

The University of Manchester

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wednesday, 11 February 2015

Present:

Mr Anil Ruia, (in the Chair),

President and Vice-Chancellor, Mr Edward Astle, Ms Charlie Cook, General Secretary of UMSU, Professor Ian Cotton, Mr Michael Crick, Mr Stephen Dauncey, Professor Colette Fagan, Professor Maggie Gale, Dr Reinmar Hagar, Dame Sue Ion, Mr Robert Hough, Dr Caroline Jay, Professor Cathy McCrohan, Dr Brenda Smith, Ms Pamila Sharma, Dr Angela Strank, Mr Andrew Spinoza (18)

In attendance: The Deputy President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer, the Deputy Secretary, the Director of Finance, the Director of Human Resources, the General Counsel, the Director of Compliance and Risk, the Vice-President and Dean of Life Sciences, and the Vice-President (Research).

Apologies: Dr John Stageman, Mr Paul Lee, Mr Neil McArthur, Mrs Christine Lee-Jones, Professor Chris Taylor, and Ms Iram Kiani.

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. The interests of the President and Vice-Chancellor as a Council Member of the Royal Society and as a Non-Executive Director of AstraZeneca plc, and for Mr Will Spinks as a member of the AHUA Executive and as a member of the Joint Negotiating Committee of USS, previously declared, were noted.

2. Minutes

Confirmed: The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2014.

3. Matters arising from the minutes

Received: A report summarising ongoing actions or business consequent on decisions previously taken by the Board.

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

Reported:

- (1) That the revised CUC Code of Governance was provided for the information of members. The Code was brought forward through substantial consultation and was published at the end of last year. As with the UK Corporate Governance Code it applies on a "comply or explain" basis. This requires governing bodies, where they do not follow particular parts of the code, to explain why. As the University governance arrangements were within the boundaries of the previous Code, there was confidence that the University would be compliant with its key principles. However, some further work would be undertaken to map our current arrangements to its provisions and will be used to inform/support the session on Board effectiveness at the Planning and Accountability Conference.
- (2) That the Board noted the proposals for the review of Board effectiveness ahead of the session at the Planning and Accountability Conference and the survey of members currently underway. The Audit and Finance Committees had also been consulted on the Board's effectiveness and this feedback would be considered at the same time.
- (3) That the Chair reported on the national honours awarded to University staff members. Professor Alistair Burns, Professor of Old Age Psychiatry, had received a CBE for his work for Health and Social Care, in particular Dementia Care, and Honorary Professor Richard Ramsden, had received an MBE for services to Otolaryngology. The Board also offered sincere congratulations to Mr Robert Hough, Deputy Chair of the Board of Governors, on the award of his CBE in recognition of his services to business in the North West.

6. Secretary's report

Noted:

- (1) That elections are ongoing within the faculties to determine membership of Senate from members of the Academic and research staff and a full report would be provided at the May meeting.
- (2) The Deputy Secretary provided a brief update on the forthcoming election of the Chancellor. Nominations would formally open for the role on Monday, 23rd February. Should more than one candidate gain nomination, a ballot of staff, members of the General Assembly and registered members of the Alumni Association would be held in May, with the result declared in June 2015, ahead of the next General Assembly meeting. The new Chancellor would then take up office from 1 August 2015. An installation ceremony would be scheduled before the meeting of the General Assembly in January 2016.
- (3) That the Board noted the electoral process governing the appointment and the concern from some members about an electoral contest which might dissuade good candidates from standing for an entirely ceremonial role. Acknowledging this, and the comments from other members who felt that an electoral element was worth maintaining, in planning for this exercise the University had previously suggested that the conclusion of the ballot would provide an opportunity for a review of the process and the relevant Statute and Ordinance that governs it. The operational group overseeing the election would therefore review the election on its conclusion, consulting as appropriate within the University, and bring back a report and any recommendations to the governing body (noting that any changes would require the amendment of the relevant Ordinance and/or Statute. In discussing the forthcoming election, the Board also suggested that the University might seek to further promote the role and office in social media and/or advertising ahead of the launch of nominations.

7. Stock-take Report

Received: The annual stock-take report ahead of its consideration and appraisal within the Conference programme.

Reported: That the report was being circulated to the Board at an earlier stage to allow for questions and enable it to be seen in the context of the Planning and Accountability Conference agenda, and thereby shape the focus of the conference.

Noted: That the Board considered the University's performance against the targets previously agreed by the Board. The Board considered two elements in further detail; the league table performance of the University, and performance against environmental sustainability targets. Both areas, in addition to equality and diversity, were identified as potential topics for future strategic briefings.

Resolved: That the reports themes and conclusions would be examined further within the Planning and Accountability Conference agenda.

8. President and Vice-Chancellor's report

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

Reported:

- (1) That the President and Vice-Chancellor briefed the Board on the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Autumn Statement, and the settlement secured for Greater Manchester with a wide range of announcements in support of the ambition to build a 'Northern Powerhouse' to complement the strengths of the capital city. These investments covered transport infrastructure, the arts and science, notably the Sir Henry Royce Institute for Materials Research and Innovation here at this University. The Statement contained details of how government will invest the £5.9 billion committed to science and research capital between 2016 and 2021. This included major new research facilities and projects, one of which is the Royce Institute. Another key point of relevance to higher education was the announcement of a postgraduate loan scheme starting in 2016–17, preceded by a bursary scheme in 2015–16.
- (2) However, the prospect of further reductions in public spending introduces potentially significant uncertainty for the HE sector. While the Treasury has not published detailed budgets for Government departments from 2016 and indeed there is a General Election pending which introduces yet more uncertainty, there is a view that existing plans will mean sizeable cuts to most departments, including BIS. Critically, generating an increase in operating surplus remained crucial for the University in order to invest in its priority activities. Realising the 2020 ambitions will require significant financial investment. To this end, the University must generate discretionary funds, exercise strong financial control, secure efficiency savings and generate new income. Funds will always be limited and the University would have to make the difficult choices about how it invests. Discussion over priorities for investment, and savings and additional income generation would be an important ongoing topic of discussion across the University, including at the forthcoming Conference.
- (3) The 2014 round of Annual Performance Reviews (APRs), which was completed in December, had been effective in evaluating performance across the University against the key priorities identified in the strategic plans and operational priorities. Overall the University had made significant progress towards many of the goals and targets described in Manchester 2020, the University's Strategic Plan, but the President and Vice-Chancellor acknowledged that the University still faced major challenges in some areas to achieve the "step change" that will be required to meet ambitions. This will be factored in to the refresh of Manchester 2020 which will be taking place over the summer.

- (4) That the President and Vice Chancellor provided an update on student number position for recruitment in 2014, and for the forthcoming year. The University had exceeded its home and international undergraduate targets. The recruitment of students not attaining ABB or equivalent was within the permitted range for the University's Student Number Control allocation and was in line with University strategy to retain high entry standards. Overall the postgraduate admission data was also positive. The University exceeded international PGT and both home/EU and international PGR targets. The home/EU PGT target was missed but the University achieved its overall home and international student targets for both full-time and part-time students. The University was now focusing attention on recruitment for the 2015 intake, which was likely to be as challenging with increasing competition for the most qualified A level students. The Intake Management Group (IMG) would be meeting regularly through the cycle to consider how best to ensure the University achieves student recruitment targets in 2015 with a focus upon attracting students of the highest quality.
- (5) That the President and Vice-Chancellor, with input from the Deputy President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, briefed the Board on the proposals for the Royce Institute. The new Institute, announced in the Autumn Statement and supported by industrial partners, will have its £235m research centre in Manchester. The Manchester centre will be supported by satellite centres or 'spokes' at the founding partners, comprising the universities of Sheffield, Leeds, Liverpool, Cambridge, Oxford and Imperial College London. The exact funding details and the formal structure was being finalised, with some form of collaborative joint venture currently under consideration. A site on the Oxford Road corridor had been identified, and any research generated within the Institute would be associated with the respective lead Universities.
- (6) That the President and Vice-Chancellor provided an update on the appointment processes underway for the Vice-President and Dean of Medical and Human Sciences and the Vice-President and Dean of Engineering and Physical Sciences.
- (7) That, as the Board had previously been informed, the President and Vice-Chancellor had initiated a review of the effectiveness and sustainability of current structures, and possible alternative structures, for the organisation of the Faculty of Life Sciences and cognate disciplines in the University. This Review Group was chaired by Professor Keith Brown, Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, and would report its conclusions to Senate in June 2015, and to the Board of Governors in July 2015. The Review Group was now consulting with leaders in the Life Sciences and cognate disciplines in this University and beyond. An interim report would be provided to Senate in April, and then to the Board of Governors at the May meeting.
- (8) That the President and Vice-Chancellor briefed the Board on the Government's "Health North" programme, proposed in January to unlock healthcare innovations in the English regions with the greatest health challenges. The funding was likely to provide a significant amount of research funding to the University and would drive a number of significant collaborative opportunities.

Noted:

- (1) That the Board discussed the appointment processes underway and in relation to the competitive offers to candidates, that had delayed the appointments. In responding, the President and Vice-Chancellor was now confident that the University had attracted stronger candidates as compared to those that came forward in the first round. The Board also noted the size of the faculties concerned, which were comparable to small and medium sized universities in

the sector, and therefore this could have undermined the relative attractiveness of the VP and Dean positions as compared to VC appointments for some candidates.

- (2) That the Board discussed the ongoing Review of Life Sciences and Cognate Disciplines. The Board recognised that the process of review could be disruptive and that therefore was important that the pros and cons of any new model were explored, within a relatively short timescale. The Review was not performance related, but was necessary given the funding challenges that the disciplines and the University would face in the future, post REF.
- (3) That the Board considered the themes of the conference, including any assessment of the University's position within the sector and maintaining distinctiveness within a highly competitive and concentrated funding model, where funding was likely to come under greater pressure after the election.
- (4) That the Board agreed that Sustainability and Equality and Diversity would be strong topics for the Strategic Briefing in June.

N.B Sustainability was subsequently deferred until the September briefing, in order to ensure the presentation could be delivered by key staff.

Resolved: That as it was likely that funding and legal structures for the Royce Institute would be confirmed before the pre-election period begins, the Board granted delegated powers to the President and Vice-Chancellor (as Chair of PRC and Finance-sub), to the Chair of the Board of Governors and to the Chair of Finance Committee to progress this ahead of the next formal meeting.

(b) Exercise of Delegations

Reported:

- (1) Acting on behalf of Senate and the Board of Governors, and on the recommendation of the relevant Head of School and Dean of the Faculty, the President and Vice-Chancellor awarded the title of emeritus professor to:

Professor Nicholas Tarrier, School of Psychological Science, with effect from 8th January 2015.
- (2) Acting on behalf of the Board of Governors, and on the recommendation of the Vice President and Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, the President and Vice-Chancellor appointed Professor Kenneth McPhail as Associate Dean for Social Responsibility for the period 1 December 2014 to 30 November 2017.
- (3) Acting on behalf of Senate and the Board of Governors, the President and Vice-Chancellor appointed:

Professor Steve Flint, as Interim Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences from 5th January 2015, until such time as a permanent appointment is made.

Professor Julian Davis, as Interim Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences from 5th January 2015, until such time as a permanent appointment is made.
- (4) Acting on behalf of the Board of Governors, the President and Vice-Chancellor appointed Mr Andy Westwood as Associate Vice-President for Public Affairs, from February 2015.

- (5) Acting on behalf of Senate and the Board of Governors, the President and Vice-Chancellor re-appointed Professor Jeremy Gregory, as Head of the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures for the period 1 August 2015 to 31 July 2017.
- (6) Pursuant to General Regulation VII.4, the Common Seal of the University has been affixed to instruments recorded in entries 1514 -1539.

(c) Report from the Director of Finance

Received: That on this occasion there was nothing further to add to the information contained in the report of the Finance Committee.

(d) Report from the Director of Compliance and Risk

Received: A report on the operational management of risk and compliance from Dr David Barker, Director of Compliance and Risk.

Noted: That, in reference to the risk map and register provided, the Board noted that the Director of Human Resources would be invited to the June meeting of the Audit Committee in relation to the risk concerning the People Strategy.

9. Research Excellence Framework (REF)

Received: A paper and presentation from Professor Luke Georghiou on the outcome of the 2014 REF Exercise.

Reported:

- (1) That as a whole, the results indicate that the University remains a leading research-intensive university and its REF rankings are consistent with those which we achieve in other measures, such as research income. However, it needed a significant improvement in the quality of research if the University was to meet the goals described in the 2020 strategy. The REF is a retrospective exercise, which assesses the period from 2008 – 2013, so does not fully reflect the upturn achieved in the past two years, which is being supported by the implementation of a new research quality strategy.
- (2) That the Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF2014) is a process of expert review, which replaced the RAE as the UK-wide framework for assessing research in all disciplines. It is of major importance for the University both in terms of reputation and financial consequences. The REF operates at the level of individual disciplines (e.g. Chemistry, Law), called Units of Assessment (UoAs) each of which had an expert panel to assess submissions. The University submitted a wide range of data about its research staff, outputs, impact and environment in each UoA covering the period 2008 – 2013. The expert panels awarded each UoA separate grade profiles for Research Outputs, Impact and Environment, using grades from 4* to unclassified. These sub-profiles were then combined, using set weightings, to give an overall profile for the UoA.
Sample UoA REF result:

4* - Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour
3* - Quality that is internationally excellent, but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence
2* - Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour
1* - Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour
Unclassified - Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work, or was not eligible under the REF criteria
- (3) That research power was a useful measure as it combines quality with critical mass. The ranking of the top five institutions is consistent on both of the main power measures: 4*/3* multiplied by staff FTE and grade point average (GPA) multiplied by staff FTE. The

University of Manchester ranks in fifth place, behind UCL, Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh. At 78%, the UoM's submission rate is approximately the same as in RAE2008, but considerably lower than several of its competitors. The University performed well in Impact and Environment sub-profiles, particularly for Environment, where it was in joint 1st place for the percentage of 4*/3* research in all but one of its UoAs. However, in outputs, it had far fewer 3* and 4* outputs than competitor universities and over 24% of research was graded at 2* or lower. Although this places the University above the target of 70% of research judged as world-leading (4*) or internationally excellent (3*), it does not take into account the research of non-returned staff. Within this overall result, there were some particular highlights with strong performances for research power in Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy; Biological Sciences; Electrical and Electronic Engineering; Metallurgy and Materials; Physics; Computer Science and Informatics; Aeronautical, Mechanical, Chemical and Manufacturing Engineering; Business and Management Studies, Sociology, Anthropology and Development Studies and Modern Languages and Linguistics.

- (4) That if the UoAs are combined to a Faculty level, research performance is relatively consistent overall. FLS, Humanities and MHS all rank very substantially higher on power than on GPA. EPS stands out as having a slightly lower power ranking, but performing much more strongly on the percentage of 4* + 3* and in GPA. The REF result as a whole is relatively consistent with other key measures of research success. In 17 of its UoAs, the REF GPA result is lower than might have been expected from the research income distribution, while the REF GPA is higher in 13 UoAs.
- (5) That the last two years have seen an upturn in the UoM's research performance, but this was too late to be reflected in the REF, which assessed research for the period 2008 – 2013. Research income was up by 7% in 2013/14 and is currently running at a 19% increase for the first four months of 2014/15, compared to the previous year, while market share of RCUK awards increased from 4.19% in 2012/13 to 5.11% in 2013/14 (fourth in the UK). The University had also improved citations: the percentage of outputs in the top 10% of citations increased from 22.1% in 2008-12, to 24.6% in 2009-13. This upward trajectory is supported by the major capital awards and Capital Programme which provide the University environment to support the highest quality of research. To maintain this upward trajectory and build towards both REF2020 and the aims of the Manchester 2020 Strategic Plan, University was implementing a new strategy to increase research quality with four key elements: a statement of expectations of staff for research; greater accountability for research quality, including impact and business engagement; development of new talent and increased support for research leaders. The intention was to achieve a change in research culture, raising levels of expectation and aspiration.

Noted:

- (1) That the Board noted the outcomes and the assessment of the challenges facing the University in the future in terms of improving research performance.
- (2) That the University was confident that the investment in staff, in particular through Project Diamond, had an impact that was reflected in the REF results, although not all of their contributions could be assessed within the exercise. The University would also review the investments in order to ensure that the impact was delivered. The profile of appointments was different across the faculties, but broadly, performance for research active staff at a 3 star level should be a pre-requisite in recruitment.
- (3) That there was likely to be reductions in funding following the REF, the volume in some key areas was comparatively low and the SE concentration had raised performance among competitors. Recognising where research aspirations were lower, the University needed to provide greater challenge to research staff at the outset of their careers and nurture their development over time.

10. Board committee reports

(a) Audit Committee, 27 January 2015

Reported:

- (1) That the Committee noted that in consultation with the Chair of the Audit Committee and the Chair of the Board of Governors, Mr Edward Astle had taken up membership of the Committee from 1 January 2015, replacing Mr Andrew Spinoza.
- (2) That the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer and the Deputy Secretary provided an update on the cases being handled under the University's Public Interest Disclosure Procedure.
- (3) That the Committee approved the appointment of Ernst and Young, from 1 January 2015, as the new auditors of the University from the 31 July 2015 audit onward, for an outline period of three years, extendable to six years. The Committee also expressed formal thanks to Deloitte LLP, who had provided external audit services to the University over the previous six years.
- (4) That the Committee received a paper providing a series of questions in relation to the Board's effectiveness and the Audit Committee's reporting to the Board of Governors was provided for discussion. Among other comments, the Committee was satisfied with the relationship between it and the wider Board. The Audit Committee's work received sufficient attention and prominence at Board meetings and the flow of information was regarded as good. The relationship with the executive was excellent, with senior officers in regular attendance at meetings and available to speak to specific reviews. Senior Officers were transparent about areas of concern or problems with the Committee and the Board, and focused audit resource on known areas of weakness. The management responses to reviews that found inefficiencies or ineffective processes was broadly good, and the implementation was validated by follow-up internal audit work.
- (5) That there was a formal requirement that the TRAC Return is also approved through a Committee of the Board for the Institution. Once every three years the University is also required to confirm compliance with the detailed Statement of Requirement, and Uniac had also reviewed the University's compliance with this requirement and was satisfied with its provision.

- (6) That the internal auditors had completed eight substantive reviews in the period. These were the Implementation of the UUK Concordat on Research Integrity, the TRAC Assurance, the UUK Accommodation Code of Practice - University Owned Halls of Residence, the UUK Accommodation Code of Practice - Privately Owned Halls of Residence, the Business Continuity Planning - Core Activities - (2013/14), Safeguarding Children (2013/14), Insurance and on EPS Research Income Coding.
- (7) That the Committee received a paper on Cyber Security from Gerry Pennell, the Director of IT Services who attended the meeting for this item to answer any questions raised by members. A key element of the work within the IT Transformation programme was the production of a cyber-security strategy for the University. KPMG were selected to assist with this work and a cyber-security strategy was delivered in the autumn of 2014. This strategy included recommendations about governance, policy and awareness as well as technical items. The strategy was presented to ISGG and the Senior Leadership Team and approved in principle subject to provision of a costed programme and options (due end of January 2015). A new governance group – the Information Security Governance Group (ISGG) - has been formed - chaired by the Dean of FLS – to provide oversight of progress on Cyber-Security. This group was formed by extended the pre-existing Data Protection Group’s remit to cover the wider aspects of Information Security. In particular, this group has reviewed progress on the development of the cyber-security strategy (see below). One of the governance recommendations arising from the cyber-security strategy work is the establishment of a central team, not in IT Services, with responsibility for the wider information security of the University (policy, guidance, compliance, awareness).
- (8) That the Committee reviewed the risk map and registers for the University, which were forwarded to the Board for review.

(b) Finance Committee, 26 January 2015

Reported:

- (1) That Finance Committee received an updated on the capital programme and noted the progress that had been made, including new projects included in this review. The Committee expressed its support for the bid for additional resources in the Estates Team. Finance Committee noted the latest report, including cash flow forecast. With the exception of the Whitworth Art Gallery, all projects remained within budget.
- (2) That it was proposed to create four endowment funds (two for each cultural institution) in the form of a permanent capital fund (where only the income may be spent) and an expendable fund.
- (3) That Finance Committee approved a proposal from Aon Hewitt to invest £25m into a diversified growth fund. This will result in a more efficient strategy going forward relative to the holdings in equities and a higher expected rate of return than investment in fixed interest gilts. These funds had originally been invested in the form of an absolute bond with Ignis. However, shortly after placement the Ignis team had left the company. Aon Hewitt would liaise with the Director of Finance to identify a suitable manager.
- (4) That Finance Committee also received presentations from the two recently appointed global equity fund managers (Investec and Harris) and was pleased to note good performance to date and confirmation of adherence to the University’s SRI policy.
- (5) Finance Committee noted the management accounts for November 2014 at the meeting. However, the December management accounts have since been

reviewed by the Planning and Resources Sub Committee, and these are attached.

- The surplus for the period was £23.0m, £14.0m favourable to budget. Key factors were: £7.2m timing of non-pay expenditure and £3.9m favourable core pay.
- cumulative income was £386.2m, £2.6m lower than budget and 9.1% higher than prior year;
- pay costs were £203.9m, £1.6m favourable to budget. Pay costs (no ERVS costs to date) represented 52.8% of total income compared to 53.4% in the prior year, and lower than the budgeted 52.9%;
- the non-pay costs were 7.4% higher than prior year, at £130.5m but £13m favourable to budget;
- cash balances stood at £456m

Finance Committee considered the paper prepared by the Deputy Secretary and concluded the following:

- the non-executive role in the University environment was markedly different to that generally encountered in industry and it would be helpful to have greater clarity on the University's expectations of lay members and where they can add the greatest value;
- Would the Executive welcome greater challenge, and where should this happen? At Board meetings, or at the meeting of the sub committees?
- Should there be more voting matters at the Board?
- In relation to Finance Committee itself, there was a concern that there was a lack of financial expertise amongst the existing lay membership;
- There was agreement that the quality of the papers presented for consideration was excellent and provided the right level of information to enable the Committee to perform its fiduciary responsibilities.

Resolved: The Board of Governors approved the creation of the four new funds for the Manchester Museum and the Whitworth Art Gallery.

(c) Remuneration Committee, 26 November 2014

Reported:

- (1) That the Remuneration Committee considered the Terms of Reference and agreed that no changes were required.
- (2) That the Committee considered the recommendations of the Senior Salaries Review Group. The Remuneration Committee considered the recommendations and noted that these were within the boundaries of the existing and previously approved pay policy for academic related grade 9 roles. The Remuneration Committee approved the recommendations from the Senior Salaries Review Group and the recommendation from the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer (Director of Human Resources).
- (3) That the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer presented a paper recommending a bonus payment to two senior individuals for their exceptional contribution to the achievement of Project Falcon. Both payments are to be non-consolidated and therefore non-pensionable, and were approved. The Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer also presented a paper recommending a non-consolidated bonus payment to the Director of Development, which the Committee also approved.
- (4) That the Director of Human Resources presented a paper summarising the proposal from the Chair of the UMI3 Board of Directors, and their Remuneration Committee, for bonus payments to be made to the Chief Executive of UMI3. The Remuneration Committee approved the proposals as presented and agreed that a review of the current bonus arrangements was appropriate to ensure

that this continues to relate to rewarding stretching and exceptional performance and is a simplified structure.

- (5) That the Director of Human Resources presented a paper for information to the Remuneration Committee bringing the outcome of a recent Tribunal case involving Kings College London to their attention. The ruling from the Tribunal was to agree that due to potential poaching of academic staff it was acceptable for Kings College not to release the salary information on this group of staff but stated that it was acceptable to provide the salaries of senior professional support staff. Kings College were considering whether to appeal against the ruling on disclosing the salaries of senior professional support staff.
- (6) That the Committee agreed the revised remuneration package proposed for the CEO of the Manchester University Press (MUP).
- (7) That the Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer brought to the Remuneration Committees attention the rise in the number of staff receiving more than £100,000 per annum as reported on page 31 of the Annual Accounts. The numbers had risen from 81 to 108. This was associated with recruitment of academic staff via Project Diamond. Individuals who were recruited part way through 2012/2013 would not have shown in the figure of 81 but would appear the following year which reflects a full 12 months of salary.

11. Report from the Senate

Received: A verbal report on the business initiated at the meeting of Senate held on 5 February 2015.

Reported: That the President and Vice-Chancellor highlighted the discussions at Senate concerning the REF, the Review of Pastoral Care, the Review of Life Sciences and Cognate Disciplines, and Middle Eastern Studies and the associated review of faculty processes in withdrawing academic programmes.

12. Report from the Planning and Resources Committee

Received: A summary of matters discussed at the meeting of the Committee held on 9 December 2014 and the items considered on 10 February 2015 will be provided at the meeting

- (1) That the Director of the Jodrell Bank Discovery Centre reported that, in its third year of operation, the Jodrell Bank Discovery Centre had continued to perform well. Achievements included visitor numbers of 138,388, up 8%, and the award of the Kelvin Medal for the contribution to public engagement with science. All of the Annual Performance Review reports will be circulated to the Board as part of the documentation for the Planning and Accountability Conference.
- (2) That the Committee considered a report on the information required for the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) and HEFCE monitoring returns for 2013/14, relating to the Access Agreement and HEFCE Student Opportunity Funding and the National Scholarship Programme. It approved the income and expenditure levels and milestone information for 2013/14.
- (3) That the Committee received the Minutes from the Finance Sub-Committee meeting held on 18 November 2014 and considered the draft management accounts as at the period ended 31 October 2014. The Committee also approved the budget and planning guidance for 2015/16 and the five year plan and noted that the introduction of the new SORP would impact on the budgeting/planning process.
- (4) That the Committee considered a report on provisional student numbers as at 1 December 2014. The University was above its targets for full-time undergraduate,

postgraduate taught and postgraduate research student numbers although within this, full-time Home postgraduate taught student numbers were below target. The University had exceeded its Student Number Control allocation (based on intake) but as the number was still below the top of the flexibility range, no financial penalties would be incurred. At the same meeting, the Committee was informed that HEFCE would allocate £50 million in 2015/16 to higher education institutions to offer taught postgraduate bursaries on a match-funded basis, and that income-contingent loans for students under 30 years old wishing to undertake a postgraduate taught masters in any subject would be introduced from 2016/17.

- (5) That the Committee noted that, on the basis of the discussions held during the Annual Performance Reviews and other ongoing developments, the University's Senior Leadership Team had identified six key priorities for 2015/16:
 - i) to accelerate progress towards our research targets by developing a post-REF strategy;
 - ii) to continue to improve the student experience;
 - iii) to sustain student recruitment target numbers consistent with meeting financial contribution and delivering an outstanding learning and teaching experience;
 - iv) to deliver a focused, distinctive and effective social responsibility programme;
 - v) to create a more performance-orientated culture;
 - vi) to increase and diversify income.

- (5) That the Committee also considered the agenda for the Heads' meeting on 20 January 2015 which was focused on two issues: the key challenges and priorities facing the University post-REF and the key financial challenges and priorities for the University in 2015 and going forward.

- (6) That the Committee was updated on the discussions concerning the Universities Superannuation Scheme and was informed of the appointment of Andy Westwood as the new Associate Vice-President for Public Affairs. The Committee was also informed that there had been an additional meeting of the HR Sub-Committee on 25 November 2014, as part of the APR process, to consider the HR-related KPIs including equality and diversity. A report would be presented as part of the APR documentation to the Board of Governors.

- (7) That the Committee considered the Commemorative Plaques Policy and agreed to recommend the Policy to the Board of Governors for approval. The Committee also endorsed the recommendations, for two commemorative plaques on the University estate to recognise the achievements and University connections of Kathleen Drew Baker (1901-1957) and Sir William Lawrence Bragg (1890-1971), to the Board of Governors for approval and requested that Chair's action be taken in order to expedite the approvals.

- (8) That the Committee received the Minutes from the meeting of the Capital Planning Sub-Committee held on 14 October 2014 and a summary of business from the meeting held on 2 December 2014. It noted in particular the approvals relating to the Main Library Project, the Graphene Engineering and Innovation Centre and the Manchester Engineering Campus Development.

- (9) That the Committee received the Minutes from the meeting of the Information Systems Sub-Committee held on 28 October 2014.

- (10) That the Committee received the Minutes from the meeting of the Risk and Emergency Management Group (REMG) held on 6 November 2014, including the report: *Current status and management arrangements for the orphan collections*, and noted that the recommendations from the report on orphan collections would be accepted and that insurance arrangements for these items would be kept under review. The Committee

also received the Minutes from the meeting of the Research Compliance Committee held on 10 November 2014.

- (11) That the Committee received the Minutes from the meeting of the University of Manchester Research Institute held on 21 October 2014.

13. Report from the University Students' Union Relations Committee

Received: A summary of matters discussed at the meeting of the University-Students' Union Relations Committee held on 26 January 2015.

Reported:

- (1) That the Committee received the final audited accounts of the Students' Union for the year ended 31st July 2014. It was the view of the Committee that the Union had achieved a very strong turnaround effort, with its financial position now looking relatively healthy. An item which will be reviewed in future is the relationship of the University and the Union for the purposes of account standard FRS8 (controlling parties).
- (2) That the Committee received a report from the Students' Union, reviewing progress after 6 months on the second year of its strategic plan. The Union will soon commence work to begin constructing a new strategic plan for the period 2016-2019. Around 1/3 of all Manchester students now take place in at least one activity now run by the Union. Around 12,000 students are members of a society, a 28% increase year on year. The Widening Participation programme (Access All Areas) had organised 25 outreach projects so far this year against a whole-year target of 10, and Manchester RAG had already exceeded the previous year's fundraising total in the first semester. Overall, around 2500-3000 students are now holding leadership roles (e.g. Society Chairs) within the Union. Welcome Week had been a great success, with internal research indicating a 91% satisfaction rate with the activities provided. Welcome Week in particular had been the beneficiary of a successful partnership effort with the University, and the Union had also forged particularly effective links with the University's Equality and Diversity Team. New positions within the Union had been recruited to manage media sales and conduct research into student lifestyles and habits. The Union will be now turning its attention to its annual Executive elections over the next semester.
- (3) That the Committee was also made aware of recent developments regarding student campaigns on the Israel/Palestine conflict. In 2007, the Union had passed a policy which had mandated that a plaque be put up in the Union building, making a statement supporting the rights of Palestinian students to enjoy higher education. This had been renewed in 2010, and had been also proposed for renewal by students in autumn 2014. Following a conclusion of a referendum, where all students were able to vote or campaign for the 'Yes' and 'No' positions, the policy (and the plaque) had been renewed until 2017. As part of a review into policy making and campaigning activity, the union had instructed legal advice, and it would ultimately be for the Union's trustee board to decide what course of action to take. The Union was keen to separate this individual issue from the principle of allowing Students' Unions to comment on wider political affairs. The University has received correspondence on this matter but is awaiting the response of the Students' Union.
- (4) That the Committee received a report from the University on recent developments. The University was making progress on its residences redevelopment and North Campus reconfiguration; the Union is keen to ensure that halls remain affordable and accessible to all students. The recent REF result has had a significant impact on the University: while it has maintained its top 5 position is likely that there will be financial consequences, which will become clearer in March. The UCU boycott has been postponed following the reaching of a settlement, but the dispute will only end following a successful ballot of UCU members, the USS Trustees accepting the changes and the Pensions Regulator not raising any concerns.

- (5) That the Committee received a paper on arrangements for identifying and resolving early signs of student concerns or complaints. HEFCE had written to Universities informing them that it was reviewing such arrangements. It was noted that the University's procedures in this area, being informal, by their nature meant it was difficult to assess their effectiveness due to the lack of formal records kept. The University needs to ensure it is being clear in informing students of the various options available, and that academic advisors are aware of these.

- (6) That the Committee received a paper on the visiting speakers approved by the Students' Union since the previous meeting. An event from the free speech and secular society on sharia law had prompted significant internal debate and the Union was reviewing its internal processes on how to best handle controversial or sensitive events.

14. Any other business