

Prof. Ronald Hartz

From: Gore, Oz (Dr.)
Sent: 19 March 2021 10:31
To: ulsb.all
Subject: Emailing: Updates and Point for Clarification on Case for Change - The Missing Context

Dear Colleagues,

On Wednesday, the Dean presented the current state of the Case for Change before our 'non affected' colleagues from WEMO.

The Dean opened by reassuring colleagues of the following:

1. That there will be no more redundancies and **that this process is a 'one-off'**.
2. That anyone not in the original pool has his 'insurance' that they have nothing to worry about, that they can carry on as before, because **their research has been identified as aligned with the School**.
3. That what the 16 at scope told you about the targeting of sociological perspectives, social issues, and criticality **has been taken out of context**.

We suspect that the Dean will repeat such reassurance in his meetings with EFA and MISO on Monday.

Because our University has a Dignity and Respect Policy, we will not say that our Dean is lying. Instead, we would like to clarify and share the following points with you.

1. While there is no assurance that our Dean is even in a position to make such promises, when decisions are made at Exec Board level, **we have the Dean himself, on record, saying to one of us that if their research changes in the future there might be need to 'revisit' and that there might be 'another case for change'**. These words need to be considered together with the fact that the University financial statements also state that there is further need to reduce costs in the immediate future.
2. **We have both the Dean and the Review Group, on record, saying that they have not read everyone's research**. Indeed, for most of the School, your research hasn't been examined at all. Perhaps the Dean can explain how his 'insurance' works when identification of research alignment happens without even looking at research.
3. The concerning statements made by the Review Group have not been taken out of context. **We would love to share here the context that the Dean claims is missing, so that you can read what was written, in full context**, and decide whether our Dean is in breach of the institutional Dignity and Respect policy, amongst other things. Here are a few pointers:
 - For reference to sociological perspectives as reason to be in the pool, you could have looked at Prof Lilley's and Prof Lightfoot's letters.
 - For reference to works published in journals with the word 'critical' in it as reason to be in the pool, you could have looked at Dr Harvie's letter.
 - For reference to being cited in CMS works as a reason to be in the pool, you could have looked at Dr Fournier's and Dr Kokkinidis' letters.
 - For reference to postmodernism and poststructuralism as reasons to be in the pool, you could have looked at Dr Hartz's letter.

- For how 'primarily' is being used to target colleagues who's 50% of their output are not in CMS/PE, you could have looked at Dr Frenzel's letter.
- For reference to social movements, contemporary capitalism, alternative organising, and the name of journals (Organization, Culture and Organisation, Ephemera), you could have taken your pick from the letters.

However, management is saying our letters are confidential. **We wave our right for confidentiality of this information. There is nothing there apart from a table with our outputs and the judgements made on them. Why is this confidential? Why doesn't the Dean let us share the context? Perhaps you can ask on Monday.**

Sent on behalf of ULSB16