

School of Law and School of Social Sciences

Minutes of the Working Group

25 June 2018

Summary	Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2018
Present	Vikki Goddard (Chair), Carolyn Abbott, Claire Alexander, Ken Clark, Rachel Dodd, Brian Heaphy, Chris Orme, Toby Seddon, Catherine Tann, Georgina Waylen, Marianne Webb, Alison Wilson.
By invitation	Soren Holm (representing David Gadd), Phil Handler (representing Claire McGourlay), Sarah Riley (Minutes)

1 Apologies

Apologies had been received from Keith Brown, Chris Thornhill, Claire McGourlay, David Gadd, Lisa McClare.

2 Minutes from meeting held on 4 June 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 June 2018 were approved as a correct record with the addition of the following sentence under Item 4 Any Other Business - Engagement: "It was recognised that there may be a need to amend the proposed timeline in response to engagement and feedback."

3 Matters arising

It was agreed that action points arising from the meetings would be circulated within 48 hours of the meeting to ensure that requested actions were addressed in a timely way.

Minutes would be circulated to the Working Group only, after the meeting as soon as they were available but needed to be treated as strictly confidential and would not be for onward circulation to all staff until they had been formally approved.

The question arose of whether trade unions should be present at the Working Group meetings. It was confirmed that it was not necessary to involve the trade unions at this stage because this process is only to consider the risks and benefits to a merger of the two Schools rather than a formal proposal. If trade union reps wished to attend meetings in the Schools at this stage, this is at their discretion.

4 **Review of narrative received**

The Group received draft narratives for all of the areas of activity that had been identified at the previous meeting.

4i) Use of the information received

A discussion took place as to the use of the information that had been brought together. It was noted that the information had been provided to feed into the position paper to be developed, which would address the risks and benefits of a potential merger.

Some members of the group felt strongly that the information that had been provided should now be made available to all staff in the two Schools to ensure that as much as possible was shared and fed into the engagement exercise. Others felt that the information had not been gathered for that purpose and was not yet in an appropriate format to be circulated more widely.

It was agreed that each paper be condensed into a two page document covering key points for collation into an overall document which would be reviewed at the next working group meeting and if agreed, would then be circulated to all staff in both Schools with an opportunity for questions/comments to be fed back by an agreed date.

It was noted that engagement over the summer period was challenging, but that the requests for feedback were not onerous, and this was not the only opportunity to engage.

It was agreed that a position paper based on the information available and the feedback received over the next few weeks, should be developed for the end of August, which would then be circulated and used as the basis of further engagement with both schools through September. This would enable any proposal to be considered at FLT on 1 October as previously discussed. It was confirmed that should it be considered that the timeline could be extended, this was a feasible option.

4ii) Comments on the sections

4ii (a) Research

The report submitted was discussed and the point was made that submission to REF should not be disrupted by this proposal.

There was also discussion about the future of the various hubs and sections within the School of Law, and where they may fit in the proposal.

4ii (b) Teaching Learning & Student Experience (including the Legal Advice Centre)

This discussion took place around how the School of Law would advertise itself, by what name would it be known externally and how the recruitment of students might be affected by a merger and how information around DL, for example, would be described and communicated.

4ii (c) Structure and Management

This was discussed. One suggestion which arose was the idea of providing an organogram to be included in this summarised paper for people to be able to identify their role in the structure. It was suggested that each school should provide a view of how it sees itself.

4ii (d) Professional Support Services

The paper set out the current support structure for the two Schools and how the various Institutes were managed within Law. Various ideas and opportunities were discussed regarding the proposed merge of the PSS staff within the two schools and how this might affect service delivery to both staff and students. It was noted that reference should also be made to PSS support to the Schools provided from Faculty and Central Directorates.

4ii (e) External Branding

Marianne Webb had circulated a paper which looked at how Law might be 'branded' within a different School structure, with a name that would accurately reflect market requirements. It might include staff/student surveys to look at suggested titles for the Law brand. MW would also look at ways to inform and publicise staff and students of the processes involved.

4ii (f) Social Responsibility

A paper had been received which explained the role of the Social Responsibility Director in SoSS which included responsibility for E&D, including Athena SWAN. A paper had also been circulated showing SR in the School of Law; its organisation and activities. It showed that there are differences in approach across both schools but that there is already SR collaboration between the two schools. Several areas of opportunity and threat across the Schools had been included which would be helpful in drawing together the shorter paper.

In the course of discussions it was suggested that Criminology should have specific representation at the Working Group, as there were concerns that otherwise its voice would not be heard. The general view of the Group (recognising that there were a couple of dissenting voices) was that the Criminologists should be able to feed in their views in the same way as all other colleagues and that it would not be appropriate for them to have specific representation, when no other subject grouping/Department was represented in this way.

5 **Communications and Engagement**

It was agreed that a timetable should be established to provide a clear procedure for the key dates and activities to be used in this process. MW would have a meeting with RD and AW to draft this, and bring back to the next meeting of the group.

6 **Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

7 **Date of next meeting**

9 July 15.30 – 17.30 2nd Floor Boardrooms, Arthur Lewis Building

Action Points from the Working Group 25 June 2018

Description	To be actioned by	Date of Action
Action points to be circulated to the Working Group within 48 hours of the meeting.	Secretary	No later than 27 June 2018
All areas of activity leads to submit key points and questions guiding their area to develop a high level position paper. Note that Social Responsibility leads will need to be contacted separately about this as they are not members of the group.	Each area lead Secretary	4 July 2018
Engagement timetable and mechanisms to be developed further for consideration at next Working Group meeting.	Head of C & M	4 July 2018
Position papers to be circulated to Working Group.	Secretary	5 July 2018
Working Group meeting to approve and amend high level position paper.	Working Group	9 July 2018
Detailed position paper to be produced and approved and circulated for staff engagement via various communication channels.	Working Group	3 September 2018