

Overview of the Impact of Change on Posts

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The current consultation process has identified a significant number of proposed changes to faculty structures in the University. These proposed changes impact posts in different ways, and this document sets out how the impact on posts has been determined in a transparent and consistent way.

2. Selection of Potentially Redundant Posts

- 2.1. We have been reviewing academic teaching structures, in light of the challenges identified in the consultation document. In reviewing structures, we have made proposals that impact posts, including the deletion of some posts, the reduction in the number of certain types of posts and changes to responsibilities of some posts.
- 2.2. It is proposed that some posts will not require any changes, or very minimal changes and these are said to be **in scope but not at initial risk**, which means the posts are in an area covered by the restructure but not at risk of redundancy under the initial proposals. The posts where there are changes required are said to be **in scope**. In scope posts, may be subject to minor changes or major changes, including the deletion of these posts. At risk means that a post may be made redundant under the proposals.
- 2.3. Each faculty have developed their proposals which are set out in their individual consultation documents, including the background to any proposed changes, the rationale for making the changes, and the proposed impact on individual posts. These are all subject to consultation.

3. Mapping Current Posts to Proposed Posts

- 3.1. For each post and colleague, we have categorised the impact of the proposed changes in line with the table below and the descriptions in the following sections.

Category	Proposed impact on post	Initial Status*	Proposed impact on colleague
1	No changes to job descriptions.	In scope but not at risk as no changes.	No impact.
2	Job descriptions are subject to minor changes but still considered suitable.	In scope, but not at risk as minor changes.	Colleagues are assimilated into post.
3	No changes to job descriptions, but there are more people than posts. Job descriptions are subject to minor changes but still considered suitable, but there are more people than posts.	At risk	Colleagues are 'pooled' with other at risk colleagues performing the same/similar role.
			Post is ring fenced for at risk colleagues.
			Colleagues are selected through a written submission/ interview process.
4	Post is deleted and does not exist in the new structure.	At risk	Colleagues are added to the redeployment register.

**Initial status reflects a person's position based on the proposals. The initial status may change if the proposals are changed as a result of consultation.*

- 3.2 **Matching (category 2)** – We have matched people to posts where there are limited changes proposed to job descriptions. By matching, we mean, there are no significant changes to the post content and the colleagues in these posts will be transferred into the new posts provided there are the same or greater number of posts in the new structure. There will be no grade or pay changes and only minor, if any, changes to employment terms and conditions.
- 3.2.1 An example of matching would be a Lecturer with generic Business and Management skills whose post-title changes, but the essential criteria of the new post are largely the same. There is no change to the grade, pay or employment terms and conditions. There may be minor changes to the job description. Where there are more colleagues who match a post within the new structure a selection process will apply (see Ring-fencing below).
- 3.3 We will consider a post to be a suitable alternative where:
- 3.3.1 There is a significant similarity between a colleague's current duties and their knowledge, skills, qualifications, and experience compared to the new post.
- 3.3.2 The new post is at the same grade, or one grade below, and attracts an equivalent package of terms and conditions of employment.
- 3.3.3 In the first instance, assimilation will normally be carried out on a grade by grade/team by team basis ensuring the team has been appropriately defined.
- 3.3.4 Where a colleague has been 'acting up' into a full vacant post and/or seconded to a different vacant post for more than 12 months by the time the consultation ends on 9 December 2025, we have proposed to assimilate the colleague into that post if it is permanent. If the vacant post, in which the employee has been seconded/acting up for at least 12 months, is not a permanent post (e.g. is time limited due to funding or project completion, etc) the seconded/acting up period will be extended, if an extension is granted, and at the end of the extended period, the employee will return to their substantive post.
- 3.3.5 Where a colleague has been 'acting up' into the full post and/or seconded to a different post for **less than 12 months** by the time the consultation ends on the 9 December 2025, we have used the colleague's substantive post for pooling decisions.
- 3.4 Final matching will take place following the end of the consultation period. Colleagues who consider that they should be matched into a post in the new structure but have not been identified for slotting, should raise this during the consultation period so that this can be considered.
- 3.5 **Ring-fenced Pools** (Category 3)- Where there are multiple colleagues who match or could be assimilated into a post within the new structure, that post will be ring-fenced and a selection process will apply.
- 3.5.1 In this instance a 'ring-fence' is placed around these colleagues from which the selection for posts will be undertaken. Ring-fence involves reserving certain posts for suitable colleagues who are at risk and have the skills-set to fill these posts.

3.5.2 The selection process for these ringfenced pools will take place in line with the [Redundancy Selection process](#). Colleagues who are not successful in securing a post in their ringfence will become part of the redeployment pool.

3.5.3 Colleagues who believe they should have been ring-fenced for selection but have not been, may raise this during the consultation period so that this can be considered.

3.6 **Redundancy/Redeployment Pool** (Category 4) - is the group of colleagues whose posts are proposed to be deleted.

4. General Principles

4.1 Proposals have been made in each consultation document on the categories that each post, and therefore person fall into. This is subject to consultation, and the outcomes may change following that consultation period.

4.2 Any queries or concerns that colleagues have about how they have been considered should be raised during the consultation period and/or as part of any written feedback submitted as part of the consultation arrangements.

4.3 Due regard will be given to the University's equality policies in matching, slotting, and appointing to posts in the new structure.

4.4 Any colleagues with any disabilities who may require reasonable adjustments as part of any selection processes should inform the People and Culture team during the consultation period to enable adjustments to be made if necessary.

4.5 In the event of a colleague leaving, retiring, or volunteering for redundancy or similar staffing changes, the categories of posts could change. For example, a selection process may be required where the number of colleagues in a match pool exceeds the number of posts in a new structure. If a colleague leaves the university before the selection takes place, then the remaining colleague will be slotted into the post without the need for a selection process.

4.6 Colleagues in category 4, or those that are unsuccessful in category 3 will be subject to redeployment. Further information is available [here](#).

5. Protection relating to pregnancy and family leave.

5.1. The University has a legal obligation to prioritise some at-risk colleagues over others where there is Suitable Alternative Employment available. These colleagues include:

- Colleagues who have notified the University that they are pregnant. If the colleague has a miscarriage before 24 weeks of pregnancy, they will have priority status until two weeks after their pregnancy has ended.
- Colleagues who are on, or have returned from, maternity leave (including after a stillbirth after 24 weeks pregnancy), or adoption leave. They will have priority status for:
 - 18 months from the child's date of birth, if this is notified to the University before the end of maternity leave, or;
 - 18 months from the Expected Week of Childbirth if they did not inform the University of the birth date, or;

- 18 months from the date of the adoption placement or date of entry into Great Britain (if overseas adoption).
 - The 18 months includes any time spent on maternity, adoption, or other statutory leave.
 - Colleagues who are on or have returned from shared parental leave will have priority status from the date they commence their shared parental leave until, either:
 - the end of the period of shared parental leave, if this is less than six continuous weeks, or;
 - 18 months (including time spent on shared parental or other statutory leave) from the child's date of birth or date of the adoption placement, if more than six continuous weeks of shared parental leave is taken.
- 5.2 If the protected redeployee has also taken maternity or adoption leave, the duration of the priority status is as per maternity, or adoption leave.
- 5.3 In these cases, at-risk colleagues who meet these criteria, should be automatically offered Suitable Alternative Employment before other at-risk colleagues.
- 5.4 Where a post is deemed to be Suitable Alternative Employment for more than one protected redeployee, a selection process will need to take place.