

# Plymouth University

## **Higher Education Corporation Board of Governors**

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 17 February 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  
Duncan Currall Denis Wilkins  
Professor Terence Lewis Professor Mary Watkins  
Steve Pearce

Secretary: Jane Hopkinson, University Secretary

In attendance: Professor David Coslett, Interim Vice-Chancellor  
Professor Richard Stephenson, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
Professor Simon Payne, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
David Alder, Chief Marketing Officer  
David Beeby, Interim Chief Financial Officer  
Vikki Matthews, Chief Talent Officer  
John Wright, Chief Information Officer  
Margaret Metcalfe, Executive Administrator  
Kirstie Godwin-Day, Programme Manager (for item 5.1)

		Action
<b>15/02/1</b>	<b><u>Membership</u></b>	
1.1	<b>Apologies for absence</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• apologies from Kathryn Goddard and Professor Ray Playford</li><li>• welcome to Professor Mary Watkins and David Alder</li></ul>	
1.2	<b>Notification of items of any other business</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• there were no items of any other business</li></ul>	
1.3	<b>Declarations of interest</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• declarations of interest as set out in the Appendix attached</li><li>• no specific conflicts of interest relating to matters to be discussed at the meeting, apart from noting that Henry Warren was a member of the Plymouth Science Park Advisory Board</li></ul>	
<b>15/02/2</b>	<b><u>Minutes</u></b>	
2.1	<b>Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on 20 January 2015 (Enclosure A)</b>	

	<p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>subject to amending an error on page 10, Minute 16/01/8.1, which should read ‘... enable them successfully to <i>enter</i> Years 2 ...’, the minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</li> </ul>	<b>MM</b>
2.2	<p><b>Matters arising: (Enclosure B)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the report for information</li> <li><b>Proposed partnership agreement with an institution in Greece (Minute 15/01/8.1):</b> the University already operated partnerships in Greece and although these did not involve any University investment it would be watching developments in Greece closely. The University’s Academic Development Committee would be considering the proposed partnership at a meeting on 18 February: this would take account of potential risks and their mitigation. Currency risks, were Greece to exit the Euro, were potentially manageable via contractual arrangements, but the overall economic situation in Greece might pose a more significant risk, should it impact negatively on the numbers of students likely to join the programme. The arrangement would not however involve any direct investment on the part of the University.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Management accounts (Minute 15/01/7):</b> the most recent available management accounts would be presented to the Board, even if they had not been considered first by Finance Committee.</li> </ul>	<b>CFO</b>
2.2.1	<p><b>Plymouth Science Park (PSP)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>following the Board meeting of 20 January it had been possible to undertake further due diligence</li> <li>a recognition that the University had been placed in a difficult position by the initial lack of visibility of the projected LEP bid and the requirement for matched funding</li> <li>a security deed and debenture dated August 2010 relating to a £2.9m HSBC loan to the then-Tamar Science Park had provided security to the bank including a floating charge over all future and current assets of the Science Park and a negative pledge prohibiting the issue of security against future borrowings</li> <li>the only assets ring-fenced outside this agreement were those associated with the previous development where the University had facilitated a grant of £4.6m, from funds provided to the University from the South West RDA (SWRDA)</li> <li>a grant clawback provision (exercised through the University) would apply if the outputs promised from Phase 4 were not delivered</li> <li>PSP had indicated that it was unwilling to renegotiate the terms of the loan with HSBC given a potential risk of less favourable terms</li> <li>the PSP business plan was relatively conservative in the current climate, although the rental income projections appeared optimistic in the local context</li> <li>while PSP was vulnerable to a future recession, it had cash reserves and any future financial difficulty was likely to result in restructuring rather than</li> </ul>	

	<p>winding up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the options open to the Board were to withdraw from the loan, or to pursue the deal but with the requirement that discussions were initiated with HSBC to seek a second charge over the additional asset resulting from the new build</li> <li>• were the University to withdraw, the LEP funding would be reallocated outside Plymouth, with consequential damage to the local economy</li> <li>• the need to ensure that the Phase 5 development was focused on the original ethos of the Science Park and was not just about the provision of office accommodation</li> <li>• while there would be potential reputational disbenefits of withdrawing from the loan at this stage, that was not of itself a rationale for a Board decision</li> <li>• concerns from the President of the Students' Union and others should the University use scarce resources to support PSP with no discernible benefit for students and staff</li> <li>• the initial involvement with the Science Park had identified the potential mutual benefits of enhanced engagement between PSP and the University, and it was apparent that both the University and PSP were still keen to maximise engagement. It was unclear why this had not yet been delivered but it would be important, were the deal to go forward, that clear deliverables of benefit to both students and staff were identified and KPIs agreed</li> <li>• the provision of internships, research opportunities and support, and spin-out support were all potentially part of these discussions: it was important that the University both extract value from its engagement with PSP and contribute more effectively to PSP's success</li> <li>• the model of alignment with research, particularly medical school research, had proved successful elsewhere but would require proactive input from the University</li> <li>• as a first step, increased engagement between the PSP executive team and University Deans had already been initiated</li> <li>• concerns that given inflation in the construction industry, the current cost estimates for Phase 5 could be exceeded unless the project scope were to be adjusted: it would therefore be important that were the loan to be approved, the University was clear about the extent to which it would or would not be prepared to provide an increased contribution</li> <li>• were the loan to be agreed, communications and PR would be critical in identifying the benefits for both students and graduates, including support for a vibrant local economy which could provide not only internships but also a diverse range of graduate job opportunities</li> <li>• a decision in principle to go ahead with the loan must be subject to legal advice in relation to the University's capacity to make loans and the extent to which the proposed loan fell within the University's charitable objects, and to a formal response from HEFCE</li> <li>• a meeting was being scheduled between the Chairman, the Interim Vice-Chancellor, the PSP Chairman and a representative from PCC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• subject to legal advice, to proceed with the loan but require discussion with HSBC about a second charge on the new build</li> <li>• a task and finish group led by John Wright (now one of the University</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>nominees on the PSP Board) and including David Alder, James Brent, Sarah Bowman, Nick Buckland, Margaret Schwarz and Mike Sheaff, would identify appropriate deliverables and KPIs. The outcomes would be circulated to the full Board for comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need to repair what appeared to have been a dysfunctional relationship between the University and PSP</li> <li>• the need to review the processes and procedures in place to ensure that similar governance challenges did not recur: the Governance Steering Group would be asked to take this issue on board.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/02/3</b>	<b>Presentation: UPSU</b>	
3.1	<p><b>Governance and overall structure at UPSU</b>  <i>Presentation by Sarah Bowman, UPSU President</i>  <b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• following consideration of the UPSU request for a sixth Executive Officer late in the Autumn term, there had been a request from a number of members of the Board for more information about the Students' Union</li> <li>• the presentation focused on governance and constitutional and organisational structures, the role of the Executive Officers, accountability, and the range of activities provided by UPSU</li> <li>• the new constitution was supported by a wide range of Bye-Laws, which had involved significant work over the past year</li> <li>• UPSU was an independent charity registered with the Charity Commission in 2011: all commercial services income went back into provision for students</li> <li>• UPSU Executive officers were elected annually by the student body</li> <li>• the manifesto pledges made by each Executive Officer, for which they would be held to account</li> <li>• numbers of students voting had declined in 2014 compared to 2013, following a decision not to offer the incentives of a draw for an iPad or similar. This was the subject of a current debate within NUS, but UPSU believed that its position meant that all votes cast were authentic</li> <li>• the UPSU Trustee Board comprised all (currently five) UPSU Executive Officers, who were also employees of the Union, two student Trustees, and four external Trustees</li> <li>• the Trustee Board was supported by a range of committees (Finance &amp; Staffing, Health &amp; safety, Audit &amp; Risk, Governance &amp; Appointments)</li> <li>• the democratic structure involved fifteen student forums, each with an elected student chair who sat on the Union Executive Committee (UEC). Any student could stand as a chair, although for the liberation forums students standing for election were required to self-identify as part of the relevant group</li> <li>• UEC was the highest level of UPSU decision making</li> <li>• an Accountability Board, made up of a panel of student representatives, scrutinised and reviewed the Forums and UEC at least once a month, observing forums as appropriate and meeting with Executive Officers to hold them to account. The Chair of the Accountability Panel was the second student member of the University Board</li> <li>• every course had at least one Course Rep, who role was to research student views and work with University staff informally and through formal committees to enhance the quality of the student experience. The majority were elected (with elections due to start in early March)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UPSU was working with the University on a Student Voice audit to review the current position of part- and full-time representatives on committees</li> <li>• in addition, every School now had one elected School Rep, who worked with Course Reps, University Staff and UPSU to help resolve issues</li> <li>• over 300 course and school reps had been trained in the current year: they were able to access some support from UPSU staff to manage busy roles</li> <li>• these were key positions in ensuring that the student voice was heard at all levels across the University</li> <li>• the AGM provided students with the opportunity to question the Trustee Board, the Chief Executive and the Executive Officers, and to put forward and vote on motions: attendance was slowly increasing, from around 30 in 2013 to over 100 in 2014</li> <li>• elections for the Executive Officers were held annually: this year there had been 34 nominations across the six roles, and elections would start on Friday 27 February, with results known on 6 March</li> <li>• the UPSU Chief Executive Officer had delegated responsibility for operations and for the strategic plan: the UPSU President was her line manager</li> <li>• beneath the UPSU Senior management Team of four people, there were 80 full time staff and over 300 part time student staff</li> <li>• UPSU was briefed about and engaged in preparation for the 2016 QAA audit. The Union would be presenting an independent submission to QAA. Ruth Titmuss, the USPU Vice-President Education, was also working with Professor Pauline Kneale, PVC Teaching and Learning</li> <li>• the University provided a block grant which formed part of UPSU funding: this was not currently performance related, but the UPSU block grant application incorporated evidence of achievements and the annual review by the University Student Advisory Group sought to rebalance funding as appropriate in line with agreed objectives. The recent refurbishment had increased student engagement with the Union, which was now looking for further capital development</li> <li>• the importance of engaging students with UPSU from the outset of their programmes was recognised. The Executive Officers had undertaken over 80 induction talks for new students, and were looking to extend these with termly briefings highlighting key achievements and activities</li> <li>• through the new MSL system it was possible to identify both engaged and non-engaged students and use forums and focus groups to identify how the Union could increase participation</li> <li>• UPSUs considerable achievements in relation to student volunteering (16000 student volunteering hours in 2014) were not well recognised across the city, and nor was the impact of charity fundraising, which had raised £235K in the past year. UPSU was encouraged to work with the University in developing new messaging (while ensuring that the contribution of UPSU was distinguished from that of the University)</li> <li>• manifesto pledges often required or would benefit from support from the University: a number were focused through specialist University Committees and the Student Life Committee, co-chaired by the PVC Student Experience and the UPSU President, also had a role to play. In addition, the UPSU Executive met with the Vice-Chancellor every six weeks or so.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would be helpful for the future to highlight the manifesto pledges of the</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	Executive Officers to the Board: the UPSU website provided information on the manifestos for current candidates and the President would circulate the appropriate links.	
<b>15/02/4</b>	<b>Report from the Chief Executive's Group (Enclosure C)</b>	
4.1	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the report now incorporated additional information on the University's activities in the context of highlighted sector developments</li> <li><b>QR funding:</b> UUK had been advised of the need to make a "robust case" to protect the dual support system for research funding, with BIS looking at concentrating all funding into the research councils. The University was lobbying, both independently and as part of the Alliance group, to ensure that HEFCE delivered on the commitment in the BIS grant letter to fund excellence wherever it was found</li> <li><b>Student Recruitment:</b> the University was 1% behind the curve in relation to Home/EU recruitment and an analytics function had been set up within the Admissions team to identify the factors contributing to this underperformance. The most recent Applicant Day had seen a fall in attendance: another Applicant Day was scheduled for the coming weekend. A potential fall in local recruitment was being explored. Some programme areas were doing better than others: there had been an upturn in Computing, History, English and Law, but Biomedical Sciences had not met expectations and Architecture was down. Business programmes including a placement year were also seeing a fall in recruitment while other Business programmes were remaining steady. The decliners survey was looking to identify potential patterns. At the same time, more work was being undertaken to better harmonise faculty and central roles in recruitment and admissions</li> <li>the University was trying to achieve better co-ordination for <b>community engagement</b> initiatives to help address issues such as those highlighted in the Plymouth Fairness Commission, for example child poverty. Specific objectives identified by the Commission had been focused on relevant areas of the University, which continued to target resources across deprived areas in the city, through initiatives such as academies, UTC and the dental clinic, to maximise impact</li> <li>the importance of ensuring that prospective <b>General Election</b> candidates in the region understood the University's contributions to the City and the wider region. The Interim Vice-Chancellor had contacted the current Plymouth MPs. The Students' Union was encouraging students to register to vote and had held a very successful election debate involving potential Parliamentary candidates for Sutton and Devonport, and had a youth panel debate scheduled for March and more hustings in April</li> <li>the University was working with the Students' Union to produce infographics for the University and student websites indicating where <b>student fees</b> were spent: this would be supplemented by a presentation at the UPSU academic forum and information in the student newsletter.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/02/5</b>	<b>Governance</b>	
5.1	<p><b>Interim Report from the Good Governance Institute (Enclosure D)</b>  <i>Kirstie Godwin-Day, Programme Manager, attended for this item</i></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• this was an interim independent report from GGI: it did not necessarily reflect the views of the Executive or the Board, but had been discussed by the Nominations Committee earlier in the day</li> <li>• the Nominations Committee, including the Interim Vice-Chancellor, had been very clear that it did not consider it appropriate to defer recruitment to the permanent post of VC: there were also a range of views in relation to the optimum size of Boards, with some move towards smaller groupings</li> <li>• not all governors had been interviewed: the University Secretary would follow this point up</li> <li>• some concerns that some of the views/recommendations were not fully evidenced and that the current focus was limited largely to matters of Board effectiveness, rather than issues of culture and structure, although work was of course ongoing</li> <li>• the need to ensure that the information derived from the GGI staff survey was not lost: GGI would be asked to ensure that key governance concerns arising from the staff survey were appropriately reflected in the final report, and that other themes were drawn out in order to inform University thinking</li> <li>• the Governance Enhancement Steering Group, including staff, student and governor membership, would receive the next draft of the report at its meeting on 4 March: in the interim, the Programme manager was holding individual meetings with members of the Group</li> <li>• the Group was tasked with advising the Board and the Executive on implementation, which would in some instances involve developing the themes highlighted in the report as well as advising on an initial response</li> <li>• the new CUC Code was a further important consideration in developing an action plan in response to the report</li> <li>• the University Secretary, Head of Strategy and Performance and the Programme Manager would be meeting regularly to review progress: any further high level concerns could be forwarded to the Programme Manager.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the University Secretary would update GGI on discussions.</li> </ul>	<b>US</b>
<b>15/02/6</b>	<b><u>Key Performance Indicators</u></b>	
6.1	<p><b>Outcomes of Key Performance Indicators for 2013/14 (Enclosure E)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the report provided an update on progress on the performance of the University against the previously agreed Key Performance Indicators associated with Strategy 2020</li> <li>• the University would welcome views on the extent to which current KPIs remained appropriate and ways of moving forward</li> <li>• there were currently too many KPIs, but concerns that those used were lagging indicators, with (in some cases) an inbuilt and significant lapse of time: there was a need to identify some predictive indicators which could provide a real time picture</li> <li>• a smaller number of KPIs in the form of an agreed corporate dashboard might be accompanied by a brief report on the actions taken to address concerns identified in the analysis or in previous discussion</li> <li>• the potential value of using spark charts rather than RAG ratings, to identify whether the University was where it should be in order to achieve the 2020</li> </ul>	

	<p>goals. Some of the RAG ratings remained contradictory in this context (eg finances, employability, commercial income). If the status was in doubt, the default position should be red.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there were some potential tensions between the current KPIs which had not previously been addressed</li> <li>• for the QAA review it would be necessary to provide data by subject area</li> <li>• the Strategy Implementation Steering Group was potentially the catalyst through which an appropriate corporate dashboard could be identified</li> <li>• the institutional planning process for 2015 had been deliberately focused on a small number of key themes.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/02/7</b>	<b><u>Committee minutes</u></b>	
7.1	<p><b>Oral report on items discussed at the meeting of the Nominations Committee held on 17 February 2015</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Review of Good Governance</b> : the interim report from GGI had been reviewed</li> <li>• <b>Board skills and diversity mix:</b> the Committee had discussed the necessary skills and diversity mix for the Board to inform the forthcoming governor recruitment round</li> <li>• <b>Process for appointment of independent governors:</b> a number of governors were coming to the end of their terms of office in July 2015, and the co-opted governors had been appointed for a twelve month period, so irrespective of future decisions about the size of the Board, it was intended to initiate a governor recruitment process shortly, using a mix of advertisement and proactive identification of potential candidates. Consideration would be given to the use of regional recruitment consultants with experience of finding NEDs</li> <li>• <b>Vice-Chancellor appointment:</b> it was intended to move forward with a tender for the engagement of recruitment consultants for the Vice-Chancellor appointment. Their views would be sought on effective ways of ensuring wider staff engagement without compromising the process. The intention was to model the formal recruitment process on that used in 2007.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Remuneration Committee:</b> all independent governors would formally be members of the Committee. Meeting dates would be circulated.</li> </ul>	<b>US</b>
7.2	<p><b>Oral report from the meeting of Audit Committee held on 17 February 2015</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Committee had reviewed the procedures surrounding the monitoring of fraud, and agreed that these were generally adequate</li> <li>• three internal audits had been considered: Income (including tuition fees); Purchasing and Accounts Payable; and Compliance with UUK Student Accommodation Code. The audit opinion on Income and UUK Student Accommodation had been satisfactory, but limited assurance had been given in relation to Purchasing, reflecting continuing concerns at the numbers of purchases made without purchase orders. The Executive was addressing this issue</li> <li>• historically there had been a significant build-up of uncleared audit</li> </ul>	

	<p>recommendations which had diverted attention from other priorities: the executive was to be congratulated on the work undertaken to secure a significant reduction in numbers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Risk Register had been reviewed. More work needed to be done to ensure that the Register was both simple and useful as an active management tool, and ensured that Board attention could be focused on high risk areas, but the current version was much improved</li> <li>• risk tolerance was an issue for the Committee and the board, and should evolve through, inter alia, the work of the Strategy Implementation Steering group.</li> <li>• Value for Money had been discussed. The University had historically prepared an annual VfM report, but this needed to be set in context. The Committee was itself asking for post-implementation VfM reports from the Project Management office in relation to major capital expenditure projects, focused on benefits realisation and lessons learned</li> <li>• the Committee was minded to seek further information on non-capital expenditure, and the outcomes of benchmarking exercises</li> <li>• compliance with regulatory requirements was an important consideration for the Committee, which was currently focused on the data quality issues which had been identified by HEFCE. The Chief Information Officer was putting considerable time and effort into this area</li> <li>• the Committee had approved updated governance arrangements for related companies and would now be looking at how to secure best value from these arrangements</li> <li>• the Chairs of Finance Committee and Audit Committee were having regular discussions to ensure that agendas were appropriately co-ordinated.</li> </ul>	
7.3	<p><b>Minutes from the Finance Committee meeting held on 20 January 2015</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Funding of major capital expenditure</b> (<i>Minute 15/01/3.3</i>): the envelope for capital investment discussed at Finance Committee had been £50m, £25m of which was the maximum available cash input allowing for encumbered deposits and working capital, with £25m new borrowings. This was however an accretive investment model (ie surpluses generated from investments might enable further borrowings to be raised).</li> </ul>	
<b>15/02/8</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
8.1	<p><b>Senior Independent Governor (SIG)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry Warren had attended a recent Executive Advisory Group meeting to outline the role of the SIG and it was intended to repeat this at appropriate staff and student fora.</li> </ul>	
8.2	<p><b>Brixham Environmental laboratories</b></p> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to ask the Audit Committee to undertake a review of the current state of play and future plans in relation to the Brixham Environmental Laboratories, in the context of the initial business plan as agreed on behalf of the Board.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/02/8</b>	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>Wednesday 18 March 2015: the Board will receive a pensions presentation from Mercers at 1330, with the full Board meeting running from 1430-1730. Lunch will be provided at 12 noon.</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</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>
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	Stoke Damerel Community College (one son is an employee) B&Q (one son is an employee) younger son has been selected by the Green Party to stand for election to Plymouth City Council in Drake Ward (in which the campus is located)	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	Plymouth Science Park Advisory Board Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust J&S Limited Fluvial Innovations Limited	Member Non-executive director Director Director
Professor Mary Watkins	PenCLAHRC (NIHR Peninsula Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care) Plymouth University  South Western Ambulance Services NHS Foundation Trust  BUPA Medical Advisory Panel Aster Housing Hamoaze House - Plymouth Acorn Academy Cornwall	Chair  Emeritus Chair, Healthcare Leadership Non-Executive Director and Senior Independent Director (SID), Member Non-executive Director  Chair
Denis Wilkins	Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust	Non-executive director