Board endorses the proposed Faculty Contribution Model, subject to minor revisions in response to comments received."</p> <p>The model can still be amended.</p> <p>Chris Hardacre (CH) started with why do we want the FCM? It has been driven by the EDIA. It is a fair transparent way of allocating duties. It will look at EDIA concerns across the Faculty, it will also look at the impact of duties for various categories of staff. It will look at how the School is doing in certain activities across the Faculty and best practice can be looked at.</p> <p>It is not for FLT or SLT to look at dictating how departments allocate duties. It is flexible and will evolve over time.</p> <p>It was built from the bottom up. CH noted that on the admissions side 150 hours seems too small it should actually be 500. This was a typographically error.</p> <p>CH shared an overview which included process for responding to feedback, staffing and leadership/service, teaching, research, option to address issue of individual research.</p> <p>IC wanted to note over 130 pieces of feedback had been received and these were mainly making consistent points.</p> <p>It was asked if there is a policy for maternity cover for academic staff similar to what occurs for PS staff. CH highlighted this is Faculty wide activity 1 FTE for 6 months.</p>		
	Items raised by Department For a Chairs		
	<p><u>Department of Chemistry</u> Nothing to report.</p> <p><u>Department of EEE</u> Departmental Fora is taking place on the 28th April.</p>		

	<p><u>Department of Materials</u> Individual comments received regarding the granularity of the model and specific elements.</p> <p><u>Department of Maths</u> Department Forum taking place on 28th April. A slide was tabled. In particular, there were concerns about lack of time for research, and about micromanagement.</p> <p><u>Department of Physics and Astronomy</u> Departmental Forum took place last week. Document circulated prior to the Board.</p>		
	Question/comments about the FCM raised verbally and in chat function include:		
	<p>PG commented that in terms of academic roles associated with disciplines, Head of Disciplines had a workshop 18 months ago that set out the original numbers. They are currently going through a review process to see if the balance is correct. With regards to delivery of teaching, this has not been looked at as a Teaching College, this will be looked at by Andrew Horn (AH) looking at the cost in hours and other resources of creating materials, delivering materials and maintaining materials.</p> <p>There has been a request to share the feedback anonymised and responses from SLT.</p> <p>A comment about how to monitor how workload is distributed around staff for various reasons. The allocation is to do each job at a basic level. If that uses up 80% of someone's time then the remaining 20% will be vastly-overcommitted for most people.</p> <p>Comment about neurodivergence in staff and students. The worry is that being more prescriptive about how academics spend their time. Previously the kind of flexibility that alleviated the problems associated with this came under light touch working practices under the banner of 'academic freedom', but if we are going to become more prescriptive about peoples' time, are we going to have to be more explicit about allowing for individuals' needs in this regard? CH noted that the local part will still exist and the flexibility will still be there.</p> <p>A major concern is the perception internally and externally of academics who are overloaded with a myriad of work duties. How will this be managed? The School needs to be very clear that this is an exercise to help the workload of many. Where will this process take us?</p> <p>What connection does the University envisage between Blended Learning and Remote Study Option? Are we going to a new form of hybrid Open University? PG had left the meeting so cannot be replied to in the meeting.</p> <p>Comment raised about academics engaging with industry to deliver impact which does consume a lot of time. Has this been taken into consideration? It was responded that this is a good point and it should go into the survey.</p> <p>How will the model will be used? A flawed model is better than no model if it used to allocate resource to see where people are over committed. The concern is if this becomes a management tool then some of the models deficiencies become of extreme concern.</p> <p>Concern about research income as opposed to outputs will squeeze out high profile but low cost research.</p>		

	<p>There isn't anything in the document about transparency which could impact academics careers.</p> <p>Centrally held data is not always correct but we must be able to revise and update.</p> <p>The model needs to be public to ensure the data is as accurate as possible.</p> <p>The professional activities of editing and reviewing are not mentioned.</p> <p>There is a question about legacy agreements and are they going to be honoured and included in the model?</p> <p>How will it be reviewed over time and who will be doing the review process?</p> <p>There is a large component at the HoD discretion, will there be a mechanism in place to review the decisions which effect peoples careers?</p> <p>Comment raised about self-directed work such as research not associated with funded projects, outreach, business engagement, sitting on panels, journal refereeing. The issue is the total amount given in the model without negotiation or arguments with individuals/HoD for the amount of time that people have to work under their own initiatives. Could the model include an extra day or half a day added to allow people to do more self-directed work? Could the 20% be changed to at least 40%? Academics need to be self-directed for a large part of their time. CH would seek Alice Larkin view on this.</p> <p>Comment raised in the meeting regarding individual research time being a day or a half day which was put down as a proposal or a target, can we in this meeting agree that that would be an explicit part of that model?</p> <p>Comment raised on how the model is going to be used?</p> <p>Comment raised from the document in the explanatory notes. Is the appropriate amount of time on a particular activity that there in section one. Is this an appropriate amount of time?</p> <p>Concerned about taught unit preparation and delivery because it's very singular it doesn't account for different norms within disciplines. A model which recognises what it takes to deliver theory against what it takes to deliver practical.</p> <p>Comment about the overall roles at the end of the document. The idea of this model is to ensure comparability and help people manage workload.</p> <p>What lessons have been learned from workload models in other Faculties? A number of documents have been written for example UCU and The Royal Academy of Engineering or the Royal Society. CH noted that the FCM will be reviewed as duties change.</p> <p>Comment raised about the time allocated for teaching units with relatively small numbers of students. It was pointed out that an academic would be required to teach 17 full 10 credit modules wach with 20 students, in order to fill their allocated time. It was also pointed out that blended learning/teaching on line is taking up a lot of time. This reveals a fundamental problem with the time allocated for teaching.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Comment raised that the model is trying too hard to have a Faculty approach and it misses out nuances that other people mentioned and that can make staff feel undervalued.</p> <p>Comment about outreach and this is not captured in the FCM. IC confirmed it this there. A Royal Society Exhibit can take up 70 hours.</p> <p>If 10 academics in a department are 10% over committed in the FCM will the University hire an extra staff member? CH responded that this would depend on budgets.</p> <p>Comment raised about the expectations of balance of commitments on a teaching and research track. The model works against this track.</p> <p>Note: additional Comments posed in chat</p> <p>I'd assume everyone is over-worked...and that this is a tool to help people. We should try and build and view the model in a positive light, if possible...</p> <p>it is almost inevitable that when we look carefully at all the demands on our time we will realize that we have to do far more than a reasonable number of hours to do our job well</p> <p>If this model results in everyone being over committed then surely that is a massive problem that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Counting all activities looks as attempt of counting electrons in Dirac's sea. Risc of not getting 100 percent at the end. Better use a simple ground state and count from it (i.e. start from uniform teaching load and then do some "release" based on an extra duties)?</p> <p>if the flexibility needed is going to be devolved to a departmental level, then I guess the ideal thing is to make sure the HoDs are equipped to recognise and apply it in the most appropriate manner.</p> <p>What lessons have been learnt from deployment of a work load model in other faculties? Have model parameters rolled out then been revised through a periodic review process?</p> <p>According to this model, a member of staff should be able to teach 17 (seventeen!) 10 credit course units with 20 students each in a year and still have 10 hours left over do something else.</p> <p>The FCM tries to capture things in a common way across faculty. However, a too coarse approach risks missing out on differences across Faculty. Given that this puts numbers to tasks, it can be demoralising if tasks aren't captured accurately. A (small) example are UCAS interviews, which are counted with 1h in physics. This does not allocate time for pre-reading and reporting and things like that can feel like undervaluing contributions or effectively a pay-cut.</p> <p>the point about 17 course units illustrates a fundamental problem with the time allocated for teaching</p> <p>(radio/television/etc.) raising the profile of our science, department, school and university is important and not captured in the FCM</p> <p>Current FCM works against, rather than encourages, a dual teaching and research track. . Our grant success fluctuates and in times of lower success the FCM will drive us towards</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>teaching, making it more difficult to continue with research and maintain the balance. The 3-year taper is basically one grant round so does not smooth over this. Similarly the 20% "Thinking time" in practise is time spent in meetings, advising students, writing references, outreach, peer-review, external meetings, dealing with email and admin. All the myriad of tasks not tracked by the FCM. We need our students to be taught by research leaders, so a healthy balance of teaching and research is good for the faculty's research and it is good for its teaching excellence. The FCM should encourage and therefore reward this.</p> <p>consideration of how much time is spent in task that are 'generalist' rather than 'specialist'</p> <p>Are you all saying it is impossible to find a single workload model that is fair to nine diverse departments containing very diverse staff?</p> <p>It is too difficult or almost impossible to have a single and fair FCM for all disciplines, as we do not have one single Department for the whole Faculty or University. I believe that putting a 40% redline for scholarly and other work as suggested by Terry and others is the only realistic way forward here.</p> <p>I am heavily involved with International collaboration for student admission, which is very time-demanding. I hope work such as this is counted in.</p> <p>I am pleased to hear from Chris, Ian and Peter about the work that is ongoing to improve the current draft of the FCM. I look forward to being able to support a future version, but it won't be a "minor correction" to what we have in front of us. So I will not be supporting it at present</p> <p>There was a proposal to allocate 5% time for an identified SR activity. This was agreed by Chris with the faculty SR committee. Has this been captured in the model?</p> <p>Vote as follows "This School Board endorses the FCM subject to minor revisions in response to the comments?"</p> <p>215 voted out of 264 attendees. It was noted that 1 person left the meeting early and wanted to vote against (this vote was not included). PB couldn't vote but would vote no.</p> <p>Yes – 16% No – 72% Abstained – 13%</p> <p>CH and PB thanked everyone for their feedback and the model will be revised. The revised model will be brought back to a future School Board for approval.</p>		
	Date of Next Meeting		
	The next School Board of Natural Sciences will be held on 5 May 2021 at 2pm		

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

REPORT TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

REPORT BY: Simeon Gill – Elected member of faculty committee

MONTH: 14/04/2021

In lieu of minutes this briefing paper provides an overview of faculty committee discussion from elected members.

1. A Level release 10th Aug.
2. Natural sciences degree discussed, to be raised at SoNS board.
 - Could create internal competition? Will we attract additional students?
 - Can be very positive for students. make it a small programme for top tier of best students to test popularity. It may be complex (term dates, international students).
 - post qual system – why put resource into interviews to assess students? If grades are known
 - interviews have other benefits (establish connections for students)
3. Noted more items directly from school boards would be beneficial, remarked on by Dean that items seem not to come from boards in a linear manner. Elected members indicated they raised items directly, which were often discussed in boards.
4. Discussed 21/22 academic year. Planning underway. Next announcement 24/05/21 from govt, this will be next cascade of detail. Consumer law applied so gaining OFS guidance for sector took time to ensure planning met expectations.
5. SEP (Student Experience Programme) discussed. Financial saving potential, with viewed workload mitigation through technology adoption. Hubbing of PS front facing envisaged, not strictly by colocation. Job description standardization envisaged to enhance PS promotion, though specialisms within grade recognised as important.
6. Impact of VS and increased student numbers: Strategic decisions to support areas of growth through specific recruitment, low numbers of staff lost in VS. Also discussed workload and FCM. Important to ensure PS roles did not drift to academic staff, hoped FCM would help balance loads. FCM discussion ongoing.
7. Discussed briefly teaching and deadlines, mainly in respect of Covid. Poor Govt messaging made planning difficult. Stressed FSE messaging aimed at ensuring staff would not interpret as increased workload over Easter. FLT were conscious this may impact and were prepared for delay due to messaging and times staff were taking a break.
8. Mitigation of high workloads in relation to Covid: Line management was stressed as route staff should seek to mitigate this. Request for higher level leadership through identifying areas that would reduce pressure on staff.
9. Working group to loom at widening participation and female applications.

Senate Meeting 28 Apr 2021

Report from some elected Senate members

The Transition Steering group which was set up for the pandemic has now been disbanded, so governance would return to normal.

Writing briefings from BoG is to be a regular item, noted as a welcome addition.

PG 26, have a push for philanthropic monies, considering campaign to raise funds. Nancy has focused on this over past 2 months to raise funds. US used as an example, rather than a model.

All 18 yr olds vaccinated by Sep, asked whether Uni could quarantine overseas students, as no capacity using hotels. Discussions re Augar report, which would significantly impact on us. Rough estimate loss of 60 million if this change happens. UoM and Sheffield and Leeds launch a northern investment fund for scale up and start up companies. Top in sustainability in the world.

USS survey had been edited and this impacts on how staff gain confidence in its use. Interactive dialogue boxes seem to have been removed. Nancy suggests she completed the survey.

SU are negotiating with student protestors, SLT suggested they engage through them, rather than management speaking to them directly..

Nalin Thakar: Campus management group, falling incidence of cases, levelling out to be more in line with national averages. Testing available on campus, encourages staff to get tested. From early May self testing kits for students. Vaccinations, suggest staff take when offered. Pfizer or moderna vaccine req for students as overwhelmingly between 18 and 28 years old; likely that home student will be vaccinated when returning home, then on campus, next semester, for 2nd dose. Looking at the opportunity to vaccinate overseas on arrival in UK.

April McMahon: UG numbers good, applications up, slow response to offers. Still the most popular UK University [Big surprise considering we are the largest UK university]. PGT home up 2%, offers up 11%, international up ~4% and offers up 10%. Interruptions and withdrawals, UG numbers withdrawals are down but PGT are up slightly. Interruptions are significantly up.

Colette Fagan: REF submission is in. Humanities grant capture significantly up as a result of several yr strategy to focus on support for larger and more interdisciplinary bids + lots of support from PS and creativity in applications.

1.3million potential hit in foreign development funding. Seen significant, but not as large as feared. Have accommodated by re profiling studies and using underspend on travel. GCRF underspend allowed it to divert to support. So far managed to keep projects viable, financial hit is within bounds, but still further cuts to come. Biggest concerns are 2 large awards which will be hit, but hope over scale of cuts. GLS: should we push back. NR: we have been, Nancy has been pushing on this at ministerial level. CF: what happens if this is the end of ODA funding. GL: hosted Uk summit and African countries are also lobbying as it impacts on them.

Seems the senate documents have new items, a treat for our visitors from Halpin. Positive developments that hopefully will be part of what happens going forwards.

SH: commutable distance removed from PGR requirements, what about support structures for those not needing to be present? Will we reduce fees as not using estates? MW: can work at distance, so clause not appropriate, we could market programmes internationally, no intention for fee reduction. Demand might change this?

RH: PhD supervisor is effectively a line manager and needs to act accordingly. PB: some supervisors, a minority who demand students they supervise work after hours and on weekends and discourage them from taking leave they are entitled to; we need a good practice guide as we effectively are line manager to them and their workloads.

Approve changes proposed by Melissa

NT: Ethics on human participants in research, updated it. Process is supervisor ultimately responsible for the process. Ultimately the supervisor is responsible and must guide them on the process. Part of research supervision is to guide on ethics process.

Agreed to this item.

ST: we would benefit from an overview of changes to make it easier for us procedurally.

Kwame attacked UCU openly at senate. Suggest holds Nancy to account, but UCU undermining his work. Accused UCU of bullying on social media. Suggested students only act as they do based on UCU influence. Claimed information (in the public domain) like restructure plan for Library is leaked by UCU to 'radicalise' students.

Junior working out how they support students, reviewed all options. Hardline of the UCU are ALLEGEDLY pushing this. He has brought this up with union leaders and claims, without giving evidence, that UCU is radicalising and exploiting UoM students. Information students are receiving, suggests UCU exec tried to get SU exec to agree with them. Consider UCU members have senate roles and should not as it's a conflict of interest.

Laetitia: Seemed surprised by 'report' by other SU members; said they were only meant to update on the occupation. Said students occupying Sam Alex from 4 different campaign groups who have been active since start of academic year

Blended learning: Document on Blended Learning presented by Stephen Pettifer and Daniel George, The proposals had been modified through discussion with elected senate members.

Recognised the importance of consultation on this and how the model has evolved. Could include evidence base and effectiveness of the techniques. Proposal suggested does not include student flexibility here.

FEB: If part of our future strategy, when will we get to look over the documents that are part of the wider proposals? No concrete answer from either NR or PH

Halpin review comes to senate in July and BoG would then review and publish.

Language tutors, positive, can have access to promotions. Alessandro Schiesaro to produce written update on implementation. Explanation to senate as to why grading for these jobs is lower than that for other teaching staff and why no meeting with the language tutors.

KB: suggests decision panel is final. Suggests matter is closed.

Requested update on panel, HR matter and will respond to Frank directly. NR: HR will respond on this as it is a grading issue.

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

REPORT TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

REPORT BY: Sam Ryder, Jen Lockhart, Kevin Jackson and Chris Muryn

MONTH: May 2021

School Priority	On agenda (Y/N)
Priority 1 Workforce and budget planning	
<p><u>FSE Technical Review</u></p> <p>Since our last update in March (https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/fse/faculty-structure/technical-review/latest-news/) the project team has been working to finalise the Cohort 2 proposal. This proposal has been endorsed by the Faculty Leadership Team, Planning and Resource Committee and the University's Staffing Committee and will be presented at the Board of Governors meeting in May for approval. Engagement will continue and open meetings for all technical and experimental will be held in May to give an update on the progress and answer any questions that technical and experimental staff may have about the transformation process. Staff can email questions, suggestions and feedback to the technical review team at FSErestructure@manchester.ac.uk and a member of the project team will get back to you.</p> <p>Two of our existing Technical Operations Managers, Gary Ingham (Materials) and John Warren (MACE), have now transitioned fully into their new TOM roles within the new operating structure. Interim line management structures for all technical staff have been implemented in those departments to enable Gary and John to focus on key Faculty priorities including MECD and TRAC/cost recovery – a crucial component of our financial sustainability.</p> <p>More information about the technical review along with useful documents including FAQs, Cohort 2 timelines, etc. can be found on StaffNet (https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/fse/faculty-structure/technical-review/).</p>	For info
<p><u>School Operations Reorganisation</u></p> <p>The creation of the School of Natural Sciences, allowed School Operations to establish a new PS business area. Following furlough and the VS scheme last year and the Covid-19 pandemic we have had the opportunity to work differently and operate as a School team. This has provided efficiencies and more effective working ensuring efficiency, and adoption of best practice.</p> <p>Over the last few months we have had the opportunity to create a career structure, with consistent job descriptions and job titles, which provides agility and the opportunity for career development. The roles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Operations Administrative Support Assistant ○ Operations Administrative Assistant ○ Operations Administrator ○ Head of Department PA ○ Operations Project Officer ○ Head of School Executive Assistant ○ Deputy School Operations Manager (DSOM) ○ School Operations Manager 	For info

<p>Alignment of staff to departments largely remains the same. Recruitment to vacant posts has concluded with appointment into 4 posts across the School. Details of the operations team will be circulated via departments shortly.</p> <p>If you have any queries please contact your departmental DSOM.</p>	
<p>Priority 2 TLSE</p>	
<p><u>MECD</u></p> <p>The FSE technical community is now represented on the majority of MECD workstream groups including telephony, inductions, safety, operations and workspace.</p> <p>Monthly MECD drop in sessions have been set up and are intended to provide short updates on key developments regarding MECD and to give staff an opportunity to ask any questions directly with members of the MECD Project Team. More information about these sessions and the MECD readiness / clearance project can be found on StaffNet (https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/fse/mecd/).</p>	
<p>Priority 5 Our Culture</p>	
<p><u>Technical and Experiment Staff Wellbeing</u></p> <p>The vast majority of our technical and experimental staff have been working full time on campus throughout the latest lockdown(s). They have been critical to the continuation of research operations throughout the latest lockdown having taken on additional and much needed duties across the Faculty, namely the OCS role.</p> <p>While we understand that there will be a desire to catch up on lost research time over the next few months we are also conscious that our technical and experimental staff have used very little annual leave, nor have they felt they can due to the need for them to be present on campus. We will therefore be running a report on outstanding annual leave for these staff and managers will be asked to work with their staff to book some time off and take a much needed break. This may result in reduced services in some areas but please bear with us as we try to mitigate any impact on services due to staff being on annual leave.</p>	<p>For info</p>
<p>Additional Items</p>	
<p><u>PS Return to Campus and hybrid working</u></p> <p>Step 4 of the Government roadmap aims to remove all legal restrictions on social contact, with this in mind FSE Core PSLT is begun planning for a PS return to campus. The last >12 months have highlighted the opportunities and benefits hybrid working offers PS as individuals and the University more widely. The Core PSLT recently met to agree draft principles to support this return, these are now being discussed with each PS team led by the HoSO and business area leads. The proposal is for these principles to be trialled between 1st July and 31st December 2021, with an evaluation period to agree which are taken forward to provide a framework for how we operate from January 2022.</p> <p>The agreed principles comprise two phases of the trial to focus on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the hybrid working elements of PS staff splitting time between campus and home; and 	<p>For info</p> <p>For info</p>

<p>2. on the space(s) we use on campus and how we can optimise this effectively.</p> <p>Importantly, teams will liaise with their academic colleagues and consider student requirements when establishing the hybrid model for the trial.</p> <p>Dr Julian Skyrme, Director of Social Responsibility, is leading on a University wide initiative - <i>Working smarter and living better: a hybrid future.</i></p> <p>The latest information on this project as well as other topics discussed during the most recent of Patrick Hackett's PSLT Open meetings can be found at:</p> <p>https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/ps/pslt-open-meetings/</p>	For info
<p><u>Staff Leavers</u></p> <p>A UNIAC report on leavers identified that there was a problem in the management of leavers that had contributed to a significant amount of staff overpayments. A University wide Task and Finish Group was set up to review the HR leavers' management process, and has concluded with recommendations. HR Services are introducing a new online leavers form to implement a consistent process across all three faculties. Details of this process will be communicated shortly.</p> <p><u>Induction resources for new staff</u></p> <p>Lucy Adams (DSOM for Physics and Astronomy) and Denise Grehan (DSOM for CEAS) have led a Community of Practice (CoP) to identify areas of best practice with induction and standardise how we deliver inductions across the Faculty and Departments.</p> <p>This CoP worked closely with HR and Staff Learning and Development colleagues in the production of a new series of resources. These are described below</p> <p>A "Working in FSE" portal for new starters –The new starter induction site provides a wealth of information about the Faculty and its structure as well as comprehensive details of training requirements, setting up IT and health and safety requirements specifically related to FSE and our buildings. There is also information about wellbeing, social responsibility, learning and development and a handy 'jargon buster' page that helps new starters understand some of the acronyms the University uses. It can be completed like a training course, if desired, or used as a reference guide. We reach out to line managers to share it with new staff members as one part of induction. Benefits of using this portal include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a valuable introduction for new staff to the Faculty and how we are structured • Signposts new starters towards helpful resources and key areas • It can be sent to the new starter before they start at the University and set up their IT account allowing us to engage with a new employee before their start date <p>Access to these portals/resources is now available on the Faculty Employee Engagement and Induction page:</p> <p>Managers resources:</p> <p>https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/fse/faculty-support-services/human-resources/manager-induction/</p> <p>New Starter resources:</p> <p>https://www.training.itservices.manchester.ac.uk/public/SLD/FSE/content/#/</p>	For info

EDIA Report for SoNS SLT

5th May 2021

Giles Johnson

Athena Swan Update: We are close to collecting all the data necessary for preparation of the Athena Swan application. This has taken longer than hoped, due to the complexity of converting the data into a useful format. However, we are still on schedule. The next step is the establishment of working parties who will examine the data collected and make recommendations for actions to be included in the action plan. These working parties are being set up in collaboration with relevant stake holder, including various members of SLT. The data/actions have been broken down into the following areas:

- Culture and policy
- Recruitment policy and process
- Promotions
- Academic/researcher progression, including fellowships and grants
- PGR experience/support, completion and pipeline
- Student recruitment, marketing and admissions
- UG/PGT student experience/support, attainment and progression into PGT/R

Anyone interested in engaging with any of these working parties, please contact me. These working parties will be meeting over the period May-June, to report back by the end of June. We will then be in a position to finalise a draft action plan for consultation in September, well ahead of a final submission in November.

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

REPORT TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

REPORT BY: Andrew Horn (Head of Education)

MONTH: 28/04/2021

School Priority	On agenda (Y/N)
Priority 1	
Priority 2 (TLSE)	
Priority 3	
Priority 4	
Additional Items	
<p><u>Semester 2 Examinations</u></p> <p>Processes for setting up and checking online assessments are now being implemented in the SoNS disciplines. Lessons learned from S1 are being used to streamline some of the processes. Late penalties for submissions past the end of the set time (plus any adjustments) will remain the same in S2 as for S1. Updated student messaging on the application of late penalties and appropriate use of 'technical time' for download and upload of exam-related materials will be released shortly.</p> <p><u>Exam Board arrangements for Semester 2</u></p> <p>The exam board calendar for SoNS disciplines is currently being finalised now that dates of submission of moderated marks from FBMH and FHums have been agreed. For FSE course unit assessments, all marking must be completed by 25th June. Following this, data dashboards to be used in moderation and scaling panels will be compiled. Raw marks will be available from course units outside FSE by 5 pm on 30th June, enabling exam grids to be compiled. FSE moderating and scaling panels, mitigating circumstances panels and progression boards will then take place from 1st July onwards. Faculty-approved marks for FHums units will be confirmed by 13th July. As a result, exam boards for graduating students will need to be held between 14th – 20th July ahead of the Faculty Exam Board on 23rd July and the University Exam Board on 27th July.</p> <p><u>Student messaging for AY 2021-22</u></p> <p>The first of two messages to students concerning arrangements for teaching in AY 2021-22 was sent out to SoNS continuing students on 23rd April. This message outlines our continued blended learning approach and specifies whether attendance on campus is required on a programme basis. Further, more detailed information on teaching and learning in AY2021-22 will be sent in the w/c 24th May. This subsequent communication will be based on the detail held in the university's main systems – a process for checking this data is currently underway.</p>	

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

REPORT TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

REPORT BY: Kevin Taylor (Research)

MONTH: May 2021

School Priority	On agenda (Y/N)
Priority 1: REF	
<p>The REF returns have been submitted and the School would like, once again, to thank all those people working on the REF for their dedication and time. This has been a big piece of work and is very much appreciated</p>	For info
Priority 2: Internationalisation and Horizon Europe	
<p>Opportunities that may be of interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AHRC-NERC Hidden Histories programme – seedcorn partnership call (£2,000 - £ 5,000) open until 12th May 2021; main research call (up to £100,000) open until 30th September 2021; for further details see: https://nerc.ukri.org/research/funded/programmes/hidden-histories-programme/#xcollapse6 ; FSE contact david.polya@manchester.ac.uk ; Faculty of Humanities contacts angelia.r.wilson@manchester.ac.uk and alison.browne@manchester.ac.uk ; applications must include both AHRC and NERC focussed investigators; The Hubert Curien Alliance Programme – call open until 31st May; Funder: Hubert Curien Alliance (managed by the British Council); Maximum Award: 5,000 Euro https://www.britishcouncil.fr/en/education/research-innovation/collaborations/alliance EU Prize for Women Innovators (HORIZON-EIC-2021-WomenInnovatorsPrize) – (100,000 EUR) call closes 30th June 2021; https://eic.ec.europa.eu/eic-funding-opportunities/eic-prizes/eu-prize-women-innovators_en The Wohl Clean Growth Alliance – call open until 29th July; Funder: Wohl Legacy (managed by the British Council); Maximum Award: £20,000 https://www.britishcouncil.org.il/en/programmes/science/wohl-clean-growth-alliance. UK based researchers working in areas including solar energy, energy demand management, alternative storage, microgrid and energy forecasting, cooling and heating and many more can consult the data base of Israeli start-ups here to find a partner to apply for the funding <p>Updates on EU funding developments and Horizon Europe can be found at: https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/eu/research-funding/</p>	For info
Priority 3: Culture	
<p>At recent PDRA and PGR open fora, discussions and questions on teaching contributions, PGR supervision and lab access. Questions arising from these meetings are being followed up.</p> <p>Webinar: Introduction to Figshare at the University of Manchester 19 May</p> <p>In summer 2021, the University's new institutional research data repository, Figshare, will be launched, offering private and collaborative storage and flexible publishing options for research data and resources at every stage of a project. The webinar will give researchers an overview of the repository, ways in which it can be used, and opportunities for questions. The</p>	For info

<p>webinar will take place on Tuesday, 18 May 2021 (10:30 – 11:30am) and will be repeated on Wednesday, 19 May 2021 (11:30am – 12:30pm). To book your place on the webinar, please register at the link below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Webinar: Introduction to Figshare at The University of Manchester <p>New Online Resources and Workshops for Researchers involved in PGR Supervision</p> <p>The Effective Supervisor is a new development package for research staff involved in the supervision of postgraduate researchers – whether informally or formally. It is also suitable for those who may supervise in the future. It addresses knowledge, skills and actions for becoming a more effective supervisor, with online study and interactive workshops on Zoom. You can register for the workshops at the links below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Effective Supervisor 	
<p>Priority 4: PGR</p>	
<p>The University has opened applications for PGR Expense and Hardship funding – details below</p> <p>PGR COVID-19 Expense Fund</p> <p>This fund is available to all PGRs who have personally incurred unexpected research programme-related costs due to the COVID-19 pandemic (since March 2020). PGRs will be able to make one application to the expense fund per academic year. Awards will be capped at a maximum of £500 except in the case of required Hotel Quarantine costs, which will be covered in full (where approved). For full details on what you can apply for, and how to make an application, please see the guidance document. Any questions can be directed to mdc@manchester.ac.uk.</p> <p>PGR COVID-19 Hardship Fund</p> <p>This fund is available to PGRs facing real and demonstrable financial hardship as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic (which can be defined as where your essential outgoings are greater than your income). PGRs applying to this fund could be eligible for a non-repayable award of up to £2,000. Awards are granted on a case-by-case basis after consideration of each application. For full details on eligibility and the application process please refer to the PGR COVID-19 Hardship Fund guidance document. Any question can be directed to your local PGR Support team.</p> <p>Further information on PGR can be found on the PGR FAQ webpage:</p> <p>https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/coronavirus/faqs/pgr/ - COVID PGR FAQs</p>	<p>For info</p>

Faculty of Science & Engineering

Meeting of the School Board – School of Natural Sciences

Date: 15 April 2021

Dear colleague

Policy and Procedure on Contracts of Employment– School Comments

The University Policy and Procedure on Contracts of Employment clarifies the types of contracts that the University uses for different working arrangements and explains the use of fixed term contracts and permanent contracts and the potential redundancy/termination arrangements that apply.

The Procedure outlines the mechanism for Collective Consultation between the University and the recognised Campus Trade Unions on the likely number of fixed term contracts and permanent contracts which are externally funded and which have grant/project end dates and which are due to be terminated over the forthcoming months. Such consultations include seeking ways to avoid the dismissals and reducing the numbers of employees to be dismissed and at all stages of both collective (i.e. with the Trade Unions) and individual (i.e. with the members of staff affected) consultation. Steps are taken to seek redeployment, extension to contract etc in an attempt to avoid as many dismissals as possible.

In accordance with University Statutes and Ordinances (Ordinance XXIII Procedure for the dismissal of members of staff by reason of redundancy pursuant to Statute XIII, Part II) a University Staffing Committee has been established to consider the proposals for dismissal of staff due to redundancy and in this regard, under the above circumstances.

The School's views are sought on the following:

In this School, for the period 1 May 2021 – 31 October 2021, there are currently 188 staff on fixed term or permanent contracts whose funding is of finite duration, and who are therefore at risk of redundancy at the conclusion of their contract of employment. Through collective consultation as described above, and individual consultation between the members of staff and their line managers, efforts are being made to seek further funding and or redeployment opportunities in order to avert the consequence of redundancy.

Experience to date shows that most of the staff in this category who wish to continue working at the University will be successfully retained in employment.

Eva Azariah
Human Resources Officer
Faculty of Science and Engineering