

The University of Manchester

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wednesday, 21 July 2021 (meeting held via video conference)

Present: Mr Edward Astle (in the Chair until item 16 iii)), President and Vice-Chancellor, Mrs Ann Barnes (Deputy Chair, in the Chair from item 16 iv)), Mr Nana Agyeman, Prof Claire Alexander, Mr Gary Buxton, Mr Michael Crick, Prof Danielle George, Mr Colin Gillespie, Dr Reinmar Hager, Mr Nick Hillman, Ms Caroline Johnstone, Prof Steve Jones, Mr Kwame Kwarteng (General Secretary of UMSU), Mrs Bridget Lea, Mr Robin Phillips, Mr Richard Solomons, Mr Andrew Spinoza, Dr Delia Vazquez, Dr Jim Warwicker and Mrs Alice Webb. (21)

Apologies: Dr Neil McArthur and Ms Ros Webster

In attendance: The Registrar, Secretary and Chief Operating Officer (RSCOO), the Deputy President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-President for Social Responsibility, the Director of Finance, the Director for the Student Experience (item 11), the Director of Human Resources (items 16-18) and the Deputy Secretary.

Before the business of the meeting was transacted, the Chair thanked the following eight members of the Board who were standing down from their positions at the end of the current academic year for their contribution to the work of the Board: Michael Crick, Colin Gillespie, Bridget Lea, Andy Spinoza, Prof Steve Jones, Dr Delia Vazquez, Kwame Kwarteng and Nana Agyeman.

1. Declarations of Interest

Reported: there were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes

Agreed: the minutes of the meeting held on 19 May 2021.

Noted: the report of the Strategy Meeting held on 5 July 2021 (a revised version incorporating some further input from the Board would be made available via Diligent).

3. Matters arising from the minutes

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

4. President and Vice-Chancellor's report and update on campus reopening

Received: the report from the President and Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-President for Social Responsibility and the Chair of the Campus Management Group provided an update in return to campus (see 9-13 below).

Reported:

(1) The National Student Survey (NSS) results had recently been released. The results were disappointing as the University's overall satisfaction score had dropped to 71% from 81% last year. Whilst the performance of the sector as a whole and the Russell Group had declined, the University's results had fallen by more than the average.

(2) Full analysis of the data would continue, but initial scrutiny suggested a number of factors, many of which related to the pandemic and some of which were Manchester specific, given that Manchester was locked down earlier and was subject to lockdown for longer than many other

regions. Some comments indicated events before Christmas that had been subject to significant media coverage had been a factor, but there were also a significant number of comments relating to organisation, communication and timeliness of response.

(3) Home and international applications and acceptances continued to show a healthy trend: EU applications had fallen by approximately 30% but the change to international fee levels for EU students negated the financial impact. The impact and management of quarantine restrictions for international students had been the subject of discussion at ministerial level.

(4) Most areas had taken a cautious approach to offer making given potential grade inflation arising from use of teacher assessed grades at A level and this would be kept under close review.

(5) The Government Innovation Strategy would be published imminently and other government announcements in relation to levelling up and place were expected in September. The Investment Minister, Lord Grimstone had visited the University (Royce Institute and the Graphene Engineering Innovation Centre) and discussion had covered the University's expertise and support for materials technologies at every level of research and development and its contribution to delivering national ambitions regarding net zero and clean growth. Contributions from international companies had reflected on the attractiveness of Manchester, given its world-leading Graphene expertise. Other innovation related activity included the launch (with Health Innovation Manchester and the Academic Health Science Centre) of a joint venture with the Morningside Group to trial a series of new diagnostics and interventions in clinical and digital health.

(6) The recent Office for Students (OfS) funding announcement had confirmed that there would be some funding reduction for high-cost subjects not related to medicine or healthcare, STEM subjects or supporting specific labour market needs. For subjects where such reductions were to be applied (e.g. arts and humanities), the current subsidy level would be halved (to £121.50). This represented a reduction equivalent to about 1% of combined course fee and OfS funding, so the impact was not expected to be significant.

(7) The OfS had confirmed that there were no issues it wished to raise regarding the University's 2019-20 Access and Participation Plan Monitoring Return.

(8) Recent press coverage had seriously misrepresented future plans for teaching and learning at the University and a message had been sent to students, clarifying what blended learning meant for them and their studies. Blended learning aimed to augment in-person lectures, seminars, laboratory sessions, discussions and workshops with high quality online self-study materials. It did not mean online only teaching and was very different to the emergency move to online learning that staff and students experienced during the initial stages of the pandemic. 177 learning spaces had been adapted to enable dual delivery (real time physical and on line attendance).

(9) Recent Department for Education (DfE) guidance confirmed that from 19 July, there were no longer any restrictions on the approach to teaching and learning and no requirement for social distancing or other measures within in-person teaching. As a result, DfE advice was that providers were able to proceed without restrictions on face-to-face provision. In this context, DfE had reminded providers of their wider health and safety obligations and of the need to communicate clearly and effectively with students on what they can expect from planned teaching and learning (this included scenario planning to accommodate any changes in health advice).

(10) Although infection rates were rising, vaccination appeared to have significantly weakened the link between rising cases and increased levels of both hospitalisation and deaths. Staff and students should continue to isolate if infected or the close contact of someone infected (noting that advice relating to the latter would change from 16 August). Regular, home testing was being encouraged.

(11) From 19 July, the University approach had been a managed, rather than unrestricted, return of staff back to campus, with focus on increasing research and laboratory activity, post-graduate teaching, confirmation and clearing activity and preparation for the new academic year. A wider return to campus was anticipated from 1 September and planning was taking place accordingly. For Professional Services colleagues this would be part of the broader hybrid working pilot: further

details would be confirmed on 19 August. Clinically vulnerable colleagues or those unable to be vaccinated on medical grounds would continue to be able to work from home while case rates remained high.

(12) Until 1 September, activities on site were subject to local risk assessment and continued wearing of face-coverings whilst moving around on campus was strongly encouraged. Consideration should be given to retaining social distancing measures in areas of the campus where it was possible to do so without restricting activity until the wider return to campus in September. Use of hand sanitisers and ensuring adequate ventilation would also be encouraged. The Campus Management Group would remain in operation.

(13) Returning students would be strongly encouraged to ensure they were fully vaccinated before arrival on campus and there would be communications to this effect. The Greater Manchester vaccination team would also have presence on campus to provide a service for those still to be vaccinated. The University was liaising closely with other local providers to ensure a consistent, coherent Greater Manchester approach.

Noted:

(1) Whilst noting that further analysis of the NSS results was ongoing, in view of the disappointing outcome, the Board would welcome the opportunity for a more in-depth review in the near future (potentially in October). **Action: VP for Teaching, Learning and Students and Deputy Secretary**

(2) Board members could sign up to receive the regular briefings about how and where the University had featured in the media. Whilst this was valuable, one member commented that there would be merit in the Board receiving more in-depth reviews of significant media issues (e.g. the issues relating to media representation of the Blended Learning discussion as outlined above).

Action: Director of Communications and Deputy Secretary

5.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

information

Redacted – restricted

6. Health, Safety and Wellbeing Report (Q3)

Received: the Quarter Three Health, Safety and Wellbeing report, including:

- (1) A summary of significant issues relating to health, safety and well-being (including any remedial actions taken and wider learning for other areas of the University)
- (2) Key metrics (or simple measures e.g. number of accidents) and selected performance indicators; showing the trend in performance, compared to the previous year, if known
- (3) Progress against key initiatives in the Health, Safety and Wellbeing work-plan for the academic year 2020-21.
- (4) A minor proposed amendment to the Health and Safety Policy Statement

Reported:

- (1) Details of a near miss following an incident where an item fell from the roof of a University building onto an occupied vehicle and subsequent remedial action and lessons learned.
- (2) Whilst the Director for the Student Experience was the officer served with Direction Orders relating to cases under consideration by H.M. Coroner, the President and Vice-Chancellor was kept fully apprised of such cases.


Agreed: to note the report and approve the minor amendment to the Health and Safety Policy Statement.

Action: Deputy Secretary and Secretary of the HSW Committee

7. Budget Approval

Received: a report presenting the 2021-22 budget for approval. A tactical approach had been taken to budget setting for 2021/22, with further strategic discussions pending.

Reported: that the report and supporting materials included the following:

- (1) Waterfall diagrams analysing the 2021/22 budget against both the January and May 2020-21 forecast summary showing movements in income and expenditure
- (2) Details of underlying contribution, cash flow, cash in bank and application of various sensitivity scenarios.
- (3) 

information

Redacted – restricted

- (4) The Finance Committee had given detailed scrutiny consideration to the budget and offered challenge, noting better than anticipated forecast outturn, and recommended the budget to the Board. Surplus generated would be invested in improvement of facilities and key support systems and services.

Noted:

- (1) The uncertainty and volatility arising from the pandemic continued to present significant challenge to accurate forecasting, and the sensitivity analysis within the report attempted to address this. Overall, and as previously discussed at the Board, the overall funding model for the

sector was seriously flawed and any future implementation of the recommendations arising from the Augar Review would throw these deficiencies into starker relief.

(2) The potential cost of quarantine for international students arriving from red listed countries was anticipated to be in the region of [REDACTED] **Redacted – restricted information** this was on the Risk Register and the impact was manageable.

Agreed: To approve the 2021-22 budget as presented to the Board.

Action: Director of Finance

8. Operational Priorities 2021-22

Noted: that consideration of the circulated Operational Priorities for 2021-22 be deferred until the October 2021 meeting to enable consideration alongside other measures of success and performance metrics.

9. Social Responsibility update

Noted: that because of pressure of other business, the update on Social Responsibility was deferred to the October 2021 meeting.

10. Governance Effectiveness Review report

Received: the final report from the Halpin Partnership setting out their findings following the review of governance effectiveness commissioned by the Board earlier in the year. The Halpin Partnership presented the report at the Strategic Briefing which took place immediately before the Board meeting and the minute below reflects issues raised at both the briefing and the meeting

Reported:

(1) Halpin had concluded that when measured against its Governance Maturity Framework, the University's governance arrangements were good and effective, with some areas of leading-edge practice. The report made a total of 34 recommendations and 26 suggestions for improvement.

(2) Other key conclusions were:

- i) The Governance Office and Secretariat Support Team is strong.
- ii) The Annual Accountability Review process is sector-leading best practice.
- iii) The lay Board member skillset is strong, and the Chair is viewed to be excellent. Equality, diversity and inclusion governance practice is on an improvement trajectory with some examples of good practice emerging. Recent appointments should increase the pace of improvement.
- iv) Stakeholders have expressed particular concern about Senate, and Halpin considered the culture and processes of governance of the Senate to be of concern, with two areas assessed to be inadequate. Whilst the culture of governance at Board level is strong, the staff perception of the wider University governance culture is less positive. There is a need for the Board to address its wider profile and engagement with stakeholders.
- v) Halpin suggested a new constitutional settlement for the University whereby respective roles and responsibilities are clearly understood and accepted.
- vi) Amongst other things, Senate should accept the authority of the Board to fulfil its regulatory responsibility to the Office for Students (OfS) for assuring academic quality and standards. The Executive and ultimately the Board should, subject to due process tested by audit, have confidence in the role of Senate as its key source of assurance on these matters.
- vii) The report highlighted concern about behaviour, courtesy, and respect - and the impact this has on effective participation. Halpin noted that this is sometimes normalised in Higher Education but would be viewed very differently in other sectors. This featured in Halpin's review of the Senate,

but they noted that the institution must also guard against this behaviour translating into meetings and interactions in other parts of the University.

viii) Halpin noted that people must feel able to challenge using the right channels but must also do that in a respectful way. There is a need to ensure acceptable standards of behaviour across the entire organisation.

(3) Subject to the Board's approval of the recommendations and suggestions in the report (which Halpin confirmed were not intended to be prescriptive) the covering report to the Board recommended commissioning of an action plan, with appropriate (full and iterative) consultation with Senate and other stakeholders and Nominations Committee retaining its role as Steering Group to oversee further work and implementation.

Noted:

(1) The response to the report from Board members was generally very positive. There was recognition of the need for the Board to reflect on how it could engage more effectively with stakeholders and Halpin noted that this was an increasingly common theme for Boards inside and outside the sector, including in the corporate world (some members with experience of the latter noted that there were examples of good practice). Halpin had highlighted the importance of recognising perception of stakeholders, noting that there were examples of robust and clear processes (for example in relation to lay member Board recruitment) not understood by the wider University community. Whilst it was important to identify opportunities for active Board engagement with stakeholders, including staff and students (and report back to the Board on such engagement), members recognised the importance of clarity of purpose and structure in such engagement.

(2) The importance of effective promulgation of key Board discussion and decisions (alongside publication of approved minutes) was also recognised: the President and Vice-Chancellor did refer to this where appropriate in her weekly message, but there was merit in a discrete communication from the Board. The comment about minutes reflecting the level of challenge from the Board was also welcomed (whilst recognising improvements in this area) and was captured in the broad recommendation relating to improving the culture of governance.

(3) Whilst the Board did ensure opportunities for student report and engagement, there was also recognition of the scope for improvement in this area, including establishment of a standing item on each Board agenda. In the context of enhancing understanding of student views and perception, one member encouraged reading of the student newspaper, [The Mancunian](#), which was now available online.

(4) The recommended broadening of the remit of Staffing Committee to include organisational development, staff performance and wellbeing issues was welcomed.

(5) The Board recognised that the most critical element of the report related to the operation of Senate. Whilst Senate had welcomed the report at its meeting on 15 July, some members of the Board questioned whether Senate fully accepted the need for the new constitutional settlement and reset referred to above, and whether the introduction of the proposed Code of Conduct would be sufficient to address the behavioural issues referred to in the report.

(6) In discussion at the briefing, Halpin had commented on the need for Senate to focus on its primary task of assuring quality and standards (and in turn providing assurance to the Board on this): this would enhance Senate's functionality and improve interaction with the Board. In discussion, Halpin had suggested a holistic approach to consideration of the recommendations relating to Senate, including interaction with Senate collectively. Whilst, in the final report, there had been reflection on the language used to describe the current operation of Senate, Halpin were confident that content and recommendations were sufficiently clear and robust to drive improvement, once implemented.

(7) Noting the comments in the report about the challenge for the President and Vice-Chancellor in chairing Senate and managing group dynamics, ensuring diversity of voices and providing boundaries for discussion of topics, one member asked if there had been any thought to recommending an alternative Chair of Senate. Whilst this had received consideration, Halpin had

concluded that given the accountability and responsibility of the President and Vice-Chancellor as Principal Academic Officer, it was important that she retained the role of Chair of Senate.

(8) Appended to the report setting out Senate's consideration of the Halpin review was a letter from 22 current and designate Senate members: amongst other matters, this recommended the establishment of an implementation committee comprising members from all five categories of Senate to consider recommendations relevant to Senate and then make recommendations to Senate for subsequent consideration by the Board.

(9) On balance and after contribution from a number of members, including those elected by Senate, the Board preferred the holistic and collective approach to consideration of recommendations relating to Senate, which meant engaging with the whole of Senate. In this context, the Board was reminded that in the recent past (2019), Senate had rejected the idea of a Standing Committee (to act on Senate's behalf between scheduled meetings) preferring to be engaged and consulted as a whole. The Board recognised the constructive nature of the communication from the 22 Senate members and agreed that the Chair should respond accordingly, with final wording of the communication subject to input and comment from the Senate Board members.

Agreed: To approve the recommendations and suggestions set out in the Halpin review report, and that an implementation action plan be drawn up, with appropriate, full and iterative consultation with Senate and other stakeholders, and Nominations Committee retaining its role as Steering Group to oversee further work and implementation.

Action: RSCOO/Deputy Secretary

11. Office for Students (OfS): Statement of Expectations-Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment

Received: a report from the Director for the Student Experience (DSE).

Reported:

(1) The OfS had published a Statement of Expectations to support higher education providers to develop and implement effective systems, policies and processes to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual harassment and sexual misconduct. The Statement includes a requirement that "the governing body routinely be given information on the provider's approach to harassment and sexual misconduct for consideration and action (as necessary)."

(2) The DSE Advice and Response team, in collaboration with Human Resources and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion colleagues had analysed the actions identified in the Statement and compared these with current practice. The review outlined good practice identified and immediate priorities in addressing areas of development.

Noted:

(1) The OfS was not expecting full immediate compliance but did expect to be assured of a trajectory to ensure full compliance by the autumn. In its self-assessment, the OfS team had been rigorous and self-critical and there was clarity of further action required. It was not currently clear as to whether confirmation of compliance with the Statement would be an annual OfS regulatory requirement.

(2) Whilst there was clear visibility of advice, guidance and support, there was still a strong likelihood of under-reporting (in the last quarter, 35 students had advised that they had experienced sexual harassment and sexual violence).

(3) There had been some recent press reports relating to the use within the sector of Non-Disclosure Agreements in an effort to resolve complaints of sexual harassment and sexual violence. The Board was assured that the Board had not, and would not in future, use NDAs in such circumstances.

Agreed: to note the review (and the intention to produce a further review in due course) and to approve the areas for further development as outlined in the report.

Action: Director for the Student Experience

12. Intellectual Property (IP) Policy

Received: a report setting out the outcome of the periodic review of the Intellectual Property Policy text, taking account of external developments and improving the clarity of guidance available to staff and students. The report noted the integration of the previously separate Copyright Policy document.

Reported:

(1) There were no changes to the Policy principles: changes to revenue sharing arrangements were proposed and articulated in the report to ensure the sustainability of innovation support activities and to improve the prospects of successful commercialisation of the University's Intellectual Property through spin-outs and licensing.

(2) The report had been agreed by Senate, with the inclusion of some minor clarifications.

(3) Even with the proposed changes, the University was at the more generous end of the spectrum in relation to revenue sharing: this would continue to incentivise academic inventors but the approach would also ensure they receive the support they need to bring their ideas into application.

Noted: there had been extensive consultation through Associate Deans, with a Working Group established with representation enabling a broad range of views to be expressed.

Agreed:

(1) Publication of the new policy text (and accompanying guidance documents) and to confirm removal of the separate Copyright Policy document.

(2) Changes to revenue sharing arrangements as outlined in the report from 1 August 2021.

(3) Implementation of consequential matters as outlined in the report.

Action: Deputy President and Deputy V-C

13. Report from General Secretary of the Students' Union

Received: a report providing an update on progress in the four agreed priority areas at the University-Union Relations Committee (UURC) (assessment and feedback, postgraduate taught experience, review of terms and conditions of student contracts and transparency of communications) noting that the Board agreed that UURC should be the principal mechanism for addressing the key themes in the report from the General Secretary to the Board to the September 2020 meeting. The report also contained recommendations on other key student issues and highlighted challenges faced by the Students' Union (SU) and potential improvements to enable SU officers to represent students in the best possible way possible

Reported:

(1) Issues highlighted in the report included ongoing issues relating to assessment and feedback and the postgraduate taught experience, with the latter referencing the potential to integrate industrial experience into the postgraduate taught offer.

(2) The SU preference for Board engagement with students to be moderated through the SU.

Noted:

(1) In the past year, there had been increased engagement between senior management and elected representatives (at both course and residential halls level) on a range of subject specific and generic issues.

(2) Whilst the importance of the SU elected representative structure was recognised, there should be scope for liaison with students who chose not to engage with the SU structure and processes.

14. Chair's Report-summary of meetings with members

Noted: a report from the Chair summarising the outcomes of one-to-one meetings with members of the Board.

15. Secretary's Report

i) University of Manchester Innovation Factory (UMIF) Power of Attorney

Received: a report seeking Board approval to extend the Power of Attorney, delegating certain powers from the University of Manchester to the University of Manchester innovation Factory Ltd (UMIF) as the current delegation expired on 30 September 2021.

Reported: the agreed final version of the Power of Attorney (with substantively the same scope as previously approved by the Board) will form a schedule to an updated Management Services and Governance Agreement between the University and UMIF. The agreement and the wording of the Power of Attorney will be submitted to the Finance and Capital Planning Sub-Committee prior to execution in September 2021.

Agreed: to approve the University entering into the Power of Attorney for a further period of five years (until 30 September 2026) in substantively the same form as previously approved, subject to Finance and Capital Planning Sub-Committee approval of the wording.

Action: Deputy President and Deputy-Vice Chancellor and Director of Legal Affairs and Board Secretariat

ii) Exercise of Delegations

Reported: the award of Emeritus Professorships and use of Seal Orders as outlined in the report.

16. Board Committee reports

(i) Nominations Committee (8 July 2021)

Received: a report from the Nominations Committee meeting held on 8 July 2021. The report included the Committee's consideration of the Governance Effectiveness Review report (see item 10 above) as well as providing an update on Board appointments and related matters.

Reported:

(1) The recruitment process for the senior, experienced lay member vacancy had been subject to a slight pause to ensure the final shortlist was as diverse as possible.

(2) The recruitment process for the lay member with digital transformation/marketing experience had produced a diverse shortlist: a preferred candidate had been identified and whilst matters had not been concluded in time for a recommendation to be made to the meeting, it was anticipated that a recommendation for appointment would be circulated to the Board shortly.

Action: Deputy Secretary

Noted:

- (1) Some recruitment agencies specialised in bringing forward diverse shortlists and the Chair confirmed that this was already a key factor in choice of agency.
- (2) The Board had been consulted on the skills matrix that had resulted in role specifications for the vacant positions.

Agreed:

- (1) To appoint Raoul Shah to the lay member position reserved for the Alumni Association for an initial three year period (1 September 2021 to 31 August 2024).
- (2) To approve the specification for the additional vacancy arising from the resignation of the Chair of Audit and Risk Committee with effect from 31 August 2021.
- (3) To approve changes to Ordinances arising from changes to General Assembly membership as outlined in the report.

Action; Deputy Secretary

(ii) Finance Committee (23 June and 15 July 2021)

Received: a report from the meetings held on the above dates.

Reported:

(1) As reported in item 7 above, the Committee had recommended the 2021-22 budget to the Board. The Committee had considered level of prudence of the budget and potential upside and downside risks, recognising that results were better than anticipated, but noting continued significant uncertainty. The budget would be monitored throughout the year and in light of the five year financial plan to be presented in October.

(2) Future activity would include: financial oversight of Strategic Programmes, with a focus on delivery and tracking of financial costs and benefits: review of the five year plan: developing governance over satellite entities (including ID Manchester): reviewing the updated Estates Strategy and priorities, including focus on Long Term Maintenance costs and residences: and a programme of deep dives into financial performance in particular areas of the University.

Agreed:

- (1) As noted above (item 7) to approve the proposed 2021-22 budget.
- (2) To note other matters considered by the Committee, including provision of an additional [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for the Finance Transformation Project and an additional [REDACTED] (relating to IT costs) for the Student Experience Programme. **Redacted – restricted information**

iii) Audit and Risk Committee (20 May and 9 June 2021)

Received: reports from the meetings of Audit and Risk Committee held on the above dates.

Reported:

(1) The May meeting was devoted to detailed consideration of the most significant risks and the report summarised the Committee's review. The June meeting agreed to a schedule for the rolling in-depth review of the most significant risks in 2021-22.

(2) In relation to internal audit, Uniac had completed seven substantive audits since the previous meeting. The most significant report related to staff overpayments and leavers, and the Committee agreed that there was an urgent need for action, asking to receive the monthly reports that were being provided for SLT to provide assurance of the efficacy of remedial measures.

(3) Terms of reference for the Committee would be reviewed in due course, in light of recent changes to Finance Committee terms of reference and recommendations in the Halpin review.

(4) The Research Compliance Committee Annual Report was appended to the report and provided assurance to the Board that the University is meeting its obligations to comply with the statutory, regulatory and policy requirements that govern research.

Noted:

(1) The Committee had given extensive consideration to cyber and related risk and this would be the subject of an in-depth review at the September meeting. A major incident planning exercise was also planned for September and cyber-related matters were also the subject of regular review at Information Governance Committee, which reports to Planning and Resources Committee.

(2) A recent Committee of University Chairs briefing had involved institutions which had been subject to cyber-attack and included reflections on lessons learned.

(3) In addition to consideration at Committee level, the Board would also benefit from a briefing on this matter in the near future.

Action; Deputy Secretary

The Chair of the Board left the meeting at this point and the Deputy Chair chaired the rest of the meeting.

iv) Staffing Committee (15 July 2021)

Received: a report from the meeting of Staffing Committee held on the above date.

Reported: recommendations in relation to the Student Experience Programme (Cohort 2b); IT Services; and Professional Services support for Researcher Development.

Agreed:

(1) On the Committee's recommendation and in relation to the Student Experience Programme (Cohort 2b) that:

a) the University enters into consultation with the campus trade unions about proposals to reduce posts by a net of 15.1 (FTE) from an "at risk pool" of 26.95 (FTE) posts and, subject to consultation, should progress with its proposals for voluntary severance;

b) the University continues to take all steps outlined to avoid the need for redundancy wherever this is possible and, in particular, to support the use of the University's Voluntary Severance Scheme in the affected areas;

c) the Staffing Committee continues to oversee these proposals in accordance with Part II of Ordinance XXIII.

(2) On the Committee's recommendation and in relation to the Directorate of IT Services, that Part III of Ordinance XXIII to effect the proposed compulsory redundancies across Grade 8 and Grade 9 posts in the Directorate of IT Services, if required, is instituted.

(3) On the Committee's recommendation and in relation to Professional Services support for Researcher Development Restructure that:

- a) the University enters into consultation with the campus trade unions about the proposals to reduce posts by a net of two (one FTE) from an “at risk” pool of three (FTE) posts at Grade 7 and, subject to consultation, should progress with its proposals for voluntary severance;
- b) the University continues to take all steps outlined to avoid the need for redundancy wherever this is possible and, in particular, to support the use of the University’s Voluntary Severance Scheme in the affected areas;
- c) the Staffing Committee continues to oversee these proposals in accordance with Part II of Ordinance XXIII.

(v) Remuneration Committee (28 June 2021)

Received: the report from the meeting of Remuneration Committee held on the above date which considered senior staff succession planning.

17. Remuneration Committee

Received:

- (1) The Committee Annual Report for 2020-21
- (2) Remuneration Committee Principles for 2021-22
- (3) The Committee Annual Workplan for 2021-22

Agreed: to approve the above documents, noting that Committee Principles would in future be brought to the Board for approval every three years (unless there were significant changes) and the Annual Workplan would be appended to the Annual Report. **Action: Director of HR**

18. Planning and Resources Committee (7 May, 11 May and 8 June 2021)

Received: a report from the meetings of Planning and Resources Committee held on the above dates.

Agreed: to approve the Capability Policy and related Ordinance as appended to the report.

Noted: that the Capability Policy was separate from and not a replacement for performance management and the Performance and Development Review process.

19. Report from the Senate (2 June and 14 July 2021)

Received: a report from the Senate meetings held on the above dates.

Reported:

- (1) Recommendations relating to the OfS: Statement of Expectations-Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment and the Intellectual Property Policy had been dealt with earlier on the agenda (items 11 and 12 respectively)
- (2) Senate member comments on the Governance Effectiveness Review had been considered under item 10.

Noted: that it had not been feasible to resume in-person graduation over the summer but conditions and restrictions permitting, this would be resumed in the winter.

Agreed: to approve the recommendations from the Awards and Honours Group.

Action: Deputy Secretary/Secretary to AHG

20. Forward agenda for 2021-22

Received: the Board forward agenda for 2021-22.

21. Any other business

Noted: there was no other business

22. Evaluation of Chair

Received: a report from the Deputy Chair advising of the outcome of the annual, anonymised questionnaire completed by members of the Board of Governors on the performance of the Chair of the Board in 2020/21.

Reported:

(1) Overall, the responses were highly positive and commended the performance of the Chair, especially so during the period of the Covid-19 pandemic. There were also some learning points from comments made and these have been fully discussed with the Chair.

(2) The Deputy Chair read a response from the Chair which, amongst other matters, expressed his appreciation of positive feedback from Board members and his determination to maintain the spirit of continuous improvement in the final year of his term (including the length and quality of Board papers). The Chair's response also covered the extent of challenge and support provided to the President and Vice-Chancellor both in private and at the Board.

(3) In future years (and in parallel with the President and Vice-Chancellor's performance review) the detailed comments from members would be made available in the Diligent Reading Room.

Action: Deputy Secretary