

To
Professor Henrietta O'Connor
Caroline Johnson
Professor Dan Ladley
Professor Jim Devlin

19th March 2021

Deferred and new questions after second collective consultation meeting

Dear Professor O'Connor,

Could you please get back to us as soon as possible on the below points?

- 1) We still require the notes and minutes from Review Group meetings in March. (In the meeting on 16 March you promised that you would inform us by the end of that day when you would share those notes and minutes: we are still waiting even for that communication.)
- 2) Questions deferred, please provide answers in writing:

Q1: In the outcome letter you make quite some effort to re-define 'primarily' as a non-quantitative assessment. Your new definition refers to 'primarily' as a descriptor to 'determine the more significant or principal focus of research activity in an individual's overall research profile'. We asked you at the second collective consultation meeting to give a definition of 'more significant' and 'principal focus' in non-quantitative terms and you said you would get back to us on this in writing.

Q1a: Since the exercise is about '[determining] the more significant or principal focus of research activity in an individual's overall research profile', if an individual quantifiably has more outputs from the basket of indicators in a different research activity, does this mean that they are now outside the scope? And if not, why not?

Q2: We asked about the list of new priority areas for future school research and its role in the screening. Initially there seemed to be two categories used to establish whether someone was at risk of redundancy or not: if you categorized their work as 'primarily' CMS and/or PE (as defined by yourselves) then they were at risk of redundancy. You now seem to have created a third category with the list of new priority areas: work that is not CMS/PE but also not aligned with the 'future strategy of the School' is also being flagged as problematic. This has manifested itself in various ways. Most worrying publications highlighted in individual consultations as *unproblematic* have suddenly become so following the Review Panel's meetings. Was this third category used in the initial screening?

Q2a If this third category *was* used in the initial screening, why were colleagues not given the chance to discuss publications that were highlighted as unproblematic when in fact they are problematic?

Q2b If this third category was *not* used in the initial screening, then please explain why you have changed the criteria for redundancy between the first and the second screening. Please also explain why you believe such a change in redundancy criteria is lawful in terms of employment law and redundancy procedures? Caroline Johnson promised to establish for us in writing whether such a change of criteria is lawful.

3) We have some additional questions:

Q3: We asked whether you could have used the term 'some work in CMS/PE' instead of 'primarily work in CMS/PE' as a criterion for being at risk of redundancy, to which you, Professor O'Connor, replied 'yes'.

If the initial screening exercise was done to identify colleagues who do 'some work' in CMS/PE, then why did you make the effort to list works that you deem unproblematic?

Q4: How did you fairly and objectively distinguish between colleagues in and outside of the redundancy pool, when the criteria is that 'some work' is in CMS/PE: several colleagues outside the pool do 'some work' in CMS/PE, for example papers in the mentioned journals, reference to research interests in CMS/PE or direct reference to these terms in the keywords and titles of their publications and grants?

Q5: You told us that the review group *reviewed* the selection of 16 members of staff out of the School? But the review panel did not in fact look at the all 66 staff in scope, i.e. it did not revisit the initial screening exercise. Can you explain in writing how the Review Panel ensured the initial screening exercise was a fair and objective, i.e. that the work of colleagues at risk of redundancy is sufficiently different from those not at risk to justify the fair and objective separation of the two?

Q6: At the outset of the process, we were not told there would be a Review Panel. Was the use of this panel decided in the middle of the process and why? We have concerns about confidentiality as findings of the initial screening exercise were forwarded without our knowledge to the review panel. Do you plan to share our files more widely?

Sincerely

Dr Gareth Brown, Professor Gibson Burrell, Dr Joseph Choonara, Dr Sam Dallyn, Dr Valerie Fournier, Dr Fabian Frenzel, Dr Chris Grocott, Dr Oz Gore, Dr Ronald Hartz, Dr David Harvie, Dr George Kokkinidis, Professor Hugo Letiche, Dr Geoff Lightfoot, Professor Simon Lilley, Dr Keir Milburn, Dr Martin Wood.