Motion – New progressive pay structure for highest earners to protect jobs at UoN

This branch notes:

1. The University's *Future Nottingham Phase One Business Case* outlines a projected £27.4m deficit for 2024/25 and includes plans to cut 258 FTE staff roles and freeze recruitment for a further 98, aiming to achieve £19m-£24m in recurring staff cost savings.
2. The business case identifies savings of £20–30m in non-pay expenditure, including some explicitly itemised reductions, such as £100,000 in vehicle hire costs, which indicates that savings of this magnitude are considered material. On that basis, the proposed salary reductions must also be taken seriously as a significant alternative.
3. What is more, the length of fixed term teaching contracts are increasingly being reduced (e.g. from 12 to 9 months, from 24 to 21 months). While comparatively small savings for the University, the impact on precarious staff is significant. We are therefore already seeing de facto salary savings for those on lower pay.

This branch believes:

1. That **compulsory redundancies should only be considered once all feasible alternatives — including fair pay moderation at senior levels — have been exhausted.**
2. That a **progressive salary reduction scheme** for the highest-paid staff is a **more just and equitable approach to addressing financial shortfalls** than cutting jobs.
3. That continuing with large-scale redundancies despite viable alternatives will **harm morale, damage the University's reputation, and intensify workload pressures** across the institution.
4. That **the University's commitment to transparency and shared values** must include a willingness to engage seriously with this cost-saving proposal, alongside non-pay efficiencies.
5. Salary moderation of senior staff during a crisis period is a proportionate and time-limited approach that aligns with the values of fairness, transparency, and shared institutional responsibility.

This branch resolves:

1. To **call on the Vice Chancellor and UEB to adopt the following progressive, time-limited salary reduction scheme**, for **an initial two-year period**, with a formal review at the end of that period or earlier if financial surplus is restored.

   Under this scheme:

   a. All earnings **in the Level 7 band C range (£103,647-£127,472)** would be reduced by **50% of the excess** above £103,647.
   b. All earnings **above the Level 7 band D threshold (£127,472)** would be reduced by **75% of the excess** above £127,472.
   c. For example:
      i. A salary of £113,647, would be reduced by £5,000.
      ii. A salary of £137,472 would be reduced by £19412.50
   d. Implementation of the scheme in the band C range (£103,647-£127,472) would be optional.
   e. Implementation of the scheme for all earnings above the band D threshold (£127,472**)**, in the executive pay range, would be mandatory.
   f. This measure could **save over £3 million per year**, protecting **more than 80 full time jobs**.
2. To call on management to **suspend the compulsory redundancy process** and to enter into meaningful consultation over all feasible alternatives, including the proposed salary reduction.
3. To **reaffirm the union's position of opposing compulsory redundancies** and to prepare to move toward an **industrial action ballot** if meaningful engagement on alternatives is not forthcoming.