

# Plymouth University

## *Higher Education Corporation Board of Governors*

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 21 April 2015.

Present: James Brent (Chairman) Dr Mike Sheaff  
Nick Buckland Stephen Tillman  
Professor Mark Cleary Henry Warren  
Professor David Coslett Professor Mary Watkins  
Duncan Currall Denis Wilkins  
Professor Terence Lewis

Secretary: Jane Hopkinson, University Secretary

In attendance: Professor Ray Playford, Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
Professor Richard Stephenson, 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  
Margaret Metcalfe, Executive Administrator

		Action
<b>15/04/1</b>	<b><u>Membership</u></b>	
1.1	<b>Apologies for absence</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Apologies received from Board members: Sarah Bowman, Steve Pearce, Dr Ranulf Scarbrough, Richard Skipper, Margaret Schwarz UEG members: David Alder, Professor Simon Payne.</li></ul>	
1.2	<b>Notification of items of any other business</b> Noted: <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.</li></ul>	
<b>15/04/2</b>	<b><u>Minutes</u></b>	
2.1	<b>Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on 18 March 2015 (Enclosure A)</b> <b>Agreed:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>the minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</li></ul>	

2.2	<p><b>Matters arising: (Enclosure B)</b>  <b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Plymouth Science Park</b> (<i>Minute 15/03/2.2</i>): discussions on the loan were proceeding. The University had made clear its wish to secure a second charge and had not received any negative indications. PSP was awaiting confirmation of LEP funding before requesting payment of the University loan. The UPSU President had been invited to the meeting to discuss opportunities for students and KPIs, which was scheduled for the following week.</li> <li>• <b>Brixham Environmental laboratories</b> (<i>Minute 15/03/2.2</i>): the Audit Committee had received an update on the current state of play. In the course of discussion, the Committee had noted that both the executive and the Board had learned lessons in relation to the way in which the proposal had been presented and discussed. The culture of governance was now materially different, with a focus on openness and transparency and a recognition that the key consideration must be long-term strategic risk irrespective of the potential cost of any investment.  The business case approved by the Finance Committee had predicted a cash surplus: the forecast for 2014/15 was a deficit as a result of a materially slower rental income stream than initially predicted, although heads of terms had been agreed with a potentially significant anchor tenant. The significant capital equipment on site was not currently used by the University but was likely to be an attraction for the anchor tenant. It was anticipated that if negotiations were successfully concluded, the site would at worst break even in the next financial year. The Board requested that in addition to regular updates through Matters Arising, a paper come to Finance Committee in the Autumn term identifying the updated position and potential future options: if the University were able to utilise the site more effectively that would be positively received by the Board, but there was no expectation that that would be the case.</li> <li>• <b>Teaching and Learning processes and update on QAA</b> (<i>Minute 15/03/3.1</i>): governor visits to PedRIO had been scheduled.</li> <li>• <b>Report from Good Governance Institute</b> (<i>Minute 15/03/4.1</i>): the report was now in the public domain and had recently been picked up by the media. Coverage varied but was broadly positive.  A paper had been presented to Academic Board in the context of the planned ACB review, referencing both the GGI conclusions and the need to clarify the assurance reporting from ACB to the Board of Governors, and this had been well-received. Professor Mark Cleary was the governor lead for the workstream.  Additionally, the VC and the wider executive were ensuring visibility at a wider range of meetings to provide briefings on the review and its implementation, and to stress the forward-looking focus of the steps being taken. The importance of face-to-face communication was recognised: the Interim Vice-Chancellor had spent time in informal actions with staff at the recent Applicant Day, and the level of engagement had been very positive.</li> </ul>	<b>DVC (RP)</b>
<b>15/04/3</b>	<b><u>Presentation</u></b>	
3.1	<p><b>Sustainable Education (Enclosure C)</b>  <b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• with regret, Professor Stephen Sterling’s absence due to illness. He was</li> </ul>	

	<p>recognised as a global leader in this field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UEG had considered the report at its most recent meeting, and had confirmed that sustainability remained a key concern for the University in the context of teaching, research and operational issues. The Dean of Science and Environment had been asked to take an executive lead on sustainability and strengthen the links with UEG</li> <li>• the Sustainable Earth research institute would be the single largest institute in the University</li> <li>• the University had historically undersold its strengths in relation to the sustainability agenda to prospective students, for whom this was potentially an important consideration, and the Chief Marketing Officer was looking to address this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the presentation would be deferred to a future meeting.</li> </ul>	US
15/04/4	<p><b>Report from the Interim Vice-Chancellor (Enclosure D)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HEFCE recurrent funding:</b> was fully explained in the attached annex.</li> <li>• <b>potential election outcomes:</b> the introduction of £6K fees, should the Labour Party lead a government, would significantly raise the University's risk profile, particularly in a context in which there were no more than very short-term guarantees that the differential would be funded. There was a need to shape discussions about that shortfall and the criteria against which differential funding might be allocated. Irrespective of the election outcome, there was an expectation of increased austerity for HE.</li> <li>• <b>future planning:</b> the need for a three-year target-driven plan, informed by the work of the Strategy Implementation Group, including significant resource set aside to manage change. The Group would produce a clearer picture of what excellent looked like, in terms of a shared understanding of the rationale for change and the criteria against which current provision could be reviewed, which would inform investment and disinvestment decisions. These were often complex, since there was not necessarily a correlation between excellent teaching and high quality research, nor between quality and income generation, and there were some 'thinking the unthinkable' options. However the Group acknowledged the need to consider whether it was possible to sustain the current wide range of discipline areas.</li> </ul> <p>In the short term, while acknowledging that the executive were very stretched, the Board nonetheless needed the information to enable it to agree a clear direction for the next financial year. The Tribal benchmarking exercise, which had been considered by the Employment Committee and would be reviewed by Finance Committee in May, provided data which could inform short term planning. While no academic area was obviously failing to deliver, sector comparisons did highlight where costs were out of line.</p> <p>There was a critical need to reduce costs and increase surpluses to secure resources for future investment, whether in academic programmes or capital infrastructure. UEG was developing business plans in relation to significant capital building projects, but the Board would need contextual information if it were going to prioritise competing projects.</p>	

	<p>Some governors believed that it would be more effective were a group including a small number of governors to brainstorm the future direction of the University and propose priorities. It was however recognised that, particularly after a number of restructuring exercises over the past few years, there was a need for an evidence base and clear criteria, and a shared understanding of tolerance bands, to inform challenging decisions about the future direction of the University.</p> <p>The Strategy Implementation Group was focused on clarifying and prioritising Strategy 2020 with regards to enabling excellence – maintaining the University’s dual focus on teaching excellence and excellent research - but did recognise the need to make significant changes, in the context of both research and teaching, rapidly and decisively and to harness the skills and energy of the Board as part of the challenge mechanism.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b> the executive would come back with a short- to mid-term (3 year) plan which would focus on meeting the challenges of continued austerity and create a realistic framework for the continued generation of surpluses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>substantive Chief Financial Officer (CFO) appointment:</b> the longlist for the CFO appointment included some potentially strong candidates. Interviews would be taking place on 27 May.</li> <li>• <b>staff and student achievements:</b> the Board was encouraged to use the links provided to celebrate staff and student achievements.</li> <li>• <b>Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research):</b> the University was in the final stages of the appointment of a Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research). The role would integrate the responsibilities of the previous Dean of Research, Professor Jim Griffiths, and the PVC Regional Enterprise, Professor Julian Beer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b> the Chairman would write formally to Professor Griffiths on behalf of the Board to thank him for his considerable contributions to the University over a period of many years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Board briefing:</b> the Board welcomed the revised format proposed for the executive report to the Board, but suggested that there would be value in reporting on some ongoing operational matters as well as major strategic developments.</li> <li>• <b>Research Excellence Framework:</b> the best performance in the REF had been in Science and Engineering, which had secured £1.6m. A further £800K had been secured by medicine, health, and human science. Discussions were underway to identify the most effective means of bringing research in these areas together to maximise impact but there were inevitable frictions and differences of focus which had not yet been resolved.</li> </ul> <p>There had been discussions at the Research and Innovation Committee and UEG about the allocation of REF funding. The proposed approach would allocate some 70% of funding to the area which had secured the money and retain 30% for institutional investment but this had yet to be agreed. As part of the exercise there was a need to understand where faculties had used previous RAE QR funding for permanent appointments which were consequently embedded in their establishment, since the new QR funding was in most cases not additional to that previously allocated. The principle was to link funding and accountability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Research funding:</b> the statement that research was subsidised from other University income reflected the fact that research funding rarely met the full economic costs of research. QR funding was a mechanism designed to meet</li> </ul>	<p>UEG</p> <p>Chairman</p> <p>UEG</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------

	<p>that funding gap, at least in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Somerset Innovation Centre:</b> the University had submitted a bid with a significant number of caveats, including a requirement for assurances on costs. This may disqualify the bid but was important in minimising risk. Going forward, the University would be seeking to apply the same KPIs to Innovation Centres as were being developed for the Plymouth Science Park, but recognised the challenge in relation to Innovation Centres located in Cornwall, given the distances involved.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/04/5</b>	<b>Finance</b>	
5.1	<p><b>Period 7 management accounts (Enclosure E)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• figures were fully in line with all estimates</li> <li>• the projected outcome was in the range £3m-4m: cash had been set aside to deal with adjustments</li> <li>• careful management of staff recruitment had created an acceptable level of surplus but there was a need to consider how this could be sustained</li> <li>• following a reduction in the level of provision for student withdrawal (based on historic trend data), withdrawals were being carefully monitored and there was sufficient provision to meet the current forecast with some room for error</li> <li>• the Board’s increasing confidence in the management accounts</li> <li>• the areas of variance identified in Annex 1 included reductions in maintenance, which raised some concern that the University may be creating a backlog which would impact on the quality of the estate. The University was reviewing the impact in the context of the development of the estate strategy but recognised the need to provide for an appropriate maintenance budget going forward.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/04/6</b>	<b>Staffing</b>	
6.1	<p><b>People Strategy (including Total Reward) (Enclosure F)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the objective of paper was to ensure the Board was aware of the current People Strategy and the priorities for implementation, and had the opportunity to provide feedback</li> <li>• the appendix would be discussed at Remuneration Committee in the coming week</li> <li>• while the broader strategy remained appropriate, the proposal was to move towards an approach which rewarded contribution, not just tenure: this would be challenging given the constraints of the national pay architecture</li> <li>• the need to ensure that judgements in relation to contribution took account of student satisfaction ratings where appropriate and that judgements were seen to be consistent and equitable: robust and trusted systems would need to be in place pre-implementation</li> <li>• the proposal to develop a flat rate bonus for all staff subject to the University’s achieving pre-determined metrics would require careful planning and management</li> <li>• the value of non-monetary recognition should not be under-estimated: the VC Enterprise Awards were being reviewed, with a suggestion that they focus on staff achievement and that other approaches be developed to showcase the University to the city more widely</li> </ul>	<b>US</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the University had an agreed 360° review process</li> <li>the need for effective consultation with staff and staff unions</li> <li>the paper deliberately did not cross-reference academic promotions. These were currently individual awards linked to output rather than role, and would require further discussion</li> <li>the proposal to adopt a single, longer, pay spine which encompassed all staff</li> <li>the University was slightly below the sector average in terms of short term sickness absence rates: the Bradford Score (developed at Bradford University) was used to monitor sickness absence</li> <li>a revised Sickness Absence Policy had just been considered by Employment Committee, and would replace the current 12 month fixed term for calculation of absence (linked with eligibility for sick pay) to a rolling 12 month period</li> <li>the University was not currently accredited for Investors in People. Although this provided a good framework to support the philosophy behind the People Strategy, it would require considerable work so had not been designated a current priority. The Chief Talent Officer would provide a review at a future Board meeting</li> <li>a recommendation from the Employment Committee that the current KPI relating to staff costs was inappropriate and required review was broadly supported.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>broad support for the proposed direction and philosophy and support for the direction of travel.</li> </ul>	<b>CTO</b>
<b>15/04/7</b>	<b><u>Programme updates</u></b>	
7.1	<p><b>Update on Governance Improvement Programme (Enclosure G)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a further meeting in the last week had noted continued good progress in implementing the GGI recommendations within the agreed timescales</li> <li>a recognition that the culture of governance was as important as hard-edged deliverables</li> <li>the importance of communication, particularly face-to-face communication, to ensure that staff understood what was happening</li> <li>the University continued to engage with HEFCE in relation to the outcomes of its assurance review, including reporting progress on addressing the outcomes of the GGI report. HEFCE would review the position formally in accordance with their usual cycle in May/June.</li> </ul>	
7.2	<p><b>Report from the Nominations Committee meeting on 21 April</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Remuneration Committee:</b> a meeting of the Remuneration Committee, comprising all independent governors, had been scheduled for the following week</li> <li><b>Vice-Chancellor appointment:</b> Perrett Laver had been appointed as the recruitment consultants for the appointment of a permanent Vice-Chancellor, following a full tender process</li> <li>the initial work for Perrett Laver would be to engage with stakeholders, including staff, students and external stakeholders, for discussion about the</li> </ul>	

	<p>requirements of the post and postholder. Thereafter an advertisement would be placed and a search initiated, with the intention of interviewing shortlisted candidates in September. A staff News Alert would be going out shortly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need to offer candidates some clarity about the role of University President: the University was taking legal advice on this point</li> <li>• <b>Governor appointments:</b> there had been a welcome level of interest in both the professional services staff governors and Academic Board governor positions</li> <li>• the Nominations Committee had discussed the size and shape of the Board and recommended a maximum membership of 16, including 2 students, 3 staff, the Vice-Chancellor and 9 independent members</li> <li>• in relation to the appointment of new independent governors, the Chairman and Senior Independent Governor would be meeting with a regional recruitment consultant with expertise in recruitment of non-executive directors in the coming week: the use of a recruitment consultant would supplement public advertisement and personal networks to extend the diversity of candidates in terms not only of protected characteristics (specifically gender) but also experience and expertise</li> <li>• co-opted governors were welcome to apply to become independent governors</li> <li>• <b>University Secretary:</b> work needed to be done to define the role in discussion with both the executive and the Board, given the current postholder's intention to retire formally at the end of the calendar year</li> <li>• <b>Committee structures and terms of reference:</b> the need for more work on committee structures and terms of reference, to avoid duplication and to review the functionality of the current Finance Committee and Employment Committee. This would be taken forward at the next meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the recommendation in relation to the size and shape of the Board as indicated above: this would mean that the University would formally be looking to appoint four new independent governors from 1 August 2015</li> <li>• to rename the Nominations Committee as the Governance and Nominations Committee</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chairman</b></p> <p><b>US</b></p> <p><b>Chairman</b></p> <p><b>SIG</b></p> <p><b>CTO/</b></p> <p><b>Chairman</b></p> <p><b>US</b></p> <p><b>US</b></p> <p><b>US</b></p>
7.3	<p><b>Update from the Strategy Implementation Programme</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a number of issues had been covered in discussion under 15/04/04 above</li> <li>• the Group had developed a summary document outlining a target operating model against which to identify priorities, focusing on enabling excellence and financial sustainability</li> <li>• ongoing work on identifying appropriate metrics, with threshold and tolerance bands, which could then be applied to decision-making</li> <li>• permission to 'think the unthinkable' in relation to a range of key issues (eg partnerships, the medical school, the relationship with the military, the student experience, the University environment, the focus on STEM)</li> <li>• the need to ensure that challenging decisions were evidence-based and could be justified in discussion with key stakeholders</li> <li>• the next meeting was intended to be the final meeting, after which the executive would take forward the outcomes and present a 'roadmap' to Academic Board and to the Board of Governors</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the potential for a high level strategic group including some governors, who could brainstorm the key challenges, had been discussed.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/04/8</b>	<b><u>Committee minutes</u></b>	
8.1	<b>Minutes of the Finance Committee held on 18 March 2015</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the need to add Nick Buckland to the list of attendees.</li> </ul>	
8.2	<b>Oral report from the Employment Committee meeting held on 20 April 2015</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the meeting had not achieved a quorum but members had engaged in a useful discussion</li> <li>a new Sickness Absence Policy (referenced in 15/04/6.1 above) had been approved, subject to comments from absent members</li> <li>the Tribal benchmarking report had raised some interesting comparisons by reference to modern universities for whom recent data was available. The Committee had asked for some further checks on the data, which would be considered by Finance Committee on 19 May.</li> <li>the current KPI relating to staff costs had been commented on: the Committee recognised that data was potentially distorted year-on-year by external factors such as increases in National Insurance, or decisions on outsourcing, and that there was a lack of comparable focus on income generation and was therefore suggesting that the KPI be reviewed</li> <li>Athena Swan Awards were significant as a criterion for research awards in medicine and dentistry. Good processes were in place to support submissions</li> <li>generic job descriptions were a work in progress but would be significant in clarifying staff roles. It was hoped that the majority of the work would be completed by September 2015 but individual consultations may take significantly longer.</li> </ul>	
8.3	<b>Oral report from the meeting of the Nominations Committee held on 20 April 2015</b> See 7.2 above	
8.4	<b>Oral report from the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 21 April 2015</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Committee had reviewed actions taken in relation to data quality, which had been an issue for HEFCE previously not highlighted by the Committee. Assurance had been given that concerns had been addressed and HEFCE were satisfied with the quality of the information now provided (although they still had the option to revisit previous returns)</li> <li>although revised processes were now in place, there was still a critical need to change the institutional culture to ensure a widespread appreciation of the essential need for accurate data</li> <li>the Committee had considered internal audit reports on tendering and month end reporting and was confident that management was addressing the issues identified</li> <li>historic audit recommendations had now largely been addressed and the focus was on Deloitte recommendations over then past 12 months. Only seven remained outstanding, which was a considerable improvement</li> <li>in relation to the historic reviews of Admissions and related processes, the</li> </ul>	<b>UEG</b>

	<p>Committee had agreed that the auditors review not specific recommendations but the achievement of outcomes as against the objectives which the recommendations were intended to address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reports on the operation of the Business Partner process had confirmed that while there was more work to do, the system was moving in the right direction</li> <li>• satisfactory reports had been received from external audits on VAT and RCUK awards, although the latter had only been a desk-based exercise</li> <li>• as reported earlier, the Committee had received an update on developments at Brixham</li> <li>• the Committee Chair would discuss with the interim Chief Financial Officer ways of reviewing value for money in relation to income and expenditure</li> <li>• the Committee had as requested by the executive made an assessment of the risk associated with governance issues for incorporation in the Corporate Risk Register</li> <li>• the Committee wished to highlight for the Board the risks associated with graduate employability (where an update on actions had been included in the VCs report); data quality; and financial sustainability, which was already on the Board's agenda</li> <li>• a reference in a National Audit Office investigation into a potential conflict of interest in the University's approach to the assessment of Disabled Students' Allowance had not identified any fault with the University, but its recommendations would lead to a tightening of current rules. It had been agreed that any future NAO investigation would be notified to the Chair of Audit Committee as soon as the University became aware of it.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chair</b></p> <p><b>UEG</b></p>
<b>15/04/9</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
9.1	<p><b>Care leavers</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unite Housing had just announced awards to be made available to students at the University leaving local authority care, comprising free accommodation for 3 years plus a stipend for 5 students.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/04/10</b>	<p><b><u>Date of next meeting</u></b> Tuesday 19 May 2015 at 1430</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; Saltrack 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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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

