

# Plymouth University

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

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 19 May 2015.

Present: James Brent (Chairman) Steve Pearce  
 Sarah Bowman Dr Ranulf Scarbrough  
 Professor Mark Cleary Stephen Tillman  
 Professor David Coslett Henry Warren  
 Duncan Currall Denis Wilkins  
 Professor Terence Lewis

Secretary: Jane Hopkinson, University Secretary

In attendance: Professor Simon Payne, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
 David Beeby, Interim Chief Financial Officer  
 David Alder, Chief Marketing Officer  
 John Wright, Chief Information Officer  
 Siân Millard, Head of Strategy and Performance  
 Gina Connelly, UPSU Chief Executive (for item 3.1)  
 Tim Sydenham, Programme Manager, Strategy Implementation Programme (for item 6.1)  
 Margaret Metcalfe, Executive Administrator

		Action
<b>15/05/1</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: Nick Buckland, Richard Skipper, Margaret Schwarz and            Professor Mary Watkins            UEG members: Professor Ray Playford, Professor Richard Stephenson,            Vikki Matthews</li> </ul>	
1.2	<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 were identified in relation to matters to be discussed: should a conflict become apparent, it must be identified at that point.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/05/2</b>	<b><u>Minutes</u></b>	
2.1	<b>Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on 21 April 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	<b>Matters arising: (Enclosure B)</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Brixham Environmental Laboratories (Minute 15/04/2.2):</b> exclusivity</li> </ul>	

	<p>terms had come to an end at the end of April, and the prospective tenant had not taken their interest forward. A meeting with an alternative anchor tenant, who had expressed considerable interest, was scheduled for 21 May, and the Board would be advised of the outcomes at its next meeting. The University was also in preliminary discussions with two other commercial research organisations (who had previously been in discussions with Astra Zeneca) and would continue to pursue appropriate tenancies. There would then be a need to consider the long-term future of the facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Future planning (Minute 15/04/4):</b> Finance Committee had considered a preliminary draft of the HEFCE three-year forecast at its meeting earlier in the day</li> <li>• <b>Dean of Research &amp; Innovation (Minute 15/04/4):</b> the Chairman had written to Professor Jim Griffiths on behalf of the Board to thank him for his considerable contributions to the University</li> <li>• <b>People Strategy (including Total Reward) (Minute 15/04/6.1):</b> the Chief Talent Officer would be asked to confirm when the item on Investors in People accreditation would be presented to the Board for consideration.</li> </ul>	CTO
<b>15/05/3</b>	<b>Presentation</b>	
3.1	<p><b>UPSU Strategic Plan update</b>  <i>Presentation by Sarah Bowman and Gina Connelly</i>  <b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the hard-copy Plan was tabled</li> <li>• key messages included UPSU’s significant growth and the Union’s achievements since the launch of the previous (2012) plan</li> <li>• the vision, mission and values agreed in 2012 had been retained</li> <li>• feedback had been sought from students, staff, trustees and stakeholders: it was intended to repeat the Big 10 student survey annually</li> <li>• the most important functions of the SU had been identified as: representation and campaigning on issues that matter to students; an advice service; and diverse entertainment and social events</li> <li>• this year, support for students in relation to employability had also been highlighted</li> <li>• student concerns focused on money, and value for money, academic achievement, career prospects and employability, and workload</li> <li>• international students generally identified a higher level of concern in relation to some of these issues and UPSU was reviewing ways in which it could provide more targeted support</li> <li>• a small survey of potential students carried out on applicant day, had reaffirmed the focus on student representation – and highlighted a continuing focus on the student experience as a reason for coming to university</li> <li>• UPSU had reviewed its strategic ambitions to focus on fewer, clear themes which reflected student voices and also ensured that all staff were clearly able to identify the ambitions to which they were contributing</li> <li>• the key themes were: representation and democracy; participation and engagement (including sports clubs, volunteering, societies and extra-curricular activities); employability; support and wellbeing; communities (being all the communities within which students lived, studied and socialised); and sustainability (not just the green agenda but also</li> </ul>	

	<p>organisational sustainability)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the next steps would be to define (up to 8) strategic goals to sit underneath each ambition and to develop a three year financial plan and realign the staffing structure</li> <li>• the intention to develop a more joined-up approach with the University in terms of supporting employability, where the SU approach would potentially include training to help students to articulate their skills and sessions both for unsuccessful UPSU election candidates and the committees associated with clubs and societies to articulate what they had learned from those experiences</li> <li>• a number of priorities for development and growth, but also constraints and limitations</li> <li>• the Plan would be launched formally at the UPSU handover on 30 June, to which governors were invited</li> <li>• an implementation plan would outline the projects and activities through which the Plan would be delivered: all departmental plans would be linked explicitly with the Plan and monitored</li> <li>• priority areas for investment were: academic representation and sports, societies and activities, where there was a need to extend the current offer</li> <li>• currently UPSU ran 112 societies and 56 clubs: a list of the current provision would be circulated. The Re-freshers Fair which had been initiated in January to reintroduce first year students to the range of clubs and societies on offer at a time when they were more settled in the University had proved very successful, as had the ability to join online at any time, and a more open approach to setting up new clubs and societies</li> <li>• the limited on-campus or University owned facilities for sport was an issue and could deter students from participating, given the need to travel to a range of facilities across the City (available either through partnership agreements with the University or through direct rental). Fragmentation of the sporting infrastructure had an impact on associated social life</li> <li>• nonetheless the University had a significant number of teams competing in British Universities and Colleges Sport (BUCS) events and sat at around 40 in the BUCS league tables.</li> <li>• congratulations to UPSU in coming 19<sup>th</sup> in the NSS survey</li> <li>• UPSU had not previously had the data which would facilitate national comparisons, having only recently entered into a formal data-sharing agreement with the University, but this was a future possibility</li> <li>• thanks to the UPSU President and Chief Executive for a very informative presentation.</li> </ul>	<p>UPSU/US</p>
<p>15/05/4</p>	<p><b><u>University Report to the Board (Enclosure C)</u></b>  <b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• following discussion at the previous meeting, the format of the report had been updated to include not only University highlights but issues in leadership and management across key functions of the University</li> <li>• the former Faculty of Science and Environment had been renamed the Faculty of Science and Engineering to reflect more accurately the range of disciplines within it</li> <li>• the recruitment process for the appointment of the substantive Vice-Chancellor was underway. Recruitment for other key senior appointments (Chief Financial Officer and Pro Vice-Chancellor Research (PVC-R)) was also</li> </ul>	

	<p>in progress. Governors asked whether the appointment of the PVC-R could be delayed until a substantive Vice-Chancellor was appointed to enable the incoming VC to participate in the appointment process. The Executive believed that this was a key role which needed to be covered. The urgent need for action in terms of research strategy was creating pressures in the context of a significant number of interim appointments. Should shortlisting not identify potentially excellent candidates, the position would be reviewed. It was anticipated that an incoming Vice-Chancellor would nonetheless have the opportunity to review the structure and composition of their executive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the latest league tables identified that Plymouth had dropped to 90<sup>th</sup> in the Complete University Guide. This reflected the fact that, while the University was making progress, it was not currently keeping pace with developments elsewhere. On the other hand, Plymouth had risen from 42<sup>nd</sup> to 37<sup>th</sup> in the Times Higher Education Top 100 Under 50 league table, largely as a result of its research performance</li> <li>• employability was one of the key issues which the University needed to address: this year's Destination of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE) survey showed an improvement over previous years but this would need to be correlated with relative performance in other institutions before it was possible to identify whether it would impact on league table position. The Board asked that the University provide an update on the actions it had taken with regard to employability and their effectiveness</li> <li>• facilities spend was another indicator in which the University was not keeping pace with its competitors</li> <li>• apparent differences in the student/staff ratio data derived from HESA and used in league tables and that reflected in the Tribal benchmarking data. This may reflect the University's high proportion of part time staff, particularly given a recent change to the classification rules which would require that such staff were returned as a proportion of an FTE rather than in relation to their teaching load</li> <li>• more students had completed the NSS this year, but this did not necessarily mean better outcomes: data would be available in August</li> <li>• a League Table Steering Group, chaired by Professor Nikolaos Tzokas, Dean of Business, had been set up to review the metrics and look more carefully at a proactive approach to the data: the Board asked that he make a presentation to a subsequent meeting</li> <li>• the Chief Talent Officer had provided a breakdown of staff by various categories, but governors had found it difficult to identify those staff who were directly student facing in terms of teaching and learning: this may reflect the strict HESA classification rules but the CTO would be asked to review and provide more clarity where possible</li> <li>• the current KPI in relation to staff costs had been discussed at a number of Board Committees recently and there was general agreement that in its current form it was not fit for purpose</li> <li>• the fifth UPSU Student Staff Teaching and Reps (SSTAR) Awards had been held on 30 April 2015. There had been a number of nominations from partner colleges, and South Devon College in particular had done very well</li> <li>• further to the National Audit Office (NAO) Report around the allocation of SFE disability funding at Plymouth University, which had been commented on by the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee and reported in the</li> </ul>	<p><b>DVC (RS)</b></p> <p><b>Dean of Business</b></p> <p><b>Chief Talent Officer</b></p> <p><b>Head of Strategy and Performance</b></p>
--	---	---

	<p>press, BIS was keen to continue discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the reference to the “Prevent” initiative should not be read as indicating that the University was confident that all staff were engaged: the initial focus had been on student services staff, but this would be rolled out more widely. It was likely that this would continue to be a government priority</li> <li>the line management accountability for student services had been reconfigured following the resignation of the Dean of Students</li> <li>research income had increased by £1,160,000 on the previous year, but this reflected the timing of research awards rather than any significant uplift in the volume of research</li> <li>with almost two thirds of its submission to REF graded at three and four stars, Plymouth had performed well by comparison with other post-92 institutions, although it was notable that others who had secured sufficient surpluses over several years to invest more heavily in research were now making significant steps forward</li> <li>Earth Science and Allied Health currently attracted more REF income than medicine, but medicine provided valuable opportunities for inter-disciplinary research</li> <li>sectoral and institutional thinking about the implications of the election outcome</li> <li>controls on immigration continued to be an issue of concern: UUK was challenging the inclusion of students in net migration figures. The issue of clamp down on post-study work visas at a time when other countries were relaxing their rules or even introducing new opportunities placed the UK at a competitive disadvantage in the recruitment of international postgraduate students. Governors were encouraged to make these points known through their networks</li> <li>a report on the University’s Access Agreement would be brought to the Board following the ongoing refresh of the Widening Participation strategy</li> <li>the summary of discussions and decisions by UEG (Annex I) was being well received by staff.</li> </ul>	<p>All</p> <p>DVC(RS)</p>
<b>15/05/5</b>	<b><u>Governance</u></b>	
5.1	<p><b>Update on the Governance Improvement Programme (Enclosure D)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the update had been discussed earlier in the day by the Governance and Nominations Committee</li> <li>work was moving ahead and largely on target, although time and resource constraints were having some impact</li> <li>the Academic Board review group was meeting for the first time on 21 May and among the issues which it was being asked to address was the means by which ACB provided the Board with appropriate assurance in relation to academic governance</li> <li>the importance of ensuring that the next ACB agenda reflected the commitment to strengthening the academic voice in key decisions</li> <li>given the extensive consultation undertaken by the GGI review, it should be possible to make changes relatively rapidly.</li> </ul>	
5.2	<p><b>Draft Schedule of Delegation (Enclosure E)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the GGI Governance Review had recommended the development of a</li> </ul>	

	<p>formal Schedule of Delegation. This was key to moving forward with a number of the GGI recommendations, and was intended to ensure that there was clarity about the ultimate authority for key decisions, the extent to which that authority had been delegated and to whom, and any conditions attached to that delegation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the document was generally felt to be both helpful and interesting</li> <li>• the value of clarifying the distinction between formal approval and advice/discussion and the order of the activities listed</li> <li>• in terms of strategy, it was for the executive to develop and propose strategy: the Board was responsible for approving strategy after appropriate testing and constructive challenge. In this context it would be expected that there would be ongoing engagement with the Board throughout the development process. This would be clarified in the Schedule</li> <li>• health and safety was a key omission, given the legal accountability of both the Vice-Chancellor and Chairman as set out in the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act</li> <li>• the value of distinguishing the various roles of the Vice-Chancellor, as key academic lead, as Chief Executive, and crucially as Accountable Officer</li> <li>• the need to clarify the process for monitoring the exercise of delegated authorities</li> <li>• governors were invited to submit further comments to the University Secretary: a final schedule of delegation would be presented to the July Board meeting, although it was recognised that there would be further iterations as it became operational</li> <li>• once approved, the schedule would be accompanied by an alpha list of the key decisions, for ease of reference, and would be lodged on the Governance site on both the intranet and extranet</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the template as proposed, subject to the comment above.</li> </ul>	<p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>All</p> <p>US</p>
5.3	<p><b>Draft revised Instrument and Articles (Enclosure F)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the purpose of the revision was to provide a simplified Instrument and Articles which were more relevant and usable than the version originally produced in 1988</li> <li>• any changes required Privy Council approval: changes to the Instrument were limited by the requirement for statutory authority but there was significantly more flexibility in relation to the Articles</li> <li>• the terms of reference of the Board and any proposed changes to the role of the Vice-Chancellor should be reviewed against the CUC Code of HE Governance</li> <li>• given that anything enshrined in the Instrument and Articles would require Privy Council approval of future changes, it was intended to make no reference to roles such as University President or Pro-Chancellor which may or may not have longevity. This in no way prevented the University from adopting those titles</li> <li>• the Academic Board Review Group would be asked to look at the terms of reference for Academic Board</li> <li>• the need to include reference to the University’s authority to enter into</li> </ul>	<p>US</p> <p>Review group</p> <p>US</p>

	<p>specific financial transactions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the intention to include provision for holding meetings electronically</li> <li>support for the direction of travel and the changes proposed to date.</li> </ul>	US
<b>15/05/6</b>	<b><u>Strategic Planning</u></b>	
6.1	<p><b>University's developing approach to strategic planning (Enclosure G)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the paper provided information on the timeline associated with the Strategy Implementation Programme, which had been accelerated, with the support of the Programme Manager, in order to maximise outputs available by the end of the academic year</li> <li>a number of headline activities were already underway and were being undertaken simultaneously with the development of a 3-5 year implementation 'road-map'</li> <li>a draft framework and metrics against which decisions would be measured had been developed</li> <li>on 20 May, the Steering Group would be reviewing the proposed prioritisation framework and metrics, accompanying structures and processes, and the outline road map and would then hand over to the Executive to manage implementation</li> <li>in relation to financial sustainability, it would be necessary to sign-off on a HEFCE financial forecast in June based largely on the status quo while working on more stretching surplus targets internally in order to secure funds for reinvestment and to support potential future borrowing</li> <li>the University continued to focus on improving its strategic and business intelligence</li> <li>planning was underway for a major portfolio review and a review of research. The portfolio review would be informed by metrics but would also require the exercise of judgment and the University would need to make the most effective use of available expertise in taking this forward</li> <li>Deans and Heads of Services had been required to focus on key priorities relating to financial sustainability, student satisfaction, student employability and international and growth in post graduate recruitment as part of the current year's business planning process</li> <li>the University was reviewing potential capital developments, including new sports facilities, and accommodation for the Business School and for the Health and Human Sciences, twin-tracked with the commencement of an Estate Strategy</li> <li>in order to maximise high quality student recruitment and admissions, the external relations function was being reoriented with a more significant focus on the recruitment and marketing offer</li> <li>a more focused approach to league table performance was under development</li> <li>in terms of the overall strategy, there had hitherto been no argument that the University should continue to be other than a broad-based institution with clusters of research excellence: the key decisions would relate to how broadly-based and how many clusters</li> <li>there would inevitably be agreement about a commitment to excellence but there were likely to be different views about the definition of excellence and where various areas of the University were on that journey, measured against a wide range of metrics</li> </ul>	Board US/CFO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>financial sustainability must be an overarching priority</li> <li>given the need for potentially challenging decisions, it would be essential to agree a communication programme to maximise buy-in from staff from the outset</li> <li>the need to be realistic about what could be achieved in any given timescale</li> <li>in relation to investment in capital infrastructure, the need to consider the level of risk which the Board was prepared to accept in the context of levels of borrowing</li> <li>the Board/UEG Away Day on 9 June would discuss the prioritisation framework, the outline road map and its formal testing and due diligence, and key short term priorities: this would be a key opportunity for deeper reflection</li> <li>the need to consider ways of enabling the Board to make informed and constructive challenge as part of the process, through developing a better understanding of strengths and weaknesses at School level. The 9 June meeting should provide a general overview, which could be further refined in discussion with Deans</li> <li>as the portfolio review was taken forward by Deans and tested by UEG and the Board, data would be programme and subject based and at a high level of granularity</li> <li>at the Awayday, the Board would need to understand the key metrics and their interaction</li> <li>thanks to the Steering Group for their considerable work.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CMO</b></p> <p><b>Chairman/VC</b></p> <p><b>Chairman/VC</b></p> <p><b>Chairman/VC</b></p>
<b>15/05/7</b>	<b>Finance</b>	
7.1	<p><b>Period 8 management accounts (Enclosure H)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the paper had been discussed in detail at Finance Committee</li> <li>a forecast operating surplus for the full year at period 8 was c£3m compared to the original target of £1.6m. This had been achieved by measures such as careful management of staff vacancies but this was not a long-term strategy for enhancing surplus or delivering growth</li> <li>there would be an unavoidable increase in staff costs for 2015/16 as a result of increased pensions and national insurance contributions as well as increments and the national pay award</li> <li>the need to secure a step change in order to secure the levels of surplus necessary for reinvestment in estates and facilities.</li> </ul>	
<b>15/05/8</b>	<p><b>Report from the Remuneration Committee (Enclosure I)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the report would be circulated with the agenda for consideration at the next meeting.</li> </ul>	<b>US</b>
<b>15/05/9</b>	<b>Equality and Diversity</b>	
9.1	<p><b>Developments to address gender diversity (Enclosure J)</b></p> <p><b>Noted.</b></p>	
<b>15/05/10</b>	<b>HEFCE</b>	
10.1	<b>Update on the HEFCE assurance schedule(Enclosure K)</b>	

	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an update on the HEFCE assurance schedule</li> <li>• the standard annual letter from HEFCE regarding institutions' assurance status was anticipated in the near future</li> <li>• the data quality internal audit report had been received in draft and was the subject of management comment. It would be considered by the Audit Committee in June.</li> </ul>	US
<b>15/05/11</b>	<b>Committee minutes</b>	
11.1	<p><b>Oral report from the Governance and Nominations Committee meeting held on 19 May 2015</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Committee had spent considerable time in discussion of the Governance Improvement Programme, focussing specifically on the need to secure assurance from the Academic Board on academic governance and the links between the Executive and the faculties</li> <li>• a discussion about the role of both Finance Committee and Employment Committee had been inconclusive and final recommendations would come to the next meeting. The Committee had agreed the need to reduce duplication and enhance the value of debate, and to ensure that the Board paid appropriate attention to key issues without losing the levels of granularity which currently characterised debate in those committees</li> <li>• the Committee had considered the schedule of delegation and draft Instrument and Articles, as presented to the Board</li> <li>• the intention to use an appropriate regionally based search firm with experience of recruiting non-executive directors to enhance the process of recruiting new governors: this would require consideration of three quotes and the University Secretary was identifying potential firms who might be invited to tender</li> <li>• an updated role profile for governors had been discussed and would be presented to the wider Board in June</li> <li>• given the move to a more transparent approach, the Committee proposed that Board agenda sheets and minutes should be published on the University's website (following approval at the next meeting) with redactions agreed by the Board where necessary</li> <li>• a suggestion that the University consider the publication of senior staff salaries, and potentially a summary of expenses, had been referred to the University Executive Group</li> <li>• copies of agendas for all Board Committee meetings would henceforth be circulated to all Governors, who would be welcome to attend any meeting as an observer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the publication of agendas and minutes as proposed. The University Secretary would review minutes for the current academic session to identify necessary redactions prior to publication.</li> </ul>	<p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>UEG</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p>
11.2	<p><b>Oral report from Finance Committee meeting held on 19 May 2015</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Committee had discussed the management accounts for Period 8, which had also been presented to the Board</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the format of the three year HEFCE financial forecasts had been considered and a final draft would come to the June meeting of the Board</li> <li>the Committee <b>recommended</b> approval of changes to the bank mandate and a resolution relating to the renewal of banking facilities: this was a standard resolution requiring Board approval</li> <li>the Tribal benchmarking data had been discussed, and was very illuminating. It would be presented to the Board at the June meeting</li> <li>the Committee had received an update on the development of the Estates Strategy, which was currently a work in progress</li> <li>costs for the Derriford Research Facility had increased due to a rise in construction costs as a result of market factors and the complexity of the specification: the Committee had agreed an increase in budget of c£400K</li> <li>the Committee had been advised of an Audio Visual Refresh and Content Capture project, which aimed to address failures of AV equipment which were resulting in disruption in a number of teaching rooms and were impacting on the student experience. This was now redesigned to incorporate a Content Capture pilot. Virtually all the costs had been covered within the existing envelope, plus the use of savings within other budgets which the Committee had agreed should be released</li> <li>the Committee had received an update on the appetite in the financial market for investment in HE, which had identified that there was a healthy appetite for the type of development the University might wish to undertake. The remaining constraint was the scope within the balance sheet. The interim Chief Financial Officer considered this was currently a maximum of £50m (£25m cash and £25m borrowings) but this could increase were the University able to increase its surpluses above the current forecast.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the formal resolution in relation to banking facilities and the recommendation in relation to changes to the bank mandate.</li> </ul>	
11.3	<b>Minutes of the Employment Committee held on 20 April 2015</b> <b>Noted.</b>	
11.4	<b>Minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 21 April 2015</b> <b>Noted.</b>	
11.5	<b>Minutes of the Nominations Committee held on 21 April 2015</b> <b>Noted.</b>	
<b>15/05/12</b>	<b><u>Any other business</u></b>	
12.1	<b>Draft KPIs for Plymouth Science Park</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the schedule of draft KPIs for the Plymouth Science Park was tabled, and the Board was invited to submit comments to the Chief Information Officer.</li> </ul>	<b>All</b>
12.2	<b>Board Away day</b> <b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the agenda for the Board away day on 9 June was currently being developed and would be circulated in advance</li> <li>the agenda would include information on the objectives of each session.</li> </ul>	<b>VC Chairman</b>

<b>15/05/13</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b> Board Away Day - Tuesday 9 June 2015 Formal meeting - Tuesday 16 June 2015 at 1430	
-----------------	--	--

**Appendix 1: Declarations of interest**

Name	Organisation	Role
James Brent	Akkeron Group LLP	Chairman and CEO
	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	Director
	Plymouth Argyle Football Club Limited	Chairman
	Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust	Chairman (non Exec)
	South West Ticketing Solutions Limited; The Plymouth Pavilions Limited; Resurgam (West End) Limited; Suite Hospitality Limited;	Director
Nick Buckland OBE	Plymouth University	Pro Chancellor & Member of Board of Governors, Associate Lecturer, PhD Student
	Finance Cornwall /Finance South West	Board Member
	Theatre Royal Plymouth	Board Member and Trustee
	PA Central Limited	Director and part owner
	Shebbear College	Governor and Trustee
	First Great Western	Advisory Board member
	Ditchen Farm	Joint Owner
	The British Computer Society	Fellow
	The Chartered Management Institute	Fellow
	The Royal Society of Arts	Fellow
	The Institute of Maths & it's Applications	Fellow
	The Royal institution	Member
	The Institute of Directors	Member
	The Wellcome Trust	Brother in law is Chief Operating Officer
	Cornwall Adult Education Service	Wife works as a Curriculum Manager
	Careers SW	Board Member
	Tempus Leisure Ltd	Board Member
National Trust	Non-elected member of Council (Governance Community)	
SuperFast Cornwall - EDT	Chair Steering Group	
Slough and Eton Business and Enterprise Academy	Chair Governor	

	Elected member of the Council for the Institute of Mathematics Cornwall College PCH Dental Ltd Maxxim Consulting Karst PCH CIC	Elected member of the Council Member of Council Chair 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

