



HUMAN RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

Wednesday 4 July 2012

MINUTES

Present:	Provost and President, Professor Malcolm Grant (CHAIR) Vice-Provost (Enterprise), Professor S Caddick Dean, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Professor C R A Catlow Dean, Engineering Sciences, Professor A C W Finkelstein Dean, Laws, Professor Dame Hazel Genn Director of Finance (incoming), Mr P Harding Dean, Population Health Sciences, Professor G J Hart Vice-Provost (Operations), Mr R Knight Dean, Medical Sciences, Professor P H Maxwell Dean, Built Environment, Professor A R Penn Vice-Provost (Research), Professor G D Price Vice-Provost (Education), Professor A Smith Dean, Social and Historical Sciences, Professor S R Smith Dean, Brain Sciences, Professor A J Thompson Vice-Provost (Health), Professor Sir John Tooke Director of Finance (outgoing), Mrs A C Woodhams Dean, Arts and Humanities, Professor H Woudhuysen
Apologies:	Dean, Life Sciences, Professor M K L Collins Vice-Provost (International), Professor M J Worton
In Attendance:	Director of Human Resources, Mr N Waugh Secretariat, Ms A Skinner

1 MINUTES

APPROVED:

- 1.1 The Minutes of the last meeting of 23 May 2012 were confirmed by HRPC and signed by the President and Provost.

2 HR DIRECTOR'S REPORT

NOTED:

- 2.1 Formal consultation on the proposed reform of Statute 18 is now closed. Feedback received during the consultation period is being reviewed. A further meeting with unions is scheduled for later on 4 July.
- 2.2 Drafting of a proposed Strategic HR Framework is nearing completion and a final draft will be brought to the next meeting of the Committee to obtain feedback prior to release to all staff for consultation.
- 2.3 The University and College Union (UCU) has indicated that it will resume its industrial action against pension reform.
- 2.4 The reform of the HR Committee structure has been approved by Council and the HRPC will meet bimonthly in the new Academic Year.
- 2.5 A review reward structures for senior professional services staff is nearing completion and a proposal will be brought to the next meeting of the Committee for approval.

3 ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS REFORM

RECEIVED:

- 3.1 A paper proposing reforms to the senior promotions criteria to address feedback from the Academic Promotions Committee.

DISCUSSION:

- 3.2 The use of the Institutional Research Information Service (IRIS) as a source of information to inform the promotion process was discussed. Mr Waugh agreed to liaise with Professor Price about how IRIS might be used productively to support the promotions process.
- 3.3 It was agreed that the format of the CV template should be revisited, especially in light of the proposed move to an electronic process.
- 3.4 The efficacy of the current criteria around impact as well as how to better promote teaching excellence as a valued and equivalent route to promotion was discussed and it was agreed that further work will need to be done to review these issues. Professor Caddick agreed to work with Mr Waugh on addressing these issues. It was felt that strong communications, including the use of exemplars, role models and case studies would be necessary to change the culture around teaching excellence as a valued and equivalent route to promotion
- 3.5 The institutional position on the Senior Lecturer and Reader titles was raised and it was agreed that this should be looked into.
- 3.6 It was agreed that there needs to be a greater emphasis on leadership as a criteria for promotion. It was felt that this would assist in promoting teaching as an valued and equivalent basis for promotion.
- 3.7 The Provost thanked all of those involved with this exercise.

APPROVED:

- 3.11 The recommendations of the paper were approved with some minor editorial corrections to the proposed text.

4. REVIEW OF PROFESSORIAL APPOINTMENT PROCESS

RECEIVED:

- 4.1 A paper to advise the HRPC of the outcomes of a review of the professorial appointment process.

DISCUSSION:

- 4.2 Mr Waugh advised that Professor Worton had noted that while there was no reference to Vice-Provosts in the presented pathway, they are still technically expected to chair the Academic Board Working Groups. Professor Worton expressed the view that now that there has been full devolution of Executive Authority to Deans he did not see that the Vice-Provosts add any significant value. He suggested that the Vice-Provosts should not need to be involved in professorial appointments unless there is a particular reason in individual cases. Professor Price made a similar query at the meeting and there was general support for the proposition that Vice-Provosts no longer be required to Chair the Academic Board Working Groups. Mr Waugh advised that he would discuss this with the Director, Registry and Academic Services.
- 4.3 Professor Finkelstein expressed disappointment that the paper did not look at more fundamental reform of the underlying issues which he saw as being the different processes for promotion to Professor and appointment to established Chairs. Mr Waugh advised that the remit for the working group had been limited to simplifying and streamlining process rather than more fundamental policy change.
- 4.4 The Provost expressed the view that the current processes were derived from requirements of the University of London, but these may no longer be so relevant. The Provost did however note that more fundamental reform in this area may be difficult to achieve.
- 4.5 Comment was made that there continues to be a great deal of manual work for each appointment and that while Academic Services do a very good job of managing this work, perhaps it needs to revisit the requirement for it.
- 4.6 In summing up the discussion, the Provost asked Mr Waugh to work with the Director, Registry and Academic Services on a more fundamental reform of the professorial appointment policy and processes with a view to addressing the underlying and other issues raised by HRPC. The Provost further suggested that it may be appropriate to look at the establishment of an Appointments Committee to replace the Academic Board Working Groups.

NOTED:

- 4.7 The HRPC noted the reviewed process and sought a more fundamental review of the professorial appointment policy and processes

5. EQUALITY ANALYSIS IN STRATEGIC AND POLICY DECISION MAKING

RECEIVED :

- 5.1 A paper to propose an approach to ensuring appropriate analysis of the potential impact of strategy and policy decisions on equality and diversity objectives.

DISCUSSION:

- 5.2 Mr Waugh advised that while the Government has now withdrawn the specific legal requirement for organisations to undertake equalities analysis, a general duty to be able to show that equalities and diversities impacts have been taken into account in policy development remains. Mr Waugh also advised that while the formal requirement had been withdrawn, the previous arrangements had raised awareness of the issue and that a number of stakeholders were exerting influence on UCL to introduce an audit based process.
- 5.3 Mr Knight expressed the view that the proposed approach is too cumbersome and this would lead to non compliance.
- 5.4 There was general agreement that the paper was ambiguous as to what policies and processes would fall within its scope.
- 5.5 There was acknowledgement of the need to have a serious discussion about the risks inherent in this area and to find a way to foster culture change.
- 5.6 The proposed approach was felt to be inappropriate for the reasons listed above and further work was requested to address this issue.

APPROVED:

- 5.7 The HRPC approved Mr Waugh withdrawing the paper and requested a revised proposal be prepared for approval.

6. REF TOOLKIT FOR DEANS

RECEIVED:

- 6.1 A paper to provide summary advice to Deans and others on tools available to attract and retain academic and research staff eligible for return under the REF.

DISCUSSION:

- 6.2 Mr Waugh apologised for the delay in presenting this document to the HRPC. He also withdrew paragraph 15 of the paper upon advice from Professor Price in relation to the nature of the REF process.
- 6.3 There was discussion of the pressure UCL was experiencing in a competitive market to attract and retain talented staff.
- 6.4 There was resistance to the proposal that UCL introduce "golden handcuffs" which were felt to be inappropriate in an academic culture.
- 6.5 It was agreed that the benefits of UCL as an employer of academic staff be emphasised in recruitment and retention exercises.
- 6.6 Concerns were raised in relation to medical and health staff being head hunted by London institutions when there was an agreement that this would not occur. Professor Tooke agreed to discuss this with his opposite numbers in other institutions.
- 6.7 The Provost observed that UCL cannot always hold onto staff and that it is not always right to do so if careers are to progress.
- 6.8 The issue of "dual career" partnerships was discussed and it was agreed that this needs more work such that high value recruits were not lost to competitor institutions which may be able to better accommodate the aspirations of partners. The difficulty of resolving

this issue was recognised as was the danger of UCL being seen to be “gifting” a post to a partner.

- 6.9 Mr Waugh asked members of the HRPC to contact him if they wished to discuss other policy changes which could assist in this area.

APPROVED:

- 6.11 The HRPC approved the paper on the basis of the changes that were requested as noted above.

6. AOB

- 6.1 There were no items.

ANNE SKINNER
HR Director's office
[telephone 0207 679 1270, internal extension 41270, email: anne.skinner@ucl.ac.uk
4 July 2012