

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> subject to amending a typographical error in Minute 15/02/7.1, to read ‘a number of governors were coming to the end of their terms of office in July 2015...’ (not 2014), the minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman. 	MM
2.2	<p>Matters arising: (Enclosure B)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the University had extended its relationship with Plymouth Argyle Plymouth Science Park (PSP) (Minute 15/02/2.2.1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the University was in the process of completing the loan agreement, pending agreement from HSBC in relation to the second charge on the new build Finance Committee had endorsed a focus in the agreement on the principles underpinning the relationship rather than specific targeted initiatives which might prove overly prescriptive the Chief Information Officer (CIO) as one of the University’s nominees on the PSP Board, had set up a task and finish group to identify key deliverables and associated KPIs, which would be meeting in April. Work to date had focused on researching the ways in which other university-linked science parks operated the UPSU President would be invited to join the group outcomes from the meeting would be circulated to the Board for information in advance of discussion with PSP and Plymouth City Council the CIO was having regular meetings with David Draffan, one of the Plymouth City Council representatives on the PSP Board a PSP Open Day was planned for end-May, focusing on research endeavours with a science focus the University’s increased engagement and involvement was welcomed both by the Board and by PSP. UPSU Governance and structure (Minute 15/02/3.1): the outcome of the recent UPSU officers’ elections and the manifestos of successful candidates had been circulated to the Board. It was intended to hold the June Board lunch in The Hive, the UPSU building. Brixham Environmental laboratories (Minute 15/02/8.2): at its next meeting, Audit Committee would receive an update on the current state of play and future plans for Brixham. Progress was being made with regard to occupancy and tenancy, although academic interactions were more challenging and were currently taking place on a relatively small scale. The potential anchor tenant had expressed an interest in future acquisition of the asset and had a legal option to purchase should that prove the best way forward for the University in the longer term. The local MP had enquired about progress and would be briefed. 	<p>CFO</p> <p>CIO</p> <p>CIO</p> <p>All</p> <p>MM</p> <p>CFO</p> <p>VC</p>
15/03/3	Presentation	
3.1	<p>Alignment of Teaching and Learning Processes to the University Strategy and update on QAA review (Enclosure C)</p> <p><i>Presentation by Professor Pauline Kneale, Pro Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning, and Pat Wilde, Head of Quality Operations</i></p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the report summarised the cyclical planning and reporting processes in relation to teaching and learning which ensured that the needs of both the 	

	<p>University and a wide range of external regulators and over 70 professional bodies were met and that teaching and learning developments were closely aligned with University strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the complex external regulatory framework • the last visit from the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) had taken place in 2009, with an interim report in 2013: the next review was scheduled for May 2016 • the QAA process focused on an evidence based peer review covering the management of academic standards and academic quality, information for students, and quality enhancement activity, all referenced to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education • the review would cover all programmes of study leading to awards at levels 4-8 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, which covered undergraduate, postgraduate and research awards • a key feature was the involvement of students, with a least one student from another institution as a member of the QAA panel and with a lead student representative nominated by UPSU, plus an independent student submission to the review • the University was required to produce an electronic self-evaluation document (SED), supported by hyperlinks: institutions were limited to a maximum of 1000 links • a small steering group, including UPSU representation, was overseeing the production of the SED, with a dozen further groups working on drafting against sections of the UK Quality Code. An awayday in May would involve an experienced external adviser and the first draft would be produced in June/July. The draft would go through relevant committees, including the Teaching and Learning Committee, in the autumn, with final sign-off in December • core elements covered by the review would be threshold academic standards; the quality of learning opportunities; student information; and enhancement of students' learning opportunities. In each case, the judgements could be meets/requires improvement/does not meet and the report could differentiate judgments within each element. The final three elements could also give rise to commendation • the review would also include a thematic element selected by the University from either employability or digital literacy: both themes would however be reflected in the University's self-evaluation document • employability presented an interesting story in the regional context. The University was currently 1.8% behind its benchmark, but holding its own in trend analysis. It was currently a key focus for the University, with an emphasis on the provision of work-based placements, and the development of the relationship with PSP to provide more opportunities for students. Data did exist in relation to those students finding employment within or outwith the peninsula • the review team would probably comprise 5 or 6 reviewers, including at least one student, who must have no previous engagement with the University • the visit would start on 9 May, with a pre-meeting in the previous week, and would take 4-5 days, including the potential for discussions with students from academic partners both nationally and internationally • following the visit, QAA would produce a key findings letter within two 	
--	---	--

	<p>weeks and a draft report for comment within six weeks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the final report would be publicly available and irrespective of the outcomes the University would be required to produce an action plan 140 institutions were due for review in 2015/16 following the disaggregation of the medical school, PUPSMD was effectively a new medical school and was therefore subject to a series of GMC visits from its inception to the first students graduating. Visits were going very well, and the planned visit schedule had been reduced following the most recent visit. Staff engagement with the process was very positive the need to align external regulatory and compliance issues with the University's own strategic developments such as the CEP, and to assess the outcomes of changes against expected benefits. For this purpose, programme and module templates could be mapped against NSS outcomes and against the university's wider strategic objectives, and gap analysis would identify issues requiring response in reviewing School-based action plans arising from annual monitoring or review, the Teaching, Learning and Quality Committee could and did refer issues back to Schools if the response was not considered satisfactory one issue which required further focus was student feedback. The University recognised the need to ensure a more consistent approach to the course rep (student programme representative), noting that UPSU was modelling its advice and guidance on the NUS recommendations and using NUS training models. The University would also work with UPSU to develop more effective strategies for responding to feedback the Board of Governors and its individual members would not be involved in the QAA review, but would see the SED and would receive feedback on both the formal outcomes and the University's action plan work was underway to identify the metrics and reports which Academic Board would need to reference in providing appropriate assurance reporting to the Board of Governors governors were invited to contact the PVC Teaching and Learning for more information or briefing: Henry Warren expressed an interest in an additional session thanks to Pauline Kneale and Pat Wilde for an informative presentation. 	<p>DVC/PVC</p> <p>DVC/PVC</p> <p>PVC/US</p> <p>US</p> <p>All PVC</p>
15/03/4	<p>Governance <i>David Cockayne and Michael Wood, Good Governance Institute, attended for this item</i></p>	
4.1	<p>Report from the Good Governance Institute (GGI) and the University's initial response (Enclosure D) Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GGI thanked all who had participated in the review and those who had assisted in managing the process and commended the transparency which had underpinned – and continued to underpin - the University's approach the initial brief had been to assess the effectiveness of the University's governance processes, systems, culture and behaviours and recommend improvements with regard to governance best practice, nationally and internationally in higher education and other sectors the review had involved a range of interviews; a staff survey, which had resulted in an unprecedented 400 responses; focus group sessions; and a 	

	<p>review of over 60 documents. Comments had all been triangulated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the major themes included the need to give more prominence to the academic voice, including expanding the University Executive group and reviewing Academic Board; the need to strengthen Board of Governors membership; , and the need to promote trust and confidence and improve engagement with staff. The report also identified some lessons learned from the events of the previous year the review had looked at the new CUC Code, which although formally voluntary operated on a 'comply or explain' basis the University was already addressing a number of the recommendations, as indicated in its formal response, through the work of the Governance Improvement Programme moving forward, the University acknowledged the need to avoid moving into a purely compliance driven approach: culture, values and behaviours were as important as systems and processes but would take some time fully to embed comments made by staff reinforced the key themes and the need to drive positive improvements and restore trust and confidence. It was intended that GGI conduct a repeat staff survey in late Autumn, in advance of the next full Capita survey in 2016, but the Board acknowledged that changes in attitudes and opinions would take time so outcomes may not necessarily be significantly different the shortcomings identified in governance processes and the events of the last year had been difficult for staff . Both the Board and Executive acknowledged that fact and wished to convey both their regret and their determination to address the issues and secure real change the final GGI report and the University's response would be circulated to all staff via a News Alert, and would also be placed in the public domain, including an email address for posting comments or queries a staff address scheduled for April would offer another opportunity to brief staff about the report and to acknowledge previous shortcomings face-to-face communication with students would be welcomed, and it was suggested that it would be helpful for the Vice-Chancellor and Chairman to participate in briefings set up through the Student Forums. It would also be important to brief incoming officers a focus on moving forward, generating different relationships both within and outside the University a suggestion that there may be benefit in opening Board meetings to the public would be debated further at a future meeting. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the report and the University's response be placed in the public domain the Executive finalise the detailed communications strategy the University Secretary would forward the report and response to HEFCE. 	<p>SU</p> <p>US</p> <p>US VC/CMO US</p>
4.2	<p>Report from the Governance Improvement Programme (Enclosure E)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> notes of the first meeting (4 March) and the draft Programme Brief and Plan a number of programme workstreams had been identified (: Governance Structure and Processes; Academic Board Review; Governor Development; 	

	<p>and Partnerships and Governance)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> workstreams were action-oriented, focusing on the actions required to deliver outcomes in line with the GGI recommendations and improvements to align with the CUC HE Code of Governance and identifying deliverables and timescales work to improve aspects of governance had already begun - such as updated web pages, reconstitution of the Executive team, and preparation for recruitment of a permanent Vice Chancellor. A paper on the review of Academic Board would be going to the ACB meeting on 25 March thanks to Kirstie Godwin-Day for her excellent work. 	
15/03/5	<u>Strategy Implementation</u>	
5.1	<p>Report from the Strategy Implementation Programme (Enclosure F)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the first meeting of the Strategy Implementation Programme (SIP) had taken place on 4 March, with a further meeting scheduled for 19 March to include presentations on the financial context and the external environment it was for the Vice-Chancellor, working through the Executive, to develop strategy which would then be discussed and finally approved by the Board of Governors, but this should always be an iterative process. The Steering Group provided the opportunity for key issues to be surfaced at an early stage, unfettered by constraint, and for challenges to be raised and addressed the primary focus was the identification of priorities for implementation of Strategy 2020, refining the current broad objectives to create a road map which the Executive could then take forward with a wider staff engagement Strategy 2020 currently incorporated a broad set of aspirations: the focus of the programme was on refining and prioritising those aspirations in such a way as to create the principles and criteria against which proposals could be judged and the tolerances around those judgments among the issues to be considered was how success would best be articulated, the criteria for good decision-making, and the associated KPIs and evidence base a focus on evidence-based decision-making the importance of ensuring engagement between the Board, Executive, Academic Board, students and the wider community. 	
15/03/6	<u>Finance</u>	
6.1	<p>Period 6 management accounts (Enclosure G)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the paper provided an analysis of financial performance against forecast for the full year based on actuals for the 6 month period to 31 January 2015 and a balance sheet as at the same date Finance Committee had considered the paper in detail earlier in the day the forecast operating surplus of £3.5m largely reflected careful management of staff vacancies and some adjustments and there would therefore be a need to identify more long-term solutions going forward some loss of forecast tuition fee income due to errors in coding old and new fee regime students: there had also been some shortfall in recruitment in two faculties and in postgraduate programmes. This latter was being addressed by the introduction of a new suite of programmes and a more 	

	<p>streamlined pg application process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the budget for maintenance and consumables had been increased to take account of IT spend deferred from the previous year. 	
15/03/7	<u>Equality and Diversity</u>	
7.1	<p>Annual Equality Report (Enclosure H) <i>Colin Shipp, Human Resources Director, attended for this item</i></p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the report had been considered by both the University Executive Group and the Employment Committee, and their comments had been incorporated the accessible and informative format adopted was commended the headline messages focused on a commitment to an inclusive culture, with good progress made against a range of agreed objectives, but with some significant challenges remaining the biggest challenge, which was sector-wide, was in relation to gender diversity in the professoriate and senior roles. This necessitated structural change in terms of capacity, process, opportunity and development in order to secure a sustainable approach to addressing the issue. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Board commended the good progress made, and requested an update on developments to address the gender diversity challenge at a future meeting the Annual Equality Report. 	CTO
15/03/8	<p>Report from the Interim Vice-Chancellor (Enclosure I)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the update covered both the national picture and also specific Plymouth University achievements the student funding question was not solely about potential labour party policy but the broader issue: more direct funding would inevitably involve a greater degree of regulation and the costs of the loan book would require action to reduce the burden, which could impact negatively on institutions such as Plymouth the use of national HESA data and other indicators to inform future planning the University was looking at potential opportunities in the context of global demand the use of information from eg HEFCE on Level 3 (BTEC) qualifications and of mapping of HE 'cold spots' to enable a more evidence-based focus on local and regional relationships heartening signs of the reinforcement of the University's positive reputation both nationally and internationally, through both media coverage, student recruitment and research awards this year's planning process had been launched by the University Executive Group in February and included opportunities for small-scale and immediate strategic investment focused on cost saving or income generation. 	
15/03/9	<u>Committee minutes</u>	
9.1	<p>Minutes of the Nominations Committee held on 17 February 2015</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

9.2	<p>Minutes of the Audit Committee held on 17 February 2015</p> <p>Noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the resolution of the SAP software licence issue should be considered as commercially sensitive. 	
9.3	<p>Minutes from the Employment Committee meeting held on 23 February 2015</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Chairman, Chair of the Committee and Chief Talent Officer had met to discuss performance related pay in the context of an overarching reward strategy. The Chief Talent Officer would bring a report to the Board in April <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in the context of changes to the Annual and Lifetime Allowances relating to pensions the Board formally endorsed the Committee’s recommendations that no universal action be taken, but that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in the context of talent acquisition or retention the University have the ability in exceptional circumstances to offer a tailored remuneration package which would not negatively affect the individual’s pension the University be authorised to pay Mercer to provide individual pension advice using a bespoke modelling tool to provide the information necessary to determine an appropriate remuneration package. 	CTO
9.4	<p>Oral report from the meeting of the Finance Committee held on 18 March 2015</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Committee had considered the management accounts, consolidated cash flow and initial financial forecast for the year ending 31 July 2016 given a significant reliance on non-recurrent savings and adjustments in the current year, it was inevitable that future years would be more challenging the Committee was looking to establish a three year financial planning timeframe focused on raising surpluses to facilitate the capital investment necessary to support University strategy. The Executive would then be asked to develop the business and financial plan which would deliver the requisite progressive growth in surpluses the focus would need to be on revenue generation as well as cost saving the Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) return had formally been approved the Committee had agreed that the University should begin development of the business case/feasibility study on two potential major capital projects,. These were the relocation of the Business School, currently located in the Cookworthy Building which was no longer fit for purpose, and the future location for PAHC (in the Faculty of Health), whose lease at Marjon had only another 5 years to run. This would not prejudge the outcomes of the Strategy Implementation Programme, but was necessary to avoid undue delay once strategic priorities had been identified an update had been provided on developments in relation to the Rolle Exmouth site, with discussions ongoing costs had risen in relation to the redevelopment of the University’s Veysey Building (in Exeter) as a dental facility but PDSE had the cash reserves necessary to meet the additional costs. 	

15/03/10	<u>Any other business</u>	
10.1	Media coverage Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recent positive coverage on UPSU achievements in relation to student volunteering, for which UPSU was commended • generally positive reporting about a rumoured settlement with Judge Taylor. 	
10.2	Investigation Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Margaret Schwarz had met with Colin Shipp to consider the outcomes of the recent investigation and identify and implement lessons learned. 	
15/03/11	<u>Date of next meeting</u> Tuesday 21 April 2015 at 1430	

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; 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	<p>Plymouth University</p> <p>Finance Cornwall /Finance South West Theatre Royal Plymouth</p> <p>PA Central Limited Shebbear College First Great Western Ditchen Farm The British Computer Society The Chartered Management Institute The Royal Society of Arts The Institute of Maths & it's Applications The Royal institution The Institute of Directors The Wellcome Trust</p> <p>Cornwall Adult Education Service</p> <p>Careers SW Tempus Leisure Ltd National Trust</p> <p>SuperFast Cornwall - EDT Slough and Eton Business and Enterprise Academy Elected member of the Council for the Institute of Mathematics Cornwall College PCH Dental Ltd</p>	<p>Pro Chancellor & Member of Board of Governors, Associate Lecturer, PhD Student</p> <p>Board Member</p> <p>Board Member and Trustee</p> <p>Director and part owner</p> <p>Governor and Trustee</p> <p>Advisory Board member</p> <p>Joint Owner</p> <p>Fellow</p> <p>Fellow</p> <p>Fellow</p> <p>Fellow</p> <p>Member</p> <p>Member</p> <p>Brother in law is Chief Operating Officer</p> <p>Wife works as a Curriculum Manager</p> <p>Board Member</p> <p>Board Member</p> <p>Non-elected member of Council (Governance Community)</p> <p>Chair Steering Group</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Governor</p> <p>Elected member of the Council</p> <p>Member of Council</p> <p>Chair</p>

	Maxxim Consulting Karst PCH CIC	Advisor Trustee Board member
Sarah Bowman	University of Plymouth Students' Union	President and trustee
Professor Mark Cleary	Management Development Institute of Singapore University of Bradford Commonwealth Scholarship Committee	Honorary Senate Member Emeritus Professor and Member of Court Selection Committee Member
Duncan Currall	Plymouth Community Healthcare Board Destination Plymouth Limited Plymouth 2020 Local Strategic Partnership Plymouth Growth Fund Foot Anstey LLP His son is a student at the University	Chair Chair Director Director Non-executive director
Professor Terence Lewis	Plymouth Marine Laboratory Plymouth University Peninsula Medical School Board Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust Plymouth Heartbeat Heartswell South West Consultancy work with hospitals and monitors Son qualified at PCMD and worked for Ernst and Young Daughter and son-in-law run Healthcare at Home companies, including some in Plymouth	Chairman Chair Non-executive director President Honorary Life President
Steve Pearce	Deputy Lieutenant of Devon Drake Foundation Devon and Cornwall Crimestopper Hamoaze House	Vice-Chairman Member Trustee
Dr Ranulf Scarbrough	BT Group PLC	Employee
Margaret Schwarz	None	
Dr Mike Sheaff	brother is employed by the University (Prof Rod Sheaff in the School of Government, faculty of Business) 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
Richard Skipper	None	Student governor
Stephen Tillman	Altitude(Ascot) Limited Altitude Real Estate LLP– name change to ARE (Properties) LLP Altitude Property Developments Limited	Director Partner Director

