

Plymouth University

Higher Education Corporation Board of Governors

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 20 January 2015.

Present: James Brent (Chairman) Dr Ranulf Scarbrough
Sarah Bowman Margaret Schwarz
Nick Buckland OBE Dr Mike Sheaff
Professor Mark Cleary Stephen Tillman
Professor David Coslett Henry Warren
Kathryn Goddard Denis Wilkins
Professor Terence Lewis
Steve Pearce

Secretary: Jane Hopkinson, University Secretary

In attendance: Professor David Coslett, Interim Vice-Chancellor
Professor Ray Playford, Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Professor Richard Stephenson, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Professor Simon Payne, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor
David Beeby, Interim Chief Financial Officer
Vikki Matthews, Chief Talent Officer
John Wright, Chief Information Officer
Siân Millard, Head of Strategy and Performance
David Cockayne, Good Governance Institute (observer)
Margaret Metcalfe, Executive Administrator

		Action
15/01/1	<u>Membership</u>	
1.1	Welcome to new governors Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• welcome to Nick Buckland and Professor Mark Cleary• Susan Davy and Professor Mary Watkins would be joining the Board in February• with pleasure, Steve Pearce's return• David Cockayne from the Good Governance Institute was attending as an observer.	
1.2	Apologies for absence Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• apologies from Duncan Currall	
1.3	Notification of items of any other business Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an item in relation to the Plymouth Science Park would be considered under any other business, following discussion at the Finance Committee earlier in	

	the day.	
1.4	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure A • no specific conflicts of interest relating to matters to be discussed at the meeting. 	
1.5	<p>Appointment of the Senior Independent Governor (SIG)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Pearce had canvassed nominations independently of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. There had been a consensus that Henry Warren would be an appropriate candidate and he had indicated his willingness to take on the role • the SIG would be to be available to any governor should they have concerns which it would not be appropriate to raise through normal channels (Chairman, Vice-Chancellor or University Secretary). <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry Warren be appointed as the Senior Independent Governor. 	
1.6	<p>Committee memberships</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to identify new committee chairs following recent resignations and appointments, and to integrate new co-opted governors within the committee structure • any further changes would await the outcomes of the external governance review • the Nominations Committee (to whom authority had formally been delegated) had agreed the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Audit Committee: following HEFCE guidance Margaret Schwarz had relinquished the chairmanship of the Audit Committee having taken on the role of Vice-Chairman of the Board. Henry Warren had agreed to take the role of Audit Committee Chair. - Finance Committee: following Stephen Pryor's resignation, Dr Ranulf Scarbrough had agreed to take on the role of Chair of Finance Committee - new governors: Professor Mary Watkins would join the Employment Committee; Professor Mark Cleary would join Audit Committee; Nick Buckland would join Finance Committee; and Susan Davy would remain in membership of Finance Committee • in addition, governors were invited to express an interest in current vacancies on the Honorary Awards Committee • the next meeting of Nominations Committee would take place on 17 February, when the Committee would consider a Board skills and diversity matrix with a view to commencing a new governors' recruitment process in the Spring. 	
15/01/2	<u>Minutes</u>	
2.1	<p>Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on 24 November 2014 (Enclosure A)</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • subject to an amendment on page 8 to show that the historical cost deficit 	MM

	for 2013 was £2,596,000, the minutes were approved as a correct record, to be signed by the Chairman.	
2.2	<p>Matters arising: (Enclosure C)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the report for information • a proposal that outstanding issues relating to the Financial Regulations (<i>Minute 14/05/8.2</i>) be discussed through the Audit Committee. 	
15/01/3	<u>Presentation</u>	
3.1	<p>Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 <i>Presentation by Professor Ray Playford, Deputy Vice-Chancellor</i></p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an excellent background paper focused on research funding had been circulated with the agenda • the interdependence of research and teaching in the university context • the majority of funding for research in UK HE institutions (HEIs) comes from the UK government, with significant non-public funding from charities and industrial/commercial organisations in the UK and overseas in the form of grants and contracts for specific research projects • EU funding was particularly significant for Plymouth University. The last programme of EU funding for research and innovation ran from 2007 to 2013 and had a total budget of over €50 billion. The latest framework programme (Horizon 2020) would make nearly €80 billion of funding available from 2014 to 2020 • research funding was not a continuous flow, but was awarded in the form of grants which were often of several years' duration • the Research Excellence Framework (REF) was a UK-wide peer-review exercise that produced quality ratings for those research staff that institutions chose to submit for assessment in their respective subject areas • the REF had involved considerable work over a period of twelve months or more leading to submission in 2013. Submissions in each of the 36 units of assessment (UoA) had been assessed by an expert panel, with outcomes published in December 2014 • the REF replaced the previous (2008) Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). Outcomes were difficult to compare, given changes both to assessment criteria (where 'esteem' had been replaced by 'impact'), changes to the UoAs and the previous joint submission with Exeter in medicine and dentistry • Plymouth had submitted 366 FTE staff across 18 UoAs and had doubled the proportion of 3*/4* research from one third to two thirds of its submission: there was an improving trajectory across the sector • rankings varied according to the metrics used (leading the Times Higher Education to note that 32 institutions were now in the top 10) • in the Research Power rankings Plymouth had maintained its 47th position from 2008: this reflected numbers of staff submitted and Grade Point Average (GPA) • the University had achieved an Intensity ranking of 59, having submitted 50% of eligible staff, which was a high proportion by comparison with other post-1992 HEIs • in UoA1 Clinical Medicine, Plymouth had achieved a particularly good result 	

	<p>in regards to its publication (output ranking), coming top in the Country as a result of a very focussed submission. This was helpful to obtain a good output score but counters against a good power ranking (GPA x number submitted)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to interpret results with caution, because of cross-representation across units of assessment, which could not always be aligned directly or uniquely with a specific School • the biggest weakness had been the University's performance in impact studies. This had not been unexpected, and reflected in part the numbers of research staff who had recently joined (where the University was unable to claim the impact of their previous work) but was particularly disappointing for the Enterprise University and might benefit from further investigation • the importance of unit co-ordinators had not always been recognised internally but had been reaffirmed in reviewing the quality of submissions and outcomes • overall the highest scores in relation to 'environment' correlated directly with the size of the unit of submission • REF outcomes would be a fundamental consideration in relation to the size and shape discussion: it would be essential to identify the strategy going forward, whether to focus on maintaining overall position or increase selectivity and concentrate resources on fewer units of assessment • the benefit of appropriate aggregation of research staff so as to increase numbers submitted in specific units of assessment (notwithstanding a preference on the part of some senior staff to submit within the UoA with which they felt more closely associated) • it was difficult to identify from the data currently published by the University the numbers of research active staff, support staff etc • the need to take forward discussions on role planning, to define clearly the expectations of individual staff members in relation to research and to other aspects of the academic role. A process of consultation with the unions about new contracts was being initiated, and some changes to contracts had been implemented prior to the REF • this was not intended to create a hierarchy of value and the University recognised the need to ensure that appropriate models of success and reward were available to all staff • this did not imply that all staff would not be expected to undertake research, as it remained a key aspect of scholarship and in line with the University's focus on research informed teaching, but not all staff would be expected to produce outputs which would form part of a REF submissions – and not all research required institutional investment • ideally a refocusing of academic roles would increase student:staff ratios at the same time as investing in research excellence • the potential value of rationalising the current number of research centres/research institutes within the University: a number of potential rationalisations were identified • the paper suggested that the University was subsidising the costs of research. While it was the case that full economic costing for research was far from universal, the QR funding which resulted from the RAE went a considerable way to reducing the apparent deficit in research funding • staff costs were in many cases embedded, and TRAC (Transparent Approach to Costing) data reflected the way in which information was submitted by 	
--	---	--

	<p>academic staff. Inputs were limited to 40 hours per week, and there was a natural inclination on the part of some staff to maximise the research element of their return given its intrinsic value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • research activity did not generate a surplus but it did have qualitative value in terms of league tables, and consequentially in terms of student recruitment, and in attracting good staff • in the context of what would inevitably be a future focus on return on investment, it would be important to identify as far as possible the benefits and real costs of research activity • the REF was not the only measure of research, which contributed in a number of less tangible ways • the next step in relation to the REF would be decisions on funding and there would inevitably be lobbying on the part of the research intensive institutions that funding be more focused in line with government intentions around research selectivity • internally, there were ongoing discussions about the allocation of QR funding, with a proposal that it would largely follow 4* contribution but with a central fund for strategic investment • for Plymouth, a key ambition must be to become engaged with research consortia: currently the University was excluded from some regional consortia but there remained an opportunity to engage with commercial partners in relation to EU bids. This could be costly and time consuming but could also be rewarding should it be successful • thanks to Professor Playford for an informative presentation which had stimulated an interesting discussion. 	
15/01/4	Report from the Chief Executive's Group (Enclosure D)	
4.1	<p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Chancellor's Autumn Statement had included an announcement of a new government-backed loan system for postgraduate taught Masters students. In the interim HEFCE was providing funding for pilot projects to stimulate progression to taught postgraduate programmes. Plymouth had been offered £650K to support 130 postgraduate scholarships on a match funding basis and the University was reviewing the potential benefits • the government had published its Science and Innovation Strategy, and the University was reviewing the possibility of a bid to upgrade its research facilities (including existing laboratories) • Plymouth was amongst 73 universities and colleges that had secured a share of the Government's £200 million of STEM funding, being awarded £1.2m in total. It was reported that the Plymouth bid had been very well received • the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) most recent report had reduced its predicted drop in numbers of applications from 4% to 1%. Applications from EU students were rising, and there had been a small rise in international applications, notwithstanding the negative signals sent out by current government immigration policy • Universities UK had named their first female President, Dame Julia Goodfellow, Vice-Chancellor of Kent University • the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) has confirmed the schedule of its formal review of Teaching and Learning, visiting Plymouth in May 2016. 	

	<p>The core Teaching and Learning team were already preparing to draft the University's self-evaluation document (SED) which would be submitted well before the visit. The QAA team would be interrogating University information via the web from January 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as part of the capital investment programme, the performing arts space 'The House' had had a very successful opening and had provided a significant uplift to the student experience as well as an enhanced community offer. There was now a move to establish a centre of excellence in drama, working with the Theatre Royal • the new Marine Station at Coxside provided an academically-led facility rather than simply a skills-based diving centre which offered opportunities for growth. An open week would take place shortly, but the formal opening had been deferred until September to coincide with a major international conference • it was intended to circulate to staff the one-page summary of discussions and decisions at the Chief Executive's Group (CEG) as part of the move to greater transparency and more effective communication. In order to ensure that the language used was appropriate and achieved the desired aims, an initial pilot had been rolled out and continuing feedback would be encouraged. Some concerns were expressed at the use of the term 'Interim' in the titles of key executives, which might imply a lack of stability • with the departure of Professor Julian Beer and impending retirement of both the Dean of Research and Innovation and the Dean of the Graduate School, it was intended to reposition research leadership, enterprise and business-facing engagement. Proposals would be brought back to the Board. 	
15/01/5	Governance	
5.1	<p>Initiation of Governance Improvement and Strategy Delivery programmes (Enclosure E)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the joint Board/Executive Development Day held in December 2014 had identified two important areas of work to be undertaken in 2015 – clarifying the delivery plan for Strategy 2020 and improving the University's governance structures, processes and culture (while ensuring appropriate alignment with the new CUC Higher Education Code of Governance) • it was proposed to approach these two areas of work as change programmes using a formal programme management approach: the paper focused on the programme management techniques, to demonstrate the integrity of the process, and provided an overview of the terms of reference and membership of the Steering Groups • the two areas of work were not mutually exclusive • governance was about leadership and culture as well as more functional issues • it would be for the Steering Groups to determine their own detailed workplan and timelines but as a first step, facilitated workshops would clarify detailed project briefs: it was suggested that GGI may be well-placed to provide external facilitation in this context • the University's current vision was fully supported, although it was suggested that the use of the term <i>the Enterprise University</i> might be revisited 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Strategy 2020 document however was very general and there was a need to prioritise measurable deliverables and identify what success looked like: this might be better reflected in the terms of reference the Groups would be asked to consider the identification of stakeholder groups and how best to engage with them, whether through co-option to the Group or otherwise the Governance group would need to engage with the staff unions Mike Sheaff would be in membership of both Steering Groups and confirmed that he would commit to the work of the groups, ensuring that he commented on papers even where teaching commitments might impact on his ability to attend meetings terms of reference and objectives of each Steering Group could usefully be reviewed by the Group to ensure that its role and objectives were clear to the wider University the Head of Strategy and Planning would be an ex officio member of the Groups, which would be supported by staff from her team the role of the programme sponsor, who would have direct engagement with the relevant Group. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the programme approach draft terms of reference as outlined, subject to detailed review by the Groups governor membership of the groups needed to be confirmed as soon as possible in order that the workshops could be set up. 	
5.2	<p>GGI update on the review of governance</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a number of 1:1 interviews had taken place, with further interviews taking place this week while some colleagues had reflected on recent events, there had been a welcome focus on forward thinking a rich vein of material had been amassed, encompassing not only structure and processes but also culture, behaviours and leadership GGI had met with HEFCE, who were supportive of the direction of travel and had asked for regular updates Dame Sandra Burslem, former Vice-Chancellor of Manchester Metropolitan, had agreed to Chair the Advisory Panel. Kevin Clarke, former Secretary at the University of Stirling, and Ann Sutton, who had worked at a senior level in the NHS and was a member of Council at the University of Kent, were the other two members. An initial meeting would be taking place on 23 January staff engagement had been extended through a staff survey, with over 10% of staff responding, and this would be followed up through focus groups later in the week and a meeting with the JCC GGI was also engaging with UPSU some emerging themes were already clear: an interim report would be submitted end-January, and would be available at the Board meeting in February, and this would then be finalised with a series of recommendations and an action plan, taking account the Board's concerns about establishing the 'classroom to boardroom' link the University would be benchmarked against other HEIs 	GGI

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEFCE's expectation was that outcomes would be published, and both the drafting of the report and the communications linked with it were therefore critical. 	
5.3	<p>New CUC Higher Education Code of Governance (Enclosure F)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the updated Code was both valuable and timely a cultural shift in terms of levels of engagement of governors with academic strategy without replicating the work of Academic Board. 	
15/01/6	<u>University Strategy and Direction</u>	
6.1	<p>Plymouth University Strategy for College-based Higher Education (Enclosure G)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the report provided the Board with a briefing on Higher Education provision within Further Education Colleges and current activities via Plymouth's academic partnerships in the South West; a summary of various policy developments that were likely to impact this market; an analysis of the potential future options and recommendations on the way forward 5300 University students were based in FE college partnerships, the majority on programmes delivered by the colleges but leading to Plymouth University awards which the University had validated the majority of students were on Foundation Degrees or Higher National Diplomas given the scale of the activity, the significant changes to the HE context, and developments elsewhere, the University had undertaken a formal review of its strategy colleges had for some time been allocated student numbers directly rather than through the University, and the cap had been removed for them as well as for the University there was a growing HE market in the validation of awards in colleges, and the potential for larger colleges to seek their own taught degree awarding powers. A number of partners had ambitions to offer full undergraduate and in some cases postgraduate degrees a potentially significant growth in vocational qualifications nationally, 6% of HE provision was delivered through colleges: in the South West the figure was 14%, although the region was still notable for 'cold spots' the University had relationships with 15 FE colleges from Bristol to Penzance, including Jersey. It was involved in co-design and co-delivery of programmes, ensuring the quality of provision, and had a national reputation for its partnership activity the partner network offered a range of benefits, both financial (through validation fees and student fees where students progressed to the University) and reputational risks included potential competition from partners (which the University was better able to manage as the validating body than were the colleges to seek validation from elsewhere) and the management of data quality the range of strategic options considered by the Executive, drawn from models elsewhere in UK and internationally the proposal was to sustain the regional network but with an increased focus on progression pathways at all levels, maintenance of the co-design and co- 	

	<p>delivery model, and a combination of a vocational offer and research informed study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need for the Board better to understand both the longer-term business case and the likely sustainability of the model. Validation fees currently totalled £2.9m pa, with costs amounting to c£1m, and progression student fees currently amounted to £7m pa, but the costs associated with those students were currently more difficult to assess, since they simply became part of a Plymouth cohort • the need to raise aspirations in the region was a key driver for the partnership. Interestingly, the widening participation/access profile of students in the colleges did not differ significantly from that of the Plymouth campus, although there were more mature students • the opportunity to develop more vocational qualifications through the college network, since the colleges were often closer to employers • concerns that although 40% of the HE students in Cornwall were Plymouth University students, and the network did give the University greater reach in Cornwall, currently classified by the European Commission as a 'Less Developed Region' with specific opportunities to bid for European funding, the University's contribution was often overlooked by comparison with that of Exeter and Falmouth. This was an issue which the Board would want to revisit • the need to analyse the reasons for the decline in progression numbers and develop mechanisms to grow Plymouth's share, notwithstanding increased competition • the potential to be more strategic about the colleges with which the University worked, who demonstrated a very significant variation in student numbers which the Board felt deserved further attention and review • the impact of the geographic range of the colleges • the impact of the size and shape discussions on the future direction of the partnership 	
15/01/7	Finance	
7.1	<p>Period 4 management accounts (Enclosure H)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the paper provided an analysis of financial performance at the end of Period 4 (November 2014) and the forecast for the full year based on Period 4 actuals • Finance Committee had gone through the paper in detail earlier in the day • the University anticipated delivering a surplus in the current year, but there were concerns about continuing volatility in student numbers forecasts which would have implications in the longer term • the bottom line was heavily influenced by the short term relief secured through effective management of vacancies: while strong controls were in place in relation to the filling of vacancies, the current level of savings would not be secured on a recurrent basis • an agreement at Finance Committee to write back the current provision for severance costs • the presentation would be improved going forward to distinguish savings, reinvestment and net savings • the provision for student withdrawal related to withdrawal after 1 December and was based on solid trend data 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> income from spin-off companies was not yet significant: holdings in other companies were consolidated under other income Brixham initial rental agreement was still being negotiated as previously reported, but had no associated income stream as yet: the University would monitor developments on the site closely a broader debate to be had about the extent to which the University was maximising the returns on its intellectual property the Finance Committee had stressed the need to look carefully at the 2015/16 forecasts. 	
7.2	<p>Resolution associated with the Hong Kong dollar credit card facility (Enclosure I)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Board had approved the Hong Kong Credit card facility on 8 July 2014, but HSBC required a formal and specific Board resolution in relation to the issuing of the cards individual limits would be set for named staff in line with the University's travel and expenses policies. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the resolution as proposed (see Appendix x). 	
7.3	<p>Schedule of insurances 2014-15</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the insurance arrangements that the University had in place for 2014-15, agreed self-insurances and levels of loss suffered in 2013/14 <i>Secretary's note:</i> after the meeting the CFO confirmed that the sum insured for business interruption was £90m. 	
15/01/8	Academic Board	
8.1	<p>Minutes of the meeting of Academic Board held on 17 December 2014 (Enclosure K)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the provision of full minutes of Academic Board was the first step in improving the Board's understanding of and connection to the work of ACB the decision in relation to the delivery of collaborative programmes in a language other than English reflected a proposed partnership agreement in Greece, in which a proportion of Year 1 work would be delivered and assessed in Greek, while the students undertook additional English language tuition which would enable them successfully to enter Years 2 and 3 in English. This was a new development for the University, and focused on assisting students in the transition from their pre-University education in Greek and the requirements of a degree taught and assessed in English. A review had been built in after one year of operation. 	
15/01/9	Committee minutes	
9.1	<p>Oral report on items discussed at the meeting of the Finance Committee held on 20 January 2015</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major capital expenditure: the potential for up to £50m capital investment funded 50% through borrowing and 50% from cash reserves. Additional borrowing to support delivery of the agreed Strategy could be considered as 	

	<p>surplus improved. Discussion of potential projects would be dependent on the outcomes of size and shape discussions and the further development of the campus strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on IT modernisation: this had outlined the positive impact of the programme to date on the student experience. The Committee was seeking a further analysis of the project 'wishlist', to enable it to prioritise investments which would deliver an appropriate financial payback • Rolle Exmouth disposal: ongoing negotiations with Rolle Exmouth Limited (REL) which sought to maximise the disposal value of the site while meeting the ambitions of the local community for education/vocational training/business incubation/support and community use. The Committee had identified minimum acceptable capital receipts, but had stressed the importance of ongoing negotiations with REL which sought to identify a mutually acceptable resolution. 	
15/01/10	Any other business	
10.1	<p>Plymouth Science Park: proposed loan</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the University and Plymouth City Council (PCC) were the two members of the Plymouth Science Park (PSP) company, under a joint venture agreement • the Finance Committee held on the morning of the Board had considered a tabled paper recommending approval in principle of a proposal to commit match funding in the sum of £1,977,570 to PSP's Phase 5 development, to be provided in the form of a long term loan at a commercial rate of interest • the Phase 5 development focused on the refurbishment of an existing hard-to-let building, with the provision of high quality smaller office space, and a new build designed to provide additional high quality office space • the context of the proposal was the availability of an indicative funding allocation of £3m from the Heart of the South West LEP Growth Deal to support the Phase 5 development. This was subject to LEP approval of the final business case and satisfactory due diligence (targeted by April 2015). The LEP allocation was contingent upon match funding of £4m, and the partners had been asked to provide such funding. In order that the LEP funding allocation could be confirmed, a decision was sought as a matter of urgency • the proposal had come to the Finance Committee and the Board at a late stage: it had initially been raised with the Chief Executive's Group (CEG) in November 2014, but CEG had asked for further information to support the proposal, taking into account the University's own need for resources to invest in the campus and its charitable objects. Regrettably, only in the last week had sufficient information been made available to CEG to secure support for the proposal • PSP had proved to be a useful resource to the University in relation to both teaching and research, through commercialisation of research (a number of spin-out companies were located there), the provision of accommodation for research groups associated with PUPSMD in the absence of suitable facilities within the John Bull Building, and graduate placements. It was however acknowledged that the University had not as yet maximised the benefits of its links with PSP and significantly more work needed to be undertaken in this context • support for the Phase 5 development was in line with the University's role as 	

	<p>an anchor institution, supporting economic growth in line with government policy, although the Board recognised that this was not of itself within the University's charitable objects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the University and the Board continued to support the City's economic strategy • security for the loan had not as yet been offered or sought but the Finance Committee had agreed that it would be necessary to secure a charge over the new build which formed part of Phase 5. This would secure for the University potential assets of equal or greater value than the value of the loan • there was a reputational consideration which was also important: PCC had already announced its support for the project and the University's decision would have significant implications for the relationship between PCC, the University and PSP as well as wider reputational implications in the context of the LEP • the University did not have an automatic place on the LEP Board: the post recently vacated by Professor Purcell was an elected post representing HE in the region and although Professor Coslett had put his name forward, there was another candidate from one of the other regional HEIs. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Board would support the loan in principle, subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a satisfactory business case and due diligence - the availability of match funding of £3m from the LEP - ongoing Board oversight of activities at PSP (currently exercised annually, through the Finance Committee) - the University securing a charge over the new build - a loan term commensurate with PSP's ability to repay but preferably shorter than the 25 years initially proposed - a review of the interest rate proposed - clarification that the University would not fund any cost-overruns on Phase 5 - further efforts to exploit the opportunities presented by the relationship with PSP for the benefit of staff and students 	Chairman /VC/CFO
10.2	<p>Numbers of staff in different categories</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Chief Talent Officer would provide an analysis of staffing numbers within the new categories. 	CTO
15/01/11	<p><u>Date of next meeting</u> Tuesday 17 February 2015 at 1430, preceded by lunch at 1300.</p>	

Appendix 1: Declarations of interest

Name	Organisation	Role
James Brent	<p>Akkeron Group LLP</p> <p>Natatomisam Limited; Akkeron Leisure Limited; Oldway Mansion Limited; Five Directions Limited; HHP Nominee Limited; Akkeron Hotels Group Limited; Akkeron Hotels Management Limited; Akkeron Hotels (Oxford) Limited; Saltrock Surfwear Limited; Destination Plymouth Limited</p> <p>Plymouth Argyle Football Club Limited</p> <p>Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust</p> <p>South West Ticketing Solutions Limited; The Plymouth Pavilions Limited; Resurgam (West End) Limited; Suite Hospitality Limited;</p>	<p>Chairman and CEO</p> <p>Director</p> <p>Chairman</p> <p>Chairman (non Exec)</p> <p>Director</p>
Nick Buckland OBE		
Sarah Bowman	University of Plymouth Students' Union	President and trustee
Professor Mark Cleary	<p>Management Development Institute of Singapore</p> <p>University of Bradford</p> <p>Commonwealth Scholarship Committee</p>	<p>Honorary Senate Member</p> <p>Emeritus Professor and Member of Court</p> <p>Selection Committee Member</p>
Duncan Currall	<p>Plymouth Community Healthcare Board</p> <p>Destination Plymouth Limited</p> <p>Plymouth 2020 Local Strategic Partnership</p> <p>Plymouth Growth Fund</p> <p>Foot Anstey LLP</p> <p>His son is a student at the University</p>	<p>Chair</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Director</p> <p>Director</p> <p>Non-executive director</p>
Susan Davy		
Kathryn Goddard	None	
Professor Terence Lewis	<p>Plymouth Marine Laboratory</p> <p>Plymouth University Peninsula Medical School Board</p> <p>Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust</p> <p>Plymouth Heartbeat</p> <p>Heartswell South West</p> <p>Consultancy work with hospitals and monitors</p> <p>Son qualified at PCMD and worked for Ernst and Young</p> <p>Daughter and son-in-law run Healthcare at Home companies, including some in Plymouth</p>	<p>Chairman</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Non-executive director</p> <p>President</p> <p>Honorary Life President</p>
Steve Pearce	<p>Deputy Lieutenant of Devon</p> <p>Drake Foundation</p>	Vice-Chairman

	Devon and Cornwall Crimestopper Hamoaze House	Member Trustee
Dr Ranulf Scarbrough	BT Group PLC	Employee
Margaret Schwarz	None	
Dr Mike Sheaff	None	Staff governor
Stephen Tillman	Altitude(Ascot) Limited Altitude Real Estate LLP Altitude Property Developments Limited Altitude (Arcott) Limited Argent Projects Nos 2 Partnerships Argent Projects No.3 Partnerships Miller Argent Holding Limited: Miller Argent (South Wales) Limited Miller Argent (Ffos-y-fran) Limited; Miller Argent (Nominee No 1 Limited) Ffos-y-fran (Commoners) Limited SGR (Bicester 2) Limited SGR (Farringdon) Limited	Director Partner Director Director & shareholder Partner Partner Director Director Director Director Director Director Director
Henry Warren	Tamar Science Park Advisory Board Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust J&S Limited Fluvial Innovations Limited	Member Non-executive director Director Director
Professor Mary Watkins		
Denis Wilkins	Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust	Non-executive director