

# Report to JSNCC



**Date:** 22 October 2018.  
*Updated 1 & 6 November 2018*

**Author:** Nikki Hyde

**Report title:** Academic Workforce Profiling: HPL Selection & Appointment Policy Principles

**Summary & context:** In 2018 an organisational change project was undertaken to review HPL deployment in 4 schools and put in place a new workforce profile with a reduction in HPL roles and an increase in substantive academic posts. For these exercises the new academic T&S posts were ring fenced to the HPL workforce.

In an acknowledgement of the unique nature of the pre-existing HPL relationship with their school and University a number of new policy principles applicable to the selection and appointment to the new roles were piloted. These principles were originally agreed the Recognising Excellence in Education Steering Group (devolved from EG and Academic Probation Committee). Following the pilot the principles have been reviewed in the light of experience and amendments agreed with the Workforce Profile Steering Group and Academic Probationary Committee. These revised principles and final proposed policy principles are now presented to JSNCC.

**Action Required:** To review with a view to agreement.

**POLICY PRINCIPLES:**

<b>POLICY AREA</b>	<b>PRINCIPLE PILOTED</b> (Following REEP decision)	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING PILOT</b>
<b>AFFECTED STAFF GROUP</b>		
<p><b>1. Inclusion of PhD students</b></p> <p>The extent to which current PhD students be considered within the affected staff group and, where they are, how length of service as a PhD student is defined.</p>	N/A	<p>Where the business case identifies that there continues to be a need to offer teaching to current PhD students on a rotational basis, and that teaching does not form part of any of the newly created academic duties, then such students should not be included as part of the affected staff group. In order to determine an individuals' length of service whilst a PhD student, the definition shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From date of first registration upon a PhD until the individual has completed four years of study</li> <li>• For part time students, it shall be five years of study from the date of registration.</li> </ul>
<b>SELECTION</b>		
<p><b>2. Pooling</b></p> <p>The extent to which new academic posts are ring-fenced (within a school or by pooling based on length of service or some other method). Thereby recognising the difference between the new posts and existing HPL roles.</p>	N/A	<p>Selection for new positions is undertaken through a two-stage pooling process, using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where an individual has a long term (five years or more) and established pattern of working (on the same or similar modules), and;</li> <li>• there is an ongoing need for that work to continue, and;</li> <li>• service was not accrued whilst primarily a PhD student.</li> </ul> <p><i>NB: length of service as a PhD defined at 1, any service prior or after PhD service shall be counted.</i></p> <p>Whilst pooling was removed during consultation in the pilot, starting with this principle ensures the University is compliant with relevant legislation and gives priority to those staff who have given significant service to the University, primarily in a teaching capacity.</p> <p>It is then also for affected staff to request to remove as part of consultation should they wish.</p>

POLICY AREA	PRINCIPLE PILOTED (Following REEP decision)	RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING PILOT
<p><b>3. Grade</b></p> <p>To determine whether HPLs should be allowed to apply for the available roles, regardless of their (HPL) grade.</p>	<p><b>This was agreed.</b> The focus will instead be on <b>meeting the essential criteria.</b></p> <p>While it is usual in a redundancy situation to ring-fence staff by grade, it was agreed that this is justified, as it is a <b>substantially different job.</b></p>	<p>As per REEP.</p>
<p><b>4. PhD as essential criterion in job description</b></p> <p>Where a role requires a PhD as essential criterion, to define what is meant by 'holding a PhD' to aid staff when considering if they may meet the essential criteria when applying for the new roles.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Holding a PhD criterion to be defined as: 'involving submission and viva, minor amendments to be made and major amendments made and submitted'.</p> <p>It may be that, where a position is subsequently offered, a school makes the requirement to have obtained their PhD within a specified time frame part of the conditions of appointment.</p>
<p><b>5. Interview process</b></p> <p>To determine the appropriate appointment process by which a current HPL staff member should be considered for a substantive academic post.</p>	<p>It was agreed that, for those staff who demonstrate they meet the essential criteria (as can be measured via an application), staff would be invited to undertake a selection process.</p> <p>For a T&amp;S position that process should comprise a <b>micro-teach and a full academic interview.</b></p> <p>It was noted that where appointments would be to T&amp;S posts research record need not form part of the selection criteria.</p> <p>For a T&amp;R position, that process should comprise the current selection process (<b>presentation and full academic interview</b>).</p> <p>In both instances, one internal reference is sufficient.</p>	<p>As per REEP.</p> <p>Recognising that redundancy is a possible outcome, the selection process needs to be sufficiently robust to ensure that full evidence can be given to support decisions made.</p> <p>The person specification must detail all the essential and desirable criteria that are required for the role and interview questions must reflect all the selection criteria, including behavioural competencies.</p>

POLICY AREA	PRINCIPLE PILOTED (Following REEP decision)	RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING PILOT
<b>TERMS &amp; CONDITIONS OF NEW ROLES</b>		
<p><b>6. Appointment decisions</b></p> <p>The principle of appointing the ‘top ranked’ candidate for the role was applied during the pilot. This meant that in some instances, one person was offered more than one fractional role within a school.</p>	N/A	<p>The principle of ‘best appointable person for the job, from the pool’ should be applied.</p> <p>This may, though, be qualified by an individual schools’ requirement for flexibility and, in addition (and all other things being equal), by the requirement to mitigate potential redundancies.</p>
<p><b>7. Spine point &amp; increments</b></p> <p>To determine the spine point to which successful HPLs should be appointed.</p>	N/A	<p>That staff currently on grades 7&amp;8 be appointed to new academic roles on their current spine point and <b>do</b> receive an increment in the October immediately following appointment <b>as per current policy on increments.</b></p> <p>Those on a 6 appointed to a new role would start at the bottom of a 7 and do not receive an increment in the October immediately following appointment, as per the current policy on increments (as will be appointed after May).</p> <p>Those currently on a 9 would be appointed to the top of on-discretionary points of a grade 8.</p> <p>This builds on the agreement through REEP that pay should not be red circled, on the basis that this is a substantially different job on different terms and the same opportunities should be available to everyone on the same terms.</p> <p>This does not rule out – where a business case identifies a need – for Senior Lecturer positions to be created as part of this process (although it is anticipated it may be the exception). In these instances, the same principles shall apply, eg where a grade 9 member of staff is successful they shall be offered the new role on their current spine point and will receive an in increment in the October <b>as per current policy on increments.</b></p>

POLICY AREA	PRINCIPLE PILOTED (Following REEP decision)	RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING PILOT
<p><b>8. Probation</b></p> <p>To determine whether the probationary period be shortened for transferring HPLs.</p> <p>To consider should there be dispensation from those elements of probation that the individual can reasonably be expected to be undertaking at a satisfactory level already, on the basis they have been teaching for a number of years.</p> <p>To consider whether there be a reduced form of probation to recognise that HPLs would have less experience of the scholarship and citizenship elements of the new academic contract.</p>	<p>It was agreed that, where an HPL who was successful in gaining an academic position had already been working for the University for at least three years, the probationary period should be reduced to two years and the focus of scrutiny during that period should be on scholarship and citizenship or research and innovation (as appropriate).</p>	<p>As per REEP, PLUS:</p> <p>To recognise that the elements under consideration during probation are principally focused on scholarship and citizenship or research, and not a full T&amp;S/T&amp;R role, and these individuals (to qualify for the reduced probationary period in the first instance) will have at least 3 years' teaching experience at Kent, the workload reduction should be amended.</p> <p>Workload reductions would therefore be specific to the individual and the number of elements they are required to undertake during probation (ie full PGCHE or already completed), but, as a rough example, may be a 35% reduction in year one and 15-20% in year two.</p>
<p><b>9. Teaching qualification</b></p> <p>To determine whether transferring HPLs be asked to gain a teaching qualification on first appointment to lectureship.</p>	<p>It was agreed that transferring HPLs should be <b>asked to gain a qualification</b>, in common with other staff on first appointment.</p> <p>UCLT advice should be sought on a <b>case-by-case basis on appointment</b> to determine whether the qualification is <b>via CPD route or full PGCHE</b> (dependent on prior experience.)</p>	<p>As per REEP.</p> <p>Consideration should be given as to the amount of time required for staff to undertake this (see also Probation).</p> <p>Contractual terms amended to state this could be via either PGCHE or CPD route (and, given in many instance these staff may have been teaching for a number of years, encourage FHEA route).</p>
<p><b>10. Promotion</b></p> <p>To determine whether transferring HPLs be eligible to apply for promotion after they have gained their substantive role.</p>	<p>As per existing Academic Promotion process. As these will be academic roles they should be open to the same career development opportunities.</p>	<p>As per REEP.</p>

POLICY AREA	PRINCIPLE PILOTED (Following REEP decision)	RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING PILOT
<b>REDUNDANCY</b>		
<p><b>11. Terms</b></p> <p>The extent to which redundancy terms should be enhanced, and a definition of those terms.</p>	N/A	<p>The application of enhanced redundancy terms as per the University's Voluntary Redundancy Scheme (standard redundancy weeks x 2 with no cap on a week's pay), with calculations for those terms based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of continuous date at the University (not contract start date) <b>using completed years' service</b>, as per legislation.</li> <li>• An average week's pay calculated using the best continuous 12 weeks' pay over the past two academic years.</li> </ul> <p>This reflects the multi-contract nature of HPL employment, and that there are often short breaks between contracts over the summer which would not ordinarily exist for salaried term-time only staff.</p> <p>It also recognises the fluctuating and fluid nature of the work offered by taking a longer reference period rather than the required 12-weeks that would be consistent for salaried staff.</p>
<p><b>12. Voluntary redundancy (outside of affected staff)</b></p> <p>The extent to which VR should be offered as an option beyond the affected HPLs.</p>	N/A	<p>That the current University Voluntary Redundancy Scheme remain and be re-publicised as early as possible, making clear the context, but that no specific group be approached or targeted for consideration.</p> <p>Where a school puts forward a VR request to EG for consideration, they should address whether or not that role would then be used to mitigate potential redundancies in the affected staff group.</p>
<p><b>13. University affiliation</b></p> <p>To determine the appropriateness and extent to which on-going affiliation with the University be offered to HPL colleagues who have been made redundant.</p>	N/A	<p>Offering institutional affiliation and other support, to all colleagues not selected for academic posts provided as part of a new one-year honorary post of "Honorary Fellow" created during consultation and approved by EG for this purpose.</p>

END