

**NOTES OF THE CAMPUS UNION WORKING GROUP MEETING HELD ON 20 JUNE 2019**

**Draft v 1.0**

**Present**: Prof Claire Annesley (CA); John Hallam (JH); Jackie Rymell (JR); Prof Chris Chatwin - UCU (CC); Andrew Chitty - UCU (AC); Paula Burr – UNITE (PB); Elaine Stephen - UNISON (ES).

**Apologies**: Sheila Gupta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Notes of the last meeting held on 31 May 2019These were agreed as a correct record.  |  |
| 2 | Draft Dignity and Respect PolicyCA updated members of the group on the current consultation process:There was good engagement with the current consultation process. Heather Paver, the independent external consultant running the internal consultation reported positive and health responses to the listening group meetings. E-mail feedback was also being received.Comments had also been offered from the Changing University Culture (ChUCl) group.No major concerns had been expressed about the content of the policy. The main issues appeared to be around implementation and training.CC said he was aware of concern from students around allegations of plagiarism which impacted on well-being. AC said as discussed in the last meeting, the Policy should require an assessment of impact and risk in respect of other policies and practices to prevent development of poor or wrong culture. It was agreed this was a matter more for the Director of Student Experience.The Trade Unions had submitted written comments which were received and discussed as follows:**3.1** AC – this section needed to reference race and gender.**3.2** PB raised an issue around the extent to which the Policy was clear about neuro-diversity. It was agreed the Policy itself should be kept as brief and succinct as possible. Specialist concerns could be dealt with in guidance notes.**4.** AC - the focus should be on expected behaviours.**4.3.3** UCU – clauses around ‘performance management’ were a ‘get-out’ clause for managers and should be removed. It was suggested it would be better to insert a clause into 1.2 or 1.3 along the lines of: ‘*where discipline or capability issues need to be undertaken the application of those Policies will be undertaken in accordance with this (the D&R) Policy*.’ Revised management wording on this point had also been circulated with the papers for this meeting. The Trade Unions expressed concerns about this wording for the same reasons. CA responded that this issue required careful consideration. Bullying might equally be perceived if expectations and obligations were not clear. AC said that UCU accepted that it was necessary for staff to be clear about their objectives and expectations but they also needed to be realistic and achievable.**5.** There should be more information about the role of Advisors / Champions.**5.1** There should be more emphasis on mediation as an option / resolution.Other general comments:1. There is strong feeling around gender naming / labelling in the Policy draft and how certain groups may be described or identified in the Policy – UNISON
2. The University should consider guidance or protocols around e-mail etiquette – some e-mails are very abrupt / rude.
3. Staff welfare advice is now offered via the EAP service.
4. Adopt the nomenclature of Dignity Advisor rather than Champion – UCU
5. The Policy needs to be focused on resolution – CA
6. Timescales need to be realistic – some cases become quite complex and therefore there needs to be some flexibility in timescales to reflect this – JH
7. It would be good to get a joint agreement on this Policy – ALL

The HSE Management Stress Standards had been circulated. UCU said they would like to see reference to the HSE work related stress standards in the D&R Policy.Next StepsThe next steps in the development of a revised Policy were noted. This would include:1. UEG update on consultation / listening meetings
2. A revised draft (August / September) for any final comments
3. Implementation / launch – Oct 2019
 | CCCACACACACACACAJHCACAALLCACA |
| 3 | Policy ReviewJH had circulated a list of current policies with dates they were implemented / last reviewed. The document suggested an initial priority rating (1-3) for each Policy. JH asked the TUs to comment on their top 10 priorities for Policy review. | TUs |
| 4 | Any other businessAC asked if the Gender Pay Gap work would lead to a new Policy. CA said it was considered there were a range of current policies which impacted on the GPG work. There would not be a new policy around GPG itself – but activity around this would be driven and measured by an institutional KPI. |  |
| 5 | Date of next meeting: **12 July 2019 10.00 – 12.00** |  |
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