

CONFIDENTIAL

THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

23 February 2015

MINUTES

An extraordinary meeting of the Appointments Committee was held on **Monday 23 February** 2015 at **14.00** in the Vera Anstey Room, Old Building.

The meeting was chaired by the Provost and Deputy Director, Professor Stuart Corbridge.

Ex Officio:

Professor Eric Neumayer (Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee)

Attendees:

Professor Julia Black (Pro-Director for Research)
Professor Jason Alexander
Professor Tim Allen
Professor Rita Astuti
Professor Pauline Barrieu
Professor Michael Barzelay
Professor Luc Bovens
Professor Richard Burdett
Professor David Coombe
Professor Myria Georgiou
Professor Emily Grundy
Professor Simon Hix
Professor Sara Hobolt
Professor Jeremy Horder
Professor Christopher Hughes
Professor Deborah James
Professor Naila Kabeer
Professor Paul Kelly
Professor Martin Knapp
Professor Jouni Kuha
Professor Elias Mossialos
Professor Susana Mourato
Professor Michele Piccione
Professor Christopher Polk
Professor Anita Prazmowska
Professor James Putzel
Professor Andres Rodriguez-Pose
Professor Juan Roses Vendoiro
Professor Max-Stephan Schulze
Professor Fiona Steele
Professor Peter Trubowitz
Professor Wim Van Der Stede

Professor Bernhard Von Stengel

Apologies received are attached at **Annex A**.

The Chair introduced the papers and thanked the Research Division and Human Resources for the Committee papers.

The Committee was informed that University College Union (UCU) had approved the proposals outlined in the papers by 96%.

1. AGENDA ITEM 1: NEW RESEARCH STAFF CAREER STRUCTURE

- 1.1 The Pro-Director for Research thanked attendees and gave background to the New Research Staff Career (NRSC) structure following the introduction of the New Academic Career Structure (NAC).
- 1.2 An overview of The Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) negotiation process was given, including details of the compromise reached with UCU, touching on the points below.
 - a) The NRSC would apply to Research staff in Bands 7-10.
 - b) Migration to the NRSC will be automatic for those who have been recruited to a School post on the basis of an externally advertised position for which they have been interviewed by a School selection panel or who were appointed to LSE through a single nomination or a named researcher process, but who have subsequently been promoted via School processes to bands 7, 8, 9 or 10.. All other cases will be considered individually by the Promotions Committee.
- 1.3 The Pro-Director for Research confirmed that the purpose of the Appointments Committee Meeting was to approve the titles and role profiles outlined in **Appendices C-E**. It was confirmed that the Appointments Committee was bound by the ACAS agreement but not in relation to titles and role profiles.
- 1.4 The VCAC highlighted Point 9 in the Migration Document (Appendix A), indicating that it will be crucial for the Promotions Committee when evaluating those candidates who do not automatically migrate to assess whether the member of staff is already fulfilling the requirement of the new role profile or has demonstrated that s/he is suitably qualified and competent to fulfil the requirements of the new role profile, taking into account the individual's qualifications and experience.
- 1.5 The Pro-Director for Research commented on existing role profiles of research staff. These would stay in place and be reviewed after one year when it would be possible to better distinguish the two different career paths. It was emphasised that Research Staff will need to continue to secure their own funding.
- 1.6 The Chair invited the Committee to raise concerns and ask questions.

NOTED:

- 1.7 Concerns were raised about departments being able to fund Research Staff in the suggested higher level roles within their own budgets.

- 1.8 The Pro-Director for Research noted in response that the School will pay the differences caused by salary increases, with pay backdated from August 2013, until the end of the current research grant. It was also mentioned that a separate piece of work was planned to look into the indirect and direct costs of future research grant applications as it was recognised that grant applications will be made less competitive due the salary increases.
- 1.9 Issues were raised in regards to the benchmarking that had been carried out during the creation of the NRSC proposals.
- 1.10 The Pro-Director for Research confirmed that benchmarking had been conducted across the UK for Research Staff primarily from the UK. No other institution offers titles like in the proposals and the new salary scales would place LSE NRSC staff well above the salary levels of research staff at other UK universities.
- 1.11 The following concerns were also highlighted;
- a) The cost to the School of backdating salaries.
 - b) The provisions set aside for underwriting bridging funds for research staff in between grants.
 - c) The gap between Research Officers (Band 6) and Research Fellows (Band 7) and the migration from Band 6 to NRSC Level 1.
- 1.12 The Pro-Director for Research suggested that the backdating cost is approximately £615,000. The underwriting cost is not yet confirmed but it was estimated that around 30 individuals will be subject to review . This will be assessed on an individual basis.
- 1.13 The Chair agreed that the cost to the School would be considerable but would have a long term benefit, providing higher quality outputs to the School. It was stated that going forward the School desires publications that the School would regard as eligible for submission to the REF as a minimum standard for NRSC staff.
- 1.15 The VCAC agreed that the gap between Band 6 and NRSC Level 1 was a big step. It was noted that the School may want to keep the Research Fellow (Band 7) role for longer as it would be easier to move from this to NRSC Level 1.
- 1.16 A further concern was raised regarding whether the School had a reliable database of Research Staff appointed and how they were appointed. It was also asked how Departments should deal with individuals who may want to remain in their current roles.
- 1.17 The Pro-Director for Research specified that the Head of Employee Relations and other colleagues in Human Resources had assessed the origins of appointments. It was recognised that there will need to be time built into the migration process for individuals to contest their categorisation and that difficult cases would be given to the VCAC for final consideration and decision.
- 1.18 The Pro-Director for Research also commented that Human Resources and the VCAC will be advising Heads of Department and Centres on how to deal with staff who wished to remain in their current roles. Individuals would have the new role profiles and be able to decide if they match the required level to move across to the

NSRC. It was emphasised that the option would be available should individuals wish to 'opt out' of the NSRC. However, Research staff will be assumed to want to 'opt in' by default.

- 1.19 Questions were raised about the distinction between the New Academic Career Structure and the NSRC.
- 1.20 The Pro-Director for Research highlighted the distinction to be that Research staff do not normally teach and will still need to raise their own funding. Research staff can apply for academic positions at the School just like any other candidate.
- 1.22 The Pro-Director for Research reminded the Committee that promotion would always be contingent on funding being available through a grant.
- 1.23 Responding to concerns that the auto-migration of many research staff would result in some staff migrating to title and role profiles that their performance does not warrant, the VCAC emphasised that mismatches are inevitable in any transition process, much like when the NAC was introduced, and that migrating staff will be assessed against the new role profiles in future career development meetings and other assessments of their performance.
- 1.25 The Pro-Director for Research added that if individuals were not performing to the correct level on the new Role Profiles then this should be reviewed when the grant comes to an end.
- 1.26 A concern was raised around titles of the NRSC.
- 1.27 The VCAC commented that the role profiles and titles had been inspired by the NAC and that the School side was unable to come up with better titles that would also be acceptable to UCU and research staff..
- 1.28 The Committee questioned the need to use 'Professorial' in the proposed new Research Staff titles.
- 1.29 The Pro-Director for Research recognised that the word 'Professorial' invoked academic connotations but that the titles proposed to the Committee were already a result of negotiation compromises with UCU.
- 1.30 The VCAC added that allowing the use of the word 'Professorial' in research staff titles was decided by the School a long time prior to the NSRC proposal when the School introduced the role of "Professorial Research Fellow".
- 1.31 The Chair suggested that the Committee's attention should be drawn to point 9 of the New Research Staff Career Structure (AC/1) paper. The Chair summarised that external referees would not review Research Staff's work; all evaluation will be undertaken internally by the Promotions Committee. Concerns were raised on this point.
- 1.32 The Pro-Director for Research emphasised that external reviews will be conducted for promotions going forward and this was the process purely for the migration to the NRSC. It was also suggested that undertaking the migration process without the involvement of external reviewers was a pragmatic way of moving through the

process in time for the Promotions Committee to review the cases on 29 and 30 June 2015.

- 1.33 The Chair thanked the Committee for their discussion and suggested that Committee members should vote on the proposals for the NSRC.
- 1.34 24 Committee Members voted in favour and there were 5 abstentions.

2: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 2.1 A committee member questioned whether the use of the title 'Associate Professor (Reader)' would be continued or if it would be phased out over time.

The Chair confirmed that allowing staff who were previously Readers to carry this title was a an agreement which could not be changed.

Human Resources
February 2015