

Dear Henrietta,

Your letter to us all today includes three different type faces and font sizes and appears to come from you while on annual holiday. This cobbling together of different scripts would be taken as a sign of possible plagiarism within a student essay and at least signal an unfortunate lack of attention to detail in presentation should we receive it as lecturers. Coming from you, it just looks like yet another example of carelessness and an amateurish mash up of previous messages, simply to get the box ticked and to move on with your baleful agenda on your return from holiday. What you say about the horrendous situation in English is for others to respond to, but we in the School should be totally sympathetic to their plight. What you say about the School of Business is where my focus lies. I have italicised your script prior to my points.

*“Throughout the process we invited feedback from staff, students and external stakeholders”.* With regard to these constituent groups, I can see no feedback that has been listened to in any way whatsoever. And the amount of commentary has been enormous. Where is the evidence that this has been listened to and action taken as a consequence? You told me that this material was being constantly digested as the process ensued. We have seen no documentary source wherein lessons have been learnt from the views of staff, students or external academic communities regarding the actions of senior management. All we have seen is your public dislike for any criticism of any kind, including your well-publicised attempts to silence the feedback from Emeritus Professor Peter Armstrong.

*"one that offers a compelling challenge to other business schools."* The School's attempt to join the 'mainstream' (a concept which the Dean has said was a 'clumsy one' even though it was placed as the binary 'other' to CMS/PE) will hardly offer a challenge, never mind a compelling one, to other business schools. Look at where the School is in the league tables. Mimetic isomorphism nearly always ends in failure in any market place and Leicester's reputation at the moment has been well and truly trashed by senior management. Does any serious institution think Leicester will offer a compelling challenge to its business school in the foreseeable future with this 'strategy'? Few in the School do.

*"The case does not, in any way, undermine or devalue the research carried out by the members of staff at risk of redundancy".* The Dean and Deputy Dean showed no interest in our research, save in ways precisely to undermine it. They looked for single words by which to tar our careers and make us 'others' to their world of economics and did not delve into our work with curiosity. They sought in our research to come up with markers of difference from their cosy understandings of the current managerial and business world where analysis of the handling of the pandemic was not seen as necessary nor desirable. You, yourself, in 2014 published a piece which talked of what your area might learn from CMS but this positive indication was totally forgotten by your pronouncements in 2020/1. An attempt has been made to undermine our research and render us redundant by those twin evils in a serious university, amnesia and ignorance.

*"as an institution we cannot continue to do everything we have always done"* How can you as a sociologist, and one time Treasurer of the BSA, contemplate the School forcibly removing sociology and qualitative approaches from the curriculum? How can you tolerate the placing of the 'dismal science' at the apex of the School's work- at the cost of sociological thinking? How can you as Head of College preside over a disciplinary war in which your own discipline so obviously loses?

*“an area of research which is not aligned with the future strategic priorities of the School”*

What are these strategic priorities? Where have they been discussed? Who has signed up to them? We have been given a list of teaching areas, not areas of research, that make the School's students supposedly fit for their future, happily working in non-unionised low tech areas of the East Midlands. But that is not a strategy. It is kow towing to the parochial wishes of the Chair of Council.

*“the School can now move forward to recruit staff in the new areas of growth”*. Where is the evidence for this prognosis on both fronts? Reports have been selectively plundered to talk about management student numbers in the case against us. Where is the evidence that numbers in the quantitative areas will grow? When will remaining colleagues see the promised new jobs to make possible the undertaking of the work we will leave behind? Remember, you have claimed it was not our teaching that was ever the problem, it was our research. Our teaching remains in the Brave New World you seek to build - with the labour of others.

I could go on, Henrietta, about other things you say in your message sent *in absentia* but suspect that you will not listen, especially if you are writing to us all about job losses while you are on holiday. It's notable that a breath-taking lack of respect for 'your' staff has been the hall mark of your ProVC ship.

Gibson Burrell