

Review of local dispute over cuts and redundancies at the University of Bath Foreign Languages Centre May-September 2016

This review is in three parts:

- Background to the proposals to cut FLC provision by 20% and dismiss 18 staff
- Timetable of the consultation process with UCU over the proposed dismissals
- Conclusions and pointers for further action for UCU

The University has had an institution-wide Foreign Languages Centre in one form or another since 1989. It has provided UG and PG students with an opportunity to add a language to any degree programme, and has provided a wide range of community courses to local people who are not full-time students.

Proposals for restructuring of the FLC were initiated by the Vice Chancellor's Group at some point in 2015 'to look at the range of FLC language teaching provided by the FLC to students, staff and the wider Bath community'. However, none of these groups were involved in the drafting of the proposals which included:

- the removal of 3 of the 11 languages taught (Polish, Russian, Greek)
- the removal of levels 5 and 6 (the highest levels)
- an overall cut of 20% in the FLC provision

The reasons given for the proposals were

- timetabling and space efficiencies
- reduction of costs
- 'to align the FLC's provision more closely with the University's International and Education strategies'
- 'a shift to a more skills-based approach to language learning ... thus enhancing employability'

To take each of these reasons in turn:

- Many staff were flummoxed by the first of these. The University has embarked on a massive new building programme and there is far more space available now than five years ago.
- The cost saving was estimated to be about £60,000 which, in the context of the University's huge and growing surpluses (£16.5m in the most recent accounts), is insignificant.
- The University launched a new International strategy shortly before proposing the cuts to the FLC. However it was obvious to all except the

senior managers of the University that the FLC cuts undermined the University's claim in this new strategy that one of its 'core priorities' is to 'support our intercultural awareness and our international community of staff and students on campus and overseas'.

The coincidence of the EU referendum with the timing of the proposals to cut the FLC had a clear impact on public, staff and student reaction to the proposals. UCU launched a petition which called on the University to mark its 50th anniversary by increasing rather than cutting the work of the FLC. Over 2600 people signed the petition in a short space of time. The petition was presented to the Chair of the University's governing body (Council) in July, but petitioners did not receive a response. Many of the comments posted by signatories suggested that the proposed cuts represented, on the most charitable of interpretations, an unfortunate, if unintended source of support for the xenophobic and racist narratives associated with the Brexit campaign. As one FLC staff member puts it:

“The refusal of management to defer the restructuring of the Foreign Languages Centre in the face of the Brexit-referendum shows a high degree of inflexibility on their side and possibly a conviction that institution-wide language provision and the Brexit-vote are not connected. Whereas I am convinced that any institution which is involved in education has a responsibility towards the society which it is part of to enhance communication with the people of Europe and the wider world”.

Even in the middle of the dispute about the FLC cuts, on July 19th the University was saying one thing in public about the value of languages, while at the same time beginning to implement the cuts to the FLC. On its website it gave an account of the Third colloquium of Innovation in Modern Languages Education, a South West regional HE event supported by the University of Bath, which 'was framed by two keynotes from leading scholars who explored the importance of languages at this time of transition for the UK.'

http://www.bath.ac.uk/polis/news/news_0127.html

The cuts to the FLC also sound a warning for the future of full-time language degrees at the University of Bath. If the University is prepared to get rid of its institution-wide language programmes, there is a clear message for the importance now attached to language teaching in general. There have been signs that the University is preparing to replace its full time language programmes with more cheaper, high volume politics and international relations programmes.

- The new emphasis on ‘enhancing employability’ is, in fact, not new at all. One of the main reasons why thousands of students, staff and members of the public have participated in FLC courses since the beginning has been related to work and employment prospects. Comments posted by those who signed the petition often mention this, but in any case all those who teach FLC programmes already know this. The University senior managers’ argument is that it is a better use of the resources allocated to the FLC for more of the University’s full time students to be recruited to fewer and lower level language courses. Aside from the lack of any evidence to support the likelihood of an increase in FT student numbers on a narrower range of lower level language courses, what is lost in this shift to ‘enhanced employability’ is any wider commitment to the promotion of intercultural awareness’ (a core priority in the University’s new international strategy) provided by a wider range of languages taught to the highest levels of competence. Why doesn’t the University of Bath mark its 50th anniversary by building on its excellent and popular foreign language courses with a significant investment to fund the introduction of, say, ten more languages taught to every level ?

The concern raised by this narrowing of both the provision and purpose of foreign language teaching by the University of Bath FLC was the primary reason for UCU’s call for a delay to allow for more time to consider the proposed changes. The fact that the proposals have now been implemented leaves behind a fear that this more narrow purpose sits in sharp contrast to the more generous, outward looking and public-spirited ideas that launched the FLC in the 1990s.

The FLC staff - a (partially) disposable workforce

The FLC, as noted earlier, was created by a workforce of mainly women engaged by the University on zero hours contracts. UCU won increased security for some of the staff an agreement with the University in 2007 which led to the introduction of more secure fractional posts for some staff working in FLC. By the time of the restructuring proposals in May 2016, 17 staff were employed on fractional contracts and 12 on variable hours (zero-hours) contracts. FLC staff are also the only teaching fellows in the University who are paid at a grade lower than other teaching contracts.

This picture is similar to the one revealed in surveys carried out by the University Council of Modern Languages/Association of University Language Centres.(UCML-AULC).

http://www.ucml.ac.uk/sites/default/files/pages/160/UCML_AULC_2015-2016.pdf

According to these surveys between 20-40% of staff working in university-wide language centres are engaged on zero-hours contracts. Many staff complain that the work is low paid, low status and lacking in opportunities for scholarly activity or career progression. Despite this, university wide language teaching was reported in the most recent survey as an expanding area, with most of the 61 universities responding to the survey describing prospects as 'encouraging'. In other words, there is a regular pattern of work and most see this pattern continuing into the future. This is an important point as UCU, like other trade unions, has argued for an end to the use of zero hours contracts where there is a regular and continuing pattern of work.

It was against this background of (semi) casualised, low paid work, together with the increased uncertainty created by the increasing number of reorganisations and restructurings of the FLC that Bath UCU carried out its own survey of FLC staff in 2013.

Our survey revealed that

- 92% thought their pay was unfair (compared to 58% of all staff at the University).
- 85% had seen an increase in the work required as part of their contracted duties in the last two years, and none had seen any increase in pay to compensate for this
- 67% were doing work that is not in their contracted duties

The survey also received comments from some staff that their work and their health were being affected by both changes in the direction of the FLC and by the effects of unnecessary reorganisations. Many FLC staff had, however, been prepared to put up with unfair pay and growing workloads in the hope that it would make the FLC flourish and give more opportunities to staff. As this response to the question "Are you doing work that is not included in your contracted duties?" suggests:

"Don't we all, though? I find it would be impossible to stick to my job description if I want the FLC to grow and give more opportunities to the staff. I really do not mind going the extra mile, but I would like to be rewarded for it or, at least, have a clear career path in front of me."

UCU membership among FLC staff doubled in size in the last 3-4 years. However, the casual and insecure nature of the job makes this a difficult group to organise.

The demand for a time to pause and reflect

The FLC has thrived on the commitment and dedication of a large group of teachers who have put up with insecure contracts, low pay and organisational

change. It has grown in popularity because it provides high quality teaching to every level in a wide range of languages.

When the proposals for restructuring were published in May 2016, UCU called for a one year delay to any further changes to allow time for consultation with all those interested: students, staff and the local community. UCU's view was that the FLC is too important, and has been plagued by poor management decisions in recent years: all the more reason to make sure the latest set of changes are going to work.

The main features of the proposals were:

- all FLC staff to be placed at risk of dismissal and required to reapply for jobs they may have had for up to twenty years
- compulsory redundancy for at least 5 staff on fractional contracts, with redundancy payments limited to the statutory minimum, the lowest in the country
- dismissal of at least 12 staff on zero hours contracts, who would not be entitled to the statutory redundancy payments
- an acceptance that FLC teaching would continue to be paid at a lower rate than other teaching in the University

The number of staff would be reduced from 17 fractional and 12 variable hours to 12 fractional with a much smaller and diminishing number of variable hours staff. The new posts would still be paid at Grade 6, a grade lower than other teaching-only contracts used by the University. With breathtaking cheek, the proposals were presented by University managers to FLC staff as an opportunity for greater job security. The price of increased security for a smaller number of staff was named as the dismissal of up to 18 of their colleagues.

UCU's call for a one year delay and a full consultation with students, staff and the public was ultimately ignored, but the University was unable to avoid the statutory consultation with trade unions on the risk of redundancies. This was formally launched on May 24th and is detailed in the following timetable.

Timetable of the consultation process

23 May trade unions notified of proposals to cut FLC provision by 20% and make up to 18 posts redundant. Deputy Director of HR (DDHR) interrupts a trade union meeting at 3 pm to give notice of a meeting for FLC staff at 9 am the following day. No date set for a consultation meeting with UCU, which represent staff at risk of redundancy. DDHR later insists that he had informed TU reps on 4th May that a consultation on changes to the FLC relating to a reduction of teaching would be coming forward as a future consultation affecting staff and posts, but that he couldn't say more at that time as there wasn't further detail on the exact proposals. He also claimed that "we were not able to provide advance notice of the meeting ... because there was a meeting (today) that was already set up for FLC staff who are a group where it is very difficult to get them all together; delaying launching to setting a meeting at a later date would be difficult to arrange and get sufficient attendees without causing concern to staff in advance." UCU reject this explanation as 'not credible' as the meeting for FLC staff had clearly been arranged by HR well in advance of 24 May, and UCU could and should have been informed of that.

24 May University managers inform FLC staff of the proposals. UCU members present at this meeting point out that their reps have not been given the agreed 5 days notice of the proposals and call for the meeting to be rescheduled. This request was turned down. UCU object to the launch of the consultation without proper notice, documentation or agreed dates for meetings between HR and UCU.

27 May UCU members in FLC begin to draft response to the proposals,

3 June 14 FLC staff request a 2 week extension of deadline for consultation process. UCU relay this to HR with request for further information about the proposals and their implementation

5 June Petition created calling on University to mark its 50th anniversary by expanding provision of foreign language teaching

6 June DDHR send formal letter to UCU required under 1992 TULR(C) Act when 20 or more redundancies are proposed by an employer within the same 90 day period. This notice (known as a Section 188 notice) identifies 36 staff at risk of redundancy, including 'Hospitality, Foreign Languages Centre, Student Services and others'. DDHR later insists that the HR1 form that employers are required to send to BIS was 'shared' with TU reps on 2 June. All three trade unions deny this was done.

8 June meeting between UCU and DDHR. He indicated that the consultation period would be extended, but he did not say by how long.

13 June Reminder from UCU to DDHR that no response yet received to UCU request for extension of consultation deadline. DDHR responds with agreement to extend deadline by one week to 30 June. UCU respond by pointing out that the S188 notice was not received until 6 June so the 30 day period should not start until then, meaning consultation should be extended to 5th July.

14 June DDHR calls UCU Regional official and says the University has taken legal advice which says that the specific wording of section 188 of TULRCA means that there's no actual legal obligation to engage in 'collective consultation' for at least 30 days. UCU responds:

“it is rarely in the interests of good and productive employment relations if either party seeks to resort to legal advice as the first option. In part, because it can be perceived as confrontational, whether this is the intention or not. Indeed, the reason we have local agreements with Universities in relation to consultation on redundancies, that usually go beyond the bare minimum statutory requirements, is because employers recognise that there are clear institutional benefits to this.”

17 June

Leafletting of prospective students and their parents at University open day by FLC staff

20 June UCU contact DDHR to say that FLC staff have not been informed of change to consultation deadline and that HR have not responded to UCU message of 13 June. DDHR replies that deadline is now 1 July and FLC staff will be informed.

24 June FLC staff informed that deadline extended to 1st July. UCU members in FLC point out that this may make it difficult/impossible for existing staff to apply for new jobs as the selection process may take place when they are on holiday. UCU request further extension to 5 July to comply with the law.

4 July ELC staff express support for FLC colleagues

4 July UCU submit response to consultation.

The proposals for the FLC should be deferred for a period of 12 months, during which period the status quo will be retained, including the current designated timetable slots. These reasons include:

- problems with the launch of the consultation. We were not provided with information about the



proposals or the intention to discuss them with our members in time for the launch meeting on 24th May

- timing of the consultation. These proposals should have been put forward earlier in the year when those whose posts are at risk of redundancy are at work and able to take a full part in the consultation process, rather than when teaching and assessment are coming to an end and some, especially those working on insecure/casual contracts, are not available.
- the need to consult with members of the local community. The huge response to our petition in a short space of time demonstrates very clearly that people who have an interest in and who use or have used the FLC in the past or intend to do so in the future, have had no other opportunity to comment on what is being proposed.
- the need to consult with students. We are not aware that this has taken place and if it has we would like to know what was said and by whom.
- the significant role played by FLC at a time when the University is seeking to become more internationally engaged means that any changes should be carefully considered by all stakeholders to avoid making mistakes that cannot easily be put right.
- the need to attend to the points we have raised in this response.

4 July FLC staff books and course materials cleared from staff workroom without notice

5 July Meeting between UCU reps and DDHR/FLC manager where they ask questions about what would happen in a 12-month consultation period and what would happen in the FLC during this period. UCU maintain that University managers should have discussed this with FLC staff before launching the consultation and should have set out its reasons for having a Foreign Languages Centre. To do this it would need to consult widely.

6 July Branch meeting expresses support for FLC staff facing compulsory redundancy and for the wider campaign to oppose the FLC cuts.

7 July Petition presented to Chair of Council following a well attended meeting of about 30 of those who have signed (including, staff, students and members of the public). Chris and Kim decked the room and the staircase leading to the Council Chamber with international flag bunting.

Evening Chronicle coverage

<http://www.bathchronicle.co.uk/bid-to-save-three-languages-from-axe/story-29487322-detail/story.html>



Wordcloud produced by student

8 July University managers respond to consultation feedback. The response claims that there was ‘mixed feedback’ on the proposals rather than overwhelming opposition to them. There are several minor changes to the detail of implementation, but the main proposals are confirmed

11 July UCU writes to VC to say that its response to the consultation process has been misrepresented in the consultation feedback, and requesting an urgent meeting. VC responds three days later to say the consultation process is now closed.

13 July UCU writes to all members about the dispute. In a message with the strapline **Underpaid, (semi)-casualised, mainly women and now the sack ! FLC staff need your support,**

UCU points out the strong connections between this local dispute and the current national dispute about fair pay, casualisation and the gender pay gap. Members notified that they will be asked to take part in a consultative ballot on action in support of FLC staff facing compulsory redundancy.

15 July UCU registers a formal ‘Failure to Agree’ notice with the University as employer. This is the procedure agreed between the University and trades unions to resolve local disputes. Neither UCU nor the other recognised unions have resorted to the procedure before. The procedure has three stages, with meetings intended to find a resolution to the dispute. Under the procedure, the proposals that have given rise to the ‘failure to agree’ will not be implemented.

15 July Pro VC (Learning and Teaching) contacts FLC staff about UCU, describing UCU’s messages as ‘confused’ and as the cause of ‘concern and distress’.

UCU responds that ‘it is the concern and distress caused by the University’s proposals to make 18 FLC posts redundant that have prompted us to speak out on behalf of our members.’

18 July Director of HR responds to UCU ‘failure to agree’ notice claiming “Although consultation takes place with a view to reaching agreement, there is

no requirement to reach agreement as it is not a negotiation and as such the 'failure to agree' process is not applicable in this situation." He does offer to talk 'in the interests of maintaining effective channels of communication'.

20 July UCU launches consultative ballot of all members asking if they are prepared to take strike action / action short of a strike if there are any dismissals of FLC staff as a result of compulsory redundancy. Members advised that the branch committee recommends a YES vote to both questions.

20 July Director of HR complains that UCU has published the University's 'outcome of consultation' document, because it contains 'personal details including the names of individuals at risk, and their employment terms.' Asked for example of personal details the Director cites 'the size of the fraction of the post of a member of staff'. UCU dismiss this as this information is readily available.

22 July UCU responds to HR that the potential for compulsory redundancies in the FLC constitutes an unresolved local issue and therefore comes within the scope of matters that can be referred as a 'failure to agree.' and informs HR that a consultative ballot of members is under way.

25 July UCU meet with Director of HR and request:

A 12 month freeze on the proposals.

Disclosure of all responses (redacted to maintain anonymity if considered necessary) made in the consultation process.

Disclosure of evidence used to support the proposals.

Disclosure of changes in staff costs of FLC before and after the proposed changes

Agreement to pay interview expenses of any FLC staff, including staff on VH contracts, invited to interview for new posts in FLC.

Further proposals from the University on the mitigation of 18 compulsory redundancies.

Director of HR claims there are not 18 redundancies because the people on variable hours contracts are no longer employed by the university, because their contracts were not renewed. So they have not been dismissed or their posts made redundant. The Director of Human Resources was quite offended when we compared that use of casual contracts to the practices of Sports Direct.

28 July Further meeting between UCU and HR, with Pro VC (Learning and Teaching) also in attendance. A fractious meeting at which the Pro VC remarked that these proposals for the FLC had saved it from an even worse fate. They agreed to ask the VC if they could offer more than the basic statutory minimum redundancy payments to mitigate the effects of compulsory redundancy.

UCU also took this opportunity to ask whether police have been spoken to in relation to concerns over the potential for hate crimes in the city when foreign students return to the University in September.

3 August Director of HR indicates that there may be an offer of improved terms of redundancy if 'there could be movement on industrial action'. This was the first indication that UCU's threat of industrial action was having an impact. UCU inform him that the consultative ballot will close on 10 August.

10 August Consultative ballot shows a significant majority of members voted in favour of action to support FLC staff facing dismissal.

Question No	Text	Total Yes	Total No
1	If compulsory redundancy notices are issued to FLC staff, branch officers should make preparations for a ballot of all members for industrial action. NB Please do not vote 'YES' for this unless you are prepared to vote 'YES' for 2 and 3 below.	128	37
2	Are you prepared to take strike action in defence of your colleagues in the Foreign Languages Centre?	117	48
3	Are you prepared to take action short of a strike in defence of your colleagues in the Foreign Languages Centre?	144	21

10 August Director of HR gives details of offer of a 50% increase in redundancy payments to staff on fractional contracts. This voluntary redundancy package would replace compulsory redundancy for any staff accepting the terms offered by 31st August. The payments made to these staff would be based on length of service including any service on a VH contract. In other words the offer acknowledged some of the casual employment of the past. Of the seven staff eligible for this offer, two had applied for a post in the new structure and five had not. The offer would not be extended to those who had worked on VH contracts only.

Director of HR also undertakes to produce by mid October a working paper which considers the issues of individual voluntary redundancy, collective voluntary redundancy and compulsory redundancy. This paper will include: use of means to avoid redundancy; selection of units of redundancy; terms of redundancy and a comparison, where possible, with other employers.

12 August following some discussion of detail UCU accepts the terms of the offer.

8 September Director of HR informs UCU that all seven staff eligible had accepted the offer of voluntary redundancy.

12 September UCU refers HR to its model redundancy avoidance agreement as the basis for future discussions

http://www.ucu.org.uk/media/3253/Trade-union-side-redundancy-avoidance-agreement-and-code-of-practice/pdf/turedundancyavoidance_v1r4.pdf

Conclusions and points for further action from UCU

The restructuring of the FLC has raised a number of important issues which need to be followed up, Some of these relate primarily to the Foreign Languages Centre and these are addressed in points 1-3 below. The other issues (4-8) relate to all staff at the University.

The future of the FLC

1 Bath University has had a widely respected and in some ways pioneering institution-wide language programme for almost 30 years. As in some other universities, it has been built on the work of a committed group of staff who have been low paid and in many cases engaged on zero-hours contracts. However, this work does not fit the template of what a new model university should be doing. The marketisation and financialisation of higher education push universities in the direction of competition with others for high volume, high fee programmes. The University of Bath is now more likely to be a pioneer for this new model university than for activities that enrich the public realm. The FLC does not provide a big enough return on investment, so those who are paid ever-increasing amounts of money to run the University find it difficult to know what to do with it. Hence the growing frequency of reorganisations / restructurings affecting the FLC. The latest restructuring is a desperate attempt to make it fit/pay by narrowing its purpose to provide lower level courses the value of which can be calculated by some measure of 'improved employability' of students.

We need to monitor the implementation of changes to the FLC over the next 12 months carefully. Already a fourth language (Japanese) is likely to disappear from the range of languages taught.

2 The FLC is popular and commands a high level of support from staff, students and the wider public. It is one of the only tangible ways in which the University provides something for local citizens, who have subsidised the University for 50 years by providing it with rent-free land. The speed with which the petition attracted support, and the content of many of the posts made by those signing the petition surprised many. The petition was launched shortly after the EU referendum and for many it became a way of articulating their rejection of xenophobic and racist discourse. It is unlikely that these views about the FLC or about xenophobia and racism will disappear, but if the University winds down the FLC completely it will represent the closure of a point at which the University of Bath connects to its locality and its replacement by warm words about 'intercultural awareness'.

We need to build on the campaign to defend the FLC because it represents a point of weakness in the relentless privatisation of higher education. We should use the UCML-AULC surveys (which show that the situation of language teachers at Bath is fairly typical of others doing similar work elsewhere) to make contact with UCU branches at other universities that have institution-wide foreign language provision.

A campaign to protect foreign language teaching in universities can strengthen the position of workers in the same position as those at Bath FLC.

3 Not only were the proposals drawn up without talking to FLC staff, students or anybody outside the clique that surrounds the University Vice Chancellor, but when there was a public outcry about the cuts and the Chair of the University's governing body was handed the largest petition he (or any of his predecessors) had ever received, the petitioners did not even receive the courtesy of a response.

We should follow up the recent petition with a letter to members of Council asking if they will undertake their own review of the FLC in view of the high level of public interest in its future. This should be a joint initiative with the Students Union.

Problems with the consultation process

4 The consultation process over the proposed dismissals bore the usual hallmarks of the way such processes are normally run at the University: lack of information, inadequate notice and a failure to engage with staff or their representatives BEFORE consultation begins to avoid problems and mitigate undesirable consequences. All three recognised unions have made representations about the shortcomings in the University's approach to consultation with its staff, but so far there has been little sign that this will change. This is the first time that any of the unions have resorted to the agreed process for resolving local disputes, yet the employer's response was that the procedure could not be used in this case. UCU's decision to move straight to a consultative ballot of its members asking them to support FLC staff with strike action and/or action short of a strike put pressure on a recalcitrant employer and ultimately produced an offer to settle the dispute.

We should be prepared to invoke the dispute procedure on every occasion where the employer refuses to engage in meaningful consultation.

The University's redundancy avoidance policy

5 The offer we received from the employer was a significant (50%) improvement in the terms of redundancy. It did not meet our demands for a one year delay to the proposals, and it did not give equal treatment to the casual staff who also lost their jobs as a result of the proposals. However, it was the first time we have secured any concessions from management. As part of the local settlement of the FLC dispute we were promised a review of the University's redundancy avoidance policies within weeks.

We should press the University to increase its terms of voluntary redundancy for all staff to at least those offered to the 7 FLC staff who accepted the improved offer.

The use of zero hours contracts

6 Bath University was exposed three years ago as the heaviest user of zero hours contracts for teaching and research of all UK universities. Following that revelation, the Vice Chancellor indicated that she wanted the University to become less dependent on zero hours and other casual contracts. The FLC restructuring suggests that she is prepared to do this only by dismissing some staff and cutting important areas of provision. The same negotiating position has been struck by the employer in relation to the uprating of the Living Wage supplement (it has not been uprated in 2016). The employer's argument is that a 'business case' has to be made for any improvements to the pay or security of staff. What this means in practice is that any gains made by the unions are offset by savings made elsewhere. The same argument is not applied to the pay of senior managers, whose pay has rocketed in the last ten years. These pay deals for the high earners at the University are not transparent, and no argument is ever put forward to justify their pay increases.

We should campaign for an end to the use of zero hours and other casual contracts where there is a regular pattern of work, and the business case for this, if one is needed, is that the terms and conditions of employment of those staff on the lowest rates of pay and with the least security are as important as those of the high earners.

The rate for the job – why are FLC teaching contracts paid at a lower grade than other teaching contracts ?

7 FLC teaching staff are and will continue to be paid at a lower rate than other staff on teaching contracts. There is a lack of transparency in the process through which the pay grades of particular jobs is determined. For those paid at Grade 6 the problem is compounded by the University's violation of a local agreement on pay struck between the unions and the employer in 2007.

Under this agreement, staff appointed on Grade 6 (the pay grade of FLC teaching staff) would have a normal expectation of progression to Grade 7. This expectation has not been met, and FLC teaching staff (and others) who reach the top of Grade 6 are offered no route for progression to Grade 7. The lack of transparency in the job evaluation process that underpins pay grades, together with the lack of progression opportunities for those in Grade 6 posts is already causing problems of recruitment and retention in other areas of the University, especially professional and technical services, where 'market supplements' are being introduced to deal with the problem. This represents not only a violation of local agreements on pay, but also a move

away from the nationally negotiated pay scale as the basis for determining rates of pay.

We should step up our demands for a transparent job evaluation process that adheres to nationally agreed criteria for rates of pay, and for the University to honour its local agreement on pay and progression for those in Grade 6 posts.

UCU membership

8 Bath University UCU has recently seen a significant increase in its membership, and one of the reasons for that is that it has responded to the growing casualisation of university work by prioritising the issues of job security and low pay. Our success in securing a small gain for a section of our membership that is, according to the UCML-AULC surveys, low status, low paid and insecure nationally can provide a platform not only for increasing the confidence of all our members that they can, through collective action and representation, protect and improve their terms and conditions of employment in the face of the tough times that lie ahead.

We should publicise our local success in securing a concession from the employer to win support for the next stage of the national campaign to challenge unfair pay, casualisation and the gender pay gap.

Hedley Bashforth
Secretary, University of Bath University and College Union
October 2016

University FOR Bath?



It's the University of Bath's 50th anniversary,
but the **Foreign Languages Centre**
won't celebrate!

Save languages at Bath!

Please sign the petition
tinyurl.com/no-FLC-cuts

- Loss of provision for the community!
- No more Russian, Greek or Polish classes!
 - Courses for higher stages will be cut!
- Job losses for people who live in the local area!
 - 18 out of 30 teaching posts to be cut!

