



Manchester 2020 - 12 reasons why redundancies are wrong and unnecessary

1. **As Prof. Alan Gilbert, Dame Nancy Rothwell's predecessor as President/Vice-Chancellor, said in his 2004 Foundation Lecture and elsewhere, compulsory redundancy and dismissal should be limited to extreme cases of professional misconduct, negligence or incompetence and have no relevance in a collegial community such as Manchester that wishes to call itself a world class university.**
2. In 2015-16 the University had a surplus of £36 million (3.5% of income) and held cash reserves to cover 177 days expenditure – better than some major corporations like Tesco.
3. Between 2011-16 the University spent over £25 million on restructuring, yet it has done no impact evaluation of previous restructures and is now proposing to sack 171 more staff.
4. The University employs roughly one member of support staff for every academic, yet 140 (i.e. over 80%) of the proposed redundancies will be academics.
5. Sacking 140 experienced academics and then recruiting 100 early career staff will result in negligible financial savings and may not even be a genuine case of redundancy.
6. The criteria suggested for identifying individuals at risk of redundancy are poorly defined, do not accord with agreed procedures, unaccountably make many senior managers and others exempt, and by focusing entirely on individual contributions take no account of the team work that is integral to almost all research and teaching.
7. There is no evidence that reducing staff and student cohort numbers will improve teaching and learning, student satisfaction, attainment, retention or employability.
8. Reducing the number of students and raising their “quality” will have a detrimental effect on Widening Participation – which is supposed to be one of the University's key Social Responsibility goals.
9. Are we now having to pay with redundancy for ill-judged management decisions that have over-committed the University to an unnecessarily grand rebuilding programme? We know it is paying £12.75 million each year until 2053 for one £300 million bond so the total cost of its £1 billion rebuilding programme may well be £40 million each year for 40 years.
10. The University's management seriously miscalculated the University's REF 2014 strategy, yet no-one has been held responsible. The University has suffered the largest drop in HEFCE Quality Related research grant income of any University in England and probably stands to lose over £100 million over the next 6 years. Are academic staff in the affected areas being asked to pay for these strategic errors?
11. 1% of staff earn over £100,000, and professors in band C and above and most senior management across the University are exempt from the risk of redundancy, while an academic member of staff on an average salary with 10 years' service would be lucky to get £5,000 if made compulsory redundant.
12. **Overall, the proposals are self-defeating since they will damage the University's reputation and turn it into a place the best people will not want to stay at or come to. If change is really needed, an alternative strategy – managed change in size and shape of schools through Early Retirement/Voluntary Severance, natural wastage etc. over several years – is clearly available.**