THE ASSEMBLY

There will be a meeting of the Assembly at 4 pm on Wednesday 19 March 2003, in the Council Chamber, University Plain.

Registrar and Secretary
12 March 2003

AGENDA

1. MINUTES
   To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2000. A copy of the Minutes will be available for inspection at the meeting.

2. STATEMENTS BY THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

3. STATEMENTS BY THE CHAIR OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

4. NEW STATUTES
   To report that this is the first meeting of the Assembly to be held under the revised Statute 23 (1), which states that

   There shall be an Assembly of the University consisting of all those persons who hold a contract of employment with the University.

   This change was approved by the Council at its meeting on 3 December 2001, and confirmed by the Council as a Special Resolution at its meeting on 9 January 2002. Subsequently, the changes have been approved by the Privy Council.
5. **THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE ASSEMBLY: MEMBERSHIP**

To report

(1) that the current membership of the Standing Committee is as follows:

Jean Boase-Beier (Chair)
Rob Evans
Janet Garton
Rupert Read
(Two vacancies)

(2) that all of the current members of the Standing Committee are drawn from the academic or academic-related staff.

Recommended

by the Standing Committee that, in accordance with the widened membership, the membership of the Standing Committee also be changed so as to include

*eight members, including at least two from the academic and academic-related staff, and at least two from the support staff.*

(If this recommendation is approved, four vacancies will exist in the membership of the Standing Committee. Nominations to fill these vacancies are welcome, and may be made to the Chair of the Standing Committee.)

6. **THE ASSEMBLY: APPOINTMENTS TO THE COUNCIL**

To report

(1) that, under Statute 15 (1) (C) the Council shall include amongst its membership

*Two members of the Assembly who are not members of the support staff, appointed by those members of the Assembly who are not members of the support staff.*

(2) that the restriction applies because two members of the Support Staff are appointed to the Council via a separate nominations' process.

(3) that, currently, the two members of the Council appointed by the Assembly are

Jean Boase-Beier
Rob Evans

and the current terms of office of both these members will end on 31 July 2004.
7. **THE ASSEMBLY: APPOINTMENTS TO THE SENATE**

To report

1. that Statute 18 (1) (B) provides that the membership of the Senate shall include

   *Eight members of the Assembly appointed by and from those members of the Assembly who are full-time members of the academic staff and such other members of the Assembly as the Senate shall from time to time determine. Of these eight members at least four shall be lecturers or of equivalent status.*

2. that the "other members of the Assembly" includes, broadly, the academic-related staff, together with Senior Research Assistants and Senior Research Associates, in accordance with the Senate's role as the supreme academic authority of the University.

3. that, with the widened Assembly membership, the "electoral college" for the Assembly's appointments to the Senate is now a sub-set of the total Assembly membership.

**Recommended**

that the process for appointing members of the Assembly to the Senate be carried out by inviting nominations from amongst eligible staff, each of which must be endorsed by the candidate, a proposer and a seconder, all of whom must be eligible to vote. If more valid nominations are received than there are vacancies, an election will be held.

8. **IRAQ**

Agenda Item and Motion from Rupert Read (SOC) and Tim O'Hagan (SOC).

To note

1. that the University has an ethical aspect to its investment policy, an ethical aspect which was initiated first by this Assembly;

2. that leading bodies in this University have in the past taken strong ethical stances on various weighty matters of foreign policy, such as the struggle against apartheid; and

3. that universities are places where there is a real possibility for thinking that is independent of our national government to take place and, sometimes, when the matter is weighty enough, for a corporate voice to be given to that thinking.
In the light of these three points we propose that

the staff of the University of East Anglia dissociate themselves from
preparations for a war against Iraq, on the grounds that such an attack would
not be justified by the principles of a "just war"; and

further that the Assembly urges the Council of the University

similarly to resolve, and hence to declare UEA corporately opposed to the
unjust war that the United Kingdom and United States' governments appear
currently to be planning.

9. QUESTION TIME

To report

that the following questions have been received. In some cases, answers are
given below; in others, written answers will be available at the meeting.

Catering

1. When does the contract between the UEA and the catering company Sodexho
   (who run the Diner etc.) expire? Who will run the Catering service when it
does?

   The contract between UEA and Sodexho expires on 30 June 2003. After
   that date, the catering service will be run by the University.

2. Does a Service Level Agreement (SLA) exist for the Catering service? If it
does could it be placed on the Web under Conference Services?

   No, a Service Level Agreement (SLA) does not exist for the catering
   service.

   (Question submitted by Mike Bristow, ITCS)
   (Answers supplied by Jenny Grant, RSD)

HERA Scheme

1. Why was HERA (from ECC) picked in preference to one of the other
evaluation schemes? Were trials on various schemes conducted here and if so
which and how many posts were evaluated?

2. Are any current or former members of staff connected with Educational
   Competences Consortium Ltd (ECC) and if so who are they?

3. Could you please provide % figures of

   i) The upgrades
   ii) The downgrades
for each dept done in the first round of 230 people?

4. We calculate that greater than 30% of ALC staff in one department (ITCS) were marked initially for lower grades, and we are aware of downgrading of other ALC-level IT jobs elsewhere in UEA.

Given this dramatic result, what investigation has UEA made as to the appropriateness of the HERA methodology for ALC-level IT jobs? If none, why not? Similarly, has UEA assessed the likely consequences for recruitment and retention of staff for roles that are downgraded?

5. Why were the AUT told that role assessment via HERA was voluntary, but UEA staff were told that it was compulsory?

6. Because we were in the pilot we could not have access to the full HERA Guidance Notes which were only placed on the Web in January 2003. These give examples taken from the pilot. We were at a disadvantage compared to people who will be beginning the HERA process now. If there is scope for inaccuracy why not re-assess everyone?

7. Were there any software developers/support specialists included in the original samples from which the HERA weightings were constructed? If certain roles were missed from the sample, how can we be sure that the weightings are not biased against those roles?

8. Why has the University not put a counselling or other support service in place to help people to deal with the stress and worry of being downgraded?

9. What training have the facilitators had to effectively analyse specialist technical roles such as those in IT?

10. What are the pensions implications for those staff whose salary it is proposed to reduce by downgrading?

11. Software developers/support specialists are required to learn and keep up-to-date a huge amount of complex technical knowledge. We believe that the HERA scoring scheme does not allow sufficient weighting for this. Furthermore we have been told that the 8% weighting given to Knowledge and Experience in the HERA scoring scheme is unusually low compared to typical role analysis schemes and this counts against the above roles. If the university believes that the above points are wrong, please provide evidence. If it believes they are right, please explain how this situation will be taken into account to give the above roles a fair grading?

Questions submitted by Chris Dunlop, Mike Slaughter, Mike Bristow, Pat Newby, Trevor Woods, Richard Woods (all members of staff in ITCS).
Equal Opportunities

(1) Does the new Vice-Chancellor fully endorse the University's Equal Opportunities in Employment Code of Practice?

(2) If so, does he believe, in the light of the report of the Equality Challenge Unit, that adequate mechanisms are in place to ensure that the provisions of the Code are equally respected and applied throughout the University?

(Questions submitted by Bill Marsh, Library)

Special Salary Increments

1) Is the system of 'Special Salary Increments' grossly unfair and subject to abuse for personal reasons by local management?

2) Would it be far better to dispense with 'Special Increments' in any new / proposed salary structure?

(Questions submitted by Al Brooks, AVS)

Organisation of Assembly Meetings

(1) Could the Web page on the Intranet (under Committees) for the Assembly be enhanced with the date of the next meeting and deadlines for submitting items 2 months before it is due to happen?

Yes

(2) Could notification of the Assembly meeting be sent to the newsgroup "uea.announce@uea.ac.uk" at the same time that it is published in Broadview?

Yes

(3) Can a mailing list "assembly@uea.ac.uk" (containing all those eligible to attend) also be set up and the same message sent to this please?

No, because all members of staff are members of the Assembly, and the e-mail list staff@uea exists already. A copy of the message which appeared in BroadView was sent to that list on 27 February 2003.

(Questions submitted by Mike Bristow, ITCS; Answers provided by Bruce Hurrell, ACAD)