

UCU/University Negotiating Committee

Minutes of meeting held on Monday 25 March 2019

Present: Professor Philippa Browning (PB), Dr Eleanor Davey (ED), Dr Gregory Lane-Serff (G L-S), Professor Wendy Olsen (WO), Dr Adam Ozanne (AO), Professor Luke Georghiou (LG) [in the Chair], Patrick Hackett (PH), Andrew Mullen (AM), Shelley Khan (SK) [minutes]

Apologies: Karen Heaton

1 Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2018

The minutes were accepted as a true record, subject to the insertion of the word planned in the second sentence of the paragraph 7 relating to the USS review.

2 Matters arising

2.1 Teaching workloads in FBMH

Following UCU raising concerns of former FLS staff in FBMH that their teaching workload was greater than other colleagues in the Faculty. It had been reported to them that teaching contributions for all staff are available for all staff to view as captured on the FBMH Teaching Contribution System and hence the system is fully transparent. There is an annual process to allocate/redistribute teaching equitably across Divisions within and across Schools.

Having received the response, UCU was consulting with relevant members and would direct any further queries or observations to the University representatives.

2.2 Teaching duties of research staff in FBMH

In response to UCU raising queries regarding research staff in FBMH being asked to undertake teaching duties, UCU had received the Faculty's guidance note on *Research Staff Involvement in Teaching*.

The guidance note sought to:

- Provide greater clarity for Research Staff on externally funded research projects who want to be, or are already, involved in teaching;
- Promote equality of teaching opportunity and;
- Help ensure the highest quality teaching through training and accreditation of Research Staff.

UCU undertook to direct any further queries to the University representatives.

2.3 Peer review forms in the School of Social Sciences

After UCU raised the issue of a department in the School of Social Sciences (SoSS) using indicative scoring for staff on Peer Review of Teaching forms, which was contrary to an agreement reached in 2017 not to do so, AM had confirmed in November 2018 that the matter had already been raised and the form was no longer in use.

3 General University Update

3.1 Augar Review

LG noted that there was strong speculation that review's findings and recommendations would be published in May and that it was expected that a main recommendation would be the reduction in UG fees. Although it was also anticipated that the report would recommend the Treasury should make up the consequent shortfall in the sector, the Treasury had no such provision to do so.

3.2 Classification of EU students post-Brexit

LG reported that it appeared that the government is now encouraging growth in international student numbers, including EU students, after the UK left the EU, though they would be classified as migrants for statistical purposes. The implications in terms of visa requirements and maximum periods of study were still subject to consultation and finalisation.

3.3 USS

LG noted that the University had submitted its response to Universities UK (UUK) after it invited employers, to give their views on proposals for top-up (also known as 'contingency') contributions as part of its consultation on the 2018 actuarial valuation of USS. It was noted that the full response had been made available to staff on 18 March 2019.

UUK has taken this action after the USS Trustee invited it to put forward a proposal for a contingent contribution arrangement, required to back the additional risk associated with the lower overall contributions deemed possible by the Joint Expert Panel 1 (JEP1) .

In common with most member universities, Manchester has agreed to it as a time limited solution to allow JEP2 time to devise and propose what it believes to be a more sustainable plan. (It was noted that three Russell Group universities have rejected this proposal).

It was recognised that the increases currently due to take place to employer and employee contributions in October 2019 and April 2020 would be have a major detrimental impact on the finances of universities. Universities also remain concerned about the "upper bookend" of any contingency contributions.

UCU noted that it was pleased with the change in the University's position. PH emphasised that the current position isn't sustainable, but it wasn't clear whether JEP 2 could deliver a sustainable solution.

It was agreed that the current USS governance model was not designed to address the challenges the current scheme presents.

UCU suggested the formation of a joint working group based on an arrangement set up at the University of Sheffield. UCU acknowledged that there may be some differences but thought it would be useful in reaching a shared understanding of the matter.

PH agreed to consider the offer, though as it is a national scheme, there is a limit to the influence of one institution.

It was noted that following the submission of UUK's consultation with universities on proposed contingency contribution, the USS board was due to meet on 28 March to consider the feedback.

UCU noted that USS members were understandably confused by the current circumstances and wanted to avoid a situation where is judged it necessary to recommend further industrial action in response.

4 **Academic probation**

UCU acknowledged that responses had been received to the effect that the timing of NAP sessions was not clashing with timetabled teaching to an extent that would hamper

completion of the programme. It was noted that the current requirements for portfolios would be the subject of review as these had also been cited as an issue hampering completion. This requires further investigation.

It was acknowledged that UCU had received additional data for 2018 across all three Faculties relating to the numbers of cases, showing gender and ethnic breakdown, of probationary lecturers who had been required to serve a fourth year of probation. For completeness, UCU requested data showing the total numbers of probationary cases of which this group formed a sub-set.

AM

5 P&DR forms and performance management

UCU noted its concerns regarding the use of supplementary forms to the current agreed P&DR form for academic staff and that the main form was not suitable for academic staff.

In addition, UCU was concerned of reports that staff were being threatened with performance management based on RRE data which they believed was unacceptable. Whilst UCU saw that RRE and REF data had to be considered at a collective and aggregate level, it was inappropriate to use it as part of probation, promotion or performance management processes as it was flawed.

LG noted that whilst in accordance with the University's Statement on Research Expectations, the University would not use RRE scores on an individual level, it was still reasonable to expect academic colleagues to produce research at an acceptable standard based on proxy indicators of research quality such as citations, peer review and journal standing. The Statement on Research expectations approved by Senate was clear about this.

UCU stated that they were not aware that this was applied as part of staff terms and conditions. AM replied that it did not need to be incorporated into a contract, to be a reasonable expectation of a member of staff contracted to undertake and produce research.

It was agreed that:

- A copy of the Statement on Research Expectations would be sent to UCU;
- Any instances of what UCU judged to be "aggressive" performance management would be referred to HR;
- A separate meeting to be organised with KH and AM to discuss in more detail the P&DR issues.

AM/UCU

6 E&D Action plans and the Gender Pay Gap

UCU acknowledged that they had received copies of The Race Equality Charter Mark Action Plan and the recently published 2018 Gender Pay Gap report. It did not, however, appear to have received the annual EDI objectives for the Faculties and PS. AM undertook to forward these.

AM

UCU also requested information relating to the action plan relating to the Gender Pay Gap report. AM noted that the actions were set out in the report, though much of its work to address the gap is by focusing on core gender equality objectives rather than attempting to target the absolute level of the GPG. One additional action that formed part of the plan was to undertake analysis of salaries of new starters by gender to ensure an equitable process is in place and is being adhered to. Following discussion, it was agreed that AM would meet with UCU representatives to discuss this in more detail.

It was also agreed that a meeting would be arranged with relevant EDI Unit colleagues to discuss how we support disabled staff and the associated action plans in place. AM suggested that UCU and the other campus trade unions could perhaps work jointly with the University to improve disability reporting, as underreporting was a major issue.

AM/UCU

7 UMUCU claim regarding Teaching Assistants (TAs)

AM reported that further constructive meetings had taken place with UCU on 13 December 2017 and 5 March 2018. The University had agreed that TAs should be paid for any mandatory training and proposed some principles governing the payment of preparation and marking time. Ahead of a further meeting early in May, the University was collating information relating to:

- Those elements of training that are compulsory and therefore should be paid, and setting out the reasons for any differences from area to area;
- How we currently assess preparation and marking time at School and discipline level.

Other aspects relating to the timeliness of contract issuing and information on payment breakdown were also being addressed.

It was agreed that as part of this work it would be helpful to circulate to UCU details of the process and associated timeline for appointing TAs, allocating teaching and issuing contracts.

8 Operation of the Redeployment Policy

UCU expressed concern that the policy provision which enabled redeployees to be considered for vacancies ahead of other candidates. It was particularly concerned that in the case of research and academic staff they were subject to a formal interview alongside external candidates.

It was agreed that UCU would provide examples to HR in order to enable further discussion about the issues of timing, format of interviews and appointability thresholds.

UCU

9 School Boards

UCU expressed concern that with the University having moved to structures with larger Schools, the Boards were not functioning well. It wasn't clear how they fed into formal decision-making. UCU suggested a possible need for Department Board to be formed at sub-School level.

LG noted that notwithstanding they had no status in governance terms as part of Statutes and Ordinances, nothing prevented the formation of informal sub-School groups.

LG also noted that the role of the School Board formed part of the remit of the current Senate Effectiveness Working Group.

10 Restructure of Residential Life services in student residences

AO raised concern that a current plan to change the structure of support for Residence Life support would serve to reduce the front line staff and that as a result those staff would not be able to cope with the demand being placed on them.

It was noted that UCU should submit their views as part of discussion and consultation on any proposed changes.

11 Next meeting

The next meeting will take place on Thursday 4 July 2019 at 2 p.m.