

## UNION CALLS FOR ETHICS CODE



**The UCU Branch is proposing ethics guidelines for University strategic partnerships, amid controversy over existing links.**

The union's proposals, currently being finalised by the Executive, argue that the reputation of the University's brand and the commitment of staff to it, are critical to the OU's success in the future. They call for a rejection of 'opportunistic' approaches, in favour of applying a set of ethical guidelines to all strategic partnerships.



The guidelines cover four areas - the arms trade, environmental impact, animal welfare and corporate responsibility (including human rights and fair trade), to be applied on a case-by-case basis when the University considers potential partners. The proposals are a response to the Vice-Chancellor's call at the January Open Forum for a list of "...parameters and criteria..." for partnership building. Prof Gourley's comments were, in turn, a response to a staff question - "But how do we vet future partners?" (see page 10).

### Protests Against Partnership

The potential damage that poor partnership selection can do to the OU brand was recently highlighted by demonstrations outside the University's Wales Office. Protestors demonstrated against the OU's participation in the Metrix partnership. Metrix is to establish a Ministry of Defence military training academy at St Athan in South Wales. Along with Nord Anglia, Europe's "...largest provider of private education", Metrix includes arms companies, QinetiQ and Raytheon (manufacturer of Cruise and Patriot missiles amongst other weaponry). A protest march through Cardiff city centre subsequently took place at the end of April, including a picketing stop outside the University's Wales Office. The OU Wales Director is apparently anticipating further demonstrations against the University at the National Eisteddfodd in Cardiff in August.

*Roger Rees, Branch Executive member*



Protest Outside OU Wales Office

#### Links

<http://www.antimetrix.org/2007/09/metrix-cosortium-arms-dealers-unethical.html>  
[http://www.qinetiq.com/home\\_metrix\\_review.html](http://www.qinetiq.com/home_metrix_review.html)

**Inside this issue** p2 - salary sacrifice; p3 - news; p5 - news updates; p7 – SSR: opinion; p8 – support for employment problems; p9 – equality; p10 - ethics background briefing; p12 - get ucu active!!!; p14 - contact us

## Salary Sacrifice

### OU Jeopardises £1M handout from UCU

UCU nationally has negotiated a “Salary Sacrifice” scheme with Universities UK and the Universities Superannuation Scheme. The scheme involves the employer paying a staff member’s pension contributions direct to USS – thus reducing National Insurance contributions for both employer and employee.

The scheme – if properly negotiated and agreed – is potentially beneficial to both parties. But the savings are not equally shared.

Savings will benefit staff to the tune of £500,000 per year – with most savings going to low paid clerical and secretarial staff. A UCU full timer on a median salary will gain a mere £25 a year. Only a small proportion of ALs will gain anything – some may lose out if they participate so there is a need for carefully negotiated and watertight safeguards on this.

The University, on the other hand, will pocket a cool £1M. In return for this deal, from which UCU members will otherwise gain little, the Union is asking that the employer savings are held in an earmarked fund, jointly controlled by both parties. In this way, the Union will be able to ensure that the savings are expended on constructive and mutually beneficial activities – not squandered on follies like new logos or “scenario planning” (remember that!).

Believe it or not, the University has walked away from the negotiating table.

Rather than agreeing to spend the money on campaigning against ELQ cuts or to avoid job losses, management wishes to assert the right to spend your money as it chooses – without as much as a please or a thank you!

Worse than that, they are blustering about introducing a scheme (Open Smart) – which involves a variation in contract – in defiance of agreed negotiating procedures and potentially in breach of USS rules, thus placing the security of your pension in danger.

If we let management get away with this, we will be setting a very dangerous precedent for the future. It took years to negotiate and agree our current terms and conditions – which are among the best in the sector. Don’t risk throwing this away by signing up individually to accept a variation in contract.

Salary Sacrifice is complicated – there can be losers as well as winners. Members would be ill-advised to sign up for any scheme which has not been properly negotiated and agreed with your Union.

We have one message for management – wise up – negotiate – and, together, we can negotiate an agreement which will be beneficial for the University as well as the Union and our members.

*Alan Carr, Branch Executive member and National Treasurer*

## Shoddy treatment of OUVS staff

### 'Move or else' says OU management

Imagine this situation – you receive an invitation, headed Good news, to a meeting of staff in your department to discuss a plan to re-organise the department. When you get to the meeting you are told that the good news is that your department is going to be moved in 10 months time and you can either move house and home or you will have no job after next February. If you leave you will get voluntary severance – how voluntary is that!

*Couldn't possibly happen in the OU?*

*But it could and it did.*

Last month staff in Open University Validation Services (OUVS) which is currently based in central London, were calmly informed that a decision had been taken - OUVS was going to move to Walton Hall and the planned moving date is next February. Not only were they not consulted at all about whether this move is sensible, they were not even told the issue was being discussed. They are now faced with the dilemma of whether to move house in most cases in order to keep their jobs - and at a time when house prices are falling - or whether to give up their jobs and try and get a job elsewhere.

Staff in OUVS are incensed about being treated in this way. The University says it is keen to keep these staff, as their experience is invaluable but it will be impossible for some to move because of domestic and personal commitments. To be expected to do so at such short notice is totally unreasonable. OUBUCU thinks staff should not be treated like pieces of furniture and will seek to obtain far better terms than those currently on offer and a deal which is likely to encourage more OUVS staff to remain with the OU. Among other things OUBUCU will be pressing for a much longer timescale in which staff will be expected to move.

---

## LTS Graphic Design

### More job reductions sought

The University has recently announced that there will be significantly less demand for graphic design staff in LTS in the next financial year. It has introduced a voluntary severance scheme with a view to reducing the number of graphic design staff in LTS by 'up to six'. This is very demoralising to a group of staff, many of whom have seen repeated reductions in staffing over the last few years. There is a fear that this might become an annual event until there are no graphic design staff left.

We are pressing the university to take all possible steps to minimise the need for job losses including

- clawing back on graphic design work which is outsourced by some areas of the university,
- offering retraining and re-skilling opportunities,
- opening up voluntary severance to staff in other areas, which might create vacancies for the graphic design staff to move across to if they wish

Long term, OUBUCU will press the university to make a firm commitment to the continued existence of a graphic design function in LTS and avoid this situation arising year after year.

## ALs in Italy and France

### OU seeks end to contracts

The University intends to stop employing ALs in Italy and France - despite the continued need to support students in those countries - because of the cost of complying with various legislative requirements in those countries. In February we asked the university a number of questions about this position. Despite repeated reminders from us and promises from them, it took the university 12 weeks to respond to these questions, so now at least two staff are in imminent danger of being made redundant. We are now seeking advice from the UCU legal department on this matter.

One part of the response from the University questioned our right to negotiate on behalf of ALs outside the UK - yet the procedure agreement explicitly recognises OUBUCU as the negotiating body on behalf of **ALL** ALs. We will not allow the University to unilaterally rewrite negotiated agreements.

---

## Regional Centres

### Review process not shared with all staff

Some regional centre staff may be aware that there is a review taking place of regional staffing models, one aspect of which is to create more 'flexibility' in staff roles. It would have been helpful if the staff involved had all been told and if OUBUCU had been informed. Any changes to terms and conditions of service will of course have to be negotiated with OUBUCU.

If you work in a Regional Centre and this review is news to you then you should ask questions - perhaps of your Regional Director in the first instance. We are after all supposed to be the OPEN University.

---

## IET Review

### Branch seeks views of Unit staff

Are you a member of the branch who works in IET? If so, how will the review of IET affect you and especially your terms and conditions of service? We have not heard about this review from any members in IET – so if there are issues you want us to take up, please let us know by emailing [ucu@open.ac.uk](mailto:ucu@open.ac.uk).

## CDSA

### Management told 'stick to the agreement'

Most of you will remember that the University tried to unilaterally impose a revised CDSA scheme last year, but after OUBUCU instituted a boycott, a negotiated agreement was reached last September. You can find this agreement on the HR intranet site: [http://intranet.open.ac.uk/human-resources/information/cdsa/local\\_agreement\\_oubucu\\_2007.doc](http://intranet.open.ac.uk/human-resources/information/cdsa/local_agreement_oubucu_2007.doc)

However, documents continue to appear on all sorts of sites - both HR and departments. Many of them were written before September 2007 and are not consistent with the key points in the agreement, such as:

- the right to request an alternative appraiser, and for this request to be considered seriously.
- no link between CDSA and rewards except that an agreed report of a CDSA - or two separate reports if appraiser and appraisee cannot agree on one report - can be made available to an appropriate body considering promotion or any special award.
- tight limits on the confidentiality of CDSA reports which must be observed (unless the appraisee agrees otherwise).

OUBUCU has drawn the University's attention to several documents, including individual units' inaccurate interpretations of CDSA, which are clearly out of line with the Agreements made in 1987 and 2007. There is no point in agreeing on a matter of dispute and then allowing other parts of the University to renege on this agreement.

We have called on management to ensure that the agreement is adhered to across the university. In particular any pre September 2007 documents on CDSA must be withdrawn pending updating to reflect the agreement. If the university continues to prevaricate on this matter, the Branch will have to consider re-instituting the boycott of CDSA until we are satisfied that the university is consistently sticking to the agreement.

---

## Expense claims

### Clarification of the need for receipts

There is still confusion in some parts of the university - including it would seem the Finance Division - about when you do and do not have to provide receipts to support your expense claim. It is not the case, as some departments are trying to tell staff, that ALL items on expense claims must be supported by receipts, including trivial items like cups of tea where receipts may not be readily available and should not be necessary when claims are well below the maxima permitted.

The full position is detailed on the document about Travel and subsistence on the HR website (MOPP Section 10, Appendix E):

[http://intranet.open.ac.uk/human-resources/mopp\\_other-reimbursable-expenses.htm](http://intranet.open.ac.uk/human-resources/mopp_other-reimbursable-expenses.htm)

Staff are expected to provide receipts when they are available. When they are not, and provided your subsistence claim is within the agreed maxima, you do not have to do so. However you should keep an expenses log to be provided if required, for example for audit purposes. You should not be expected to provide the log to verify every claim.

If your head of unit tells you that you must provide receipts for absolutely everything, tell him or her plain and simply that they are wrong. And if they persist, tell us and we will take this up for you.

## Employer contributions to pensions

### Branch awaits action!

We reported previously that we were pressing the University to continue to contribute to pensions of staff after they had reached 40 years pensionable service - to do otherwise would be in breach of age legislation. The University has indicated that it is likely to agree to this - clearly it has belatedly realised that its legal position would be precarious if it did not do so. But we have not yet had a firm indication that they will do so. We have also pressed for this to be retrospective - and for it to be clear that any Additional Voluntary Contributions will not in any way affect university contributions to pensions. A handful of staff have already reached 40 years pensionable service and the University is not contributing to their pensions.

---

## Salary dates

### U-turn achieved on payments

After pressure from OUBUCU, the University has withdrawn its proposal to change payment dates when the 25th of a month is on a weekend day or a closure day because it could not be confident that some staff would not be disadvantaged. Surely the University should have got this right before making the change? Still, at least we have managed to salvage the situation and thereby avoid possibly significant inconvenience to staff.

---

## Mileage rate

### Call for recognition of rising prices

Even if you don't drive a car, unless you have spent the last few months on another planet, you will have noticed that there have recently been substantial increases in petrol prices. OUBUCU is therefore pressing for an increase in the standard university mileage rate. The university is dithering about this. We wonder if some members of management have indeed come from another planet!

Mileage rates constitute part of your terms and conditions of service and we will continue to press for an increase to reflect increased motoring costs.

# The Student Support Review

## Vigilance rather than alarm required

The Senate meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup> was not the end. It was not even the beginning of the end. But it was perhaps the end of the beginning.

Senate voted on 28 recommendations about the SSR, which were all carried by a significant majority. But what exactly have they agreed to? In essence, the project has been given the go-ahead to test a range of propositions. It has a year to design and set up a collection of integrated pilot studies, and two years to run them. Senate was reassured that students and ALs who take part in these experiments will be protected against any adverse consequences.

If what is going to happen remains unclear, Senate was left in no doubt that the University is facing a difficult future. By the standards of Committee-speak, the paper is unusually frank. It even acknowledges that many of us believe that the pace of change has been too slow for the University's long-term well-being. Something must be done. But although this paper does not tell us very much about *what* (let alone *how*) it does set out some fundamental principles. Of these, I think four are particularly significant:

- a) **support at Level 1 will be enhanced** in order to allow for 'increasingly autonomous learners' who will need
- b) **different kinds of support at Levels 2 and 3**. At all stages students will be
- c) **supported to continue**, while curriculum development will be better integrated with changing student needs by requiring
- d) **all central staff to spend at least 10 days p.a. working directly with students**

Of these, (a) and (c) seem relatively uncontroversial, though we might want to see all new students (and not just those entering at Level 1) receiving enhanced support. And whilst course completions have shown a modest rise recently, continuation rates are still in decline, so helping more students to progress is vital to the University's long-term future. It almost goes without saying that this will be even more vital in the post-ELQ world.

Recommendation 6 states that 'The resources allocated to level 1 course support and to pathway support will increase as a proportion of the total resources for student support.' Whilst there is no proposal (at present) to shift resource allocation overall, 10 days p.a. from every central academic does represent a significant supplement to resources, but there is a lot of work to be done before we can see what this will mean in practice. It would be far too simple to think that the increase for Level 1 and pathway support will come directly from CAU input, but neither should we leap to an over-hasty conclusion that it will necessarily come from a *reduction* in support at Levels 2 and 3. But people are naturally worried about their jobs, and the University must be urged to clarify its intentions as soon as possible so that we can prepare for a struggle if necessary.

Nevertheless, it's the second of the list above that's the one to watch, expressed in Recommendations 7 and 8:

- *All Level 2 and 3 undergraduate students will have access to course support from appropriately qualified staff.*
- *The University will offer every student support to become increasingly autonomous learners at undergraduate Levels 2 and 3.*



At this stage we should be vigilant rather than alarmed. ‘Appropriately qualified staff’ might prove to be Associate Lecturers. And we have, after all, been committed to creating ‘more independent learners’ for about twenty years. Only a suicidal institution would work harder to get students to continue, only to lose them later from inadequate support. So although these words seem to invite a dire reading, it is better *at this stage* to see them as the University giving itself permission to think experimentally. The Action Plan that comes next should be clearer.

I’ve been at the OU since the beginning and I’ve spent the last ten years battling for retention. Teaching has been at the centre of my working life. I want the University and its mission to survive and flourish, but what lies ahead could be painful. Senate’s decision to require all central academics to have some direct contact with students is to me a step in the right direction, and personally I would be very sorry if the Union opposed it. Several hundred central academics are or have been ALs. Many regret the shortage of residential school opportunities and most accept that losing touch with students is not in their own long-term career interests (let alone the interests of students). Some of the concepts in earlier phases of the SSR (‘super tutors’, shifting presentation responsibilities to a team) would have altered the workloads of central academics. It remains to be seen how this proposal can be managed. But its intention is to narrow a gap that has grown far too wide for a healthy future.

*Cicely Havely, Branch Executive member*

## Having a problem at work?

### Caseworkers here to help

Personal Cases arise when a member has difficulty with his/her employment. These problems include issues arising from: probation; CDSA; performance; absence; ill-health; unpaid leave; study leave; work-related stress and depression; and, bullying and harassment. Instead of trying to deal with problems alone union members can contact the branch for advice and support. We have several trained personal caseworkers based centrally and around the country, including ALs. You probably won’t be the first person to approach the branch with a particular issue, so we have a great deal of experience to draw on.

The examples of problems quoted above are covered by the various policies and procedures the University has in place. Most problems can be dealt with via advice to the member on their rights under these policies, and what to do to protect them. The advice can be given by e-mail, phone, or in person, whichever is most appropriate to the enquirer. However, there are occasions when the union representative accompanies the member to a meeting with their unit and/or HR, perhaps to “clear the air” via informal means. Regrettably, there are occasions when the caseworker has to be present at formal proceedings to ensure the member is adequately represented and defended, as for example, in probation review meetings. Happily, we manage to sort most problems via informal methods but we are extremely effective at the formal ones as well.

So, if you do want any advice on employment related problems, contact us – your case will be treated in confidence.

email [ucu@open.ac.uk](mailto:ucu@open.ac.uk)



# Equality Issues

John Bennett, Equality Officer

[j.e.bennett@open.ac.uk](mailto:j.e.bennett@open.ac.uk) 01908 653307

## Duties

The full duties for the new post of Equality Officer are listed on our website at <http://ucu.open.ac.uk/rules/> in Rule 8.5 of the new Rules. You will see that the Equality Officer's role covers all equality issues.

## Membership data:

However, odd as it may seem, the branch has little information about the number of members we have with disabilities, or who are from an ethnic minority, or who are lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, or transgendered. The reasons for this are various, but these include the fact that declaration of these issues is voluntary. Another difficulty is that the equality information requested in the standard membership application forms used over time has changed so that those who have provided information may no longer match the criteria used.

## Personal Casework:

One of the duties of the Equality Officer is to "monitor the volume and nature of personal casework which involves equality issues, in particular issues of discrimination, bullying and harassment, to ensure that the branch has appropriate mechanisms in place for handling such personal cases." With one exception, so far the only cases I am aware of involve those members who came straight to me via my e-mail or contacted me by phone.

In a future newsletter there will be a comparison table of the demand for help and advice over the last two years and what data there is available for this year. In the meantime, if anyone has any comments or queries, or need for advice, on equality and related issues, please e-mail me.

## “BUT HOW DO WE VET PARTNERS?”



### Qs + As On The OUBUCU Ethics Proposals

**Q: Why is the Branch proposing Ethics Guidelines for partnerships?**

A: The agenda for Higher Education behind ELQ is designed to make it ‘commercially relevant’. This will increase the need for partnership income – in itself and to show we are ‘meeting the needs of the economy’. But how will the University manage this process? The Branch Executive believes now is the time for discussion and debate about how partnerships should be selected and developed. We don’t believe the alternative to ethical guidelines, that the University enters into opportunistic partnerships without clear and transparent guidelines, is ‘smart business’ in today’s commercial climate. The Branch recognises that if the OU brand does not succeed, this will have an effect on the levels, terms and conditions of employment of staff. We want the University to succeed financially *but* ethically. Entering into partnerships that damage the brand can only have a negative effect on the University in the long-run.

**Q: What ethical considerations does the University currently apply to partnerships?**

A: We don’t know. The Branch asked to speak with the Senior Projects Officer (responsible for partnerships) but we were refused a meeting. We were told Committees decide on partnerships (which the Branch is not challenging) and that VCE applies ethical considerations to partnerships. We weren’t informed what those were.

**Q: Does it matter what partnerships the University takes on?**

A: Resources have been spent on re-branding. They will be wasted unless the University lives up to the brand in practice. The Vice Chancellor has stated that partnerships should be in line with the OU’s values but without guidelines, how do we assess that? Guidelines send messages to partners, students and staff about the kind of organisation the OU is and help turn the University commitment to ‘social justice’ into practice. The OU has an enviable reputation. Fair and ethical business is increasingly important to both ‘consumers’ and organisations. It’s time the OU caught up.

**Q: Is the Branch against partnerships with the Armed Forces?**

A: UCU nationally and at Branch level, does not oppose students from the Armed Forces. The Metrix partnership is different. It raises controversial issues regarding privatisation and the business methods of those we enter into partnerships with. One of the company’s has been involved in a series of bribery and industrial espionage cases and another has been condemned for applying ‘racial stereotypes’ to recruiting (and sacking) staff. Involvement with Metrix associates the University with the murky world of international arms trading. What is the brand message there?

**Q: What are the guidelines about?**

A: The guidelines focus on four main areas – the arms trade, animal welfare, ecological impact and corporate responsibility (including human rights). They set basic requirements that organisations wishing to partner with the University should meet. Rather than ‘re-invent the wheel’, the guidelines are based on those successfully used by the Co-operative Bank. They are set out as proposals in a preliminary Branch document which will be presented to senior management in the next month.

*continued...*

**Q: Are other Universities doing this?**

A: While the OU heads into partnerships with arms manufacturers, other universities *are* going in the other direction. University College London has decided to withdraw all investment from arms companies. St Andrews University and Pembroke College, Cambridge, have already done so. UCL has said it is conscious of the negative effect arms investment may have on alumni donations. New Hall and St Catherine's Colleges, Cambridge, have divested from companies doing business with the Sudanese government. The more 'commercial' universities become, the more strategic partnerships will come under the media spotlight, and influence the attitudes their stakeholders take to them.

**Q: What next?**

A: The Branch Executive is currently finalising the ethical guidelines. These will be presented to University management and uploaded onto the Branch website for member discussion.

The Branch is then planning a series of events to open up discussion on these issues, giving all members the opportunity to express their opinions and contribute to this important debate.

*Roger Rees, Branch Executive member*

The Branch has established an Ethics Working Group. If you are interested in joining this Group and/or contributing comments in relation to its work, please email [ucu@open.ac.uk](mailto:ucu@open.ac.uk)

## **‘think not what your union can do for you, but what you can do for your union...’**

### **Union Learning Reps**

We are trying to gauge any interest from members in becoming UCU union learning reps.

A union learning rep (ULR) is a union representative who is trained in advising members on learning needs and opportunities, recruited from the workforce.

The UCU is an affiliated union to unionlearn and part of unionlearn’s campaign for learning in the workplace is to recruit union learning reps.

Unionlearn hope to have around 22,000 by 2010. However the OU branch of the UCU currently has none!

Their key role is to raise awareness of training and developments across the membership they represent.

#### **The Union learning representative is a new breed of activist**

The Employment Act 2002, section 43 states that ULRs are entitled to reasonable paid time off for training and carrying out their duties

A 5 day training programme meets the requirements of the Employment Act 2002, which says that new ULRs should attend suitable training within 6 months of their appointment. The Act also gives a right for union members who wish to have access to the services of a ULR reasonable time off without pay to do this.

Have a look at [www.unionlearn.org.uk](http://www.unionlearn.org.uk)

If you are interested in finding out more please contact Bethan on [b.norfor@open.ac.uk](mailto:b.norfor@open.ac.uk) or call 01908 652570.

*Bethan Norfor, OUBUCU Executive Committee member*

---

### **Walton Hall volunteers required**

Do you want to get more involved in your Union? Are you interested in becoming a Department or Unit Union Rep? Maybe -

- maintaining a noticeboard with up-to-date information for members?
- being the first point of contact for members in your area?
- running information and recruitment drop ins?

If you can help with any of these activities, or think of others, please contact Meridian: [meridian@open.ac.uk](mailto:meridian@open.ac.uk), x59523.

**THE NEXT GENERAL MEETING OF THE UNION IS ON WEDNESDAY, 25 JUNE, 12.30 – 1.30, IN THE BERRILL LECTURE THEATRE.**

Some of the issues raised in this newsletter will be under discussion, so put the date in your diary, and come along.

The Meeting will be broadcast over the internet, and questions can be sent on the day via email. *(Details will follow closer to the meeting).*

OUBUCU MEETING SCHEDULE

<b>June</b>	Mon	23	JNC	
	Wed	25	Exec. meeting	
			<b>GENERAL MEETING</b>	<b>Berrill Lecture Theatre</b>
				<b>12.30-1.30</b>
<b>Sept</b>	Tue	16	Exec. meeting	
	Wed	17	JNC	
<b>Oct</b>	Wed	22	Exec. meeting	
<b>Nov</b>	Tue	18	Exec. meeting	
	Wed	19	JNC	
	Wed	26	Exec. meeting	
			<b>ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING</b>	<b>Berrill Lecture Theatre</b>
				<b>12.30-1.30</b>
<b>Dec</b>	Wed	10	<b>First New Exec. meeting</b>	

## The Open University Branch of the University and College Union

OUBUCU  
Room 015  
Wilson C Block  
Walton Hall  
The Open University  
Milton Keynes  
MK7 6AA

E-mail: [ucu@open.ac.uk](mailto:ucu@open.ac.uk)

This issue of **the spark** was edited by Roger Rees and Meridian.

If you wish to submit comments on any of the articles here, to appear in a 'Letters' page in the next issue, please post to the "newsletter feedback" sub-forum in the OUBUCU Discussion Forum at

[http://www.oubucuforum.org.uk/cgi-bin/simpleforum\\_pro.cgi](http://www.oubucuforum.org.uk/cgi-bin/simpleforum_pro.cgi)

**the spark** reserves the right to edit or refuse to print (for reasons of space or appropriateness) any correspondence submitted.

## YOUR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### Officers:

**President:** Roger Walters ([r.j.walters@open.ac.uk](mailto:r.j.walters@open.ac.uk)) x 58810  
**Honorary Secretary:** Meridian ([meridian@open.ac.uk](mailto:meridian@open.ac.uk)) x 59523 (SocSci)  
**Treasurer:** David Knowles (AL)  
**Vice Presidents:** Alan Carter (LTS); Mike McNulty (AL)  
**Equality Officer:** John Bennett (SocSci)  
**Central Academic Staff Officer:** vacant  
**Associate Lecturers Staff Officer:** Lesley Kane (AL)  
**Regional Academic Staff Officer:** Judy Ekins (R05)  
**Central & Regional Academic-Related Staff Officer:** Chris Bollom (OUBS)

### Ordinary Members:

Karen Angelasanto (AL)  
 Cheryl-Anne (AL)  
 Pauline Collins (R12)  
 Maria Francis-Pitfield (FELS)  
 Cicely Havelly (Student Services)  
 Malcolm Jenner (AL)  
 Maria McCrea (R11)  
 Anne McKee (IET)  
 Bethan Norfor (Strategy Unit)  
 June Payne  
 John Peters (AL)  
 Jon Pike (R13)  
 Peter Piper (AL)  
 Roger Rees (SocSci)  
 Eric Wade (Retired)

### Ex-Officio Members:

John Bennett (Past President) (see Equality Officer)  
 Alan Carr (National Treasurer) (R12)  
 Rob Clifton (National Executive)

### College and University Support Network

The College and University Support Network (CUSN) offers support services to all staff in further and higher education and their families, including:

**Counselling:** confidential, solution-focused counselling on personal and workplace issues

**One-to-one coaching:** personalised practical and emotional support via a secure email system

**Information, advice and support material:** news, guides and factsheets on relevant topics such as well-being, work-life balance, workload problems, stress management, coping with bereavement, and dealing with difficult people

**Financial assistance:** a needs-based grants and loans programme

**Money management advice:** individually tailored strategies to address financial difficulties, restructure debt and secure benefits

**Signposting to relevant organisations:** the information you need to take the next steps to a better future

All these services can be accessed online at [CUSN's website](#), or through a 24/7 telephone support line, on **Freephone 08000 329952**