



*Key to abbreviations*

AB

Academic Board

ACAS





involvement of legal representatives should be avoided. Professor Finkelstein also expressed a concern that the proposition which was before the Board was not a serious attempt to engage with the reform of Statute 18 and the employment issues that this entailed, but an attempt to delay meaningful reform indefinitely. UCL had a duty to its employees to ensure that its employment policies and procedures were consistent with employment law and that it has in place employment processes which are appropriate and fair, and which allow UCL as an employer to deal with cases of serious staff misbehaviour.

- 16.8 On a procedural point relating to the second clause of the proposition, the Convenor of the non-professorial academic members of AB commented that she had been asked by that constituency to clarify whether the Board had the authority to establish a working group to examine Statute 18. The Secretary and the Acting Chair advised that, as a committee of UCL and in accordance with the UCL's Committee Code of Practice, AB was entitled to establish working groups, although governance issues, including the reform of UCL's Statutes, were ultimately matters for Council as the governing body.
- 16.9 During the course of the discussion, the following members of AB asked that their support for the proposition be minuted<sup>3</sup>: Professor Iain Stevenson; Professor Susanne Kord; Martha Robinson; Professor Lucie Clapp; Professor Jane Rendell; Dr Kerstin Sailer; Professor Jennifer Robinson; Dr Martin Fry. (Dr Fry also read a personal statement to AB describing his previous experience of being under threat of redundancy and the impact that this had had on him and his family.)
- 16.10 The UCL Union's Postgraduate Association Officer and the Education and Campaigns Officer reported that the UCL Union supported the proposition before the Board.
- 16.11 A longstanding member of AB suggested that external legal advice should be sought as many staff understood that the provisions of Statute 18 were implied in the terms of their employment contracts with UCL. There also seemed to be a lack of clarity over the rights of staff to have legal representation or access to legal advice. It was clear that many members of AB were concerned about the proposals as currently framed and that while staff were open to the idea of reform, they were opposed to any measure which could weaken academic freedom.
- 16.12 In response to the above comments, AB was advised that staff would have a right of appeal and a right to legal advice, but, as had been explained in previous meetings of AB, this was a matter which should be incorporated in UCL's HR policies and procedures rather than enshrined in Statute. Also, those policies and procedures would be the subject of full consultation with the recognised trades unions *via* the established consultation processes.
- 16.13 It was noted that it would be helpful if the above advice could be included in the

for and against the proposition which had been submitted to AB. Following the show of hands, the Acting Chair noted that the proposition had been approved by a very large majority of those present and asked that this be recorded in the Minutes of the meeting and relayed to Council.

JASON CLARKE

Secretary to Academic Board

xi/2012

[telephone 020 7679 8594; internal extension 28594; e-mail – [jason.clarke@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:jason.clarke@ucl.ac.uk)]