At the meeting of Senate on October 28, it was agreed that reports made by the Deans and other officers should be circulated in a Special Issue of The Bulletin together with a list of the motions passed at the University Discussion on October 27.

THE SCHOOL OF AFRICAN AND ASIAN STUDIES

1. Substantial savings would be required to be made by the University during 1981/82 - 1983/84. The cuts were expected to be large but their magnitude was uncertain, as the projections were based on a number of assumptions (eg. inflation supplementation, overseas student entrance, etc).

Planned action was necessary but it was important to maintain flexibility and avoid irreversible or unnecessarily heavy damage. It was important to react positively to policies that would buy time, in the sense of making the transition less harsh.

2. Compulsory redundancies were totally unacceptable, for both academic and non-academic areas.

3. Questions of academic shape are for the Area to consider; individual subject group level discussions may lead to outcomes which would damage that shape; planning should, therefore, be undertaken by the Area Committee in the first instance and they should lay down priorities; the guiding principle should be "parity of sacrifice" for all groups, although different subject groups, etc, may contribute in different ways to sharing the burden; normal consultative procedures should be followed but the Arts and Social Studies Committee should hold a special meeting given the urgency of the matter (unlikely to be before the next Senate); the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Arts) should consider the desirability of wider subject chairmen representation, by invitation.

4. If savings are made by groups (eg, Subjects or Schools) what proportion of such savings can be retained by the group? A more positive response was likely to be forthcoming if "incentives" in this sense were generous.

5. What is the relationship between the financial "targets" imposed by the UGC and the proposed logistic shape of the University that has to be submitted to the UGC?

6. While saving of jobs was equally important for all areas, the non-academic areas should bear a higher than proportional financial cut. The library should be considered an academic area.

7. The School discussed a number of alternatives to compulsory redundancies such as unpaid leave on some agreed basis, and felt that a more positive attitude should be taken than is evidenced in the GRIPE Report.

8. Further non-salary economies should be considered, eg, telephones.

9. While there was no objection in principle to a tax on the Common Room catering service, the taxable surplus after allowing for replacement, etc, was likely to be very small.
1. GENERAL REACTIONS TO GRIPE

The Dean reminded the School of the past history of this report. He advised the School to consider the GRIPE Report, both in terms of its diagnosis and its remedy, so that we need to consider whether we agreed or not with either or both of the diagnosis and the remedy. We also needed to remember that we could not be sure of the accuracy of the predicted reduction by 1983, nor of the potential for political changes at a national level which may or may not reverse the current Government's strategy with regard to public expenditure in general and higher education in particular.

Finally, the Dean informed the School that the recent meeting of Planning had been advised by the Finance Office that unless reductions are achieved the University will be insolvent some time in late 1982/early 1983. Also, that the University is forbidden by statute to sell property and has limited potential for acquiring Bank loans. The GRIPE proposals had included some element of income generation assumptions.

2. INCOME GENERATION: Various points were made, including:

(a) the potential of MSU and the Television Studio for commercial purposes;
(b) the use of the Language Centre as "appropriate plant" for organising short courses for teaching of English to foreign students;
(c) the potential of commercial use of the Gardner Centre and other fixed plant resources;
(d) accepting the ambivalence about seeing overseas students as income generators but there was a query about the extent to which Sussex University expertise, particularly the use of faculty contacts in overseas Universities was being maximised.

3. HEALTH SERVICE

A paper by Barry Wood, Johanna Turner and Brian Bates was laid round the table outlining the serious implications for the academic life of the University of the closure of the Health Service; the School will return to this important matter at its next meeting on 4th November.

4. M.S.U.: Concern was expressed about the GRIPE recommendations for MSU:

(a) CCS faculty make regular use of the video and film facilities;
(b) the income-generating element, particularly with regard to the Conference trade, may well have been under-appreciated;
(c) the loss of posts fall heavily on the four technicians involved in the Television Studios;
(d) it looks as if there is no committee structure other than Schools in Arts & Social Studies to comment on the GRIPE proposals specifically with regard to MSU.
5. LIBRARY

Peter Stone from the Library welcomed the opportunity to inform the School about the implications of the GRIPE proposals on Library services. Again it was recognised that there is no committee structure, other than Schools, through to Arts & Social Studies for comments on these particular proposals.

(a) GRIPE, page 17, outlined reductions in budgets across the University. Senate had already been asked to confirm reductions resulting in a 23% reduction on book expenditure, which in real terms amounted to a 44% reduction. It follows that there will be serious difficulties both for the acquisition of new books and for the maintenance of subscription to periodicals.

(b) Given the centrality of the Library to the Sussex pattern of teaching and learning, the implications for the reduction, both on saving as well as acquisition of new materials, have yet to be appreciated. It looks to have a most dramatic impact on the level of service to which faculty and students have become accustomed over the years.

6. PROPOSALS

The School showed broad agreement on the following points:-

(i) the GRIPE Report makes no systematic reference to Schools in the Arts Area. The writers seem seriously to misunderstand the pattern of teaching and the centrality of the Schools within the Arts Area.

(ii) the GRIPE Report showed no appreciation of the past 20 years of Sussex commitment to interdisciplinary teaching and learning, so that the focus on subject groups was inappropriate.

(iii) the document itself is open to criticism because of its inconsistent use of evidence, its failure to make explicit the criteria by which judgements about retention or elimination of subject groups such as Urban Studies had been arrived at.

(iv) by focussing on subject groups, faculty were being encouraged to fall into a potentially divisive set of discussions and decisions.

(v) we need to consider year by year planning in terms of figures that we know to be accurate rather than rush towards a planning cycle which may or may not turn out to be necessary.

(vi) we reiterate the general opposition to compulsory redundancy for any staff within the University.

(vii) we criticise a jump in the thought-processes of the authors of the GRIPE Report who move from an analysis of the budget and the required cuts in money terms towards a statement about reductions in posts. The argument remained too implicit.

The School, however, divided on the most appropriate course of action. To what extent should the School take the view that if management are determined to make cuts, then staff should resist any involvement at whatever level of discussion and decision-making towards helping to
bring those cuts about, because the inevitable implications of cuts of this nature are to damage the institution of the University of Sussex? On the other hand, to what extent by commenting in detailed criticism of the content of the GRIPE Report, as well as seeking clarification of the implicit assumptions with regard to subject groups in the Report, might we seek to move towards Arts Area autonomy for determining the pattern of inevitable reductions of whatever figure turns out to be necessary?

After a lengthy discussion of this dilemma, it was agreed that subject groups be invited to report back to the next School Meeting so that the School might organise its response in time for the meeting of the Arts &Social Studies Committee this term.
The Dean began by reminding the School that this was a special meeting called solely to discuss the GRIFE report. He informed the School that Planning Committee had accepted the general analysis and strategy of the report and recommended its adoption as a discussion document. It would be discussed in general terms of Senate on October 25th and at Council on November 5th. The Chairman of Council had given assurances that no matters of detail would be decided at that meeting. Planning had accepted the indicated reductions per spending unit and wished to see urgent discussions taking place concerning (a) strategies alternative to compulsory redundancies and (b) income generation, particularly in relation to overseas students. He pointed out that if nothing was done to counter the cuts it was likely that the University would become insolvent sometime during 1982-83.

During the two-hour discussion the following seemed to be the most important points made:

(a) That GRIFE had not given alternative strategies in a sufficiently clear and detailed manner.
(b) That members of faculty should have seen the text of the Vice-Chancellor's letter as soon as possible after it was sent.
(c) That it was not the job of the Faculty to plan for its own mutilation.
(d) That the report is not merely a discussion document but a public document which implies many criticisms of the work carried out in the Arts Area without giving any clear, logical reasons for the cuts proposed.
(e) That the proposals concerning the Health Service could have appalling consequences for our Admissions and Examining policies and for the ways in which we monitor the progress of our students.
(f) That it was absurd to consider admitting many more overseas students to what would be a skeleton of our former system.

(g) That proposed Admissions quotas for 1982-83 had been taken in the light of the GRIFE report and therefore it could be said that some of its recommendations were already being implemented. Although it would be possible for the Subject Groups and Schools to press for a correction of these quotas.
(h) That it appeared that the report had been released to the Press before being discussed in the University.
(i) That, nonetheless, the report does give a basis for further discussion and proposal of alternative strategies. Some members felt that the School should make a positive response, particularly in the areas of income generation and voluntary severance.
(j) That compulsory redundancies were unacceptable. The Dean said at this point that, from both personal and institutional views of his position, he would find it impossible to participate in the creation of compulsory redundancies.
(k) That the setting up of GRIFE had been a mistake in that a very small planning body had been completely isolated from the rest of the University and thus we had seen a total reversion of the planning process which had been used in this institution for the past fifteen years.
(l) There was some difference of opinion as to whether or not Senate should now set up an alternative committee.

During the discussion it was recognised that complete opposition to the report could force Council into interfering in an uninformed way in the planning process of the area but it was also felt that the reaction to the report, as demonstrated at this meeting, was very oppositional and that Council would have to take into account pressures coming from Schools and Areas.

The Meeting closed with two motions:

1. Proposed by Michael Dunne and Seconded by Alan Sinfield.
   "The School of English and American Studies deplores the neglect of established decision-making procedures in the University which has led to the GRIFE report and its presentation to the University and further deplores and rejects the criteria which inform the academic discussions and decisions of GRIFE, both as they concern the University community as a whole and specifically the academic interests of the School of English and American Studies."
   PASSED MEM CON (2 Abstentions)

2. Proposed by Alan Sinfield and Seconded by John Drury.
   "Members of the School should take no part whatever in the writing of reports, attendance at committees or any other procedures designed to facilitate involuntary severances and should report any invitation to serve in such a capacity to the Dean."
   PASSED MEM CON (3 Abstentions)

The Meeting closed at 4.15 pm.
Minutes of extraordinary meeting held on Wednesday 21 October in E212 in order to discuss the Report of the Group to Review Income and Plan Expenditure

Present: The Dean (in the Chair), Professor T Barna, C Baxter, C Beare, Mrs C Brown, Dr G Carseniga, Dr S Collini, G Craig, Professor J Cruickshank, B Dammann, Dr M Deuchar, Dr L Duroquet, Professor T Elkins, Dr D Forgasca, Dr S Freeman, Dr S Hackel, Dr T Hankey, Dr P Holmes, H Hunt, Dr C Jenkins, S B John, Dr R Jones, Z Kavan, Dr J Lane, Dr L Lüb, Professor N Lynton, C Martindale, J McGivney, Professor M McGowan, S Medcalf, Mrs U Meinhold, R Miller-Gulland, Dr N Osmond, Dr R W Outhwaite, Dr L Pertile, Dr S Reynolds, Dr G Rose, Dr C Sanders, Dr E Schulpink, Dr G Shepherd, Dr A Stevens, Rev Dr C Thompson, Dr J K J Thompson, Professor A Thorby, Dr A White, Miss B Williams, Stephen Gibson, Jimmy Holloway, Catherine Mayer, Louise Perrett.

Apologies were received from Mrs P Bowron, S Kon, B Nicholas, Professor J Röhl, Professor C Thorne.

The Dean introduced the discussion, emphasizing that the cuts did appear to be a reality, that without them, according to the accountant's projections, the University would be insolvent by early 1983 and that the GRIPE proposals before the meeting should be regarded as a 'discussion document' (the expression of the Vice-Chancellor). He then invited general discussion.

Before this discussion began Dr Nick Osmond argued that it was necessary to establish whether the School accepted the premises of the report and he proposed a motion that these premises should be discussed before the Report itself. This motion was seconded by Jimmy Holloway and then voted on. The voting was 18 in favour and 23 against.

This motion having been defeated the School proceeded to discuss both the premises and the content of the Report. The discussion had three major themes (1) general issues arising from the Report (2) issues specifically pertaining to areas of the School and (3) suggestions about income-generation.

(1) General Issues arising from the Report

- It was noted that there were absolutely no guarantees provided in the Report that the proposed cuts would be the final ones. Unless such guarantees were provided co-operation from University members could not reasonably be expected. The cuts might represent a beginning, not an end, to a process and if such was the case it would be better that they were opposed, in conjunction with other Universities.

- It was argued that the Report was insincere in so far that academic grounds were being provided for cuts which purely had political causes. That these political causes revealed themselves in that the Government was prepared to invest large sums in running down Universities and that a political response was necessary. That voluntary as well as compulsory redundancies should be imposed in so far that the former just as much as the latter would reduce the University.

- It was emphasized that the part of the GRIPE Report dealing with compulsory redundancies was quite unacceptable and argued that it would be preferable to experience insolvency than the moral bankruptcy which would result from collaboration in a redundancy programme.

- It was argued that the School should not limit its discussions purely to matters directly affecting its own interests but should consider, too, those of the University community as a whole. With relationship to this it was noted that the Report singled out for harshest financial treatment some of the areas least able to defend themselves. Particular concern was expressed about the effects of the cuts on the Garden Centre, Health Centre, Accommodation Service, Counselling Service and Chaplaincy.

- It was stressed that the Library cuts were particularly harmful to the Arts Area and that it was regrettable that there had been no consultation about the form which these cuts had taken.

- It was argued that the Report gave too much consideration to redundancies in different subjects and thereby to add to a general insensitivity in tone showed insensitivity to the special character of Sussex - flexibility between subjects.

- It was stressed that the proposed shifting in the balance between Arts and Sciences ratios seemed unwise. Areas which had never succeeded in attracting their complement of students were being favoured at the expense of others which had invariably proved attractive to students. There was a risk in such a policy in as much as the University might fail to attract sufficient students.

- It was pointed out that there was a danger that the reaction to the GRIPE proposals might appear simply as a desire to save the jobs of aged faculty and that priority, too, should be given to the serious problem of the lack of employment opportunities open to promising graduate students.

(2) Issues specifically pertaining to areas of the School

Russian Studies (see also attached paper) It was emphasized that if the Report were implemented the School would be losing two of its major languages and becoming, increasingly, a school of French Studies. GRIPE, it was argued, had not been recommended on the grounds of the quality of the Sussex major.

Classical and Medieval Studies (see also attached paper) The fact that the authors of the GRIPE Report apparently conceived of the University as composed of distinct subjects was emphasized. Loss of a post would damage the School's contextual programme and loss of two posts would make the Foundations course inoperable. The gains to be obtained from closing the major would be petty whereas two sorts of damage would be incurred: (1) the loss of the major would withdraw a guarantee of seriousness from the contextual courses (2) and it would also reduce the incentive of subject group members.

The Language Centre: Five points were raised about the implications of the proposed cuts for the School:

(i) (i) That they would result in a reduction in teaching back-up services

(ii) That subscriptions to foreign journals and the showing of foreign films would be reduced.

(2) That the teaching of European courses by Language Centre faculty might have to be reduced.

(3) That the reduction in the provision of English as a Foreign Language teaching would affect (a) European exchange students (b) potential income generation.

(4) That the cuts might affect the BSc/European Studies degree (ie a European School minor).

(5) That some rationalization of language teaching between the Centre and the School would be necessary.
Geography. The inaccuracies in the statements made about this subject in the Report were such that they gave grounds for doubting all the academic judgements made in the report. The figures for reductions appeared to have been thought out before the reasons for them.

Politics. Anne Stevens, commenting on the Report, expressed her concurrence with the report's attribution of her post to the Politics group.

Sussex European Research Centre. A difficulty in comprehending the Report's criteria for suggesting a merger with Science Policy Research Unit was expressed. The group's close affinity to, and tradition of co-operation with, the School was emphasized and the possibility of extending this co-operation, and involving European faculty in SERC research projects, stressed.

German. The possibility of coping with logistic problems by redeployment of faculty was emphasized by the Group which has recently boosted its ranks by two half posts transferred from other majors.

Philosophy. The exceptional extent of the reduction in this subject proposed by the Report was emphasized - 40%. The importance of this subject to all manner of contextual and preliminary courses throughout the Arts area which do not necessarily have "philosophy" as part of their titles was emphasized and the backing of the School in opposing this harsh treatment requested.

Italian. The Group had effectively been suffering from cuts since 1966. Redeployment deprived other subject groups of man-power.

English. (see the attached paper which was read out to the meeting).

Intellectual History. (see the attached paper).

3) Income Generation

- Peter Holmes emphasized that the Economics group was achieving economies on the basis of taking unpaid leave, and he stressed the significant possibilities which existed in the market for overseas students to whom Sussex, with its wide range of courses, should prove attractive - especially Americans.

- In was indeed this market, Margaret McGowan emphasized, which was the most promising one in so far that the market for MAs and MScs was already near saturation.

- Carole Sanders emphasized that although potentially an 'income-generator', the Language Centre's resources would be strained by the demands of an increasing number of Exchange students and that the lack of a full post in the teaching of English as a foreign language and the high price of accommodation made the University less attractive as a place to learn English.

Voting then took place on the following motions

1) The School of European Studies, having considered GRIPE's report and the particularly damaging implications it has for the School, while accepting the gravity of the present financial crisis and the inevitability of substantial expenditure cuts, deprecates that the Report
(a) disregarded Senate's recommendations to Council that the University's educational provisions and other services be maintained at their present level;
(b) does not include any commitment to the preservation of academic and other jobs and attempts to undermine the principle of academic tenure enshrined in the Charter and Statutes;
(c) gives spurious and unacceptable justifications for cuts which are largely prompted by financial considerations and requests Senate to set up a working party representative of the academic and other interests of this University and fully accountable to Senate to prepare alternative strategies, in keeping with a commitment to the preservation of academic standards, the protection of jobs and the principle of academic tenure.

in favour: 28
against: 9

2) The School of European Studies, having considered GRIPE's report and the particularly damaging implications it has for the School, while accepting the gravity of the present financial crisis and the inevitability of substantial expenditure cuts, requests the University to explore to the furthest possible extent other means of saving posts besides those already listed in Appendices D and E, and to affirm unambiguously its commitment to the preservation of academic standards, the protection of jobs, and the principle of academic tenure.

in favour: 13
against: 12

3) The European School deprecates the threat constituted by the proposed abolition of Classical and Medieval Studies, Russian Studies and Intellectual History to the range of its subjects and to the survival of its contextual programme and asks for these proposals to be reconsidered in an appropriate forum.

voting: nem con

The meeting closed at 5.43 pm.

J K J Thomson
Academic Secretary
Notes on the informal meeting of the School of Social Sciences held on 21st October 1981 to discuss the GRIPE report.

No formal votes were taken or resolutions passed at this meeting, but it was agreed that the sense of the discussion should be summarized and recorded. This is done below.

There was broad agreement among those present on the following points:

1. the financial cuts with which this and other universities are faced are intolerable, and must be opposed; there is no satisfactory way of absorbing them.

2. we must retain our commitment to high academic standards generally, and to the specific character and strengths of the Sussex way of doing things.

3. the University should undertake some concerted form of political action, with the national lobby planned for November 18th as one obvious focus, to oppose the cuts and draw attention to their consequences.

4. compulsory redundancies must be avoided.

5. given the many uncertainties in the situation, and the near-impossibility of rational planning within the imposed time-scale, anything that can be done to buy time is desirable, and care should be taken to avoid irreversible decisions.

6. ways of meeting and surviving the financial constraints which do not involve redundancies or other irreversible actions should be explored and developed to the greatest extent possible.

There was a fair amount of backing among those present, although less consensus than on points 1-5, on the following further points:

7. the tone of the GRIPE report was regretted, in that it does not sufficiently deplore the cuts or indicate the extent to which they are damaging.

8. the acceptance by the GRIPE report of c.20% as the best estimate of the order of magnitude of the cut, and its failure to make suggestions on how to meet better or worse contingencies, were deplored.

9. the report makes academic judgments, particularly in discriminating between subject groups, which cannot be justified.

10. whatever the overall level of the cut, it should be spread evenly across groups rather than distributed in ways that make discriminations between them.

11. further discussion of how to cope with the cuts should take place in some other body, which would be of a more representative nature and/or closer to the grass-roots sources of direct knowledge; this might be a working party of Senate, or some modified version of the group on community relations envisaged in the report (2.2.4) - or the normal structure of Schools etc.
Statement from the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences

The School of Engineering and Applied Sciences shares with other Schools the general criticisms of the GRIPE Report. At an informal meeting of the Faculty these were expressed in the strongest possible terms and there was a feeling of bitter resentment at the way in which the School had been treated - detailed points follow below.

The School has already been seriously eroded by the loss of Material Science. Materials Science has had a distinguished research record and it was particularly surprising that the U.G.C. recommended that specialist teaching in the subject should cease. It is nevertheless the resolved intention of the School that Materials should continue to form part of the core course for students in the School.

The proposal to close the Operational Research Group will result in a serious gap in the education of engineering students. The Finniston Report and the Institutions which accredit engineering degree courses have specified that courses in engineering management are an essential component of the education of the engineering graduate. The O.R. group also runs a successful M.Sc. course which is self financing and which has supported a number of temporary faculty for many years. The course has attracted a very creditable number of H.E.C. and overseas students and is adequately supported by the S.E.R.C. - it cannot, therefore, be considered to be non-viable.

In all, the GRIPE Report proposes a reduction from 36 to 30 posts in the School. The School is already very heavily loaded and because of the importance of laboratory, design and practical work, essential to the training of engineers, an adequate staff/student ratio is essential. The School has always suffered through being one of the youngest in the University and now has one of the worst staff/student ratios. This is compounded by the necessity to maintain an adequate base level of U.K. student numbers coupled with the pressures to educate a significant number of overseas students.

It must be added that the members of faculty are wholly committed to providing a full and thorough engineering education required for the achievement of professional qualifications. It is most deeply regretted that the research activity, which is outstanding and attracts very substantial income from the S.E.R.C., Government departments and industry, will, in consequence, be seriously disrupted. The School has established strong links with local and national industry and must continue to provide engineering graduates of adequate number and quality to satisfy the needs of U.K. industry, and at the same time continuing to serve the needs of many countries of the World. The School is particularly conscious of its obligation to overseas students and takes great pride in the numbers of these students who have already received engineering degrees at Sussex and have become valued Anglophiles.
SCHOOL OF CHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR SCIENCES

The School will meet formally to consider the GRIPE report and its implications on Wednesday 4th November. Informal discussion within the School indicates, however, that a large majority will favour using schemes such as unpaid leave in order to prevent enforced redundancies in the School. Consideration is also being given to the promotion of new M.Sc. courses in order to attract overseas students.

C.N.B.
29.10.81

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES

At a well attended Special Meeting of the School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences held on October 21 1981, the following motion was carried nem con

"The School of MAPS believes that to attempt to enforce reduced staffing levels by compulsory selective dismissals would be discreditable and unworkable."

Professor J P Elliott

29 October 1981
Minutes of an Extraordinary School Meeting held on Monday, 12th October, 1981, to discuss the GRIPE Report.

Professor R.J. Andrew, Dean of the School of Biological Sciences was in the Chair.

The Chairman opened the meeting by saying that the timetabling of discussions of the Report was not entirely clear, and that he would press for assurance at the next meeting of Planning Committee that the discussion of the Report by subjects, schools and area committees proposed in the Report would, in fact, be able to be considered before the Report had to be submitted for consideration for acceptance in its full detail by Senate and by Council.* It seemed very likely that the overall size of cuts would be decided at Council's first meeting on Nov. 6th.

He felt that the immediate issues with which the School must concern itself were:

1. The preparation by the university of concrete proposals as to the way in which savings (eg. from unpaid leave of absence) or the generation of additional income would benefit the group of staff whose exertions were responsible for either. The minimum acceptable position seemed to be an agreed postponement of reductions in staff not financially necessary whilst savings or extra income continued for the time for which such arrangements might be shown to be reasonably expected to last.

2. The submission to the UGC by the university of a request that the instruction for a 'decrease' in student intake into BIOLS (now generally estimated as less than 10%) be removed. It was noted that this was the only specific academic adjustment mentioned by the Vice Chancellor in the letter already sent to the UGC, and that it might well be arrived at by
   (i) the increase of the proposed intake into the Science Area which the University intended to request
   (ii) a clarification of the use to which the UGC might have put the annual return from the University in 1980, when total student numbers (ie Home and Overseas) were projected, in view of the then announced reduction in grant, to fall in Engineering, Biological Sciences and Mathematics by about 5%. A letter from the Chairman of the UGC to Mr. T. Rathbone, MP, suggested that this was a factor in the decisions of the UGC.

3. If it were possible for the School to agree a change in the proportion of cuts between subjects, this would clearly be very influential. In the event, discussion suggested this was impracticable.

In the medium term, the main overall constraint remained the estimated 20% cut in grant, which without economies of a corresponding scale would lead to insolvency in 1½ to 2 years. Unless this fact could be controverted, attempts to reduce staff losses in BIOLS had to be mainly at least at the expense of others, and it was with this in mind that our case for internal argument must be prepared.

The following motions were then discussed and put:

1. 'That the School requests the University to clarify the UGC's recommendations for Biological Sciences, both by internal discussion at any level and with the UGC. Following this the School believes that the cuts in staff should also be reconsidered.' (Dr. O. Darlington)

The motion was carried nem.con.
2. 'That the School of Biological Sciences condemns as arbitrary and unjust the treatment accorded to the subject groups Logic and Scientific Method and History and Social Studies of Science in the GRIPE Report; it rejects the Report's recommendation that these groups be closed. With regard to the guidelines supposedly used by GRIPE in formulating this proposal, we believe that the first - "current student demand" - should not be used as a major criterion in deciding the fate of an entire subject group, and that the second - the "academic standing" of a subject group is not, in these particular cases, a matter which the members of GRIPE have any competence to assess. (Dr. G. Webster and Dr. B.C. Goodwin).

The motion was carried by 12 votes to 6.

3. 'That the School urge the University to allow an extension to the timetable for discussion of the GRIPE Report so as to allow full and comprehensive consideration of all the points entailed'. (Dr. A. MacGillivray).

The motion was carried nem. con.

4. 'That the School reject any proposal for the implementation of compulsory redundancies as quoted in Appendix E.5 of the GRIPE Report, and that the University be urged to give the widest possible consideration to the alternative proposals described in Appendix D.' (Dr. A. MacGillivray).

The motion was carried nem. con.

5. The meeting then considered a motion from Dr. T. Collett. 'That the School affirms that none of its members will participate in any committee to advise on compulsory redundancies.'

It was noted in connection with Motions 4 and 5 that such a position if adopted would considerably reassure members of the School. The Chairman urged that a more practical, effective way of doing this would be to state that, once it was clear how savings and additional income would benefit the School, the School would make its first object to avoid compulsory redundancies by these two means. In the discussion, the additional point was made that saving jobs should be done on a School-wide basis.

The motion was carried nem. con.

The meeting closed at 3.30pm

* This assurance was in fact given by the Chairman of Council to the Dean at Planning.
COMMUNITY SERVICES AREA

1. Representatives of campus unions on Community Services Committee met with the Chairman to express their views, and those of their members working in the area. They find the GRIPE report to be unhelpful in that it creates a negative climate at a time when a positive spirit is needed to sustain collaborative and imaginative efforts to improve the University's financial position. Avoidance of compulsory redundancy and a minimum of disruption to our work as a University should be essential principles in any plan of action and alternative strategies should be developed.

2. Office staff in Community Services met with the Chairman and the Community & Estates Officer to discuss the implications of the GRIPE report. They expressed anger at the lack of civilised values in current government policy; dismay at the consequences for universities and other public bodies; frustration and uncertainty about the best response the University should make. This uncertainty extended to the views of the GRIPE report.

Nevertheless they were unanimous in their determination to provide the best possible service to students and others in terms of accommodation and catering services and the general quality of life on campus. They recognised that in any efforts to generate income the Community Services area has a major responsibility to ensure that its many trading and service activities must be operated efficiently and effectively.

29th October, 1981

A. J. Bailey
Chairman of Community Services
COUNSELLING SERVICES: A RESPONSE TO GRIPE

Presented to Senate by the Chairman of Counselling, Dr. I.L. Griffiths, on 28th October 1981.

The Chairman reported on discussions he had had with Heads of Units, all the Sub-Deans, all members of the Health Service, the Health Service Committee and most other members of the Area.

The general impression was one of disappointment and confusion. The Gripe Report was felt to be insensitive and showed a lack of appreciation (in both senses) of what has gone on in the Area. Section 4.4 is garbled through ambiguity to total obscurity. The net effect is one of alienation and a rejection by a majority in the Area of the concept of a more than proportionate cut. There is no recognition of the degree to which the work of Counselling Services is closely related to, and supportive of, academic processes.

The size of the cut in Counselling Services Area is 54 percent, not the 40 percent suggested in the Report. The Report has included the NHS contribution of £51,000 in both columns. Such a representation does not give confidence in the rest of the report.

The Area is pledged to a view of education which is concerned with the whole person, and Senate and Council should remember that large numbers of people live on an isolated campus 24 hours a day and that their continuous needs and welfare must not be ignored.

The arguments advanced in 4.4.3 are rejected in the Area. It is deplored that no allowance is made in GRIPE for the value of the Health Service and other services in the Area to the University as an institution. The contributions to Students' Progress Committee, Admissions Committee, and Examinations Boards are totally ignored.

There is total resolve in the Area to maintain all services offered in the Area, that is: general medical care on campus, sickbay, psychiatric care, personal counselling, Chaplaincy, and OAS.
STATEMENT AT SENATE BY PROFESSOR E.M. EPPEL, 28 October 1981
CENTRE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

1. Two informal meetings of members of the Centre's faculty and secretarial staff have been held to consider the GRIPE Report. The extremely difficult task set by the UGC for GRIPE was recognised, but concern was expressed at:

a) the lack of clear educational/academic principles to act as a framework for the suggested 'reshaping' of the University;
b) some apparent lack of coordination between related elements of the Report;
c) the fact that the time-scale of the operation envisaged was almost impossibly short.

2. The meeting agreed that there was a strong case for a downward revision of the severe cut imposed on the Centre's UGC finances, and felt that some of the comments on CCE continued to indicate a lack of understanding of how it worked, especially of the interrelatedness of its budgetary items and its constraints within a national system of Extra-Mural Departments.

3. The main source of concern and astonishment was about the fact that CCE is the only teaching/academic unit which, while expected to increase its Full-Time Equivalent student numbers by 1983/84, is awarded a higher percentage cut than the other teaching/academic units in the University. These numbers indicate an increase from an already high baseline figure of about 300 FTE attributed to CCE in 1979/80. In fact the UGC letter merely reflected back the figures that the Centre agreed were possible on the assumption of something like level funding that obtained when the discussions were held last session - certainly not on the assumption of c.24% cut in the University funds to CCE.

4. A continuous expansion (40 to 265 courses) in the decade to 1980 has been achieved on the basis of a very small Centre staff (just viable from the DES's viewpoint). The high productivity of the Centre, i.e. courses/full-time equivalent students to administrative/secretarial staff, with a wide range of work and relationships both inside and outside the University, has been commented on nationally. Comparisons with the size of Extra-Mural Departments in other Universities with similar programmes strongly reinforce this conclusion.

5. The meetings agreed that there is very little scope for reductions in the size of the Centre's staff without a considerable, immediate and serious effect on the programme; such reductions could well bring it below the threshold of viability as a DES-recognised Responsible Body, and jeopardise the substantial guaranteed annual DES grant. Diminutions of the order envisaged by GRIPE could do serious damage to the main contribution of the University to adult education for citizens in its region.
Computing Centre

The proposed figures in Table 2.1 of the GRIPE report call for a disproportionate reduction in the Centre's UGC allocation of some 26%. There is a failure to recognise correctly the significant contribution by the Computer Board to the overall budget of the Centre. The University receives a direct recurrent grant from the Computer Board to maintain and to operate the equipment it has provided. If this Computer Board Grant (£85,000 in 1981/82) is properly taken into account, a 20% reduction in the UGC baseline allocation will result in a reduction of £58,400 by 1983/84 not the £76,000 required by GRIPE. A saving of this magnitude does not require an above average cut in salaries budget - the 25% proposed by GRIPE is unfairly and unnecessarily high.

LIBRARY/MSU

1. No formal meetings comparable to School meetings have yet taken place, but they have been arranged.

2. The Library/MSU would wish to be considered as an academic area, rather than a "Support and ancillary service". Over the years it has been built up as a result of very close collaboration with academic areas, and any changes likely to be made now in academic areas will have immediate consequences in the Library, and vice versa.

3. The Library may have staffing costs slightly above the national average for University Libraries, but it must be remembered that the usage of the Library is far above the national average, and that such a good library service inevitably requires staff. The Library is also self-supporting for its computing needs, which again include highly qualified staff who in some cases correspond to staff in other institutions employed outside the Library.
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

The following is a summary of a statement on the financial position of the University made by the Finance Officer at the beginning of the discussion in the GRIPE Report:-

The financial projections in the report are based on a continuation of existing policies e.g. on the freezing of vacancies but do not allow for the effects of implementing the proposals in the Report. Over the last two years savings from the non-filling of vacancies have amounted to about £800,000. If it had not been for these savings we would not have reserves from which to meet the expected deficit in the current year. Savings in the current year from vacancies and unpaid leaves are expected to amount to about one million pounds and this together with a 12½% across the board cut in non-salaries budgets reduces the deficit of £2.11 million shown in the table on page 18 to about £700,000 (as shown in the tables on pages 16 and 17). Even so we are likely (unless we make further savings) to exhaust the reserves set aside for recurrent purposes by the end of July 1982.

The University Grants Committee is likely to announce the grant for 1982-83 and a revised provisional grant for 1983-84 in April or May 1982. Based on the provisional figures in the July 1981 announcement and allowing for savings arising from the continuation of existing policies but not for additional income or savings resulting from the implementation of proposals in the Report, the estimated deficits for 1982-83 and 1983-84 are of the order of £1,250,000 and £1,750,000 respectively. There is no way in which the University could finance such deficits. It would be possible to survive some months into 1982-83 by using up balances on accounts other than the recurrent reserves (which would already have been exhausted). Funds are held for various long term purposes such as the repair and decoration of buildings, and the replacement of equipment and specific purposes such as postgraduate support grants, research grants and student deposits. If they were spent to keep the University going for a few more months they would not be available for their intended purposes. Even if they were so used it is likely that the point would be reached sometime in the winter of 1982-83 when the stark choice had to be made between paying the accounts for gas, electricity and other essential supplies and services and paying salaries and wages in full. Even if members of staff and unions agreed that in these circumstances in order to avoid the immediate closure of the University salaries and wages should only be paid in part it is doubtful if we could survive beyond the end of the academic year 1982-83. In such circumstances (with a larger prospective deficit in 1983-84) it would not be possible to contemplate the admission of new students in October 1983 and it would be doubtful whether the U.G.C. would be prepared to go on paying grant to what would, in effect, be an insolvent institution. Closure would follow within a very short time.

A commercial enterprise finding itself in such a situation would, after exploring and where appropriate implementing, all feasible ways of increasing income and reducing recurrent expenditure consider the sale of capital assets or their use as security for loans. Unfortunately by far the greater part of the assets of the University was acquired with the help of Treasury grants a normal condition of which is that any proceeds of sale revert to the Treasury. This option is not, therefore, open to us except in relation to quite small sums of money.
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It is still possible that we might be able to raise commercial loans from our bankers. They would, however, expect us to show that we had taken steps which would give them confidence in our ability to repay the loans from our general income over quite a short period. In considering such applications our banks would be bound to have regard to loans already outstanding. These amount to something approaching £2 million largely in respect of loans for student accommodation. Such an approach might be made after the implementation of plans to solve our problem in order to give us more time to bring them to fruition. It is not an alternative to such measures.

The effect of the closure of the University on our students in mid course is too obvious to require elaboration. Staff would lose not only their jobs but would also stand to receive very much smaller redundancy payments than they would otherwise have expected. The size of such payments would depend very much on the generosity of the University Grants Committee. Members of faculty who might otherwise have considered legal action against the University for wrongful dismissal would be unlikely to feel it worthwhile proceeding against an insolvent institution. Members of the nationally financed Universities Superannuation Scheme (U.S.S.) who had already retired could rely on the continued payment of their pensions including any additional benefits under the Premature Retirement Compensation Scheme. Members over the age of 50 who were made redundant could qualify for pensions based on their actual service to the date of redundancy but without the benefit of any additional pension which might have been approved under the Premature Retirement Compensation Scheme. Members of the University's own superannuation scheme would be in a similar position except that total benefits would be limited by the money in the fund. At present this amounts to about £2 million. Averaged amongst 700 pensioners and current members this would produce about £3,000 per head but payments would be allocated according to priorities laid down under the rules of the Scheme.

In the end it is a matter of political judgement whether the government would come to the rescue of an institution which it considered had not taken all possible steps to save itself. Anyone who took the view that it was the intention of the government to cut expenditure on higher education with little regard to the academic consequences might be expected to take a gloomy view of the prospect of such a change of heart. The closure of a whole institution would certainly be one of the cheaper ways of reducing the size of the system as it could minimise the cost of redundancies and avoid problems about tenure rights which might arise from other methods.

29th October 1981
The meeting was held in Mandela Hall; although no attempt was made to count those present the room was crowded and the numbers were probably in excess of 800.

The motions were as follows:

(i) This meeting has no confidence in GRIPE and rejects its Report. (carried nem. con.)

(ii) This meeting has no confidence in the Vice-Chancellor because of his unwillingness to fight against the cuts and calls upon him to resign. (carried by a large majority).

(iii) This meeting calls for the closure of the University from 11.30 a.m. on November 18th to permit attendance at a mass demonstration in London and for wages to be paid for that day. (carried nem. con.)

(iv) That a new committee, including all campus trade unions and the Students' Union, be formed for the sole purpose of finding ways and means of fighting the cuts. (carried by a large majority).

(v) This meeting demands that a meeting of exactly the same type as this one be held in four weeks time at which we can take note of the progress of the Vice-Chancellor and the Administration in opposing the cuts. (carried nem. con.)

(vi) A report of the motions passed at this meeting should be published in "The Bulletin" (carried nem. con.)