

To  
Professor Jim Devlin & Professor Dan Ladley

CC:  
Professor Henrietta O'Connor  
Caroline Johnson  
Brigid M.C. Boucher

28<sup>th</sup> January 2021

Dear Professor Devlin and Professor Ladley,

We are writing this collective email in response to the 1st collective consultation on possible redundancies you conducted with us on Tuesday. We request another 1st collective consultation before individual consultations can go ahead. We don't need to remind you of Section 188(2) TULRCA which requires meaningful and genuine consultation. We believe no meaningful collective consultation has taken place yet.

So much of importance was unsaid in the meeting, many questions were unanswered, and the length of time given to the meeting (50-minutes, 30 min of which was your presentation) was totally inadequate.

To be clear, we are not refusing to attend individual consultations in the future. But a full 1st collective consultation that can be considered meaningful has yet to take place.

Most importantly, you have so far not fully disclosed the criteria and process according to which individual staff were selected for the redundancy pool. In the presentation you stated the following four criteria for selection in the redundancy pool:

*Publications, Grant Applications, Self-declared Affiliations and Content on the University website*

In our meeting, you also stated that the selection was undertaken without input from ULSB's AD for Research and Research Cluster Leads. We must therefore assume that you as Dean and Deputy Dean have made the selection. In our meeting, you referred to this selection as an 'initial exercise' and a 'hypothesis'. And in a separate meeting with staff not targeted you have also stated that it is not 'beyond the realm of possibility' that members of staff in the redundancy pool were identified wrongly.

This would imply that members of staff not in the redundancy pool may have also been identified wrongly. But at the same meeting, you have ruled this out too.

This seems to indicate that your pre-selection, far from being a 'hypothesis' or an 'initial exercise', is effectively determining whether or not members of staff will be made redundant. The pre-selection must already comply with the fair and equitable process laid out in the redundancy ordinance and this cannot be left to individual consultations.

We need, collectively, to understand the full criteria for inclusion in the redundancy pool, including how you two made the selection, also considering your limited expertise in the research areas of targeted staff, what methodology (including any proxies used for CMS/PE) you used to evaluate publications, grant applications, self-declared affiliations and staff web sites.

We would appreciate your suggestions for a suitable date to continue the 1<sup>st</sup> collective consultation meeting.

Yours 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.