

Confirmed minutes

The University of Manchester

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wednesday, 8 February 2012

Present:

Mr Anil Ruia (in the Chair),

President and Vice-Chancellor, Dr Stuart Allan, Mr Stephen Dauncey, Mrs Gillian Easson, Professor Colette Fagan, Professor Maggie Gale, Professor Andrew Gibson, Mr Mark Glass, Mr Robert Hough, Dr Keith Lloyd, Miss Letty Newton, Professor Nancy Papalopulu, Mr Neville Richardson, Dr Brenda Smith, Dr John Stageman, Dr Pam Vallely, Mr Gerry Yeung (18)

In attendance: The Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer, the Deputy Secretary, and Dr David Barker, Head of Compliance and Risk (*agendum* 7(b), in part) also attended.

N.B. The Chair opened the meeting by offering congratulations, on behalf of the Board, to those members of the University community that had received national honours in the recently announced New Year Honours list. The Board noted, in particular, the knighthoods conferred upon Professors Andre Geim and Kostya Novoselov, the CBE for services to education awarded to Professor Mel Ainscow, and the OBE awarded to Dr John Stageman, member of the Board of Governors.

1. Declarations of Interest

Noted: That the declaration of interest made by the Chair, Mr Anil Ruia, in relation to his role on the HEFCE Board and previously declared in the session, remained relevant to some items on the agenda. New declarations were also recorded for Professor Dame Nancy Rothwell, who had recently joined the Manchester International Festival Board, and had also been invited to serve as Co-Chair of the national Council for Science and Technology, from 13 February 2012 to 31 December 2013.

2. Minutes

Confirmed: The minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2011.

3. Matters arising from the minutes

Received: A report summarising actions consequent on decisions taken by the Board.

Noted: That the Board Monitoring Group, established to allow a sub-group of board members to liaise closely with senior management as contingency plans were developed for approval by the full Board, would stand down, as there was no requirement for it to meet on an ongoing basis.

4. Summary of business

Received: A report, prepared by the Deputy Secretary on the main items of business to be considered at the meeting.

5. Chairman's report

(1) Deputy Chair of the Board of Governors

Reported: The role of Deputy Chair of the Board of Governors will become vacant on 1 September 2012, when Mrs Gillian Eason stands down from the Board of Governors to take up the role of Pro-Chancellor. The Deputy Chair is an officer of the Board, appointed by the Board of Governors, and may serve for a maximum period of two three-year terms.

Noted: That the Chair invited expressions of interest in the role of Deputy Chair from amongst the lay membership of the Board of Governors. Members in category 2 were asked to notify the Chair, the Registrar, Secretary and COO, or the Deputy Secretary, of their interest by the end of April 2012, in order to be considered.

(2) Update on recent HEFCE analysis of UCAS statistics and the HEFCE Grant Letter

Reported: That the Chair provided the Board with an update on the UCAS position, as recently reported to the HEFCE Board. In broad terms, the decline in applications of 7.4% was highlighted, with the greater proportion of this decrease from applicants above the age of 18. Applicants from within the UK, and the EU had also fallen by 8.7% and 11.2% respectively, but applicants from Overseas had increased by 13.7%, suggesting that demand for UK higher education from Hong Kong, Malaysia and the Middle East remained strong. In terms of the HEFCE Grant Letter, overall support for teaching would continue through the transfer to increased fees and therefore the Teaching element of the HEFCE Grant would reduce accordingly. HEFCE would continue to provide support for strategically important subjects, smaller institutions, higher cost subjects, and it also remained committed to widening participation. HEFCE had also sought to recognise the importance of postgraduate provision, and would provide additional funding for taught postgraduate students, who are not eligible for publicly funded tuition fee loans. The overall budget HEFCE had set for the 2012-13 academic year was £5,311 million. This was lower than the 2012-13 financial year total because it incorporated some of the further reductions arising in the 2013-14 financial year. The HEFCE Board had agreed that the total funding for research would be £1,558 million, and agreed that activity with a quality rating of 2* (two star) in the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise should no longer be counted towards mainstream quality-related (QR) funding. This would release £35 million which would be used to increase the funding provided to support research degree programme supervision.

Noted: That following the government's decision to postpone bringing forward the Higher Education Bill at this time, the scale of further changes within the funding system and the sector, remained uncertain. However, within the sector it had been noted that an increased role for private providers did not necessarily depend upon the introduction of additional legislation.

(3) The Effectiveness of the Governing Body

Reported: That in autumn 2011, the University commissioned an independent review of the effectiveness of its governing body. This was in accordance with best practice as recommended in the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) Code of Governance. The last review, conducted internally, was in 2005. The review was undertaken by Dr David Fletcher, a higher education consultant and former Registrar and Secretary of the University of Sheffield and former Secretary of the Committee of University Chairs (CUC). Dr Fletcher assessed the responses from board members to a questionnaire, and conducted a series of one-to-one and group interviews to further examine those responses.

Noted:

- (a) That in respect of the Nominations Committee, and after eight years of its operation, it was agreed that a review of its operation was warranted. Sir John Kerr, the Pro-Chancellor and Chair of the Nominations Committee, had identified an error in the Report in relation to its current operation, as it was not the case that Board Members were nominated to the General Assembly prior to joining the Board. However, the Pro-Chancellor agreed with the recommendation for a review and also expressed his willingness to participate in this process.
- (b) That members noted that the full implementation of some of the recommendations would have consequences for the balance of the relationship between the executive and the governors and the time commitment of the governors.
- (c) That the recommendation concerning the appointment, rather than election, of Senate members, via the Nominations Committee was not universally accepted, and would clearly require further consultation if it was to be considered further.
- (d) That there was some support for recommendation 2, which suggested that the Board should discuss, with advice from the Nominations Committee, its skills matrix with a view to identifying gaps and fully utilising the expertise and networks of its membership.
- (e) That the key points arising from the Report concerned the Board's consideration of strategic issues, its role in monitoring performance, and in holding the executive to account. The implementation of the Report should seek to strengthen and enhance these areas where possible.
- (f) That the time demand on Board members, and in particular its lay members, was already significant, and that adding to this considerable burden would be very difficult. Therefore, the Board and University, in implementing the Report, might usefully focus on ways in which time could be released from more routine considerations to allow a greater focus on strategic concerns.
- (g) That some members emphasised the importance of the Board's visibility and specifically, recommendation 14, and that the debate on fees in March 2011 was a demonstration of where this had previously worked well. The Board and University should therefore continue to seek to raise the profile of the Board and increase its visibility across the University and with the University's stakeholders.
- (h) That the Review of governing body effectiveness was intended to assess the processes and procedures of the Board against the level of the CUC Code, ensure that assurances could be provided with confidence, and to seek to challenge the Board to be more effective in its behaviours and operation.

Resolved: That a paper building on the Board's outline discussion of the Report would be presented at a session within the forthcoming Planning and Accountability Conference.

6. Secretary's report

Reported: The Board of Governors was asked to approve minor revisions to The University of Manchester Innovation Group's (UMI3) Limited Document Sign-Off Process.

Noted: That the document had been brought forward in consultation with the Innovation Group the Research Office, and reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel. The revisions in the document concerned the change in the name of the principal business (from UMIP to UMI3), and the clarification of responsibilities under Section 5: Research and Other Collaboration Agreements arising from projects managed by UMI3.

Resolved: The revisions were approved.

7. President and Vice-Chancellor's report

(1) The Report of the President and Vice-Chancellor to the Board of Governors

Reported:

- (i) That the 2011 round of Annual Performance Reviews (APRs), which was completed in December, had been effective in mapping areas of good practice and poor performance across the University, and in providing a basis for evaluating performance against the key priorities identified in the strategic and operational plans of the activity centres concerned. The APR process forms the basis of the annual Stock Take Report, which would be presented to the Planning and Accountability Conferences early in each calendar year. The 2012 conference would be dominated by consideration of the new Strategic Plan along with substantive discussion on the steps to improve the student experience and of preparations for the REF, which remain the University's major immediate challenges.
- (ii) That that the Manchester Strategic Vision 2020 had been adopted, and the next stage would be the development of a strategic plan in support of the vision. The Strategic Plan will focus on the key strategies and actions required over the next 3-5 years to make the Strategic Vision a reality. There will continue to be three Core Goals (as in the Strategic Vision) but the development of a new Strategic Plan provides an opportunity for reflection about the structure of the rest of the plan, particularly the Enabling Goals. There will also be Key Performance Indicators as appropriate. The Strategic Plan will be supported by strategies for each of the three Core Goals and a series of other underpinning Strategies, many of which have already been developed or are being updated, including the Estates Strategy, People Strategy and IT Strategy. Following discussion at the Board of Governors Conference in March 2012, it was the intention to finalise the Strategic Plan in May 2012.
- (iii) That as reported previously, realising the University's 2020 ambitions would demand significant investment and a major change in performance in order to differentiate the University from many other excellent universities in the UK and overseas. As part of the University's ongoing commitment to maintaining its strategic momentum it launched a number of major initiatives to meet its ambitions for Manchester 2020. Most of these investments focus primarily on people - students and staff. The re-investment of significant revenue funds to enhance the estate and secure state-of-the-art equipment for both teaching and research was vital.
- (iv) That throughout the 2011 admissions cycle the focus had been to maximise the quality of the student intake and the associated fee income, and to improve the student experience. In November 2011, early indications suggested positive student recruitment outcomes for 2011 against targets. The Higher Education Students Early Statistics Survey (HESES) Return submitted in December showed that home/EU full-time undergraduate student registrations were 22,206 against a target of 22,106 and that first year home/EU intake was 6,627 against a target of 6,657. The University exceeded both its home/EU PGT target of 2,156 by 7 and its home/EUPGR target of 1,895 by 116. The University had another strong year in the recruitment of international students and significantly exceeded its UG international target of 4,151 with a total of 4,381. The PGT and PGR international targets were both missed by relatively small amounts, with 2,929 PGT students against a target of 3,021 and 1,149 PGR against a target of 1,184. The University had exceeded its overall international target of 8,356 by c100 and in doing so became the first University in the UK to have over 8,000 full fee paying international students on its campus.
- (v) That the University remained focussed on the recruitment for the 2012 intake as changes to the financing of home undergraduates were likely to have an impact on which and how many students decide to go to university and their subject choices. The President and Vice-Chancellor expressed concern about the impact on the significant proportion of students recruited from less privileged backgrounds. To-date, the total number of UG applications to the University had decreased by 11%, from 40,751 to

36,448. Worryingly, home/EU UG applications had decreased by 13%, from 35,052 to 30,359; however International UG applications had increased by 7% from 5,699 to 6,089. It was a concern that University's home UG applications, to-date, have suffered a greater decrease than the sector as a whole. While it was accepted that this is an unusual year with the introduction of the new student fee regime, the Intake Management Group, Chaired by the Vice President for Teaching, Learning and Students, was monitoring the situation closely. PGT applications had increased overall by 3% from 13,020 to 13,455. This increase was due to the rise in international PGT applications by 13% from 10,471 to 11,788. The ability to deliver continued growth in International student numbers was subject to influence by external factors and the University's ability to be responsive to changes in UKBA Tier 4 policies and processes. Home/EU PGT applications have declined considerably by -35% reflecting economic factors and uncertainty about further personal investment in PGT. PGR applications to Manchester had increased by 33% from 1,507 to 2,007 on the same time last year. Home/EU PGR applications had increased by 54% from 423 to 653 and international PGR applications had increased by 25% from 1,084 to 1,354.

- (vi) That for the past three years, the University had been working to HEFCE student number controls as part of the Government's policy to limit the total number of Home/EU full-time undergraduate students applying for student support. However, HEFCE had issued some important changes to how the Student Number Control (SNC) for 2012 would be calculated which further complicates the 2012 recruitment round. For 2012-13, the SNC will reduce dramatically as students achieving AAB+ or equivalent are removed from the controls and the SNC is further reduced to allow for the redistribution of 20,000 places to institutions charging less than £7,500 in fees. Although the University has calculated an assumed SNC, the actual SNC will not be confirmed until late February 2012, which is well into the recruitment cycle for 2012. A detailed definition of AAB+ or equivalent qualifications is available (though we have ongoing concerns over omissions from the equivalent qualifications) – any student without the qualifications listed will count towards the SNC. As part of the OFFA Agreement, the University has agreed to recruit target percentages of intake (young full-time UG) from low participation neighbourhoods and from lower socio-economic Groups). While it is not the intention that formal Fair Access targets are calculated and disaggregated to Faculties and Schools as part of the 2012 recruitment process, Schools will have to monitor this aspect of recruitment and ensure they are maximising opportunities to recruit students from WP backgrounds. Since the 2011/12 entry cycle contextual data has been provided automatically in Campus Solutions as part of the admissions process. This is helping to flag up WP students to admissions decision-makers for additional consideration. It is crucial that all staff involved in admissions use these tools. While many students from LPN or NS-SEC backgrounds enter with AAB+ qualifications, the School SNC limit will also be an important tool for managing and hopefully improving the WP profile of 2012 entry. In all cases, the number of WP students, including from NS-SEC backgrounds are lower than the SNC limit for an individual School, so it is in theory feasible (though not easy) for Schools to manage the different requirements. The University recognised that the 2012 recruitment process needed careful managing. The policy was to maintain quality above quantity, but also to maintain the University's commitment to widening participation.
- (vii) That following endorsement by the Senate and the Board of the new structure for the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences attention had turned to its implementation. *Agendum 8* provides detailed proposals for the implementation of the new structure.
- (viii) That the report by Lord Woolf about London School of Economics' links with Libya was published at the end of November. In asking Lord Woolf to undertake his independent review, the LSE requested that he also make recommendations on guidelines for international donations and links. Aside from implications for the acceptance/rejection of gifts and donations, the report's recommendations highlight the importance of having policies and procedures in place, particularly in the following areas:
- The selection and progression of students
 - Dealing with ethics more widely and reputational risk.

The report addressed events and decisions taken at the LSE, but could have much wider ranging implications. The University of Manchester already had in place a policy covering donations and ethics which was approved and implemented in 2006. The University had recently reviewed these guidelines and would update draft guidelines ready for consideration and approval after checking against any recommendations contained within the Woolf Report. The University also had a policy in place for Socially Responsible Investment, and in relation to ethics, the University had a significant and detailed ethical framework in place for its research activities. This included:

1. The University's Code of Good Research Practice
2. The University's Research Ethics Committee Guidance
3. A set of FAQ on Research Ethics.

The University's ethics review structure includes five independent research ethics committees (RECs) composed of membership that represents virtually all academic Schools. The committees also have a few external lay and expert members. At School level, there are panels or other processes to review which projects require ethics approval. More broadly than this our existing 2015 and its successor 2020 Vision, details the University's Values. This specifically includes a commitment to "Exemplary ethical standards in relation to all our activities and objectives". Thus while the University has a range of policies for dealing with donations and potentially sensitive relationships, along with other universities, this will be reviewed in the light of the LSE's experience. The Registrar, Secretary/ Chief Operating Officer was considering whether the other recommendations made by the Woolf report to LSE have any implications for Manchester.

Noted: That previously, the Board of Governors had granted approval for the continuation of the ERVS scheme within the areas of Business Engagement, the Directorate for the Student Experience and the IT Services Directorate, in order to allow staff within those areas to take advantage of the scheme, on the terms previously offered during the 2011 scheme, whilst restructuring was underway. The Board was now asked, to extend the offer, on the same terms, to those staff members affected by the implementation of the recommendations of the Review of Research Finance and Administration (RoRFA), as the area should have been included within the extension previously requested. The University would continue to be selective in approving applications from staff members eligible to take up ERVS, noting the concerns expressed by some staff representatives about the potential loss of skilled staff through the scheme.

Resolved: That the Board of Governors agreed that the terms of the 2011 ERVS scheme should also be offered to staff members directly affected by the restructuring arising from the implementation of the Review of Research Finance and Administration (RoRFA).

(2) Compliance and Risk Management, including presentation of Accident Statistics for Q4 2011 and the Health and Safety Minutes of 19 December 2011

Reported:

- (a) That a review of the Health and Safety procedure was underway, and it was anticipated that a new procedure would be introduced from September 2012. An update will be brought forward for a future meeting.
- (b) That an assessment of near misses and near miss reporting will be undertaken at the year end. There remained concerns that the volume of near-miss reporting was not at the level that might be expected, but that nonetheless, an analysis of those reported was providing useful information.
- (c) That work on the Coggan Review was continuing under the oversight of the Health and Safety Committee, with the analysis of waste and the mercury monitoring work concluded with no issues raised.

- (d) That induction and e-training would be important elements of the Health and Safety training provided to staff and research students.

Noted: That the University may wish to retain 3 day reporting, rather than 7, under RIDDOR, as this would be helpful in terms of making comparisons year-on-year.

(3) Report to the Board of Governors on exercise of delegations

Reported:

- (a) Professorial appointments

The following appointments have been approved on behalf of Senate and the Board of Governors:

Ad Personam Promotional Chair

Dr Andrew Russell in the School of Social Sciences, from Senior Lecture to Professor of Politics.

- (b) Award of the title Professor Emeritus

That acting on behalf of Senate and the Board of Governors, the President and Vice-Chancellor approved the conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus/a on the following:

Professor Jonathan Conner, with effect from 31 December 2011.

Professor Robert Cottis, with effect from 1 October 2011

Professor Michael Moore, with effect from 1 October 2011

- (c) Extensions of terms of office (Head of School)

That acting on behalf of Senate and the Board of Governors, the President and Vice-Chancellor approved the extension of terms of office for the following Heads of School:

Professor Simon Guy in the School of Environment and Development from 1 August 2012 to 31 July 2014.

Professor Fiona Devine in the School of Social Sciences from 1 August 2012 to 31 July 2014.

Professor Kersti Borjars in the School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures, from 1 January 2012 to 31 July 2012.

- (d) Appointment of Head of School

That acting on behalf of Senate and the Board of Governors, the President and Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following as Head of School:

Professor Paul O' Brien as acting Head in the School of Materials, for a period of 12 months with effect from 1 December 2011.

- (e) The Brotherton Collection Advisory Committee

That acting on behalf of the University, the Chancellor has appointed the following as the University's representative on the Brotherton Collection Advisory Committee at the University of Leeds:

Ms Rachel Beckett, Head of Special Collections.

- (f) Seal Orders

That pursuant to General Regulation VII.4, the Common Seal of the University had been affixed to instruments recorded in entries no 1102 – 1136 (seal order books 2-3)

8. Structure for the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences

Received:

- (1) A paper on the implementation of the agreed structure for the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences.
- (2) The recommendation that a limited ERVS scheme be opened to academic staff members within the Faculty as part of the structure's implementation.

Reported:

- (a) That following a strategic review, an extensive consultation process with staff within the Faculty and external partners had taken place over the summer months of 2011 and resulted in widespread support for a new structure for the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences as an enabler for transforming the profile of the Faculty in research and education. However it had been recognised that while structural change was important, it would not be sufficient to deliver the full scope of the University's ambitions in this area. Work had since been underway to assess the options for implementation and the timescale required to effect the changes required to secure the momentum that exists and to begin delivering on these ambitions.
- (b) That new investment in strategically important posts and a redistribution of existing resource were required to make the new structure successful. An investment of £25 million over 5 years (i.e. equivalent to £5 million per annum staff costs) from a combination of Faculty funds (£2.5 million per annum) and the University's SIRF (£2.5 million per annum) has been agreed and the Faculty's search and recruitment exercise was underway.
- (c) That a working group had been established to consider the options for implementation of a major improvement in performance in medicine chaired by Professor Colin Bailey, Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences. The group included Professor Ian Jacobs, Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences (FMHS); Kay Day, Head of Faculty Administration for FMHS; Sinead Hesp, Employment Lawyer; Mike Shore-Nye, Director of Change Management and Process Improvement and Karen Heaton, Director of Human Resources. The group had met on a number of occasions to discuss a range of possible options to implement a transformational change programme and carefully considered the strategic, operational, financial and legal impacts of each.
- (d) That a recommendation was then presented to the Senior Leadership Team and subsequently approved. The preferred option was to proceed to populate the new Faculty Institutes and to actively manage improvements in performance through a clearly defined and managed process. This option allowed the new structure as agreed to move forward quickly in allocating staff to an appropriate Faculty Institute, and allowed the investment in new staff to take place at the same time. The process involved a supportive and robust performance management process, with every individual member of staff undergoing a performance and development review set against clear goals and assessment criteria for research and teaching. The emphasis would be on achieving continuous improvement in performance whilst also managing below standard performance. This exercise involves over 350 members of staff. For some staff this provided the opportunity to reinforce their high level of performance and to make sure they have the necessary resources to support them to continue to achieve. For other staff the key message would be around performing well with potential to improve. Again the aim would be to highlight areas of potential and to offer the relevant support, for example, mentoring. It was anticipated that there would be a number of staff, yet to be determined, who do not currently meet the profile required and that these staff would be set clear objectives and targets and managed through a fair and robust performance management process using existing University frameworks.

It was acknowledged that this would not be without challenges and the focus would therefore be on improvement and in supporting those individuals who have potential and those whose performance falls short of the standard required with an identified mentor. This route will involve identifying the managers to lead this process and ensure they are trained and supported. It will also demand temporary investment in the Human Resources Directorate, as Human Resources personnel will support managers undertaking the performance management role at each stage.

- (e) That the Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty had set a target of 31st July 2012 for the completion of the new structure affecting academics. This was necessary to secure the momentum that currently exists and to start delivering on the ambitions for the Faculty. The performance management process will begin in May 2012, taking up to 2 years to complete. Three interim Directors of the Faculty Institutes had been appointed and advertisements for the remaining three were due to be placed externally in addition to the use of a search consultant.
- (f) That built into the implementation plan was a communication strategy to provide consistency of message. This would be important within FMHS to ensure the key messages are conveyed at the same time to all affected staff and that external stakeholders are effectively managed through the process. Members of the Board of Governors would be provided with key messages to use when representing the University. Maintaining a good working relationship and a dialogue with the campus trade unions throughout this exercise would contribute to the effective implementation of the transformational change.
- (g) That the ERVS Scheme 2011 closed on 30th September 2011, except for limited identified ring-fenced areas of the University where staff were about to undergo or were in the process of a restructure. FMHS was not identified at the time as it did not meet this criterion. Reopening the ERVS scheme for academic only staff in FMHS would significantly aid the performance management process and have a positive impact on embedding the new structure and strategy. The scheme launched in 2011 had very good terms which were required to provide an attractive package for staff to realistically consider. Furthermore the scheme has been through a consultation process and extending its availability to academic staff within MHS would therefore be expeditious from a practical point of view, avoiding unnecessary delays.

Resolved: That the Board of Governors approved the recommendation that the ERVS scheme should be made available to those academic staff affected by the implementation of the agreed structure for the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences.

9. Report from the University Students' Union Relations Committee

Received:

- (1) Minutes of the first meeting of the University Union Relations Committee (UURC) held on Friday 27th January 2012.
- (2) A revised constitution for approval by the Board of Governors.

Noted:

- (a) That the Union's attempts to introduce a revised constitution in the previous year were unsuccessful. Subsequently, the Board of Governors (at the meeting on 3 October 2011) approved a scheme amending the constitution of the Student's Union that provided two new ways to call a referendum, and a lower quorum for any referendum duly called under this process.
- (b) That the constitution presented by the Union had been endorsed by the student body through such a referendum, and is therefore now in a form which can be enacted, with immediate effect.

- (c) That the Constitution presented for approval was consistent with the Articles of Governance previously approved, in principle, by the Board of Governors in July 2011.
- (d) That the University would continue to work with the Student's Union towards incorporation, and on the transfer of the articles of governance within the Memorandum and Articles of the company limited by guarantee. The approval of the Board of Governors would be sought, at the appropriate point or points, within this process.
- (e) That through this process the UURC would ensure that the bye-laws developed by the Union were consistent with the obligations and responsibilities contained within the constitution.

Resolved: That the Board of Governors approved the constitution of the Students' Union in the form as presented.

10. Board committee reports

(1) Finance Committee

Received: An executive summary and minutes from the meeting of the Finance Committee held on 23 January 2012, including the management accounts for the period ended 30 November 2011.

Noted:

- (a) That the Committee had received an updated on the capital programme and noted the progress that had been made and that there were no financial risks associated with these projects at this time.
- (b) That Bruntwood had been selected as the preferred partner to facilitate the redevelopment of MBS and the Precinct Centre.
- (c) That in order to facilitate the rationalisation and restructure of the University's endowments, the Committee resolved to recommend for approval by the Board of Governors to give delegated authority to the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer or the President or the Chair of the Board of Governors to sign any resolutions or other documents required to be submitted to the Charity Commission as part of the restructure of the endowments. (The initial phase of the project relates to endowments to the Museum and Whitworth Art Gallery).
- (d) That the Committee approved a banking mandate with the University's new bankers, National Westminster Bank plc (RBS).
- (e) That the Committee noted the management accounts for November 2011 at the meeting.

Resolved: That the Board of Governors approved the delegation of authority to the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer or the President or the Chair of the Board of Governors to sign any resolutions or other documents required to be submitted to the Charity Commission as part of the restructure of the endowments.

(2) Audit Committee

Received: An executive summary and minutes from the meeting of the Finance Committee held on 23 January 2012.

Noted:

- (a) That the Audit Committee noted that Bruntwood had been selected as the preferred partner to facilitate the redevelopment of MBS and the Precinct Centre.
- (b) That the Audit Committee received a comprehensive presentation from Dr David Barker, Head of Compliance and Risk, on the management of risk within the University and agreed that the registers and the accompanying institutional risk register would be re-presented to the Audit Committee, before onward transmission to the Board of Governors. The Audit Committee would, in future, receive a copy of the institutional risk register at each meeting of the Committee.
- (c) That the Committee reviewed audits and reviews undertaken by the internal auditors on Asset Management, Data Quality, Fraud Awareness, and of the Travel Management System. Two further follow-up reviews had been completed on the University's web hosting arrangements, and on Employment Status.
- (d) That the Committee received a report from the Director of Finance on the follow-up work conducted in response to the observations noted by the external auditors in the previous year. The Committee noted that Deloitte had been satisfied with the responses received and they had undertaken to assess the follow-up work formally within their report later in the year.
- (e) That the final version of the University's TRAC return was in preparation and would be signed off by the Financial Sustainability Strategy Board prior to the end of January 2012, to allow submission to HEFCE. The Audit Committee would receive a copy and an accompanying report on the compilation of the return in May 2012.

(3) Staffing Committee

Received: An executive summary and minutes from the meeting of the Finance Committee held on 30 January 2012.

Resolved: To approve the recommendations of the Staffing Committee that:

- (a) The University proceeds with the process outlined in the agreed contracts procedure to deal with those staff considered to be at risk on open ended contracts linked to finite external funding for the period through July to December 2012;
- (b) The University continues to ensure that all suitable and appropriate alternative strategies for resolution.

11. Report from the Senate

Received: A report on the items considered at the meeting of the Senate held on 1 February 2012.

Noted:

- (a) That Student recruitment for 2012 was discussed and concern regarding the decrease in the total number of undergraduate applications was noted. The University's ongoing commitment to maintain quality above quantity, whilst also maintaining our commitment to widening participation, was emphasised.
- (b) That the work being done to review the possible implications of the Woolf report for the University of Manchester was noted.

- (c) That the Vice-President (Teaching, Learning and Students) reported on work being undertaken to: revise the University's undergraduate and postgraduate taught degree regulations; develop a Student Charter; and develop a teaching, learning and student experience strategy. The recommendations of the Employability Working Group were discussed and progress reports received on new mechanisms for unit evaluation questionnaires and the establishment of the University College.
- (d) That the Vice-President (Research and Innovation) presented revisions to the Code of Practice for Dealing with Complaints of Misconduct in research and reported on preparations for the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF).
- (e) That revisions to Regulation VIII Public Interest Disclosure Procedure were also considered.

12. Report from the Planning and Resources Committee

Received: A report on the items considered at the meeting of the Senate held on 1 February 2012.

Noted:

- (a) That the Committee noted that the Annual Accountability Returns 2011 had been submitted to HEFCE by the deadline of 1 December 2011. These included the financial statements, financial forecast for 2011-12 and associated commentary, and the Annual Monitoring Statement. The Committee received the Minutes of the Finance Sub-Committee meetings held on 1 November 2011 and 29 November 2011, and considered the draft management accounts for the period ended 31 October 2011.
- (b) That at its meeting on 6 December 2011, following discussion and noting the Students' Union concern at the proposed minimum home tuition fee proposed for postgraduate taught programmes for 2013-14, the Committee approved the standard (i.e. minimum) fees for international students for 2013-14 and the increase for all non-standard tuition fees for 2013-14. It also agreed that the home tuition fees for taught postgraduate programmes should be increased to £6,300 in 2013-14 and that there should be further investigation of the cost of PGT programmes and how the University might support students in some areas. It also agreed that an institutional fee model for validated arrangements be adopted and agreed the tariff to be applied for 2012-13.
- (c) That the Committee approved the income and expenditure figures in the University's Office for Fair Access (OFFA) Monitoring Report 2010-11, which was subsequently submitted to OFFA and HEFCE by the deadline of 12 January 2012. The Committee also agreed that for the for the 2013-14 Access Agreement (the timescale for which was as yet unknown), a range of options should be provided for it to consider the support that could be provided, measures to attract students including those from low to middle income levels, and the implications for expenditure.
- (d) That at its meeting on 6 December 2011, the Committee received update reports on possible industrial action and on the consultation exercise on the proposed changes to UMSS. It also received the notes of the HR Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 November 2011, and considered a report on the discussion of the HR-related Annual Performance Review (APR) key performance indicators which had taken place at that meeting.
- (e) That the Committee considered the proposed outline structure for the Strategic Plan and the timetable for its progress, including consultation. The Committee also received a provisional indication of student numbers as at 1 December 2011, which were very close to the targets and reflected the planned fall in the number of home undergraduate

students, and noted that the University would be below its HEFCE student number control limit.

- (f) That at its meeting on 6 December 2011, the Committee considered a report on the discussion of Environmental Sustainability-related APR key performance indicators which had taken place at the meeting of Capital Planning Sub-Committee on 18 October 2011.
- (g) That the Committee was informed that The Woolf Inquiry report, An inquiry into the LSE's links with Libya and lessons to be learned, had been published on 30 November 2011, and that The University of Manchester was looking at its process for accepting donations.

13. Any other business

Noted: That the Chair alerted members the programme of informal visits, or Faculty events, that was ongoing. An event had been held within the Faculty of Life Sciences prior to the meeting of the Board, but regrettably, only a small number of members had been able to attend. Members were therefore encouraged to make every effort to attend the future events within the programme.