

## Human Resources Policy Committee

Wednesday 7 July 2021, 10:00 am

### Minutes

#### Present Members:

Dr Michael Spence (Chair); Ms Wendy Appleby; Dr Matthew Blain; Professor Stella Bruzzi; Professor Piet Eeckhout; Professor Dame Hazel Genn; Professor Deborah Gill; Professor Li Wei; Ms Collette Lux; Professor Ivan Parkin; Professor David Price; Professor Geraint Rees; Professor Sasha Roseneil; Ms Fio.32 BTBT and Professor Alan Thompson; Professor Nigel Titchener-Hooker

#### Apologies:

Professor Mark Emberton; Professor Graham Hart; Professor Christoph Lindner; Professor A.3-3(t)8(h)-3(o)-3(n)-3(y)8(S)-2(m)-6(i)12(th)]TJETQ.000008871 0 59.32 841.2 reW\*nE

was  
required and how it would be implemented. The following points were made  
during the presentation:

- a. The policy had been drafted to ensure compliance, due diligence, and best practice.
  - b. Funders had previously requested such a policy.
  - c. UK law may not be relevant overseas, so it was beneficial to have a specific policy for UCL staff and students overseas.
- 2.2. The following points were raised in discussion:
- a. Professor Ivan Parkin raised that overseas organisations that UCL students attended often had their own policies that would largely mirror this policy. Would UCL be able to accept another organisations policy if it mirrored its own safeguarding policy? Ms Lorren Rea confirmed that this would be acceptable, and the wording could be adapted to reflect this in the policy.
  - b. Professor David Price raised that due diligence groups and ethics reviews would need to include this policy. It would need to be embedded into current procedures. Ms Lorren Rea confirmed that once approved there would be a full roll out which would include briefing and training for all relevant parties.
  - c. Professor Sasha Roseneil raised the following suggestions and questions:
    - i. the onus should be on an individual such as the HoD rather than the

for a period of 12 weeks or more could apply, temporary or agency staff would not be able to apply and different to secondments, staff would not need to seek permission from line managers.

- 3.2. The following points were raised in discussion:
- a. The pilot was a good idea, but concern was expressed that we would need to be cautious not to create an echo chamber. There was a risk that the scheme would not encourage change or new ideas from coming into UCL.
  - b. In response to a question whether a line manager reference would be obtained for internal candidates, Ms Laura Tomson confirmed this would be the case.
  - c. The group had some concerns over candidates who were performing poorly being able to apply for a new role across UCL. Dr Matthew Blain confirmed that there were processes in place to manage poor performance and this should prevent line managers being able to recommend those who are under review. Ms Lorren Rea confirmed that a line could be added to confirm that if someone was under review for poor performance, they would be unable to apply for an internal role.
- 3.3 HRPC approved the pilot and asked that the results be reported to HRPC in due course.

#### **4. Pilot Remote Working Policy (Paper 3-04)**

- 4.1. Ms Lorren Rea, Head of Employment Policy, introduced a draft Remote Working Policy and Guidance to be piloted in the next year, to accompany the [Returning to UCL Campus – Interim People Management Guidance](#). The following points were made during the presentation:
- a. As there was now interim guidance on returning to campus and remote working, a policy was needed for remote working. By piloting the policy, it allowed it to be adopted for the longer term as appropriate with any changes or issues being discussed at HRPC.
  - b. The key points covered in the policy were: where remote working was approved, staff should work from UCL buildings for at least 40% of their time., remote working was a voluntary choice and the default workplace was in UCL buildings, the importance of health and safety, legal and financial implications, working overseas and how this affected taxes, social security and local health and safety laws.
- 4.2. The following points were raised in discussion:
- a. There appeared to be an internal inconsistency as the policy advised staff to complete a DSE risk assessment and report health and safety incidents at home but then the rest of the policy contradicted this as it stated that home should not be a workplace. There were also questions raised about what happened if staff's workspace was not suitable, and would then be instructed they had to work on campus.

- b. There were a very high number of academic staff who had not been to campus for over 18 months now. Dr Matthew Blain advised that there are plans for staff induction tours and for new staff who may never have been to campus. Mr Ian Dancy was working on plans for induction.
  - c. Section 10.2 of the policy could cause difficulties for staff who already worked overseas. Dr Matthew Blain raised that it will be a light touch approach to begin with but going forwards we would need to be more compliant.
  - d. The policy may have implications for staff who worked part time at UCL and part time at another institution which may not be in the UK.
  - e. Some staff had never worked for 40% of their time on campus for that amount even before the pandemic.
  - f. Ms Chloe Milano advised that this was an interim policy and a pilot so and would be evaluated how it worked in practice. There was an understanding that legal advice and investigation may be required, particularly to ensure that the equality act was met, and reasonable adjustments could be made for staff.
- 4.3 HRPC approved the pilot policy with the addition of risk assessment messaging and a revision to the wording in relation to overseas working. It was agreed that the policy should be brought back to HRPC in the future.
- 5. Confidential: Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS)/Furlough Leave Update (Paper 3-05)**
- 5.1 Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

### **Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information**

- 6. Senior Academic Recruitment Procedure (Paper 3-06)**
- 6.1. Dr Matthew Blain, Executive Director of HR, was due to present the proposed updated Senior Academic Recruitment Procedure. This item was not discussed as there was not enough time.
  - 6.2. Dr Michael Spence advised that this should be discussed at the Senior Management Team meeting on Tuesday 13 July 2021. HRPC members agreed this was a suitable forum.
  - 6.3. The minutes from the discussion at SMT were included as [appendix 1](#).

Hannah Swallow  
July 2021

