The University of Manchester

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wednesday, 22 July 2020 (meeting held via video conference)

Present: Mr Edward Astle (in the Chair), President and Vice-Chancellor, Dr John Stageman (Deputy Chair), Prof Claire Alexander, Mrs Ann Barnes, Mr Gary Buxton, Mr Michael Crick, Prof Danielle George, Mr Colin Gillespie, Dr Reinmar Hager, Mr Nick Hillman, Prof Steve Jones, Mr Kwame Kwarteng (General Secretary of UMSU), Mrs Bridget Lea, Dr Neil McArthur, Mr Robin Phillips, Mr Richard Solomons, Mr Andrew Spinoza, Prof Nalin Thakkar, Dr Delia Vazquez, Mrs Alice Webb, and Ms Ros Webster(22)

In attendance: Ms Caroline Johnstone (Board member and Chair of Finance Committee designate), the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer (RSCOO), the Deputy President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Chief Financial Officer, the Interim Director of Finance, the Vice-President, Teaching, Learning and Students (item 1-4), the Director of Planning (items 1-4), the Director of Compliance and Risk (item 7), the Head of Equality, Diversion and Inclusion (item 9), the Associate Vice-President for Learning, Teaching and Students (item 9), Mr Daniel Smith (Deloitte), Mr Martin Chapman (Deloitte) and the Deputy Secretary.

1. Declarations of Interest

Reported: Alice Webb declared that she had been appointed as a Trustee of the Royal Foundation of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge.

2. Minutes

Resolved: The minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2020 were approved as a correct record.

3. Matters arising from the minutes

Noted: an updated report on ongoing issues that had been raised at previous meetings.

4. Dialogue with Sir Michael Barber, Chair of the Office for Students (OfS)

Reported:

(1) Sir Michael Barber had accepted an invitation to attend a Board meeting following correspondence with the Chair of the Board earlier in the academic year. The Board had notified Sir Michael in advance of issues that it wished to raise and these included scale, scope and approach of OfS, reflections on the relationship between the regulator and individual institutions and the agility and responsiveness of OfS.

(2) In his remarks to the Board, Sir Michael reflected on matters where the OfS could have done better, matters where he believed OfS had performed well, areas of likely future focus and areas for longer-term consideration.

(3) Sir Michael noted that, particularly in its early days, the OfS had been too bureaucratic and its approach had not been sufficiently targeted and proportionate. The tone of communications had on occasion been inappropriate and advice and guidance provided could have been clearer (for example, initial guidance in relation to Reportable Events).

(4) However, as a new regulator, Sir Michael noted that OfS had responded well to a previously unregulated market that had changed substantially following the increase in maximum undergraduate tuition fee to £9,000 in 2011 and the removal of the student number cap in 2013. In this context focus had been on unconditional offers, senior staff remuneration and unexplained increases in the proportion of first class degrees. Its approach to regulation had been transparent, with use of persuasion to encourage institutions (for example in situations where there was marked difference from published
data/sector norms). The OfS’s clear focus on access and participation and progression to the labour market was another example of early success.

(5) Further to (3) above, Sir Michael commented that the sector could expect a less bureaucratic, and a more nuanced and proportionate approach (for example, in relation to data requests). OfS would continue to be a strong advocate, inside and outside government and abroad, for the value of UK higher education. As noted in his recent exchange of letters with the Secretary of State, before he stepped down from the role of Chair in March 2021, Sir Michael would consider measures to enhance the quality of online delivery.

(6) Sir Michael noted that Manchester was an exemplar of a globally connected university with a world class reputation and encouraged the University and the Board to reflect on how it could maintain that position in the challenging circumstances of a post-Brexit and post-Covid world. It was also important to ensure that there was general appreciation of the significant contribution the sector and the University specifically was making to society, industry and the economy to guard against any potential populist reaction against the sector. Finally, and developing one of the themes explored in (5) above, there was now a real opportunity to reflect on optimal delivery of digital teaching and learning.

Noted:

(1) The University was cognisant of the need to demonstrate the value of higher education to society and its wider impact.

(2) In response to questions about the balance between regulation and protection of institutional autonomy, Sir Michael reiterated the OfS’ persuasive and transparent approach to regulation and the importance of institutions understanding and accepting responsibility for decisions made.

(3) In response to a question about reliance on international students, Sir Michael noted the importance of avoiding over-reliance on any one country; there was recognition that unless the current research funding model was altered, research intensive institutions like Manchester would continue to be dependent on significant international recruitment.

(4) Regarding a question about the recent consultation on the temporary additional registration condition, Sir Michael noted that this had been introduced in response to behaviour by a significant minority of institutions in relation to unconditional offers. The introduction of the consultation meant that this behaviour had ceased and the potential retrospective application of the condition had therefore not been necessary. After consultation, OfS had confirmed the temporary nature of the condition (lasting until 30 September 2021).

(5) Sir Michael reiterated that, notwithstanding recent government pronouncements, the OfS Board remained committed to the Access and Participation Plan as a key element of the OfS Regulatory Framework and as a major contributory factor in improving social mobility.

(6) In response to a question, Sir Michael noted that international students (along with postgraduate students) had not been a primary focus of OfS to date, but would become so as the regulator matured.

(7) In relation to measurement of quality, Sir Michael noted that OfS largely relied on proxy measures (e.g. continuation rates, NSS comments and scores, student destinations) and that this was preferable to a more intrusive inspection regime. Noting that the bar in relation to the above was currently relatively low, Sir Michael noted potential future consultation on raising this bar.

(8) Sir Michael noted that as a regulator, the role of OfS was different to its predecessor, HEFCE, but there was potential for OfS to contribute to sector enhancement by encouraging collaboration and disseminating good practice (and in this context, he cited the funding of the Centre for Transforming Student Access and Student Outcomes in Higher Education, TASO).

(9) Noting Sir Michael’s focus on enhancing the quality of online delivery, both Prof April McMahon as the Vice-President for Teaching, Learning and Students and Board member Prof Danielle George, as Associate Vice-President for Teaching, Learning and Students, would be very happy to assist in this work. This would include for example, enabling clearer definition and shared understanding of terms such as online, blended and flexible learning.
In response to a question, Sir Michael emphasised OFS’ commitment to the humanities (as exemplified by support for small and specialist institutions).

Responding to a question about likely future size and shape of the sector, Sir Michael commented on the overdue increased financial commitment to further education and potential increased permeability of the boundary between the higher education and further education sectors. Whilst increased stratification was a potential outcome, this should not be at the expense of increased social segregation.

On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked Sir Michael for his attendance and contribution to the meeting. Whilst recognising the significant challenge of establishing a new regulator, the Board welcomed Sir Michael’s reflections on lessons learned and encouraged the less bureaucratic and more nuanced approach to regulation outlined by Sir Michael. Generally, the Chair encouraged OfS to reflect on matters requiring Board sign off to ensure adoption of a proportionate approach.

5. President and Vice-Chancellor’s report

   Received: the report from the President and Vice-Chancellor.

   Reported:

   (1) There had been regular updates to the Board since the previous meeting, most recently on 3 July 2020 and these had been supplemented by briefings of committee chairs.

   (2) There continued to be considerable uncertainty in relation to student recruitment; whilst applications showed a significant increase against the corresponding time last year, the extent of deferrals was uncertain and there were 25% fewer accommodation applications compared to last year. The increasingly volatile geopolitical environment in relation to China was a further cause of uncertainty.

   (3) Extensive preparations were being made for both the start of the new academic year and to facilitate international student arrival, including liaison with airlines.

   (4) The University’s overall National Student Survey score was 81%, which was disappointing as it was below the sector average of 83%; the result had undoubtedly been impacted by the pandemic and earlier industrial action. There was variability in local performance, which was being analysed.

   (5) 640 applications for voluntary severance had been received, the majority from Professional Services staff.

   Noted:

   (1) In response to questions, it was difficult to predict the impact of the current political tensions with China, although it was possible that it would result in a further downturn in student admissions.

   (2) Recent ministerial statements and the recently announced government supported restructuring scheme were an indication of government concerns with perceived poor value of courses, senior staff remuneration and freedom of speech. In relation to events involving controversial speakers, the experience of the University and the sector more generally was that permission for events was rarely refused and it was important to document this.

   (3) In response to a question on the recent Sunday Times article about the impact of a decline in international recruitment on universities, including Manchester, there had been little follow-up (other than an article in the Manchester Evening News). The article contrasted with a recent Institute for Fiscal Studies report which noted that thirteen (unnamed) institutions in a financially difficult position before the pandemic were the most likely to be adversely impacted.

6. Budget

   Received: a report summarising the financial response to the Covid 19 crisis and the development of the 2020-21 budget (including underlying assumptions), following consideration by Finance Committee at its meeting on 17 July 2020.
Reported:

(1) Outturn for 2019-20 was better than originally forecast, given restrictions on expenditure (some of which was deferred); the final position would be determined once the volume of agreed Voluntary Severance applications was known.

(2) The initial draft budget for 2020-21 had been predicated on cost savings in Professional Services to improve efficiency and plans to deliver these had not been fully realised when the Covid-19 crisis hit.

(3) As previously reported, the greatest uncertainty was in relation to student recruitment, particularly for international students (and as noted above this was potentially exacerbated by the deteriorating geopolitical situation). The report outlined scenario planning based on different potential outcomes and the impact on income, level of deficit and borrowing requirement to meet liquidity targets.

(4) The latest version of the budget (which had been scrutinised rigorously by Finance Committee) indicated an expected deficit of £81.7 million in 2020-21, which reflected time needed to deliver anticipated pay savings, a re-estimate of the amount of non-pay savings that can be delivered and some additional adjustments to other revenue.

(5) Work would continue to develop strategic and structural cost savings in the early part of 2020-21, noting that some of the measures identified in the latest version of the budget were relatively time-limited.

Noted:

(1) In response to a question, whilst the University had not discounted exploration of shared services in the future (assuming that any current VAT limitations could be addressed) it was focusing on measures to achieve internal efficiencies and develop a more effective operational model.

(2) In its approach to Voluntary Severance, the University was endeavouring to be as strategic as possible and ensure that key institutional capability was not undermined. The extent of further required measures would be determined once the position regarding student recruitment and the consequential scale of the financial gap (and impact on different parts of the institution) was clearer.

(3) The Chair of the local Universities and Colleges Union (UCU) branch had written to the Chair of the Board setting out UCU concerns about aspects of the University’s approach to the crisis, and this communication had been circulated to Board members. The Board recognised that the University, along with the rest of the sector, was facing significant financial challenges as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and was very supportive of the extensive actions taken by the Senior Leadership Team to mitigate financial losses and develop contingency plans for dealing with greater reduction in income. These actions were focused on reducing non-pay costs, introducing voluntary pay and severance measures and protecting jobs.

(4) However, the Board accepted that, given the scale of the financial impact, significant job losses may, regrettably, be an essential response in order to maintain the core mission and financial sustainability of the University.

(5) The Board recognised and was very appreciative of the impressive way in which colleagues across the institution had responded to the impact of Covid-19 and encouraged UCU and other recognised trade unions to maintain constructive engagement with University management.
Resolved:

(1) To approve the pay cost and other operating expenditure budget as set out in the latest version of the budget, in order to contain expenditure in the very short term and allow clear limits to be set and enforced. (A final budget and three year plan would be presented to the November 2020 meeting once there was clarity on student numbers)

(2) To continue existing initiatives to reduce costs, along with the creation of a detailed plan (underpinning the final budget and plan referred to in (1) above) to deliver strategic and structural cost savings (these will be achieved through process re-engineering, delivering a sustainable business model to support the University going forward, with the plan to be available by December 2020).

(3) That a plan to match the academic shape of the University to future student demand be created once the longer-term impact of the pandemic was clearer (this should be available by June 2021).

7. Risk Register

Resolved: to defer consideration of the revised Risk Register until the next meeting of the Board on 4 September 2020 and in the meantime to invite comments from members on both content and format.

Action: Deputy Secretary
8. **Report from Critical Friend/Trusted Advisor**

*Received:* a report from Deloitte, who had been appointed to provide advice and support to the Senior Leadership Team in the development and delivery of financial and operational strategy in response to the unprecedented circumstances created by the Covid-19 pandemic. Deloitte was acting as a trusted advisor and critical friend to the Senior Leadership Team and was providing an additional source of reassurance for the Board.

*Reported:*

1. Deloitte had focused on seven work areas (stakeholder engagement and communication, programme management and governance, human resources, cost reduction, student experience, campus re-opening and debt structure) and in each area had identified areas that were working well, priority areas to focus on and matters to reflect on. The work had been carried out at pace in a relatively short time frame.
2. The report noted that the University had recognised the scale of challenge and had responded promptly but significant risks and uncertainties remained (including execution risk). The report further encouraged the University to reduce complexity whilst increasing oversight, undertake broader scenario planning across a range of key areas, achieve broader stakeholder engagement and “buy-in”, add expertise and capacity in some key areas (e.g. human resources and programme management) and ensure that the tactical and recovery response to the crisis underpinned longer-term strategic change.

*Noted:*

1. Whilst the report had identified areas for improvement and future focus, it had not revealed any unexpected or surprising results. Along with the Board, the Senior Leadership Team had received the report shortly before the meeting and would need time to reflect on it more fully.
2. The comment from a number of members that the report was a helpful source of further assurance to the Board.
3. Production of the report was one element of Deloitte’s engagement as trusted advisor and critical friend, which had been commissioned at a competitive rate.
4. In light of the observations in the report, it was important to reflect on organisational capacity and capability (noting that this was an area being addressed by the Deans and Policy Vice-Presidents).
5. In comparison to the HE sector, the University’s response had been relatively swift, although generally the private sector had responded much more quickly (for example taking advantage of financial facilities before the hardening of the credit market) and in this context, there was potential to benefit from the experience of Deloitte’s wider network of clients.
6. The importance of stakeholder engagement, communication and dialogue, noting the challenges of the current environment.
7. The increased importance of agility and flexibility, which was being facilitated in Professional Services by the establishment of a Staff Deployment Group to enable the movement of staff to priority areas.
8. Deloitte would reflect on feedback from the Board and Senior Leadership Team, working with the RSCOO to determine next steps.  

**Action:** RSCOO/Deputy Secretary

9. **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Update**

*Received:* the annual Board equality, diversity and inclusion update (which included reference to the 2020 Equality Information Report) and provided the latest key staff and student equality data covering all protected characteristics at the University.

*Reported:*

1. The University’s current strategic plan included key performance indicators relating to annual increases in senior appointments of women and BAME staff at senior level until they are representative of relevant benchmark pools or profiles.
(2) The proportion of women among senior academics had increased from 24.7% in 2011 to 31.5% in 2019; the proportion of women among professors had increased from 18.9% in 2011 to 26.1% in 2019. The proportion of Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) staff among senior academics had increased from 9.0% in 2011 to 11.7% in 2019: the proportion of BAME staff among Professors had increased from 7.9% in 2011 to 10.3% in 2019. The proportion of women among senior Professional Services (PS) staff (Grade 6 and above) had increased from 49.3% in 2011 to 54% in 2019. The proportion of BAME staff among senior PS staff had increased from 6.4% in 2011 to 9.3% in 2019.

(3) The report contained the latest Gender and Ethnicity Pay Gap information, noting that 2020 data had not yet been published. The data indicated that the University had one of the narrowest pay gaps among the Russell Group (sixth on mean and fifth on median).

(4) The undergraduate student population consisted of 55% women and there had been an increase in the proportion of women since 2017-18 and in each of the last five years, there had been more undergraduate women than men. 32% of UK domicile undergraduate students were BAME, an increase of 4.8% over the past five years; the largest represented BAME group was Asian (18.6% of the undergraduate student population). 10.3% of all undergraduate students had a declared disability, an increase of 1.3% since 2015-16 and the majority of disabled students reported learning difficulties and mental health conditions.

(5) In relation to Access and Participation Plan (APP) targets, the OfS published data for 2018-19 showed that the ratio between the most and the least disadvantaged students increased. Whilst this was disappointing, measures to address gaps in the APP would not have been in place for those students. Internal data for 2019-20 showed that progress was being made against target and that the University had already matched its 2021-22 milestone target.

(6) Over the past few months, work had focused on equality issues related to the pandemic and responding to the “Black Lives Matter” movement (the latter included the establishment of a Rapid Response Group). In relation to the pandemic, equality impact assessment analysis of voluntary severance applications and staff coming to the end of fixed term contracts (noting the diversity of the latter group) was being undertaken.

(7) A new Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Governance Group had been established to provide leadership and strategic direction on EDI across the University, reporting to Human Resources Sub-Committee. Three members of SLT were on the Group, which also included academic leads for race, gender and disability. More recently, there had been discussions with Board Apprentice, an organisation focused on allowing BAME individuals to shadow Board members to gain Board level experience and facilitate progression to Board appointments.

(8) Numerous actions were being taken to address differential student outcomes. These included the establishment of Task and Finish Groups overseen by the Manchester Institute of Teaching and Learning in relation to assessment (including on-line assessment), curriculum, academic advising and transition and induction (student co-creation was a feature of all these groups).

Noted:

(1) Understanding of data at a more granular level was important and a summary of this data this would be presented to the Board at a future meeting. **Action: Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion**

(2) The comment that, although the report highlighted encouraging and commendable activity, progress in some areas was still disappointingly slow. In the past year, there had been discussion with a number of members about how to effect further and more rapid progress and there was encouragement for these discussions to continue. **Action: RSCOO/Deputy Secretary**

(3) A recent seminar on Board diversity attended by a number of members had highlighted the potential to learn from sectors and organisations that had made greater progress. **Action: RSCOO/Deputy Secretary**

(4) Encouragement to pursue participation in the Board Apprentice scheme (noting the potential to use Board committees and subsidiaries for this purpose, and for it to include external Board opportunities for University BAME staff). **Action: Deputy Secretary**

(5) Despite budget challenges as outlined under earlier items, progress in this area and achievement of next steps as outlined in the report should be seen as a priority.

10. Board committee reports

   (i) **Finance Committee** (17 June and 17 July 2020)
Received: a summary of the meetings of Finance Committee held on 17 June and 17 July 2020.

Reported: in addition to matters covered under item 6 above:

(1) Approval of the formation of Manchester Graphene Company as a new subsidiary, and the winding up of the current vehicle, Graphene Enabled Systems Ltd.
(2) The Committee had considered progress on unlocking and restructuring of endowment funds.
(3) Approval of both extension of a loan to North West E Health until September 2020 and the University selling its shares in the UMIP Premier Fund.

(ii) Audit and Risk Committee (8 June 2020)

Received: a summary of the meeting held on 8 June 2020.

Reported:

(1) The Committee had received an update on satellite entities, with a further update reflecting work on risk assessment and three lines of assurance to be made to the next meeting in September.
(2) The Uniac progress report advised that, in addition to completion of six audits, Uniac had completed sufficient work prior to the pandemic to prepare an annual opinion and work that would inform that assessment continued. The opinion was likely to differentiate and comment on the University’s position up to the date when the impact of the pandemic became serious and the period after (up to the date when the opinion was prepared). The Committee had also been updated on the development of the 2020-21 internal audit programme; noting the need for a flexible approach an initial plan (covering the period until January 2021) had been agreed by circulation.
(3) EY had outlined their approach to the audit of the 2019-20 Financial Statements, with particular emphasis on Going Concern and an increased likelihood of an “emphasis of matter” in the final version.
(4) The Committee had received updates on the evolving Risk Register and Board Assurance Framework and cyber security (the latter included an analysis of specific incidents arising from the pandemic and mitigations).
(5) The Committee had also received the annual Research Compliance Committee report, which provided assurance that the University was meeting its obligations to comply with the statutory, regulatory and policy requirements that govern research.
(6) The Committee had recommended the appointment of EY as external auditors for a further year (i.e to include the audit of financial statements for the year ending 31 July 2021). However, following notification from EY after the meeting of a significant increase in audit fees for 2019-20, the Chair of the Committee and the Chair of the Board were recommending that a competitive tender exercise for external audit services be undertaken to enable appointment early in 2021.

Resolved: that a competitive tender exercise for external audit services be undertaken to enable appointment early in 2021. 

Action: Chief Financial Officer/Deputy Secretary

(iii) Staffing Committee (8 July 2020)

Received: a summary of the meeting of Staffing Committee held on 8 July 2020

Reported:

(1) The Committee had been updated on negotiations with the trade unions regarding potential pandemic response measures, including pause on incremental progression, options on pay reduction and changes to current redeployment and pay protection policies.
(2) Amongst other matters, the Committee had noted that 38 Voluntary Severance applications had been accepted in relation to the Student Experience Programme Phase 1.

Noted:
(1) The Committee had expressed concern at the level of engagement with University proposals by the trade unions, although in the past week, there were some more encouraging signs.
(2) The importance of both constructive engagement by the trade unions and eventual adoption of a formal position in relation to revisions to relevant policies and related pay measures to address the challenge of the pandemic.

(iv) North Campus Working Group (17 June 2020)

Received: the minutes of the North Campus Working Group meeting held on 17 June 2020.

Reported: the Group had noted the re-commencement of the previously paused OJEU Procurement Process and had focused on the new commercial implications for the development, post-Covid.

11. Report from Senate (9 June and 7 July 2020)

Received: a report from the Senate meetings held on 9 June and 7 July 2020, including the recommendations from the Awards and Honours Group.

Noted:
(1) It would be beneficial to review the existing criteria for honorary awards to ensure that there was sufficient scope for diversity and recognition of the contribution and achievement of individuals across a broad range of activities.
(2) Senate was apprised of the intention to undertake a wide-ranging governance review in 2020-21 (see item 15 below).

Resolved: to approve the list of candidates for honorary awards as set out in the report.

Action: Deputy Secretary

12. Remuneration Committee

Received: the Committee’s annual report, principles and annual work plan.

Resolved: to note the annual report and work plan for 2020-21 and approve the Committee principles.

13. Chair’s report

(i) Outcome of Board member evaluation and review meetings with the Chair

Received: a report summarising the results of Board member evaluation of self and overall Board performance and issues arising from annual review discussions between the Chair and individual Board members.

Reported:
(1) Actions agreed for the forthcoming year included enabling Senate and staff Board members to propose a menu of optional campus visits, to provide lay members with insights into the teaching and learning experience; enabling greater engagement by the Board with staff and students; and, continuing efforts to improve the quality of Board and committee papers. Action: Deputy Secretary
(2) The report updated the Board on actions agreed after the previous review.
(3) Overall, the report indicated a very positive view of the performance of the Board from Board members.

(ii) Staff appointment to Board Committees

Received: a report advising the Board of the appointment of Prof Steven Jones to Finance Committee and Dr Delia Vazquez to Remuneration Committee. (Dr Vazquez would attend Remuneration Committee for
consideration of the remuneration of the President and Vice-Chancellor and matters of general interest, such as Gender Pay Gap and Ethnicity Pay Gap reports.)

14. Health and Safety

Resolved: to defer consideration of the Health and Safety update to a future meeting and to approve the minor amendments to the Policy Statement.  
Action: Deputy Secretary

15. Secretary’s Report

(i) Planned Governance Review 2020-21 and update on governing instruments

Received: a report recommending that the Board commission an externally led review of governance, to take place in the second half of 2020-21, and that given increased expectations for governing bodies regarding academic governance, quality and standards, this report should be wide-ranging, covering all aspects of the University’s governance framework. The report also updated the Board on engagement with Senate on proposed amendments to a limited number of Statutes and Ordinances and a review of Regulations, noting that recommendations would be brought to the Board for consideration at a future meeting.

Resolved: to commission an externally led review of governance as outlined in the report, subject to further consideration of the detailed specification and procurement process for the exercise by the Chair of the Board in consultation with committee chairs.  
Action: Deputy Secretary

(ii) Governance arrangements during the pandemic

Noted:
(1) Decisions made by the President and Vice-Chancellor by delegated authority as attached to the President and Vice-Chancellor’s report. In the immediate response to the pandemic, the Board had delegated authority for all urgent operational matters to the President and Vice-Chancellor and this delegation was extended by the Board at its meeting on 20 May 2020 until 22 July 2020.
(2) Notes of informal Board briefings held on 12 June and 3 July 2020. Given that Board meetings were scheduled in September, October and November 2020, no further briefings were planned unless there were exceptional circumstances.
(3) Notes of meetings of committee chairs meetings held on a regular basis since 11 May 2020 were available in the Diligent Reading Room. Bi-monthly (ie every two months) committee chairs meetings would continue from September.

Resolved: to confirm the termination of the extension of delegated authority for all urgent operational matters from 22 July 2020, with matters being routed through relevant committees.

(iii) Office for Students; temporary condition of registration and reportable events

Received: a report setting out the outcome of OfS consultation on a temporary condition of registration (see also 4 above) and advising the Board of a small number of programme deferrals where offers had been made to students, notified to OfS as Reportable Events in accordance with revised reporting requirements in light of the pandemic.

(iv) Elections to the Board-Senate members

Reported:
(1) Dr Jim Warwicker (Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health) had been elected to the Board for a three-year term with effect from 1 September 2020 (replacing Prof Nalin Thakkar)
(2) Dr Reinmar Hager had been re-elected to the Board for a further three-year term with effect from 1 September 2020.

(v) Exercise of Delegations

Reported: award of Emeritus Professorships, appointment of Prof Geraint Howells as Chair of the Manchester University Press Board from 1 July 2020 for a three-year period, and, pursuant to General Regulation VII.4, that the Common Seal of the University had been affixed to instruments recorded in entries 2243 to 2251.

16. Planning and Resources Committee (7 April and 5 May 2020)

Received: reports from the above meetings of Planning and Resources Committee.

17. Forward agenda for 2020-21

Received: the outline forward agenda for 2020-21 (members were encouraged to submit comments or suggestions to the Deputy Secretary).

18. Vote of thanks

Reported: this was the final Board meeting attended by outgoing Board members, Dr John Stageman and Prof Nalin Thakkar, and the Interim Director of Finance, John Cunningham. They were all thanked for their contribution to the work of the Board. The Board noted with sincere thanks and gratitude the significant contribution made by Dr John Stageman over his ten years on the Board. During this time he had taken on a wide variety of roles and responsibilities, including Chair of Finance Committee and the North Campus Working Group, and latterly, since 2018, as Deputy Chair.

At this point, the Chair left the meeting and the Deputy Chair (Dr Stageman) chaired the Board for the remainder of the meeting.

19. Evaluation of Chair

Reported:

(1) Member feedback on the Chair (from 15 members, representative of all categories of membership) had been exceptionally positive, with over 90% approval ratings across all categories. Comments had been highly appreciative of the Chair’s approach, which was seen as extremely effective; the Chair continued to be an exemplar to the Board and members agreed that the Board was very well served by having such an effective and well-respected Chair.

(2) Comments had referenced the potential to further increase Board focus on academic governance, to continue to ensure transparency in the process of appointment to Board committees (through Nominations Committee) and to continue to encourage contributions at Board meetings from all Board members.

Action: Deputy Secretary

20. Any other business

Reported: in response to a question, confirmation that the current position was that all Board and Board committee meetings would be held via Zoom until the end of the calendar year. Members would be advised should this position change.

Action: RSCOO/Deputy Secretary

Close.