Research Staff Representatives Committee Meeting minutes
Progression and Promotion review discussion
Thursday 18 October 2018, 13:00 – 14:00
Brunel Room – Hawthorns

Apologies: Scott Greenwell (Chair), Maaike Van Den Berg, Paras Naik (Co-Chair), Oliver Lord, Claire Wrixon, Eric Morley, Kirsty Garfield, Katherine Baldock

Present: Kristopher Magee (KM, Co-Chair), Daisy Gaunt (Secretary), Sean Roberts, Abigail Smith, Marco Longana (ML), Mike Gulliver (MG, academic staff development ASD), Philippa Lewis, Chris Yates, Simon Swales (SS, Head of ASD), Ian Bull, Padriag Dixon, Katie Manktelow, Ilse Daly, Ella Gale

1. Welcome - KM

Kris welcomed everyone to the meeting, noting the lack of attendees for such an important meeting.

DG will write up discussion and formulate a document to be circulated and signed off by reps to be sent to the RSWP who will progress to other university committees.

2. Progress so far – MG

MG presented overview of timeline and what has happened. P2 review and report commissioned in Summer 2017 after this reps committee felt strongly that this was an important issue from research staff in departments. This report was delivered in August 2017. It detailed 9 recommendations and also a **core issue** - how can researchers feel supported to progress in their academic career by the university? (detailed on pages 4/5). P1 and P3 reviews were also done concurrently.

The P2 review was combined with P1 and P3 reviews and then Judith Squires with a Task and Finish Group created the Senate paper (SN/17-18/017). This T&F group then evolved into an implementation group, of which SS is a member but MG stepped down from. This group has taken the recommendations from the Senate paper and has created implementational actions over a three-year timescale. We are waiting on an updated Senate paper describing which specific actions have been taken forward, as some have been dropped due to feedback from the unions (such as not removing the term progressable).

> **DG/KM** email new Senate paper when received

3. Open Discussion – ALL

The core issue (detailed above) was not taken forward from the P2 review into the Senate paper, but there are potential difficulties in translating this message into implementable

objectives to address. Most of the Senate paper was heavily focussed around objectives that relate to P1 and P3, rather than P2.

RSWP are willing and able to give support to our claim that the P2 review was given enough weight in the Senate paper.

As a group we should write a letter detailing our concerns and send this to the RSWP. Tim Peters has asked Judith Squires if a rep can sit on the Task & Finish/Implementation group.

> **DG** outline letter to RSWP for approval

> **DG/KM** to find out if approval for rep on the Task & Finish/Implementation group has been granted

4. Implementation group – SS

SS gave an updated of what has been happening in the T&F group recently. He stressed the importance of giving our feedback on the Senate paper ASAP as changes are happening concurrently.

New Progression and Promotion criteria
- Around teaching, leadership and citizenship within each level and pathway
- Being tested with Heads of School first
- Consultation will happen more widely secondly

Workforce planning

- HR led process
- Help HoS and HR to see what staff will be needed and when over the longer-term
- Process happened each year

Staff review

- Improving the quality of conversation between staff and manager/PI
- Not many P2s have SR
- Training being planned for PIs/manager
- Cultural difficulties, PIs sometimes use it to review work/project whereas it should be a chance for staff to review career, progress and barriers

> Actions:

> > **SS** Keep reps updated, as much as allowed with T&F group actions

Next Meetings:

RS reps committee meeting 23 October 2018, 13:00-14:00, Cabot Room, Hawthorns

Summary of recommendations that were or were not included from P2 review in Senate paper

SN/17-18/017 – retained most of the process recommendations, such as:

4.1 – move to 'promotion' only rather than 'progression'

6.1 – Introduce clearer distinction between posts that are on progressable pathways and those that are on fixed roles. Undertake a detailed review of posts currently identified as P2… to resolve the current hybrid nature of roles.

… 6.3 – PIs be provided with guidance within the funding application process to ensure consideration is given to career development for staff included in grant applications.

7… basis of need, funding, and readiness. (contra Manchester, which outlines 'readiness' but places 'need' and 'funding' on School.

11 – Career development guidance and support for staff be provided via Staff Induction, and annual Staff Review.

However, these recommendations from the P2 were not addressed:

1. Manage ongoing expectations by sharing standard and consistent information with all P2 candidates at recruitment stage. Consider including:

> a. Explicit demystification of 'automatic' progression, exploration of drivers for researchers and the UoB, and outline of options for advancement (incl. revision of P&P 'arrows' schematic).

> b. A robust local induction process for all P2 staff to back up, and answer questions.

> c. To ensure consistent expectations, realistic expectations for P&P should also be communicated to existing P2 staff.

No clarity around what needed to be done/changed in local induction processes or at recruitment. No communication planned for existing staff about changes to P&P.

3. Consider removing designation of roles as 'progressable' or 'non-progressable'. We could consider separating personal title from grade title and funding to offer prestige recognition without additional cost, or core-funding supplements to support outstanding candidates to develop.

Not clear if just the term progressable instead of promotion still to be used at the request of the unions (item 4.1) or if 'progressable' or 'non-progressable', will be kept or not (item 6). Core-funding not recommended.

7. We believe that we need to re-communicate the purpose of SRD, particularly for FTC staff.

Guidance and support for academic staff in item 11.1, but not for PIs, who are key to SRD.

9. HR could inform PIs/HoS once a year of all researchers who are reaching the top of their grade (or other potential significant career points) and encourage a conversation about next steps with the SRD conversation.

Not addressed.